

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2008-09**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2008-09, including joint meetings with the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee in June and the UC Admissions Directors in July, 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. BOARS also has three key subcommittees – Admissions Testing, Articulation and Evaluation, 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

After the Academic Senate’s Admissions Reform proposal “Entitled to Review” (ETR) went before the Regents in September for a preliminary discussion, the President asked for updated projections of ETR outcomes using 2007 CPEC data. BOARS studied UCOP’s simulations of student profiles and application volume for ETR based on updated CPEC weights, and found that the updated data were consistent with the earlier simulations and reinforced the Senate’s proposal. The Committee also produced a statement outlining the educational pros and cons of two minimum GPA options for ETR status, and although BOARS favored a 2.8 unweighted minimum GPA, the President decided ultimately to recommend a 3.0 weighted/capped minimum.

BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado, Senate Chair Mary Croughan, former BOARS Chair Mark Rashid, and former BOARS and Senate Chair Michael Brown worked with UCOP to develop communication strategies for the reform. They met with legislators and journalists and responded to groups and individuals opposing it. In December, those three recent BOARS chairs and Associate Director of Admissions Sam Agronow, who was chief analyst on the reform, [responded](#) to a paper critical of the proposal published at the [Center for Studies of Higher Education](#). Finally, on February 4, the Senate team presented the reform proposal to the Regents’ Committee on Educational Policy, which the full Board voted to endorse on February 5.

Later, UC and Senate leaders, including the current and past chairs of BOARS, met with the Asian Pacific Islander Legislative Caucus, Asian Pacific American Legal Center, and several other API community organizations to address concerns about the impact of the new policy on Asian-American access to the University. These meetings highlighted the need for UC to respond to different communities and convey clear messages about its admissions and comprehensive review policies.

BOARS also clarified that students should be required to complete any 11 a-g courses by the end of the 11th grade for Entitled to Review status, and that the 11th grade pattern should be modified to reduce the English requirement from three to two courses by the end of the 11th grade for consideration of the local ELC guarantee.

Implementation of Eligibility Reform

Amendments to Senate Regulations: BOARS recommended amendments to the Senate regulations pertaining to eligibility and admissions with the help of campus admissions directors, Admissions Director Susan Wilbur, and former BOARS Chair Rashid. The revisions included several mandatory changes required to align Senate policy with the admissions reform policy

approved by the Regents. Other amendments were intended to improve the clarity and/or alignment of the regulations with current policy and practice. BOARS incorporated feedback from a systemwide Senate review of the modifications into a revised set of amendments, and in June, the Academic Assembly unanimously approved the changes.

Comprehensive Review Policies: BOARS noted that with the passage of the admissions reform policy, all campuses will have to become more selective and expand the use of comprehensive review as part of their selection processes. BOARS reviewed existing campus comprehensive review guidelines and philosophies, noting that some campuses already have elaborate comprehensive review policies and procedures in place, while others require more development. Chair Hurtado asked members to review and assess their local policies, and if necessary, develop new or revised principles and guidelines in preparation for the new admissions era with the help of their campus committees and admissions directors. Additionally, BOARS produced a set of practical guidelines for comprehensive review to help ensure and promote proper implementation of the admissions reforms.

Report to the Regents on Standardized Testing

The BOARS Testing Subcommittee, chaired this year by Peter Sadler and joined by Darnell Hunt and Julie Bianchini, continued to analyze the extent to which the new SAT Reasoning Test aligns with BOARS' January 2002 testing principles. In 2003, The Regents provisionally approved UC's current testing pattern pending a report from BOARS about the extent to which the new SAT aligns with the principles. Over the last two years, BOARS and the Testing Subcommittee have consulted experts to assess the degree to which these goals are being met. This year, BOARS requested additional information from the College Board about the new SAT and from ACT, Inc. about the ACT with Writing. BOARS also reviewed data on UC students who took both the ACT and SAT, and a study drafted by Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow comparing the predictive validity of the California Standards Tests and the SAT.

BOARS reviewed a series of draft reports produced by the Testing Subcommittee and a near final draft was being prepared in August. The report proposes that the SAT Reasoning and ACT with Writing tests meet BOARS' principles better than before, but still do not meet them fully. It recommends that UC prefer curriculum-based tests that are scored by achievement standards. It does not make an explicit recommendation for changing current testing policy, but presents possible pathways to change that UC should continue to consider. The report will be completed and forwarded for Council and Regents review in Fall 2009.

Request for BOARS to Reassess the "d" Requirement for UC Admission

In June 2008, the Davis Senate Division requested a Senatwide review of the possible expansion of courses approved for credit in UC's "d" laboratory science admissions requirement, to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS). Council referred the issue to BOARS, which in a December memo to Council opposed the proposed change and recommended against pursuing the issue further. BOARS acknowledged the proponents' view that EESS courses help engage high school students in science, but noted that most EESS courses do not provide basic science knowledge and reasoning preparation equivalent to the biology, chemistry, and physics required for the 'd' requirement as necessary preparation for university-level science. The Committee noted that ninth grade EESS courses can fulfill the area "g" elective requirement, and individual EESS courses can, and have been, accepted for 'd' if they also provide fundamental knowledge in at least one of the basic science areas.

Council decided a systemwide review would help resolve the issue and BOARS was asked to consider what materials should be sent to campuses to help them make informed decisions. BOARS decided to gather additional data on college preparatory science standards and credential requirements for California science courses, and asked the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute to administer a web-based survey to UC departments offering introductory courses in science, mathematics, and engineering to help get a systemwide picture of faculty expectations for student preparation. The survey was expected to be complete by September.

Principles for Enrollment of Non-resident Undergraduates

BOARS discussed a UCOP memo asking campuses to set separate admission targets for State-supported resident undergraduates and fee bearing non-resident undergraduates. The Committee also heard reports that some campuses were planning to generate new revenues by significantly increasing non-resident enrollment. BOARS decided to respond by proposing a set of guidelines and principles for the admission and enrollment of non-residents. In an April memo, BOARS expressed concern that campuses were being forced to generate NRT revenue to fund budgets; that some campuses were planning to increase non-resident undergraduate enrollment far beyond traditional ratios to help address budget shortfalls; and that such actions would decrease California resident access to UC and could inject fiscal considerations into admissions decisions. Council sent the proposed principles for systemwide Senate review. In July, BOARS reviewed divisional Senate and systemwide committee feedback and responded with a revised document, which Council endorsed and forwarded to Interim Provost Pitts for dissemination to campus Admissions offices, the EVCs, and the Enrollment Management Council.

Career Technical Education and ‘a-g’

BOARS discussed the increasing pressure on UC and CSU to advance Career Technical Education in California high schools by accepting more CTE courses to fulfill the ‘a-g’ subject requirements for undergraduate admissions. BOARS also reviewed Director Wilbur’s discussion paper on the ‘a-g’ requirements and CTE, a set of draft principles to guide UC’s work in implementing and communicating the ‘a-g’ requirements, and a document drafted by BOARS Vice Chair Bill Jacob outlining the purposes of the ‘a-g’ requirements from a faculty perspective. BOARS agreed that UC should help expand access and opportunity to higher education and ‘a-g,’ including academically rigorous CTE courses, but should remain vigilant that expanding the number of ‘a-g’ courses maintains curricular rigor and does not add stress to already overburdened schools. CTE and ‘a-g’ were also major topics of discussion at BOARS’s joint half-day meeting in June with the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee. BOARS and the AAC discussed the state’s request for UC and CSU to do more to accept CTE courses, common goals for CTE, and potential legislation that could divide CSU and UC on the issue.

Understanding and Improving the Transfer Admission Path

BOARS discussed the California legislature’s request for UC and CSU to accept more Community College transfer students and to make the transfer and course articulation process more efficient and effective. BOARS also discussed the President’s new initiative to strengthen transfer paths between the CCCs and UC/CSU, and increase the number of transfers admitted to UC. In May, Director Wilbur described the major transfer-related issues facing UC, CSU, and the CCCs, including efforts to develop an intersegmental common course numbering system for lower division major preparation courses, challenges related to increasing the alignment of general education and lower division transfer preparation requirements, and related legislation. At their half-day joint meeting in June, BOARS and the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee

discussed major issues and obstacles associated with fostering and improving the transfer path, including the work of the “CID” Task Force, IGETC, CSU’s Lower Division Transfer Pattern, and other transfer admissions procedures and initiatives.

Shared Admissions Review

BOARS discussed the progress of the Shared Review initiative, which is developing a system to allow campuses to share reviews of freshman application data and scores. Last year, two Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) subcommittees comprised of BOARS faculty and admissions directors drafted two protocols for processing, extracting, and distributing application information centrally. The first would generate a score or set of scores from a holistic, human read of the application, based on the UCB and UCLA systems. UCLA and UCB made scores from common applicants available to campuses on a trial basis in 2008-09, and some campuses used them to help make or review their decisions. The second committee would generate a set of “machine” scores based on an algorithmic assessment of various comprehensive review factors in the application. The “machine” score subcommittee met December 9 to refine the data elements that will include information that can be used by campuses in their review processes along with other information from the application as well as local context data. BOARS members thought that the new data elements would be useful to their campuses, supported the work of the subcommittee and the goal of making the data widely available to campuses, and suggested that UCOP proceed. UCOP is moving forward in incorporating some of the new data elements in the electronic information campuses receive.

Changes to the Mathematics (‘c’) and Laboratory Science (‘d’) Requirement Descriptors

BOARS reviewed revisions proposed by the C and D Task Force for the mathematics (c) and laboratory science (d) descriptions in the [*Guide to “a-g” Requirements*](#). The charge to the intersegmental faculty on the Task Force was to review and clarify the descriptions to help schools identify the criteria distinguishing a suitable (c) or (d) course. William Jacob and Robert Jacobsen recommended that BOARS adopt all of the Task Force recommendations except a recommendation that all three years of math be taken in grades 9-12. BOARS felt this change could be construed as a new policy and would be contrary to the State’s new 8th grade algebra requirement, and decided to leave in place the language requiring three units but strongly recommending four units of college preparatory mathematics.

BOARS Articulation and Evaluation (A&E) Subcommittee

The A&E Subcommittee, chaired by BOARS member William Jacob, and joined by Juan Poblete (UCSC) and James Given (UC Irvine) was charged with reviewing all issues dealing with high school preparation and serves as guardians of ‘a-g’ requirements that serve both UC and CSU. Joe Watson (UCSD) joined the group to develop the materials for systemwide review of the EESS issue.

BOARS Statistical Analysis Subcommittee

The Analytic Subcommittee, Robert Jacobsen, Bill Jacob, Sylvia Hurtado, and Sam Agronow, was an instrumental and integral part of all statistical-analysis designs used in the eligibility proposal. Several analyses were conducted this year, which were reviewed by the committee prior to presenting them for discussion at BOARS. These analyses included an evaluation of the admissions impact on Asian Americans, course-taking alternatives for the 11 ‘a-g’ courses that will be required in the eligibility reform, and analyses of SAT and ACT test-taking of UC applicants and performance in college.

The American Diploma Project

BOARS followed the progress of the [American Diploma Project](#), an initiative of the National Governor's Association and Achieve Inc. intended to help states align K-12 standards, tests, and data systems to better prepare students for college and career success. Director Wilbur and Vice Chair Jacob both attended Achieve meetings. BOARS agreed that UC should be engaged in the project as part of its public service mission and that UC faculty should be at the table helping to drive the process. There was also concern about the Diploma Project's emphasis on designing academic standards around testing, which may not align with what students need to know and how they learn, and on "accountability," which alone will not solve fundamental problems with instruction and learning.

Joint Meeting with the UC Admissions Directors

In July, BOARS hosted its annual half-day meeting with the UC admissions directors. The two groups discussed issues that arose during the review of the Senate admissions regulations; strategies for implementing and strengthening comprehensive review policies and procedures; best practices for comprehensive review; a retrospective on comprehensive review due to the Regents by December 2009; collaborative efforts to share application data and scores and progress on a project to develop a systemwide shared score read sheet; challenges facing admissions offices as a result of the budget crisis; and BOARS' proposed guidelines for the admission of non-resident undergraduates.

BOARS Chair Hurtado also met with the Admissions Processing Task Force, once by telephone in October and in a face-to-face meeting in May to stay apprised about progress in the evaluation and processing of UC applications.

Other Reports and Recommendations

BOARS also issued a response in formal views or initiated letters on the following:

- *The Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan*
- *The Draft UC Accountability Framework*
- *BOARS initiated a letter regarding concerns that the reorganization of the Departments of Academic and Student Affairs will result in the loss of critical expertise that has helped BOARS successfully explore policy alternatives and solutions in admissions. The letter placed a high priority on support for data/information needs to support the retention of positions at UCOP vital for Senate decision-making. It was supported by Council and forwarded to the President/Interim Provost.*
- *A Request from the University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) to change Senate bylaws and add UCAF to Council*

Other Presentations, Issues, and Additional Business

BOARS also discussed the impact of the State budget crisis and national recession on undergraduate admissions, a possible wait list system, the effect of the UCOP reorganization on the ability of BOARS and UCOP to carry out their responsibilities and functions, and the importance of diversity to the UC mission. In June, BOARS met with UCLA Professor Patricia Gándara in the UCOP videoconference room to learn more about [Project S.O.L.](#), a joint initiative with the Mexican government to improve access to a-g courses for California high school English language learners. Chair Hurtado also provided regular updates to BOARS about the deliberations of the Enrollment Management Council advising the President about enrollment options and their impact on UC and its mission.

President Yudof joined the December meeting to discuss the problem of unfunded over-enrollment on UC campuses, his plan to curtail the size of the freshman class and increase transfer enrollment, and his proposal for a new financial aid guarantee program—the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan—to help cover fees for needy students. Interim Provost Lawrence Pitts attended the March meeting to discuss campus progress in meeting new enrollment targets, and he returned in July to ask BOARS to consider ways in which UC might be able to increase efficiencies and reduce costs in admissions related functions.

BOARS Representation

BOARS Chair Hurtado represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, Admissions Processing Task Force, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, and the President’s Enrollment Management Council. She was also invited to serve on the steering committee for a new multi-campus initiative led by the UCB Law Dean, which will be examining various P-16 education issues facing California. James Given represented BOARS on the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) Board of Directors, and Peter Sadler served on the UC/CCC Transfer Advisory Board.

Consultation with UCOP and Acknowledgements

BOARS benefited from regular consultation with Admissions Director Susan Wilbur, who provided updates about application and admissions outcomes, efforts to help schools develop rigorous CTE courses, transfer initiatives, and the ‘a-g’ certification process. Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow provided BOARS with essential data related to the eligibility reform effort, often on short notice. He also briefed BOARS on improvements to [StatFinder](#) and new racial/ethnic data collecting and reporting requirements mandated by the U.S. Department of Education for the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. External Affairs Director Nina Robinson was integral to the Eligibility Reform effort, Special Assistant to the Vice President William Kidder was instrumental in matters affecting student diversity, and Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux, who joined the committee as a regular consultant mid-year, provided insight into the high school course articulation process

Thanks also to the faculty who served as alternates for regular committee members: Martin Johnson (UCR); Duncan Lindsey (UCLA); George Johnson (UCB); Pei-te Lien (UCSB); and Stephen Tucker (UCI).

Respectfully submitted,

Sylvia Hurtado, Chair (LA)

William Jacob, Vice Chair (SB)

Robert Jacobsen (B)

Juan Poblete (SC)

Keith Widaman (D)

Peter Sadler (R)

Darnell Hunt (LA)

Susan Amussen (M)

Joseph Watson (SD)

Julie Bianchini (SB)

James Given (I)

Cynthia Pineda-Scott, Graduate Student (LA)

Cynthia Flores, Undergraduate Student (LA)

Mary Croughan (Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Henry Powell (Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)

Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst