TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met nine times in Academic Year 2007-08, including a joint meeting with UC Admissions Directors in July, to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 145, to advise the president and appropriate Senate agencies on matters relating to the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. BOARS also has three key subcommittees – Articulation and Evaluation, Admissions Testing, and Statistical Analysis – charged with reporting to the parent committee. The major activities of BOARS and its subcommittees, and the issues they addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility Policy
The Academic Council released BOARS’ original eligibility reform proposal for systemwide Senate review in August 2007 and a supplementary Q and A document from BOARS about the proposal in September. After the initial Senate review concluded in December, Council asked BOARS to address questions and concerns raised by reviewing agencies. BOARS responded to Council in February 2008 with a revised proposal that maintained its original recommendations for the “Entitled to Review” (ETR) admissions pathway and the elimination of the SAT Subject Test requirement. It also expanded the referral guarantee over the original proposal to a subset of ETR students that are in either the top 5% statewide among graduating high school seniors, or in the top 12.5% of graduates from their school.

Senate agencies expressed general support in both reviews for the principles underlying BOARS’ efforts and its goals to broaden the pool of applicants visible to UC through ETR, to encourage selection of the top students for admission, and to increase admission from underrepresented and low-income groups. There was also wide support for eliminating the SAT Subject tests as a strict requirement, and some support for a more flexible approach to the a-g requirements. In the first proposal review, the main concerns were related to the elimination (but for the 4% ELC program) of the referral guarantee, the cost of implementation, and the potential impact on student quality. In the revised proposal review, many faculty supported the expansion of the referral guarantee, but some expressed significant concerns about the statewide vs. within-school proportions of the new guarantee structure. At its May meeting, Council settled on a compromise proposal to institute the ETR admissions pathway, eliminate the SAT Subject test requirement, and establish an initial modified admissions referral guarantee structure of 9% within-school and 9% statewide. The Academic Assembly endorsed the proposal at its June 11 meeting, and sent it to the president for his review and review by the Board of Regents. The Regents began their review in July and planned to take the issue up again in the fall.

During the year, BOARS Chair Rashid visited campuses to discuss and field questions about the proposal. He also made presentations at meetings of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, and The Regents. BOARS members reported on the status of the campus reviews; collected feedback from campuses about the proposal’s potential impact on local comprehensive review processes; and discussed strategies for better informing colleagues about admissions policy. In July 2008, UC Admissions Directors met with BOARS to discuss campus-specific expectations, hopes, and concerns for the proposal.
Amendments to Senate Regulations Pertaining to Eligibility and Admissions

BOARS noted that implementation of the eligibility reform proposal, if passed by the Regents, will require multiple changes to Senate Regulations pertaining to admissions policy, involving systemwide Senate review and eventual passage by the Academic Assembly. BOARS agreed that regardless of the Regents’ action on eligibility reform, BOARS should re-write all admissions-related provisions of Senate Regulations 410–468 to better reflect current admissions policy and practices. In May, BOARS reviewed some potential modifications drafted by Chair Rashid and will continue its work next year.

Shared Admissions Review

In November, the Office of Student Affairs (OSA) was asked to devise a system that will allow campuses to share reviews of freshman applications. The OSA’s Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) proposed a scheme in which two scores would be generated centrally for the use of all UC campuses - the first based on a holistic, human read of applications similar to those used at UCB and UCLA, and the other a “machine” score based on an algorithmic assessment of various Comprehensive Review factors. BOARS concluded that the shared review protocols constitute admissions policy and therefore require significant Senate involvement. Senate and administrative leaders agreed to form two work teams of BOARS faculty, administrators, and admissions directors to develop each protocol. The work teams met during the year to discuss various models for processing, extracting, and distributing application information centrally.

The Holistic Read Work Team included BOARS Vice Chair Sylvia Hurtado (co-chair), members David Stern, Daniel Weiss, and Robert Jacobsen and Director Nina Robinson. Its discussions focused on methods for aligning the UCLA and UCB holistic ranking systems and for distributing those rankings to other campuses, as well as the advantages of a single holistic ranking versus a system that would provide separate (dimensional) holistic sub-scores around common characteristics. Next year, the work team plans to work closely with campuses to solicit feedback and undertake a pilot study to determine the time and resources needed for the system to work. This academic year, holistic score data generated at UCLA and UCB will be made available for the first time to other campuses to use alongside their own rating system.

The “Machine” Score Work Team included BOARS Chair Mark Rashid (co-chair with Director Sam Agronow), Bill Jacob, and Joseph Watson. Its discussions focused on devising a system that will employ application data and a series of complex algorithms to generate sub-scores for many of the 14 Comprehensive Review categories. The plan is to provide a single machine score to campuses along with the raw data, sub-scores, the algorithms used to generate them, and possibly a system of “flags,” which will indicate the need for further investigation by human readers on individual campuses.

BOARS Articulation and Evaluation (A&E) Subcommittee

The A&E Subcommittee, chaired by BOARS member William Jacob, was charged with amending the ‘g’ college preparatory elective course requirement language to explicitly include Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses. The initiative is a legislative mandate to the California State University system, but UC has primary responsibility for the ‘a-g’ curriculum policy to which both UC and CSU adhere, so the A&E Subcommittee proposed new ‘g’ course language that will be mutually agreeable to both UC and CSU. Chair Rashid and UCOP admissions staff also met with legislators in Sacramento to discuss CTE Initiative issues.
The Subcommittee also reviewed a number of applications for “program status” from a number of on-line course providers, pursuant to UC's new policy for certification of entities that wish to offer on-line courses that carry a-g approval.

**BOARS Testing Subcommittee**

The Testing Subcommittee, chaired by BOARS member Daniel Weiss, was charged this year to analyze the extent to which the new SAT Reasoning Test aligns with BOARS’ January 2002 “testing principles.” Over the last two years, BOARS and the Testing Subcommittee have consulted various experts to assess the degree to which these goals are being met, with the goal of reporting to the Regents by the end of 2008. In December, College Board representatives attended a BOARS meeting to discuss several issues, including the impact of the changes made to the SAT; the alignment of the new SAT with California content standards and classroom experiences; research into group differences in testing scores and comparisons of test scores across numerous administrations of a test; the College Board’s new student feedback report program; and the consequences of UC’s proposal to eliminate the SAT subject tests from its admissions requirements. At the end of the year, the Subcommittee drafted a letter for transmission to the College Board requesting additional data and answers to a number of questions.

**BOARS Statistical Analysis Subcommittee**

The Analytic Subcommittee, chaired by BOARS member David Stern, was an instrumental and integral part of all statistical-analysis designs used in the eligibility proposal. Professor Stern also helped draft the revised proposal.

**Task Force on the Mathematics (‘c’) and Laboratory Science (‘d’) Requirements**

The C&D Task Force consisted of representatives from UC, CSU, CCCs, and high schools, and was charged to report to BOARS its findings and recommendations about new language that will provide clearer, more specific guidance to high schools about how to structure courses to meet the mathematics (‘c’) and laboratory science (‘d’) coursework required for UC eligibility. The new language is based both on UC’s own educational goals and on various state-specified curricular standards, including the California Academic Content Standards and ICAS’ *Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students*. It outlines the course requirements for students, the educational goals of the requirement, and what courses must include to be approved. BOARS will approve a final version in the fall. The Task Force will be submitting its work product to BOARS for consideration and possible approval.

**American Indian Tribal Affiliation in Undergraduate Admissions**

In August 2007, the Senate referred to BOARS a question about whether membership in a federally recognized American Indian tribe should be considered as one of many factors in undergraduate admissions. BOARS discussed the issue at several meetings this year with the help of Special Assistant William Kidder, who presented a briefing on the related legal issues as well as data on UC admission and enrollment rates for American Indian students. BOARS determined that considering American Indian students who are members of federally recognized tribes is consistent with the list of factors contained in Selection Criterion 13 of the Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. Moreover, such a practice is consistent with the University’s obligation under Proposition 209 not to take race or ethnicity into account in admissions, because membership in a federally recognized tribe is a
classification in federal and state law that is distinct from race. In February, BOARS unanimously endorsed a position statement on Selection Criterion 13 and a resolution in support of considering a student’s membership in a federally recognized American Indian tribe in admissions. Council endorsed these statements in July.

**UCOP Policy Governing Funding of Non-resident Undergraduates**

In January, BOARS requested more information about a UCOP policy directing campuses to set separate admission targets for state-supported resident versus fee-bearing non-resident undergraduates. Memos from UCOP clarified that the new policy allows campuses to control Non-Resident Tuition (NRT) revenues, while specifying a target for fee-bearing non-resident enrollment. In contrast to previous practice, the new policy provides that shortfalls in non-resident tuition revenue will not be made up by UCOP, thereby putting pressure on campuses to meet their non-resident enrollment targets. BOARS is concerned about the possibility of fiscal considerations being injected into admissions decisions and about a system in which campuses are forced to generate additional non-resident tuition revenue to fund budgets. BOARS agreed that next year it would begin discussing a set of guidelines and principles around admission and enrollment of non-residents for broader Senate review.

**Other Reports and Recommendations**

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, BOARS also issued views on the following:

- *Proposed UC Undergraduate Mission Statement*
- *Systemwide Senate Review of the Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140 – University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity*
- *UCOPE-Proposed Amendments to Senate Regulation 636*
- *Standards, Policies and Procedures for Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC)*

In addition to the previously mentioned reports and recommendations, Academic Council and Assembly also acted on the following BOARS recommendation:

- *Proposal to Repeal Senate Regulation 458* (submitted to Council June 19, 2007; sent for systemwide Senate review October 16, 2007; approved by Assembly February 20, 2008)

**Other Presentations, Issues, and Additional Business**


- In November, BOARS learned about StatFinder, UC’S new web-based system for statistics on undergraduate admissions, enrollment, and graduation, and Sam Agronow presented a report examining the value of SAT Subject exams in predicting first year UC GPA.

In addition, BOARS expressed concern about the impact of the state budget crisis on undergraduate admissions, and the effect of the UCOP reorganization on the ability of BOARS
and UCOP to carry out their responsibilities and functions. The Committee also discussed the possibility of expanding the number of Asian American and Pacific Islander categories on the UC undergraduate application and discussed a petition from Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences faculty (EESS) requesting that BOARS revisit the issue of broadening the range of EESS courses that could be approved for admissions credit in the d-subject area. Finally, the Committee reviewed the findings and recommendations of the Undergraduate Work Team of the Regents Study Group on Diversity, including a report on disparate impact in admissions, and passed the following resolution regarding its inclusiveness indicators: “BOARS urges the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in collaboration with BOARS to update the inclusiveness indicators on an ongoing basis.”

**BOARS Representation**
The BOARS chair represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, Admissions Processing Task Force, and Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

**Acknowledgements**
BOARS benefited from regular consultation and reports from the following members of the systemwide administration: Admissions Director Susan Wilbur, who provided the Committee with application and admissions data for the fall 2008 admissions cycle and who regularly updated BOARS about the Office of Undergraduate Admissions’ work on the CTE and Transfer Preparation Paths initiatives and the ‘a-g’ certification process; Associate Director of Admissions Research and Evaluation Samuel Agronow and Assistant Director of Admissions Research and Evaluation Roger Studley, who provided BOARS with expert data reporting and analysis in the development of the eligibility reform proposal; Director of Policy and External Affairs Nina Robinson, who provided BOARS with regular updates from APTF meetings concerning shared review and long range enrollment planning; and Special Assistant to the Vice President William Kidder, who contributed to the drafting of the revised eligibility-reform proposal, and who was instrumental in BOARS’ review of the “plus factor” in undergraduate admissions for American Indian tribal members and other matters affecting student diversity.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Rashid, Chair (D)  
Sylvia Hurtado, Vice Chair (LA)  
David Stern (B)  
Daniel Weiss (SF)  
Keith Widaman (D)  
James Given (I)  
Peter Sadler (R)  
Duncan Lindsey (LA – spring)  
Michael T. Brown ((SB); Chair, Academic Senate, Ex Officio)  
Mary Croughan ((SF); Vice Chair, Academic Senate, Ex Officio)  
Michelle Ruskofsky, Committee Analyst  
Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst