

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2010-11**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2010-11 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 145](#), to advise the President and Senate agencies on the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. The BOARS chair also charged two subcommittees – Transfer and Articulation and Evaluation – with reporting to the parent committee about specific topics. One hour of each regular committee meeting was set aside for subcommittee break-outs; the subcommittees also met in between meetings via teleconference. BOARS also collaborates closely with consultants in the UCOP Office of Admissions. The major activities of BOARS and its subcommittees, and the issues they addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

PRESIDENT’S RESOLUTION ON INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC ADMISSIONS

President Yudof responded to recommendations BOARS made in its May 2010 [Report on Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions](#) by asking BOARS to recommend several next steps to campuses: (1) incorporate electronic read sheet data into their selection process; (2) implement individualized review of all applicants and reduce the number of applicants admitted based on a limited set of factors; (3) develop a plan to use a holistic scoring system as part of the 2012 reforms (selective campuses); and (4) collaborate on generating holistic scores (all campuses).

Some campuses opposed a holistic review mandate, noting that single score holistic review is only one possible approach to comprehensive review. Holistic review has advantages, but campuses should be allowed to rely on established methods of individualized review as the admissions reform is implemented while they explore the possibility of moving to a holistic process. BOARS was also concerned about holistic review being equated with selection; the score is important for campuses that use holistic review, but it is not the only factor they use in selection. School context priorities or proposed major can also have significant impact on admissions outcomes and should not be lost in the discussion.

In its response to the President, BOARS affirmed its goal of having every UC applicant receive an individualized review and every campus using read sheet information in individualized review, noting that campuses will find single-score holistic evaluation useful as they become more selective and that the diversity of the student body can be enhanced through other best practices such as school context priorities. BOARS also affirmed that all campuses should receive Berkeley and UCLA holistic review scores beginning in 2011, and should collaboratively devise a plan for the remaining applications to receive a holistic score. Finally, BOARS agreed to examine the use of the holistic read scores in the referral process and identify areas for further work essential to successful implementation of the new [Freshman Admissions Policy](#) taking effect for fall 2012, including establishing a metric for ensuring admissions offices have sufficient personnel for adequate individualized review and outreach at every campus.

In December, BOARS reviewed the President’s draft resolution to the Regents regarding *Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions*. At the request of BOARS, the Academic Council [endorsed](#) the resolution, noting that its diversity goals can best be realized with enriched and focused outreach, recruitment, and yield efforts. The Regents adopted the resolution at their January meeting.

At the May Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) meeting, it was suggested that BOARS develop a policy and procedure for campuses that want to request an exemption from holistic review. BOARS views an exemption process as unnecessary. It will respect local Admission Committees' authority to make decisions and not intervene unless concerns are raised. The Committee also asks UCOP to consult with BOARS about any concerns it may have about local implementation first to allow BOARS to make a recommendation.

ADMISSIONS OUTCOMES AT CAMPUSES IMPLEMENTING HOLISTIC REVIEW

BOARS paid particular attention to admissions outcomes at campuses using holistic review in selection for the first time in 2010. One campus followed an approach similar to UCLA and another used a dual review system that admitted applicants based on holistic review and the prior year's numeric comprehensive review. Outcomes on that campus indicated that holistic scoring could result in a smaller proportion of underrepresented minority and First Generation College admits, and a larger proportion of high-income admits, compared to a more numeric comprehensive review. BOARS notes, however, that the holistic score is only one factor in the final selection decision. There are many possible explanations for these outcomes, and the campus has a variety of options for fine tuning their selection processes. BOARS asks that as campuses import holistic scores and/or scoring approaches from another campus, they remember that local values help drive holistic scores. Ideally, each campus should develop its own holistic scoring rubric based on read sheet data and context information reflecting its applicant pool. BOARS stands behind the basic fairness of holistic review, but notes that Regents policy allows campuses flexibility in the approaches they use to meet admissions goals, and there are selective campuses that do not use holistic scores who also achieve academic excellence and diversity in admission outcomes.

COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND UCLA STATEMENT ON THE FUTURE OF UC

In November, BOARS commented on an Academic Council recommendation that UC reduce the number of employees, including faculty, though attrition; institute a moratorium on construction; and require chancellors to identify a stable source of funding for any new program and its impact on existing programs. BOARS also commented on an alternative statement drafted by the UCLA division. BOARS expressed concern about the implications of downsizing for undergraduate student enrollment, diversity, and access, but also accepted that serious actions were necessary to protect UC from cuts. BOARS restated its continued support for the [Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment](#) authored by BOARS and endorsed by the Academic Council in 2009, and for increasing non-resident undergraduate enrollment insofar as UC can maintain its Master Plan commitment to residents and in the context of appropriate enrollment funding from the state. BOARS also recommended that faculty and administrators work together to coordinate undergraduate programs across campuses to ensure that UC does not unnecessarily reduce undergraduate access.

CLARIFICATION OF PRINCIPLES FOR NON-RESIDENT ENROLLMENT

As the year progressed, it became clear that all campuses planned to increase non-resident enrollment. BOARS discussed the effect of increasing non-resident enrollment on UC's ability to serve the California population. As a result of APTF discussions, Chair Jacob asked the Committee to address an ambiguity in Principle #6 of the [Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment](#). Principle #6 was based upon the [Master Plan](#) requirement that out-of-state applicants meet higher entrance requirements and "stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible." While BOARS has interpreted this to mean that each campus should admit

nonresidents in the upper half of their admit pool, there was the concern that “eligibility” could instead be interpreted as general UC eligibility, which could significantly alter nonresident admit standards at selective campuses, and that this ambiguity could become greater with the 2012 eligibility reform. With the help and consent of the APTF, BOARS drafted a clarification of Principle 6, noting that its purpose is to help prevent a resident applicant from claiming that her/his admission slot was taken by a non-resident with weaker credentials but a willingness to pay non-resident tuition. BOARS also re-emphasized the importance of Principle 3, which states that “non-resident enrollment should not be used exclusively as a revenue-producing strategy to the detriment of resident access,” and Principle 5, which urges that “fiscal considerations should not be a primary factor guiding the review of files or admissions decisions.” The Academic Council [endorsed](#) BOARS’ revision in June.

“FUNDING STREAMS” PROPOSAL

Associate Vice President for Budget Debora Obley joined BOARS in February to discuss UCOP’s “Funding Streams” budget proposal, which allows campuses to retain all revenues they generate, to help provide background for BOARS’ discussion of the distribution and use of application fee revenue. The Committee’s comments to the Academic Council on Funding Streams included a concern about how the new budget model could impact admissions processing functions. BOARS also was concerned that Funding Streams could weaken UCOP’s ability to influence enrollment targets, and that decentralization of enrollment planning could fail to protect the campuses’ collective interests and the systemwide character of the University. BOARS did endorse UCOP’s decision to distribute application fee revenue to campuses based on the number of applications received, regardless of fee waivers granted to students applying to a particular campus.

BOARS PRINCIPLES AND METRIC FOR ADMISSIONS FUNDING

In May, the Academic Council endorsed a funding [metric](#) developed by BOARS to assist campuses in determining the staffing required for the review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts necessary to implement the new freshman admissions policy. Council’s memo to President Yudof asked the President to forward BOARS’ analysis to the campus executive vice chancellors.

The funding metric highlights BOARS’ concern that the success of the new admissions policy will require campus admissions offices to have more resources available to handle the anticipated increase in applications and the required individualized reviews, but that campuses may not have adequate resources due to budget cuts and the implementation of the Funding Streams budget model. To develop the metric, BOARS surveyed the nine undergraduate campus admissions offices about their freshman and transfer admissions workload and available staff resources. The survey revealed general consistency across campuses in the time and personnel required for individualized review of particular types of applications. BOARS used the data to determine the personnel resources necessary to support implementation of the policy at each campus. The metric does not prescribe funding levels; rather, it identifies the per applicant staff necessary to meet the Regents expectations regarding comprehensive and individualized review. The admissions process will be at risk if campuses fall below these levels. The funding provided to campuses under Funding Streams will be equalized to ensure that campuses with larger numbers of fee waivers are not handicapped. BOARS believes that admissions offices will have sufficient resources if they receive funding per applicant derived from application fees. Chair Jacob participated in a conference call with campus EVCs, where he communicated BOARS’ intent to establish the metric, and the metric was thoroughly discussed and supported by the

APTF. BOARS is concerned that admissions offices may be short personnel if application numbers grow substantially next year, which will put the 2012 reforms at risk. The Committee has asked that campuses be given the flexibility to hire back retirees on short notice in December.

TRANSFER ADMISSION

BOARS Transfer Subcommittee

The Transfer Subcommittee (Bill Jacob, Tyrone Howard, John Whiteley, Charles Akemann, Ralph Aldredge, Daniel Widener, and Adam Jackson-Boothby) met monthly to discuss, among other topics, UC's response to transfer legislation; the work of the UC transfer "streamlining" groups who met to explore commonalities in lower division major requirements across campuses; the Course Identification Numbering System; a UCI Computer Science Department request that students receive 12 quarter units for a score of 3 or better on the AP Computer Science BC exam; and a proposal to add the Statway statistics sequence as transferrable to UC and to IGETC. The subcommittee also explored the possibility that UC recognize CSU's General Education Breadth pattern, which would benefit prospective Community College transfers who could choose between IGETC and CSU Breadth knowing they would be prepared for either institution. This latter issue was ultimately rejected by a BOARS/UCEP/UCOPE working group.

Responding to Transfer Legislation

BOARS discussed the California legislature's request that UC and CSU accept more Community College transfer students and make the transfer and course articulation process more efficient and effective. In March, Executive Director Michele Siqueiros and Associate Director Jessie Ryan of the Campaign for College Opportunity joined BOARS to discuss SB 1440 and AB 2302, transfer legislation authored by the Campaign, which requires CSU and the California Community Colleges to design Associates Degrees for transfer to CSU and requests the participation of UC in streamlining transfer to UC. BOARS expressed support for the goals of the legislation, although there was concern about unintended consequences and the lack of data projecting the effect of the CCC/CSU implementation of SB 1440 on transfer readiness, which could backfire for students uncertain of their intended major upon entry to the CCC. BOARS' work on transfer and its Transfer Proposal are also discussed in UC's June 2011 interim report to the legislature as required by AB 2302.

Transfer Proposal

In July, the Academic Council voted to send a [BOARS proposal](#) for major-based transfer admissions to the campuses for targeted review. The proposal outlines new pathways to transfer admission that parallel the "entitled to review" feature of the new Freshman Admission Policy taking effect for fall 2012. UC transfer applicants would be entitled to a review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete any one of three proposed pathway options: completion of a yet to be developed UC Transfer Curriculum with a minimum GPA set by each campus; completion of an SB 1440 AA Degree for Transfer with a minimum GPA to be set by each campus; or the current pathway specified in Senate Regulation 476. The proposal responds to the requirements of AB 2302 that UC consider aligning transfer with the AB 1440 Transfer AA degrees. BOARS believes the approach will also improve the preparation of UC transfers, as many campuses/departments currently evaluate applicants on the basis of specific major preparation, but others admit them using general transfer requirements and GPA. It is in the best interest of UC and potential transfers to have a consistent evaluation approach. BOARS wants to

communicate to community college students that if they pick a major, prepare for it, and show a strong case for being able to complete their declared majors in two years, they will be fully considered for transfer to UC. The proposal will retain current Transfer Guarantee Programs (TAG), which some campuses may choose to expand while other campuses are reducing due to yield that exceeds capacity.

Transfer Credit for Courses Taken in the Military

On the advice of the Transfer Subcommittee, BOARS endorsed a proposal from the Office of Student Affairs to remove current restrictions on the acceptance of military coursework for transfer to UC. The change allows UC to accept American Council on Education (ACE) credit standards to award academic credit for courses completed as part of military education.

Revisions to Senate Regulation 480

Admissions Evaluation Coordinator Evera Spears joined BOARS in March to discuss UCOP's proposed clarification of [Senate Regulation 480](#), which relates to transfer credit for students whose pre-collegiate education was largely completed in a single language other than English, and who then enroll in courses in that language. Campus evaluators differ in their interpretation of the regulation and were asking for clarification. BOARS and the Transfer Subcommittee agreed to a revision, which the Academic Council approved in April. It will be reviewed by the Academic Assembly in 2011-12.

BOARS ARTICULATION AND EVALUATION (A&E) SUBCOMMITTEE

The A&E Subcommittee (George Johnson, Juan Poblete, John Heraty, Lynn Huntsinger, Susan Amussen, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, and Mallory Valenzuela) was charged with reviewing issues around high school preparation, the 'a-g' requirements, and selected courses submitted for a-g approval where faculty input is required. It focused considerable attention this year on on-line provider applications, and more generally, the role of online education in secondary education. The Subcommittee met monthly during regular BOARS meetings and also held additional conference calls to conduct business.

Online Providers of 'a-g' Courses

Early in the year, A&E expressed concern that BOARS' 2006 policy outlining the [Criteria for Approval of Online Providers and Courses](#) was no longer relevant to the rapidly evolving nature of the online education industry. The subcommittee recommended that BOARS suspend course and provider applications until it had a chance to consult with educators and experts to help determine whether the current criteria and processes are appropriate, review data on course-takers, and compare online and traditional course completion, passing rates, and grade distributions. There was concern that BOARS would be obligated to assess applications according to existing criteria and that delaying approval would inconvenience under-resourced school districts and students that need online courses to help fulfill the a-g criteria. In January, BOARS met with Senior UC Counsel Mary MacDonald to review the legal ramifications of a moratorium.

The A&E subcommittee spoke on the phone with representatives from the Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and San Jose school districts, who answered questions about their rationale for partnering with online providers, how districts provide and assess online courses, and how they address the possibility of differential access to online courses and technology. In April, Kelly Schwirzke, Santa Clara County Office of Education Online Learning

Coordinator, met with both BOARS and A&E to discuss her study of online learning in K-12 school districts. A&E agreed to resume consideration of pending applications according to the current policy with the understanding that all providers would be asked to regularly provide data that are not currently being provided. The Subcommittee approved several new providers and rejected others. BOARS also expressed interest in obtaining more information about the number and type of online courses taken by UC applicants, and approved the idea of including a box on *ApplyUC* that applicants would check if a course was taken online; however, this addition to the application was deemed unworkable at present.

SCORE SHARING PLAN FOR 2012 ADMISSIONS

BOARS discussed UCOP's plan to offer all campuses the same application data in "read sheet" form that UCLA and UCB now receive, to use as they see fit, campus plans to incorporate these data into their review processes, and additional data elements that would be useful to incorporate into the read sheets. The read sheets would be customized to include campus specific data elements (comparisons among applicants to that campus) for each campus. BOARS also discussed the idea of generating holistic review scores for every UC applicant and sharing them across campuses. BOARS decided it would be better to propose a general plan for score sharing that does not push for a specific mode of implementation to allow campuses to maintain systems that reflect their unique values. Eventually, each campus will develop its own individualized review process rather than rely on the UCLA/UCB scores or processes. BOARS' white paper describing the plan is a statement of understanding between BOARS and the admissions directors that can be modified periodically. Members asked that when campuses share scores, they provide information that will help other campuses interpret the scores; particularly the scoring rubrics and justifications for using the scores. Throughout these discussions it was emphasized repeatedly that a holistic score does not define selection, as there are many other aspects of the process.

BOARS investigated the extent to which campuses might be able to use UCB and UCLA holistic review scores as part of (or in lieu of) a local review. UCOP Institutional Research Content Manager Tongshan Chang presented data to BOARS showing the distribution of freshman applicants and admitted students to individual campuses based on variety of UCB or UCLA holistic read scores and the "Predicted Value" gradations for students within the UCB 4-5 single score range for applicants and admits to each campus, compared to the UCLA score. BOARS believes that score sharing will help all campuses improve their review processes, project enrollment, and compare comprehensive review outcomes, and that having access to UCLA/UCB scores could allow some campuses to devote more time to their own individualized review of applicants with lower scores. The Committee doubts, however, that score sharing will produce significant new efficiencies or monetary savings in the near future.

REVISIONS TO 'AREA C' (MATHEMATICS) AND 'AREA B' (ENGLISH) DESCRIPTIONS

BOARS revised the "area c" (Mathematics) description in the UC Freshman admissions requirements. The revision replaces citations to the 1998 California Math Standards with language referring to the Common Core Mathematics Standards, which were adopted along with the Common Core Language Arts Standards by the California State Board of Education in August 2010. A BOARS subcommittee also revised the 'area b' (English) description to incorporate concepts that reflect California's adoption of the Common Core Standards for the language arts. In July, BOARS sent the draft 'area b' revision to an intersegmental area 'b' task force for review and feedback by August 15.

JOINT MEETING WITH CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

In June, CSU faculty and administrators—Academic Senate Chair James Postma, Admission Advisory Council co-chair Stephen Stepanak; Assistant Vice Chancellor Eric Forbes; and Chancellor’s Office Associate Dean Ken O’Donnell—joined BOARS by phone to discuss issues associated with fostering and improving the transfer path, including SB 1440 and BOARS’ transfer admission proposal, the role of ‘a-g,’ and Career Technical Education. CSU representatives expressed support for the BOARS transfer proposal, noting that there would be an additional benefit if UC could align its UC Transfer Curricula with CSU’s Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs). The CSU guests also noted key problems related to transfer: some community college students are unable to find courses they need, or receive poor advising; and others lose motivation due to a general education curriculum that tracks them into remediation sequences before they can enroll in a more engaging curriculum connected to the real world. Legislation may require the development of CTE courses that would not necessarily be UC-approved for a-g, but would be CSU approved for a-g in disciplines that might not be offered at UC.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

In July, BOARS met at UC Berkeley for its annual half-day meeting with the UC admissions directors. BOARS and the directors discussed topics of shared interest, including the transition to the 2012 admissions policy, non-resident enrollment, score sharing, admissions funding challenges, and the BOARS transfer admission proposal. Each director was asked to share perspectives and suggestions. Concerns about adequate staffing and funding to implement the 2012 policy were prominent, with directors noting that during the read season it is not always possible to give campus visitors an adequate level of attention. Directors also provided feedback on the Transfer Proposal, which was amended to reflect the discussion. They noted that collaboration between faculty and administration was strong and helpful this year.

OTHER BRIEFINGS

- Chair Jacob, Academic Senate Chair Daniel Simmons, and Vice Chair Robert Anderson briefed BOARS at each meeting about Academic Council business, and presentations made to the Council about state budget cuts, faculty salaries, and other topics.
- Chair Jacob briefed BOARS about the work of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senate (ICAS) on the [C-ID project](#), implementation of transfer legislation (in particular the AB 1440 work underway in the CCC and CSU), and ICAS’ collective advocacy on behalf of public higher education in California.
- The Admissions Processing Task Force is chaired by UCSB Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Michael Young and consists of the campus admissions directors, UCOP Admissions staff and the chair and vice chair of BOARS. Chair Jacob and Vice Chair Johnson regularly reported on APTF work, which focused on holistic review training/score sharing, processes for implementing the 2012 Admissions policy, collaboration involving wait lists and the referral pools (including the new nonresident referral pool), and some intense discussions of criteria for admission of nonresident applicants. The APTF provides a critical forum for exchange of ideas and information between BOARS and the campus Admissions Directors.
- Bonnie Halpern-Felsher introduced BOARS to research on the stress felt by ultra-competitive high school students whose daily lives are scheduled beyond a reasonable limit with the goal of getting into a top college.
- Don Daves-Rougeaux briefed BOARS on two UC-organized Curriculum Integration Institutes, which brought together high schools teachers to develop academic courses

integrated with CTE content that are sufficiently rigorous to be approved for a-g. Chair Jacob attended both meetings and Vice Chair Johnson attended the second as BOARS representatives and to interact with participants on math, science and Engineering content.

- In October, Director Wilbur outlined the process by which the Eligibility in Local Context cohort would be determined for entering 2012 freshman class, which will be selected in accordance with the new eligibility policy. Instead of identifying the top 4% of each high school graduating class and sending them a letter that they attained an ELC guarantee, UC will collect transcripts for the top 15% cohort at each school and send them a letter stating that they have been identified as among the school's top students and encourage them to apply. If they do apply, UC will match GPA information with the transcript to see if they qualify for the 9% ELC and will then provide that information to the campuses. UC is confident that it can identify the complete top 9% by asking for the top 15%. Later, UC will analyze transcripts from 1/3 of high schools each year to update its records about average GPAs. An external vendor will also analyze the transcripts and send information about ELC segments of 1% each up to 9%.
- In May, the Admissions Office consulted BOARS on a proposal to increase the UC application fee, and in July BOARS learned it will increase by 25%, from \$60 to \$75. Fee waivers for low-income students will remain in place.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2011-12

BOARS will monitor implementation of the Freshman Admissions Reform Policy, the progress of holistic review score sharing, and appropriate funding of admissions functions on the campuses. Chair Jacob and Vice Chair Johnson are working with UCOP staff (Kate Jeffery, Shawn Brick, Tongshan Chang) on developing research questions and appropriate data and analysis to evaluate the new 2011-12 policy. BOARS will continue work on its transfer admissions proposal based on feedback from campuses. The success of the admissions policy will depend in part on UC admitting some students who are Entitled to Review but not guaranteed, and on the smooth operation of the referral pool. BOARS will monitor and ensure that the entire 9% ELC cohort is accepted by campuses the students actually want to attend, so that no subgroup is overly relegated to the referral pool. BOARS will develop metrics to help measure the success of the policy, include how well it expands the applicant pool, particularly into underserved populations; diversity outcomes in both the applicant and admitted pools; and outcomes for the 9x9 cohorts, both overall and in the referral pool. Initial applicant outcomes will be available at the December 2011 BOARS meeting.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Jacob represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, the Admissions Processing Task Force, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and the Executive Director of Admissions Search Committee. Vice Chair Johnson substituted for Chair Jacob in his absence at the Academic Council, and also served on the Admissions Processing Task Force and the Executive Director Search Committee. Charles Akemann represented BOARS on the Education Finance Model Steering Committee.

CONSULTATION WITH UCOP AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS benefited from regular consultation with Vice President for Student Affairs Judy Sakaki, Admissions Director Susan Wilbur, and Interim Director Pamela Burnett, who updated BOARS at each meeting about preliminary and final data on application, admission, SIR, and enrollment outcomes for freshmen and transfers; initiatives to promote access and affordability;

enrollment management; the new wait list system; the new pilot referral process for non-residents; improvements to the *ApplyUC* website; and the struggles of California high schools to offer a full set of curricular offerings in the context of budget cuts. Director Wilbur also shared observations and suggested priorities for admissions policy at her final meeting before retiring in January after many years of distinguished service to UC. Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux attended each meeting to brief BOARS on the high school ‘a-g’ course certification process, efforts to help high schools develop rigorous CTE courses, and other topics. He also worked closely with the A&E Subcommittee to review online provider and course applications. Associate Director Shawn Brick attended each BOARS meeting to update the full committee about transfer initiatives and legislation, and worked closely with the Transfer Subcommittee. BOARS also appreciates the time and work of Debora Obley, Tongshan Chang, and Evera Spears; the campus admissions directors; and the CSU representatives who met with BOARS in June.

Thanks also to the faculty who attended meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Steven Clark (UCR), Katherine Snyder (UCB), and Rahul Warrior (UCI).

Respectfully submitted,

William Jacob, Chair (SB)	Juan Poblete (SC)
George Johnson, Vice Chair (B)	John Whitely (I)
Charles Akemann (SB)	Daniel Widener (SD)
Ralph Aldredge (D)	Adam Jackson-Boothby, Graduate (R)
Susan Amussen (M)	Mallory Valenzuela, Undergraduate (LA)
Bonnie Halpern-Felsher (SF)	Daniel Simmons, <i>ex officio</i>
John Heraty (R)	Robert Anderson, <i>ex officio</i>
Tyrone Howard (LA)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst
Lynn Huntsinger (B)	