

Minutes of Meeting – January 11, 2008
UCOP Room 5320, Oakland, CA

I. Chair's Announcements

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**

BOARS Chair Rashid welcomed committee members and consultants to the meeting, and reported on the following:

December 19 Academic Council Meeting: The Academic Council decided to return the BOARS Eligibility Reform Proposal to BOARS for further refinement in light of the systemwide committee and division responses received during the review period, and requested that BOARS resubmit the proposal as soon as possible. Although Council did not discuss the content of the proposal at this meeting, Chair Rashid expressed his gratitude for the reviewers' thoughtful comments that were submitted. Council's other agenda items included approval of amendments to Senate Regulation 636 (UC Entry Level Writing Requirement), and consideration of a resolution on UC's role in manufacturing nuclear weapons. Both of these issues will be presented to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for action at its January 30 meeting.

'C' and 'D' Task Force: The task force met on December 14 to continue progress on developing replacement language for the mathematics ('c') and science ('d') subject areas in UC's 'a-g' coursework admissions requirement. The task force has agreed that the California content standards areas will define the curricula breadth from which the mathematics and science college preparatory courses should draw from, and they also agreed on the objective of the eventual policy language. BOARS will continue to hear updates, and consider the task force's final report when it is completed later this year. The task force's next scheduled meeting is in February.

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the December 7, 2007 BOARS meeting minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar via unanimous consent.

III. BOARS' Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**
- **BOARS Members**

ISSUE: The systemwide Senate review of BOARS' Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy concluded in December, when the Academic Council decided to send the proposal back to BOARS for further work. BOARS is expected to incorporate the comments and suggestions submitted during the review process into its revised proposal, and resubmit it to Council in the spring. BOARS Chair Rashid has prepared a draft outline of a response to

Council for the committee's consideration today, and to stimulate discussion of the revised proposal.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members reviewed the contents of the systemwide committee and division comments received during the Senate review process, noting consistent themes that emerged from a majority of the responders. Members agreed that the revised proposal must focus on the perceived diminishing of the "guarantee", and also respond to concerns that changing eligibility requirements will lower UC's academic quality. Members observed that the revision should look to reconstruct the "guarantee" in a way that aligns with the goals of the original BOARS proposal. Most agreed that the revision should incorporate both a point-by-point response to the first review, as well as a new, full proposal; and that a draft should be written in time for consideration at the February 8 BOARS meeting.

The committee then discussed the content of the revised proposal, and brainstormed new ways in which to reconstruct the "guarantee" within the original "entitled to review" construct. Some members expressed concerns about eliminating achievement tests from UC admissions requirements, and the perception that by doing so, UC is lowering its academic standards. They stated that transparent eligibility criteria are important for students and parents, and suggested that the revision should seek to capture more academically qualified students, offering guidance and rewarding them for their hard work. Other members responded that the main goal of the original BOARS proposal was to eliminate the reward for students' successfully jumping through arbitrary hoops to admission; and that the merits of the comprehensive review process should not be up for debate at this time. Most members agreed, however, that the revision would benefit from increased emphasis on academic rigor and high standards. The discussion then led to an in-depth consideration of a new eligibility construct that incorporates separate statewide and local paths to a "guarantee to admission"; and statewide and local paths to "entitled to review." Most members expressed a great deal of enthusiasm over this new draft index, with some again noting caution over moving too far from the goals of the original proposal itself.

Late in the discussion, BOARS members considered a motion to sustain BOARS' decision to eliminate the SAT II tests as a requirement for UC eligibility, contained in BOARS' original proposal, and focus on other portions of the revised proposal. The motion was seconded and discussion ensued, centering on process issues, and the desire for BOARS to not lose its momentum in developing a revised proposal by rehashing already-settled issues. Those opposed to the motion expressed concern that BOARS has not yet evaluated new predictive validity analyses, seeing the motion as premature at this time. A second motion was then introduced to table the first motion. The motion to table failed by a vote of 2 in favor, and 8 opposed. The first motion then passed by a vote of 8 in favor, and 2 opposed.

ACTION: BOARS members will continue discussion of the revised Eligibility Reform proposal at the February 8 BOARS meeting, with a subset of BOARS members working on a draft document in preparation for that meeting. BOARS will request further analyses from UCOP Student Affairs staff to aid in the development of the revised proposal, also for consideration in February.

ACTION: BOARS members agreed, by a vote of 8 in favor, 2 opposed, to include in the revision the proposed elimination of the SAT II tests as a requirement for UC eligibility.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Admissions

- **Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions**

REPORT: Director Wilbur reviewed with BOARS members some preliminary data concerning the Fall 2008 admissions cycle. The campuses are reviewing and vetting the information now, and final reports are expected to be released at the end of January. Director Wilbur then distributed for BOARS' information a letter sent from her office to all California high school principals and college counselors, which requests from them updates to their course offerings lists, and other critical items and reminders. Lastly, Director Wilbur reported on issues involving Career and Technical Education (CTE), including recent and upcoming meetings with Legislators in Sacramento, and progress in developing new 'g' elective subject area language to reflect UC's work in this area.

V. Continued: American Indian Tribes and UC Admissions

- **William Kidder, Special Assistant to the Vice President – Student Affairs**

ISSUE: BOARS is continuing its consideration of whether to recommend that student membership in a federally-recognized Indian tribe should be treated as a "plus factor" in UC admissions.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Rashid reminded BOARS members that this issue first came to the committee via a request from Vice President-Student Affairs Judy Sakaki, to Academic Council Chair Michael Brown. BOARS has an obligation to consider the issue and report back to the Academic Council in a method of its own choosing. BOARS members discussed how to justify the proposed policy in light of the rest of UC admissions policy, as well as procedural matters in recommending this change. Members expressed general support for the proposal, noting its importance in addressing the under-representation of American Indian tribe members at UC. The committee then brainstormed how best to accomplish the policy change. Most members agreed that the proposed "plus factor" would be consistent with the Comprehensive Review Guidelines as currently written, as an additional factor for campuses to consider in admissions decisions. They focused particularly on Guideline 13, which mentions "experiences and circumstances" for consideration in admissions. Members expressed broad support for this initiative, which would seek to recognize tribal membership as a unique category, accompanied by a special responsibility for a public institution like UC.

ACTION: BOARS Chair Rashid will draft a letter to Council incorporating the results of today's discussion, for final consideration at an upcoming BOARS meeting.

VI. Follow-Up: Testing Issues Raised During BOARS' December 7, 2007 Consultation with the College Board

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**
- **Daniel Weiss, BOARS Testing Subcommittee Chair**

ISSUE: BOARS members were asked to consider any issues or questions they would like to submit to the College Board, as a follow-up to the December BOARS meeting.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Rashid reviewed with members the questions they already agreed to submit to the College Board, including a request of more information on the SAT, other than the mathematics portion; more information on "curriculum-basedness" between the SAT and the college-preparatory curriculum; and additional details about the College Board's student

feedback reports on the SAT. BOARS members added other requests to this list, including: race/class biases and correlations with the SAT I and the SAT II subject exam scores; analyses of correlations with race/class with test scores and test-taking, and whether the correlations with test scores are stronger/weaker than other measures of performance (i.e., gpa); how the writing portion of the SAT is scored, how that score is integrated into the main SAT score, and what feedback is provided on the writing portion; as well as other inquiries.

ACTION: BOARS Chair Rashid, David Stern and Daniel Weiss will compile BOARS' requests for additional information, for eventual submission to the College Board.

VII. Continued: Shared Admissions Review

- **Nina Robinson, Director, Policy & External Affairs**

ISSUE: BOARS is continuing its discussion of the UCOP-proposed shared admissions review policy, including consideration of review models that increase efficiency while preserving campus autonomy in decision-making.

REPORT: After reviewing the policy initiative and progress made so far, Director Robinson emphasized that Provost Hume has mandated that the policy be implemented in a way that focuses on increasing efficiency, and removing routine, duplicative reviews at the campus level. Director Robinson would like to see a process that enhances campus admission processing, and allows campuses to focus on reviewing those applications that require extra attention. Two potential simulation models are currently under evaluation. Model 1 is the Berkeley/Los Angeles review process, chosen because 72 percent of UC applications are reviewed either by Berkeley or Los Angeles, and because their processes are extremely similar. Model 2 is the linear/fixed weight formula approach, which may either evolve from current campus processes or be developed out of a mechanized approach at the systemwide level. Director Robinson emphasized that these are only models right now, and are not being evaluated as proposals. Many have noted the following principle to adhere to during the early stages of this initiative: decisions at one campus will not be mandated to others, but outputs of one campus review could be made available to other campuses; and the other campuses could decide what to do with the information, retaining the distinctiveness among campus decisions and processes.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members discussed the pros and cons of the initiative, both in general, and regarding the specifics of each of the models presented. They also contemplated the scoring scales used at different campuses. Then members focused on identifying what information would be useful in further developing the shared review initiative, and moved away from discussing implementation details. Overall, members found Director Robinson's report extremely informative, and expressed the committee's desire to continue discussion next month.

ACTION: BOARS will continue discussion of this issue at its February 8 meeting.

VIII. For BOARS' Review: Issues Under Systemwide Senate Review

- CCGA – UCEP – ITTP “Dialectic” Paper on Remote/Online Instruction
- Reports of The Regents' Task Force on University Diversity

ACTION: BOARS will discuss these items at its February 8, 2008 meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Mark Rashid

Minutes drafted by:
Michelle Ruskofsky
BOARS Analyst