

I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS May 2012 draft minutes.

Action: BOARS approved the May 2012 minutes.

II. Announcements - Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair

In May, the Academic Council endorsed BOARS' [disclaimer](#) language for use in marketing materials of campus-affiliated programs offering courses to non-matriculated student. Council also approved BOARS' transfer proposal, which the Academic Assembly will consider on June 6.

Council met with Regent Fred Ruiz, who shared his commitment to diversity and his desire to increase faculty diversity. Council members spoke in support of the [President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program](#), which had its budget cut this year.

Council and President Yudof discussed the Governor's May Budget Revision which leaves UC funding largely intact at 2011-12 levels, but also proposes a \$250 trigger cut to UC if the November ballot measure fails.

President Yudof and the Academic Senate strongly oppose a proposed state constitutional amendment (SCA22) that would limit nonresident enrollment to 10% at each UC campus. In a letter to the author of SCA 22, President Yudof noted that UC already enrolls far more California residents than the State funds, and that depriving UC of nonresident revenue would further impair the University's ability to enroll and educate residents. He also noted that UC enrolls a higher proportion of State residents than its comparison public institutions, some of which have non-resident enrollments of 30% or more.

Council has issued [recommendations](#) for the rebenching project, urging the resolution of several pending issues, including the treatment of "off the top" items, and the appropriate incentives for campuses to meet their resident undergraduate enrollment targets.

UCLA released a report on Holistic Review in Freshman Admissions (the "[Mare Report](#)"), which examines holistic review outcomes at that campus. The report shows that UCLA is implementing holistic scoring according to the criteria set by the faculty. Traditional academic indicators influence scoring most strongly, and achievement in the context of available opportunities and life challenges are also taken into account.

The July BOARS meeting will include a session with the campus Admissions Directors. Topics will include implementation of the new admissions policy, holistic review, and the transfer

policy, BOARS' "compare favorably" policy, and budget issues. It was suggested that BOARS and the directors discuss the campuses' recruitment strategies for residents and non-residents.

III. Revision of SR 424 B (2) to Clarify GPA Calculation Policy

When the Senate Regulations were modified in 2009 to align with the new admissions policy, an important qualifier in [424 B \(2\)](#) was inadvertently omitted. Prior wording capped at two the number of 10th grade honors-level courses that can be used to calculate the minimum GPA for freshman admission. BOARS reviewed a modification to the wording of 424 B (2). BOARS agreed that the cap should remain and that the modification appropriately addressed the problem.

Action: BOARS unanimously approved the revision to 424 B (2), and will forward a memo requesting the change to the Academic Council and Assembly.

IV. Consultation with UCOP - *Russell Rumberger, Vice Provost for Educational Partnerships*

Vice Provost Rumberger serves on a U.S. Department of Education [Technical Working Group](#) that is developing an evidence-based framework about the effectiveness of online learning and other educational technologies. The framework is intended to better inform consumers, technology designers, and educators who want to integrate technology into their curricula and classrooms.

Vice Provost Rumberger attends a regular meeting of high school district superintendents, who strongly support UC's efforts to approve more CTE courses for "a-g" through the UC Curriculum Integration Institutes and other means. Some superintendents support the "a-g for all" movement, which encourages high schools to adopt the "a-g" pattern as their default curriculum. Others, however, are concerned that "a-g" is a barrier to UC eligibility for many students, and they want UC to base admissions decisions on standards-based assessments rather than on "a-g" grades. Research shows the "a-g" pattern provides a positive benefit in preparation for college, but UC and CSU have limited capacity to admit more "a-g" eligible students, especially in an era of budget cuts.

At least one superintendent is promoting the idea of using online education to increase high school completion and college preparation, particularly in underserved schools and districts. VP Rumberger and the College Board are also discussing how UC can participate in the development of online AP courses through the UC online academy at UC Santa Cruz. He noted that 705,000 students are enrolled in 20,000 sections of 5,000 distinct transferable online courses at the California Community Colleges.

He noted that four UC faculty are on a National Research Council committee preparing a new document on 21st century skills.

Discussion: It was noted that many teachers are skeptical about the notion that data can help influence and inform real instructional decisions. It was also noted that students who take

Algebra II in high school do automatically receive “a-g” credit for Algebra I taken in 7th or 8th grade.

V. Geometry and Area ‘c’

Three years ago, the area ‘c’ (mathematics) work group revised the [area ‘c’ description](#) to include a condition that students must take one course in geometry or an integrated sequence that includes sufficient geometry as one of the three area ‘c’ courses in the “a-g” pattern required for UC eligibility. At least one school, however, is advising students to skip Geometry as part of their “path to calculus.”

Chair Jacob drafted a letter for California educators and Superintendent of Schools Torklason noting that students who fail to take Geometry will not meet UC’s mathematics requirement, and will not be eligible for UC or CSU.

Interim Director Jeffery noted that the revision to area ‘c’ was not disseminated broadly enough. The Office of Admissions wants to work with BOARS to get the word out about the requirement, and in doing so, also clarify the rules for grade validation. It was agreed that the letters should note that students who completed Algebra 1 or an Integrated 1 math course in the 2011-12 academic year must take Geometry to meet area ‘c,’ and that courses such as Algebra II or Pre-Calculus do not validate the Geometry requirement.

Action: Chair Jacob will revise the letters to incorporate the BOARS decisions, and Interim Director Jeffery will send out a letter to all schools clarifying the policy.

VI. Consultation with UCOP

- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*
- *Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research*
- *Erika Jackson, Senior Research Analyst, Institutional Research*

SIR Data: BOARS reviewed data on freshman Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) showing that the pool of students offered admission to UC and the pool of students who subsequently submitted SIRs have similar characteristics, in general. The number of admits and SIRs from the ELC-only-eligible cohort are both small, but both pools include higher proportions of African-Americans, Chicano/Latinos, first generation college students, and students from low API high schools. African-Americans, Chicano/Latinos, first generation college, and low API students also comprise a larger proportion of admits and SIRs from the Entitled to Review cohort. The proportion of SIRs and admitted students who did or did not take one or more Subject tests was generally consistent across disciplines. The cohort of SIRs who did not take a Subject exam includes a larger proportion of underrepresented minorities.

Effect of the SAT Subject exam on admissions outcomes: BOARS turned to an analysis of the specific impact of taking one or more Subject exams on admissions outcomes. Students who took Subject exams were more likely to be admitted, but BOARS wanted to account for the fact that such students also tend to have higher GPAs, SATs and may take more a-g courses. Models prepared by Institutional Research use a logistical regression to predict the odds of admission to

a campus and the extent to which taking the test is more or less correlated than the SAT, GPA, and other indicators in the value it adds to the admission decision. The models show that the value-added effect of taking the test decreases when controlling for these other factors.

Effect of the ELC designation: BOARS reviewed an analysis of the effect of the ELC designation on admissions outcomes for CA residents with ELC status from public high schools. Systemwide, 90% of ELC-eligible applicants were admitted to a campus to which they applied, compared to 53% of non-ELC applicants. The models use a logistical regression to predict the odds of admission controlling for SAT, unweighted GPA, both SAT and unweighted GPA, and within each SAT, GPA, and API decile. The numbers are large and consistent enough to conclude that ELC status has a large effect on admission decisions, although GPA reduces the effect significantly.

Resident and nonresident comparison: BOARS reviewed campus-by-campus data comparing the credentials of admitted California resident freshmen to those of domestic and international nonresident freshmen, based on academic index score, unweighted GPA, and test scores, and an analysis of the odds of admission for different residency groups within each GPA quintile and SAT quintile.

For the next BOARS meeting, Institutional Research will provide an analysis of how the cohort of students admitted through the Entitled to Review criteria might have fared under the prior admissions policy.

Discussion: BOARS members expressed some concern about whether campuses with large increases in SIRs will be prepared to accommodate extra students.

It was noted that the ELC models argue for the importance of the ELC program and its continued funding. It was suggested that future modeling control also for GPA and API and examine the difference in effect, if any, between the 1-4% ELC and the 5-9% ELC cohorts.

It was noted that BOARS' "compare favorably" standard refers to admissions decisions, but that campuses may need to admit nonresidents at a higher rate to meet targets because they tend to accept admissions offers at a lower rate. It would be useful, then, to look at the data on enrolled students and yield for the top scoring nonresidents. Also, because the context information used for California residents is not available for nonresidents, several campuses want to investigate nonresident performance at UC as an additional lens to see if they "compare favorably".

VII. Resolution on Maintaining the Pre-Admission Verification Program - Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions

BOARS reviewed a draft resolution calling on the University to continue the process of undergraduate application data verification and to extend the process to all applicants. Interim Director Jeffery said concern has been expressed about the integrity of the application process, particularly the possibility of falsification of transcript information and the personal essay. She said UC asks all applicants to substantiate the information on their applications, and beginning with fall 2003 applicants, UC has conducted a verification process on a random sample of applications; however, some campuses have stopped verifying international applications due to

timing and workload issues. She said UC has a responsibility to verify the applications of all applicants, and the resolution will help make UC's policy and process known to the general public.

Action: BOARS voted unanimously to approve the resolution and add it to the BOARS website.

VIII. The UC Online Education Project

BOARS reviewed a marketing study identifying potential audiences for UCOE courses. The study lists students at affluent public high schools and private high schools – referred to as “overachievers” – as the primary target audience for a marketing effort set to begin by late June. UCOE has invited BOARS to suggest principles to guide the effort.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that the excellent quality of the initial set of UCOE courses and the faculty teaching them is promising for the eventual success of the larger program. There was concern expressed, however, about UCOE's efforts to monetize the project, based on its need to pay back the loan, and the lack of a financial aid model to ensure access for low income students. Members noted that the plan to target affluent students would violate a principle expressed in BOARS' [Statement on K-12 Online Learning](#) that “All students in a school or district must have equal access to all courses for which they are qualified, regardless of socioeconomic status, disability, or other factors.” Members noted that it would be inappropriate for UC to explicitly advantage students who are already advantaged, for no reason except their ability to pay. UCOE should be encouraged to develop a business and marketing model that includes a return-to-aid component, and that mirrors BOARS' established goals for online education that are rooted in principles of opportunity and equity and the stewardship of the University's public mission.

It was noted that the [disclaimer](#) BOARS approved in May will be included in UCOE marketing materials.

One member remarked that affluent students will seek out supplemental courses anyway, and that UC should seek to capture that market.

Action: BOARS will write a memo responding to the marketing plan document and forward it to the Academic Council.

IX. Comprehensive Review Report

BOARS will report to the Regents in September about the implementation of holistic review and the new admissions policy. One BOARS member noted that the report should be candid about any struggles or challenges campuses may be having in their efforts to implement holistic review. The report should also be clear that holistic review is not a panacea for diversity, and that campuses are implementing holistic review because they view it as a fairer system, not as a way to increase diversity. There have been diversity gains, but those gains are not necessarily the result of changes to admissions, and should be considered in the context of the state's demographic changes.

X. Score Sharing

Chair Jacob said that prior to the Regents' January 2011 [Resolution on Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions](#), UCOP expressed hope that score sharing would increase the efficiency of admission processing and save money. Recent evidence challenges this assumption, but there are other benefits to score sharing. BOARS should consider how campuses could get more out of the process of score sharing.

It was noted that one campus has established a methodology for converting scores it receives from other campuses to a local scale to make the scores more meaningful and relevant to its local goals. It was noted that score sharing helps with tie breaking decisions, not just the initial review, and that there are different ways of looking at decision-making within the general range of admissibility at a campus. Including percentile information may help campuses interpret the scores.

Interim Director Jeffery suggested that BOARS form a work group involving admissions directors and faculty to look at best practices, with the goal of refining the process on all campuses. The upfront investment in time would pay off in the long term.

It was noted that interim director of admissions Kate Jeffery is retiring, and that June 29 would be her final day at UC. BOARS gave her a round of applause in appreciation of her excellent service to BOARS and the University of California.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Bill Jacob