

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting – January 13, 2006

Approved February 17, 2006

I. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the December 12, 2005 BOARS teleconference meeting were approved as written.

II. Consultation with Office of the President – Student Affairs

Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

REPORT: Director Wilbur provided the committee with updates on the following items:

Fall 2006 Applications

Preliminary data for the Fall 2006 admissions cycle indicates the University received a record number of applications this year. The overall number of applications increased over 6 percent compared to the Fall 2005 admissions cycle. The overall number of freshman applicants increased on every campus except Merced, and all campuses except Berkeley experienced a decrease in the number of transfer applicants compared to last year. Two campuses have remained open for freshman applications and five campuses have remained open for transfer applications. More detailed application data will be provided to BOARS when it is available.

Test Pattern Issue

At the December BOARS meeting the committee discussed the potential issue of applicants taking the incorrect pattern of SAT II subject examinations since this is the first year of the new examination requirements. It was decided that campuses will be advised to use the Admissions by Exception policy if they choose to admit any students who have taken the incorrect pattern of examinations. Some of campuses may also decide to admit students provisionally with the requirement that they will take the necessary examinations prior to enrollment. Director Wilbur will report to BOARS on the number of applicants/admits that did not meet the correct examination pattern when the information is available.

III. Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy

DISCUSSION: Members provided oral and written responses from their divisional admissions committees to the BOARS November 18, 2005 letter regarding UC's Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy. Campus committees concurred with BOARS' concerns about the equity and efficacy of the honors bonus policy, and the committees were generally supportive of the concept of eliminating the bonus from the GPA calculation used for determining eligibility; however, a number of questions and concerns remained about the potential unintended consequences of

eliminating the honors bonus at eligibility. The committee agreed that individualized replies should be provided to campus committees to respond to the specific questions and concerns they raised about honors bonus point policy data and research.

BOARS members also agreed that the committee should send a communiqué to campus committees that would include the following:

- A public statement about the importance of students engaging in and being offered academically rigorous college-preparatory coursework;
- Strong recommendation that campuses work to strengthen their comprehensive review processes by implementing mechanisms to evaluate the rigor of a student's coursework in context;
- Notice of BOARS intentions to continue examining the honors bonus point policy with the goal of eventually recommending changes to the policy, and the intention of BOARS to explore other areas in which the eligibility determination can be improved (e.g., use of class rank).

ACTION: BOARS members are asked to identify and submit their campus committee's specific questions and data needs to the BOARS leadership and analyst.

ACTION: The BOARS leadership will draft a communiqué to campus committees for review and approval by the BOARS members.

IV. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)

Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation

This item was deferred.

V. Class Rank

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

This item was deferred.

VI. Analytic Subcommittee Report

David Stern, Chair, Analytic Subcommittee

Sam Agronow, Associate Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation

Tongshan Chang, Principal Analyst, Admissions Research & Evaluation

REPORT: Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern and Associate Director Sam Agronow presented samples of school-based and household-based indicators on inclusiveness. These indicators will allow BOARS, the University, and other interested parties to examine and track data on inclusiveness. The intention is to eventually publish this information on the UC website.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members provided feedback on the draft indicator sets and made suggestions for improvement of the displays of the inclusiveness measures. It was suggested that

clear explanations of the indicators and their purpose should accompany any displays published on the UC website.

ACTION: Members are asked to provide feedback to Subcommittee Chair David Stern and Associate Director Sam Agronow on the inclusiveness indicator displays.

VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee Report

David Stern, Chair, Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

REPORT: Subcommittee Chair David Stern reported on the November 2, 2005 meeting of the BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee. Issues the subcommittee is currently undertaking include:

- The subcommittee granted ‘a-g’ course list program status to “The Met,” a network of small charter schools that offer students a highly individualized curriculum (<http://www.bigpicture.org>). The Met schools’ courses will be accepted under program status as an experiment for several years, after which a review of the program, including an evaluation of the performance of UC students from these schools, is conducted.
- A subgroup is gathering information to aid the subcommittee in drafting policy for approval of online and distance education courses.
- The subcommittee is developing clarifying language for the Laboratory Science (‘d’) requirement for BOARS’ consideration.
- The subcommittee is beginning a longer-term project of evaluating and identifying ways to improve the ‘a-g’ course approval process.

ACTION: Members are asked to communicate informal feedback to BOARS Vice Chair Mark Rashid on the draft Laboratory Science (‘d’) requirement language.

ACTION: BOARS members are asked to communicate informal feedback to Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee Chair David Stern on the draft discussion document, “Can We Do Better? Improving and Augmenting UC Approval of High School Course Descriptions”.

1. Meeting adjourned 3:45 p.m.
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst