

**Minutes of Meeting – January 5, 2007**

Approved February 2, 2007

**I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements**

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

BOARS Chair Mark Rashid welcomed the committee and reported on the following activities of the Academic Council and other items of interest:

Academic Council

The December meeting of the Academic Council again focused on UC budgetary issues, including the development of a resolution, "[Safeguarding the University's Future: A Resolution of the Academic Council on Returning UC to a Sound Fiscal Basis](#)," that conveys the Academic Council's concurrence with the findings of the report of the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) on "[Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California](#)." The resolution expresses the concern that the University's current budget trajectory can neither achieve the Regents' budget priorities nor maintain UC's historic quality and scope of mission.

The Academic Council received a presentation from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) regarding the committee's "Memorandum of Recommendations for Changes and Additions to Mercer's Total Remuneration Report." The Regents requisitioned Mercer Consulting to produce a report of total remuneration of UC faculty and staff compared to other institutions. UCFW's memo outlines several significant issues the committee identified regarding the remuneration calculations produced by Mercer.

Chair Rashid briefed the Academic Council on the committee's current efforts towards eligibility reform. This briefing generated considerable response from Council members, and Chair Rashid agreed to continue to update the Council as BOARS moves forward the development of an eligibility reform proposal.

Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates

Chair Rashid also briefed the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) on BOARS' current efforts towards eligibility reform at its meeting on December 6. At the suggestion of CSU Academic Senate Chair Marshelle Thobaben, it was agreed that BOARS would convene a joint meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council this year to discuss eligibility reform and other admissions issues. ICAS is also creating a subcommittee to develop the CCC Academic Senate's Course Identification Numbering Project (C-ID) proposal, which BOARS reviewed at its November 3 meeting.

Other Meetings

Chair Rashid also reported to BOARS on two additional recent meetings: (1) a meeting with Provost Rory Hume to brief him on the committee's discussions regarding eligibility reform, and (2) a meeting with UCOP Strategic Communications staff regarding public

relations and communication strategies as BOARS develops an eligibility reform proposal.

## II. Consent Calendar

**ACTION:** The minutes of the December 1, 2006, meeting were approved as written.

## III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Admissions

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

**REPORT:** Director Susan Wilbur provided the committee with preliminary data on undergraduate applications to the University of California for fall 2007. These data are currently being finalized by the campuses and it is anticipated that the information will be made available on the UC website by the end of the month. It was noted that several campuses are still accepting applications for freshman and/or transfer admission, so the final application numbers will differ from the preliminary data.

The preliminary application data indicate a 5.0 percent increase in freshman applications and a 5.7 percent decrease in transfer applications compared to fall 2006 application numbers (NOTE: Subsequent data show a much smaller decrease in transfer applications – compared to fall 2006 application numbers, transfer applications for fall 2007 decreased by only 0.7 percent: <http://www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/2007/07app.html>).

Data on the California freshman applicant pool reflect increases across all racial/ethnic groups, especially in the number of applicants who are Chicano/Latino (10.2%) and African American (8.4%). The increase in freshman applications outpaces the overall increase in California public high school graduates, especially increases for Chicano/Latino and African American students.

Director Wilbur also provided the committee with a report on the outcomes of the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) transcript evaluation process for the high school class of 2006-07. Each year high schools are asked to submit the transcripts of the top 12.5 percent of students who have just completed the 11<sup>th</sup> grade. Nearly 100 percent of public and public charter high schools submit transcripts for UC's ELC evaluation process. The University evaluates these transcripts and classifies each student in one of three categories:

1. Eligible in the Local Context (ELC): These students have completed a required pattern of 11 'a-g' courses, and based on a UC-calculated GPA, have attained at least a 3.0 GPA and are ranked in the top 4 percent of their high school class.
2. Qualified on Track (QOT): These students have completed a required pattern of eleven 'a-g' courses, and based on a UC-calculated GPA, have attained at least a 3.0 GPA, but are not ranked in the top 4 percent of their high school class.
3. Not ELC Qualified (NEQ): These students have not completed a required pattern of 11 'a-g' courses and/or have not attained at least a 3.0 GPA.

Each student whose transcript is evaluated receives a letter from UC, informing them of their status and the additional requirements they must fulfill to become UC-eligible, and encouraging them to apply to the University.

**DISCUSSION:** Members expressed an interest in examining data on the percentage of ELC students that apply to the University, and how this number was impacted by the decision to enforce the requirement that ELC-eligible students must take the full pattern of required admissions examinations.

