

Minutes of Meeting – February 2, 2007

Approved April 6, 2007

I. Consultation with Office of the President – Student Affairs

- Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs

REPORT: Judy Sakaki, who was recently appointed as the Vice President for Student Affairs, introduced herself to the BOARS members and provided information on her personal and professional background. Prior to joining the UC Office of the President, VP Sakaki served as Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at UC Davis. VP Sakaki grew up in and attended public school in Oakland, and as a first-generation college student, pursued a bachelor's degree at California State University, Hayward. She later received her Ph.D. in education from UC Berkeley.

VP Sakaki has been dedicated to the issues of educational access and equity throughout her entire professional career, starting at the CSU Hayward campus where she first served as an outreach counselor in the Educational Opportunity Program. She conveyed to BOARS her commitment to addressing the challenges facing the University of California, such as providing access to and preparation for higher education to the diverse populations of the state, and ensuring that UC campuses provide an educational environment that facilitates student success.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members raised several issues with VP Sakaki, including:

- The possibility of BOARS recommending reforms to UC's freshman eligibility policy and the UC administration's receptiveness to such a proposal.
- The challenges inherent to maintaining ten unique and autonomous UC campuses while also maintaining the University as a system, especially in terms of campuses' differing admissions selection processes and competition for student enrollments.
- The movement towards increased testing and standards-based reforms, its effect on the K-12 educational environment, and the potential impact of this movement on the University and its connections with K-12.
- Legislative and other public pressures for California high schools to make the subject ('a-g') requirements for freshman eligibility the default curriculum.

II. Welcome and Chair's Announcements

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

REPORT: Chair Mark Rashid reported to the committee on a number of recent actions of the Academic Council and other items of interest:

- Senate Officer Removal Bylaw (SB 110.A.4). The Academic Council, at its January 24, 2007, meeting, approved for transmission to the Assembly, an amendment to Senate Bylaw (SB) 110.A. This amendment provides an explicit policy and procedure

for effecting the suspension and removal of an elected Officer of the Assembly (the chair or vice chair).

<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/feb2007/assembly.02.14.07.pdf>

- ▶ Academic Senate Vice Chair. The Academic Council elected to nominate Prof. Mary Croughan (UCSF), who currently serves as the chair of the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), to serve as the Academic Senate vice chair for 2007-08. Professor Croughan's nomination will be voted on by the Assembly at the February 14, 2007, meeting.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/feb2007/assembly.02.14.07.pdf>
- ▶ Tobacco-Industry Funding of Research. At their January 18, 2007, meeting, the Regents considered a proposal (RE-89) to institute a Universitywide ban on the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry. The Regents have asked for the Academic Senate's formal input on this proposal in time for consideration at their May meeting. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/jan07/re89.pdf>
- ▶ Transfer Preparation Pathways. On some campuses, there appear to be concerns about the clarity of the language and the faculty review process of the Transfer Preparation Pathways documents. Options for formalizing the campus-level review process and creating a mechanism by which concerns will be reported back to BOARS and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) are currently being considered.

ACTION: BOARS members are asked to report to the committee if they learn of any campus concerns regarding the Transfer Preparation Pathways initiative.

- ▶ Admission Directors Meeting. Chair Rashid was invited to the January 30 meeting of the UC Admissions Directors to talk generally about freshman eligibility reform. The directors welcomed the discussion, but also expressed concerns about implementation of an "eligible for review" pathway and the potential unintended consequences of eligibility reform (e.g., eliminating the referral pool might result in fewer applicants for consideration by the Merced and Riverside campuses).

ACTION: BOARS will request the admissions directors submit a written summary report of campus application review practices, including processes for Admissions by Exception and other special reviews. The directors will be given a May due date for this report.

- ▶ Fall 2007 Admissions GPA Change. Fall 2007 is the first admissions cycle in which UC freshman applicants are subject to the increased minimum GPA (raised from 2.8 to 3.0) for eligibility. UCOP has identified 943 applicants this year that are "newly ineligible," that is, they have GPAs ranging from 2.8 – 3.0 and would have been eligible under the minimum GPA for fall 2006 eligibility. In 2006, more than 600 applicants who fell in the 2.8 – 3.0 GPA range for eligibility were admitted to selective UC campuses. It was noted that several campuses have committed to considering these "newly ineligibles" for Admissions by Exception this year.

ACTION: Chair Rashid will draft a letter, for BOARS' review, encouraging the campus admissions committees to consider reviewing "newly ineligible" applicants for Admissions by Exception this year.

III. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the January 5, 2007 Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the January 5, 2007, meeting were approved with the addition of one notation regarding updated transfer application numbers.

B. Proposals Under Systemwide Academic Senate Review

ACTION: BOARS elected not to opine on "Draft Proposal on the Relationships Between (Pharmaceutical) Vendors and Clinicians."

IV. Consultation with Office of the President – Admissions

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur reported on the following admissions-related issues:

- Transfer Applications. Updated applicant data reveal a much smaller decrease in the number of transfer applications than was previously reported – there was an overall decline in transfer applications of 0.7 percent this year compared to the fall 2006 admissions cycle. Despite experiencing only a slight decrease in transfer applications, there remain concerns as to whether or not all UC campuses will be able to meet their transfer enrollment goals for the year. Several UC campuses remain open for off-quarter/semester transfer applicants, and the majority of the CSU campuses, which have also experienced declines in transfer applications this year, also remain open for transfer applicants. Various theories for the weak transfer application numbers are being proposed, including: (1) more students are enrolling in for-profit institutions, (2) the economy is strong so students are entering the workforce instead of seeking transfer to 4-year institutions, and (3) greater numbers of high school students are becoming eligible and applying for freshman admissions, which is depleting the pool of potential UC transfer students.
- Enrollment Management. UCOP has engaged in a more active role in enrollment management planning this year. UCOP Admissions staff have developed preliminary enrollment models, which predict enrollment yields and the likelihood of an applicant being in the referral pool, to assist campuses in strategic admissions and enrollment planning.
- Application Revisions. The following revisions to the UC application are currently under development and will be brought to BOARS for review:
 - *Non-'a-g' Courses.* Concerns have been expressed that UC does not currently recognize courses outside of the subject ('a-g') requirements, such as career

- technical education (CTE) courses, that students engage in during high school. Adding a question to the application that would allow students to describe their non-‘a-g’ courses might provide additional information about applicants’ educational choices and opportunities in high school.
- *Personal Statement.* The prompts provided for the personal statement portion of the application are currently being reevaluated for their usefulness. One option being considered is developing a prompt that would better align applicant responses with the goals for University of California admissions outlined by the May 1988 Regents’ Policy on Undergraduate Admissions (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/6168.html>). Another question being considered would give applicants an opportunity to provide more information about their personal background and the community in which they live.

DISCUSSION: Members remarked that as part of the rethinking of the prompts for the personal statement portion of the application, it would be helpful to know what type of information UC desires to obtain from the students and how that information would be used by campuses in making admissions decisions. Suggestions for information to seek from students in the personal statement portion of the application were made by BOARS members, including seeking information on leadership and the potential to make contributions, in various areas, to the state. The committee also noted that it is important to structure the questions in such a way that facilitates meaningful responses, even for those students who may have difficulty discussing the challenging circumstances they have faced. It was also suggested by one member that UC should reconsider the practice of not seeking recommendation letters since they might provide additional insight and information about applicants.

V. CCGA Proposed Amendment to SR 694 and New SR 695

ISSUE: The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 694 and a new Senate Regulation 695, both of which relate to graduate degree residency requirements (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.SR694.SR695.0107.pdf>).

DISCUSSION: Concerns were raised about the intent of the regulation proposal. Although the proposed new regulation is supposed to regulate residency requirements for graduate degrees, it appears to actually regulate the acceptable modes of delivery for courses that may be counted toward graduate degrees. It was noted that the determination of whether or not a course should be granted graduate credit is within the purview of the divisional Committees on Courses and Instruction or their equivalent. Members also noted that given the rapidly changing nature of electronic course delivery, it seems unwise to write prescriptive requirements for these new types of courses into Academic Senate regulation.

ACTION: Chair Rashid will draft a BOARS’ response to the CCGA proposed amendment to SR 694 and proposed new SR 695.

VI. Career Technical Education (CTE) – Standards for College Preparatory Elective ('g') Subject Requirement

- Trish Stoddart, BOARS Vice Chair and Articulation & Evaluation Subcommittee Chair
- Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

REPORT: Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee Chair Trish Stoddart reported on the subcommittee's consideration of how to meet the requirements of California Senate Bill 1543. This legislative measure requests UC and requires CSU to 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.

BOARS was provided a report from the California Department of Education on the numbers of CTE courses currently approved as satisfying the subject ('a-g') requirements for UC eligibility. A total of 4,705 CTE courses met UC's 'a-g' requirements in 2006-07, a significant increase since 2000-01 when only 258 CTE courses satisfied the eligibility requirements. The majority of these CTE courses that met UC's 'a-g' requirements in 2006-07 satisfied either the Visual and Performing Arts ('f') requirement (2,476 CTE courses) or the College Preparatory Elective ('g') requirement (1,427 CTE courses).

DISCUSSION: BOARS members were supportive of the subcommittee's plans to examine the College Preparatory Elective ('g') requirement guidelines and develop language that is more explicitly inclusive of CTE courses. Additional efforts to provide guidance and dispel misconceptions that CTE courses cannot be approved as satisfying the University's subject ('a-g') requirements should also be considered.

ACTION: The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee will develop a report on SB 1543 implementation plans and related CTE course and subject ('a-g') requirement issues for BOARS' review.

VII. Consultation with Office of the President – Admissions Research and Evaluation

- Sam Agronow, Associate Director and Coordinator, Research and Evaluation
- Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Research and Evaluation

REPORT: Assistant Director Roger Studley presented simulations of five different scenarios for identifying an "eligible for review" (EFR) category of students:

1. Students who, by the end of their senior year, fulfilled the 15 unit 'a-g' course requirement with a grade of C or better in each course. These students are also assumed to have met the "7 of 15" rule, which mandates that at least 7 of these courses be completed in the junior or senior year.
2. Students who, at the end of their junior year, had completed, with a grade of C or better, the 11 'a-g' courses required for ELC eligibility.
3. Students who, at the end of their senior year, were either:

- a. In the top 12.5% of graduating seniors from CA public high schools statewide (i.e., not within their school, as with ELC) based on their weighted, capped 'a-g' GPA. These students must have met the 15 unit 'a-g' requirement.
 - b. In the top 12.5% of graduating seniors from CA public high schools statewide on the 2003 admissions test score composite (SAT I Total plus 2 x SAT II Total). These students did not have to meet the 15 unit 'a-g' requirement.
4. Students meeting CSU's 2003 eligibility requirements.
 5. Students meeting UC's 2003 eligibility requirements.

DISCUSSION: For discussion of this analysis, please refer to item VIII of the minutes.

REPORT: Associate Director Sam Agronow provided BOARS with a supplement to the "High/Low" analyses provided to the committee at the January meeting:

- Students who left after 2nd year with GPA < 2.0 for Groups Created by Median Cut Points on SAT and High School GPA, Fall 2004 Freshman Entrants
- Demographic Profile of Students for Groups Created by Median Cut Points on SAT and High School GPA, Fall 2004 Freshman Entrants

DISCUSSION: It was noted that students with low high school GPAs left UC in academic difficulty after their sophomore year at higher rates than students with low SAT scores.

VIII. UC Freshman Eligibility Reform

DISCUSSION: The committee continued its discussion of freshman eligibility reform, and in particular, three potential elements of a proposal:

1. Create an "eligible for review" (EFR) policy and define the pool of students who would be eligible for this review.
2. Modify the Comprehensive Review Guidelines to accommodate greater flexibility in the eligibility policy.
3. Develop guidance to students about what they should do to prepare for UC and how various elements of the application will be used in the admissions process.

The committee further discussed the idea of expanding the number of potential students visible to the University for freshman admissions consideration by modifying the current statewide eligibility construct to become an "eligible for review" or "entitled for review" (EFR) policy. Applicants who meet certain criteria would be guaranteed a comprehensive review by the UC campuses to which they apply and deemed eligible for admission to individual campuses via a comprehensive review evaluation. The relative merits of various scenarios for defining the EFR pool were discussed, such as students having completed a minimum number of 'a-g' courses or having attained CSU eligibility or "substantially equivalent preparation."

The committee also briefly discussed the notion that the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) pathway should be maintained, and that ELC status might still guarantee

applicants an offer of admission to a campus in the UC system. BOARS members also noted the importance, especially for homeschooled and other non-traditional applicants, of maintaining some form of the Eligibility by Exam Alone policy. Whether or not the examination alone policy retained a guarantee of admission would depend in part on the anticipated numbers of students that would be eligible for this pathway to admission.

The committee debated whether or not to retain an examination requirement for admission to the University. Several options were discussed, including: making test score submission optional for all applicants; making test score submission optional for applicants who attain a minimum GPA, which is similar to CSU's eligibility policy (applicants with at least a 3.0 GPA are not required to submit test scores); or reducing the number of examinations required of applicants by no longer requiring the SAT II exams. It was noted that even if test score submission is made optional, the majority of applicants will likely still choose to submit their scores. Members agreed 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. Clear guidance will also need to be provided to students, schools, and the public as to how best prepare for UC and how applications will be assessed by the campuses.

IX. 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
Committee 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
MEMBERS:											
Mark Rashid, Chair	Davis (Civil & Env. Eng.)	X	X	X	X	X					
Trish Stoddart, Vice Chair	Santa Cruz (Education)	X	X	X	X	X					
David Stern	Berkeley (Education)	X	X	X	Alt	X					
Jennifer Chacon	Davis (Law)	X	--	X	Alt	X					
John Whiteley	Irvine (Social Ecology) - Sept-Dec	X	Alt	X	--	--					
James Given	Irvine (History) Jan-Aug	X	Alt	X	X	X					
Sylvia Hurtado	Los Angeles (Education)	X	Alt	X	X	X					
Peggy O'Day	Merced (Natural Sciences)	X	X	X	--	X					
Peter Sadler	Riverside (Earth Sciences)	X	X	X	X	X					
Akos Rona-Tas	San Diego (Sociology)	X	Alt	X	X	X					
Daniel Weiss	San Francisco (Psychiatry)	X	X	X	X	X					
William Jacob	Santa Barbara (Mathematics)	X	X	X	X	X					
David Anthony	Santa Cruz (History)	X	X	X	X	X					
ALTERNATES:											
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	--					
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:											
Arshad Ali	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X	X	X	--					
Tina Park	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X	X	X	--					
EX OFFICIO:											
John Oakley	Chair, Academic Senate	X	--	X	--	X					
Michael Brown	Vice Chair, Academic Senate	X	--	X	X	X					
CONSULTANTS:											
Samuel Agronow	Assoc. Dir., UCOP SAS	X	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	X					
Judy Sakaki	VP, Student Affairs	--	--	--	--	X					
Roger Studley	Assistant Director, UCOP SAS	X	X	X	--	X					
Susan Wilbur	Director of Admissions, UCOP	X	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
GUESTS:											
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	--					
William Kidder	Special Assistant to VP Student Affairs	--	--	--	--	X					
STAFF:											
Kimberly Peterson	Senate Analyst	X	X	X	X	X					
<p>Key: X = In attendance, -- = Absent, Alt = Alternate attended, T = participated via Teleconference</p>											