#### **IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Admissions Research and Evaluation**

- Sam Agronow, Coordinator of Admissions Research and Evaluation

**REPORT:** Coordinator Sam Agronow presented the results of two sets of analyses:

- “A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Prediction of UC GPA and Two-Year Success.” This analysis examines factors from the UC application, beyond those currently used for the eligibility determination, and their ability to predict UC success: (1) first-year UC GPA and (2) whether or not a student left UC in academic difficulty after their second-year at UC.
- “High/Low Analysis.” This analysis shows the distribution of first-year UC GPA and those students who left UC in academic difficulty after the second year, for students in each of four categories: (1) high High School GPA and high SAT scores, (2) high High School GPA and low SAT scores, (3) low High School GPA and high SAT scores, and (4) low High School GPA and low SAT scores. For these analyses, “high” is defined above the median, and “low” as below the median, for both GPA and SAT scores.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members noted the limitations of these types of analyses, given that the data only examine students that apply to and enroll at UC. It was also noted that partitioning students into these four large categories reduces variability and the ability to make reliable conclusions based on the results. Although the prediction of UC GPA and persistence are important factors for BOARS to examine, these are not the only factors the faculty and the University should consider and value when determining admissions policy.

**ACTION:** UCOP Admissions Research and Evaluation will provide demographic information for the “High/Low” analyses.

#### **V. UC Freshman Eligibility Reform**

**DISCUSSION:** The committee continued its discussion of freshman eligibility reform, and specifically the role of testing in UC’s admissions policy. Proponents of maintaining an examination requirement argue that testing is beneficial to admissions processes because:

- Test scores add to the prediction of UC academic outcomes.

- Tests allow students to demonstrate academic achievement in spite of a lack of opportunities or discrimination in their educational environments (e.g., limited access to courses that fulfill the subject ‘a-g’ requirements).
- Subject tests, such as the SAT II and AP/IB exams, provide an incentive for students to master their coursework.
- Tests are the only standardized measure of academic achievement, especially given differences in grading practices.

Those opposed to rigid testing policies in admissions, maintain that the purported benefits of test scores are insignificant when weighed against the costs associated with test requirements:

- The value test scores add to the prediction of UC performance is relatively small.
- The number of students who take the required tests and students’ access to test preparation resources varies disproportionately across racial/ethnic and socio-economic groups.
- Among those high school students who complete the subject (‘a-g’) requirements for UC freshman eligibility, failure to fulfill the SAT II examination requirement is the most common reason for these students not attaining UC-eligible status.
- Test fees are a financial burden to low-income students.
- The high-stakes nature of the tests leads to a significant number of “false negatives” – students whose test scores do not accurately convey their level of academic achievement or ability.
- Admissions tests may motivate high school teachers and students to focus on strategies to raise test scores (“teaching to the test”) rather than mastery of coursework.

Members noted that BOARS will also need to address how tests scores are used in campus comprehensive review processes if a decision is made to propose a test-optional policy for eligibility. Some campuses and specific majors currently weight test scores heavily in their selection process.

The committee further discussed the idea of expanding the number of potential students visible to the University by creating an “eligible for review” or “entitled for review” (EFR) pathway, in which applicants would be guaranteed a comprehensive review by the campuses to which they apply, and deemed eligible for admission to individual campuses via this comprehensive review evaluation. As an EFR pathway proposal is developed, a number of questions, in addition to the role of testing, still need to be addressed by BOARS. For example:

- How would students qualify for review (e.g., attain a minimum GPA in ‘a-g’ courses, or meet some minimum standard for application “completeness”)?
- Should some “guarantee” of admission to the UC system be retained for some portion of applicants (e.g., systemwide admissions guarantee for ELC students)?

**ACTION:** BOARS Chair Mark Rashid will prepare a summary of the committee's discussions to date regarding eligibility reform, as well as an outline of next steps for committee consideration.

**VI. CPEC University Eligibility Study**

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- Charles Masten, Assistant Director of Undergraduate Admissions

**REPORT:** Assistant Director Charles Masten reported on the plans of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) to conduct a University eligibility study for the class of 2007. CPEC is responsible for conducting periodic studies to estimate the UC and CSU eligibility rates of graduating high school students.

A comparison was provided of the methodology used for the 2003 CPEC Eligibility Study, which was based on electronic transcripts of all graduates from a sample of 48 schools, and the methodology used for previous years' studies, which requested at least one student transcript from every high school. Due to the limited sample size of the 2003 study, the results of that study had significant error bands. To increase the power of the results, sampling with replacement methods were used, which added to the criticism of the study's methodology and findings. The plans for the 2007 study include increasing the school sample size to reduce the margin of error. The decision of how much to increase the sample size of the eligibility study depends in part on the availability of resources (e.g., staff time, funding) needed to conduct an expanded study.

**DISCUSSIONS:** Members stressed the need for the study to be as accurate as possible given the impact of the findings on admissions policies at UC and CSU. It was noted, however, that even with an increased sample size, the CPEC study can only produce an "estimate" of eligibility rates, and therefore, the findings should not be portrayed as completely reliable and accurate rates of eligibility.

**VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee Report**

- Trish Stoddart, BOARS Vice Chair and Subcommittee Chair

**REPORT:** Vice Chair Trish Stoddart provided a brief report of the recent meeting of the BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee. The subcommittee is drafting a letter requesting nominations for faculty members to serve on the task force to review guidelines for the mathematics ('c') and laboratory science ('d') subject requirements for eligibility. This letter will be sent from Academic Council Chair John Oakley to the chairs of the divisional senates, and once a list of nominees has been compiled, the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) will make the necessary faculty appointments for the task force membership.

Another item under consideration by the subcommittee is implementation of the requirements of California Senate Bill 1543. This legislative measure requests that UC and requires that CSU develop "model uniform academic standards" for career technical education (CTE) courses that will satisfy completion of the College Preparatory Elective ('g') subject requirement for eligibility. Director Wilbur provided BOARS with

additional information on legislative efforts related to CTE courses, including Governor Schwarzenegger's plans for expanding career technical education programs in California.

**ACTION:** BOARS will discuss career technical education and the subject ('a-g') requirements at the February meeting.

**VIII. University Diversity Study Group – Academic Senate Analysis**

Due to lack of time, discussion of this item was deferred.

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

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Senate Analyst

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**
**Attendance 2006-07**

		10/6/06	11/3/06	12/1/06	1/5/07	2/2/07	3/2/07	4/6/07	5/4/07	6/1/07	7/13/07
<b>MEMBERS:</b>											
Mark Rashid, Chair	Davis (Civil & Env. Eng.)	X	X	X	X						
Trish Stoddart, Vice Chair	Santa Cruz (Education)	X	X	X	X						
David Stern	Berkeley (Education)	X	X	X	Alt						
Jennifer Chacon	Davis (Law)	X	--	X	Alt						
John Whiteley	Irvine (Social Ecology) - Sept-Dec	X	Alt	X	--						
James Given	Irvine (History) Jan-Aug	X	Alt	X	X						
Sylvia Hurtado	Los Angeles (Education)	X	Alt	X	X						
Peggy O'Day	Merced (Natural Sciences)	X	X	X	--						
Peter Sadler	Riverside (Earth Sciences)	X	X	X	X						
Akos Rona-Tas	San Diego (Sociology)	X	Alt	X	X						
Daniel Weiss	San Francisco (Psychiatry)	X	X	X	X						
William Jacob	Santa Barbara (Mathematics)	X	X	X	X						
David Anthony	Santa Cruz (History)	X	X	X	X						
<b>ALTERNATES:</b>											
Hugh Roberts	Irvine (English)	--	X	--	--						
Duncan Lindsey	Los Angeles (Public Policy)	--	X	--	--						
Hans Paar	San Diego (Physics)	--	T	--	--						
Bob Jacobsen	Berkeley (Physics)	--	--	--	X						
Keith Widaman	Davis (Psychology)	--	--	--	X						
<b>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:</b>											
Arshad Ali	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X	X	X						
Tina Park	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X	X	X						
<b>EX OFFICIO:</b>											
John Oakley	Chair, Academic Senate	X	--	X	--						
Michael Brown	Vice Chair, Academic Senate	X	--	X	X						
<b>CONSULTANTS:</b>											
Samuel Agronow	Assoc. Dir., UCOP SAS	X	X	X	X						
Maria Bertero-Barceló	Exec. Director, Academic Senate	X	--	--	--						
Joyce Justus	Acting VP, Student Affairs	--	--	--	--						
Judy Kowarsky	Assoc. Director of Admissions, UCOP	--	--	--	--						
Nina Robinson	Director of Policy, UCOP SAS	X	X	X	X						
Judy Sakaki	VP, Student Affairs	--	--	--	--						
Roger Studley	Assistant Director, UCOP SAS	X	X	X	--						
Susan Wilbur	Director of Admissions, UCOP	X	X	--	X						

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**

Attendance 2006-07

		10/6/06	11/3/06	12/1/06	1/5/07	2/2/07	3/2/07	4/6/07	5/4/07	6/1/07	7/13/07
<b>GUESTS:</b>											
Kyra Caspary	Analyst, UCOP SAS	X	X	X	--						
Tongshan Chang	Principal Analyst, UCOP SAS	--	X	--	--						
Margaret Heisel	Assist to VP and Exec Dir, UCOP	X	--	--	--						
Eric Taggart	Director, ASSIST Coordination Site	X	--	X	--						
Charles Masten	Assistant Director, UCOP SAS	--	--	--	X						
<b>STAFF:</b>											
Kimberly Peterson	Senate Analyst	X	X	X	X						
<b>Key: X = In attendance, -- = Absent, Alt = Alternate attended, T = participated via Teleconference</b>											