

Minutes of Meeting – February 17, 2006

Approved April 14, 2006

I. Welcome and Announcements

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair
- Rory Hume, Acting Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs

Senate Vice Chair-Elect

BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown announced his election as Vice Chair of the Academic Senate. His term as Vice Chair will begin September 2006.

LA Times Article

BOARS was provided a copy of a recent LA Times editorial regarding the committee's review of the Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy for UC Eligibility. Concerns were raised about inaccuracies in the article and public reaction to the information.

Eligibility and Admissions Study Group

Acting Provost Hume informed BOARS of the plans to reconvene the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group (Study Group). Acting Provost Hume will be co-chairing the Study Group with Regent Joanne Kozberg. One area of interest to the Regents and President Dynes is how the comprehensive review process is working for the UC campuses.

ACTION: Acting Provost Hume will be invited to a future BOARS meeting to discuss the Study Group and other admission-related issues.

II. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the January 13, 2006 BOARS meeting were approved with amendments.

III. Consultation with Office of the President – Student Affairs

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

Fall 2006 Applications

A preliminary summary and data findings for Fall 2006 undergraduate applications to the University of California was provided. Overall application volume for Fall 2006 admission increased by 6.6% (from 100,138 to 106,784). This represents an 8.8% increase (from 76,152 to 82,841) at the freshman level and a slight decline of 0.2% (from 23,986 to 23,943) at the transfer level. The increase of freshman applicants from California public high schools was 8.4%, nearly double the 3.4% projected rate of increase of California public high school graduates.

This is the second year that UC has experienced no growth in the overall number of transfer applications, and all campuses expect Berkeley experienced a decrease in transfer applications

this year. As a result, most campuses stayed open for transfer applications beyond the November 30th deadline. Many of the campuses have also already announced they will be open to accept transfer students in the Winter quarter.

UC Score

An upcoming edition of *UC Notes* (<http://www.ucop.edu/pathways/ucnotes/welcome.html>) will announce the introduction of the “UC Score,” a common scale for admissions test score conversion developed by BOARS.

IV. Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair
- Mark Rashid, BOARS Vice Chair

DISCUSSION: Members reviewed a draft communiqué to campuses regarding BOARS’ examination of the Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy. A number of revisions to the document were suggested, including:

- Create a summary document explaining and providing references to the data and research BOARS examined during the committee’s review of the Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy for UC Eligibility.
- Refer to the specific comprehensive review guidelines and selection criteria that relate to assessing advanced coursework.
- Provide examples of how campuses might assess advanced coursework and student achievement in these courses. List the resources and data that are available to campuses to implement these assessment models as part of their comprehensive review processes.
- Streamline the text and reorder the paragraphs.

ACTION: BOARS Vice Chair Mark Rashid will develop a revised draft communiqué.

V. Examination of Statewide Eligibility Construct

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

DISCUSSION: BOARS discussed a draft proposal, “Toward a Conceptual Definition of UC Eligibility: The Guarantee of Admissions and the Guarantee of Consideration for Admission.” The committee briefly discussed the idea of establishing eligibility thresholds at which some applicants would be guaranteed admission to the UC system and other students would be guaranteed consideration for admission to the UC system. Those guaranteed “consideration” could be admitted through comprehensive review.

BOARS discussed the purpose of eligibility and why UC uses this unique process. As defined by the Master Plan for Higher Education, part of UC’s social contract with the state is to admit the top 12.5 percent of California’s public high school graduates. Eligibility is the process by which the University defines and determines this top 12.5 percent of students, and UC repeatedly affirmed its historic commitment to provide places in the University for all eligible students. Members discussed the benefits and constraints of abiding by this Master Plan commitment. Defining the requirements for eligibility gives students a clear academic goal to work towards and has allowed UC to remain a system of equal campuses. However, as greater numbers of

students are graduating from high school and preparing for college, the constraint of defining only the top 12.5 percent of students as eligible, coupled with the understanding that the state does not provide funding for enrollments beyond those students generated by the 12.5 percent eligibility rate, sometimes forces UC to raise the minimum requirements for eligibility. This means that students that were previously considered qualified and capable of attending UC are no longer deemed eligible. This constant adjustment to the eligibility construct often has the greatest negative impact on underrepresented groups of students.

VI. Senate Regulation 477: Streamlining UC Major Preparation Articulation Proposal

- Margaret Heisel, Associate to the VP for Student Affairs and Executive Director
- Barbara Hoblitzell, Director, Transfer Preparation Policy and Programs
- Eric Taggart, Director, Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST)

ISSUE: BOARS and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) have been charged by the Academic Senate to collaborate with UCOP Student Affairs to develop implementation guidelines and procedures for the new Streamlining Major Preparation Articulation (SR 477) and SciGETC (SR 478) policies.

REPORT: BOARS was presented a proposed framework to facilitate implementation of SR 477 and 478. It is proposed that all existing commonalities in lower division preparation across all UC majors and campuses be identified as “UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways,” and that these preparatory pathways be accessible through ASSIST and widely communicated in UC publications and websites. The UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways is intended to provide students with a mechanism that enables easy access to information needed to understand and compare transfer preparation patterns across campuses. The transfer preparatory pathways would identify:

- (1) UC campus majors for which the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is sufficient preparation,
- (2) UC campus majors that require (or recommend) completion of a common preparation pattern, and
- (3) UC campus majors for which common preparatory course patterns do not exist.

DISCUSSION: BOARS and the guest consultants discussed the future possibilities for expanding the capabilities of and information provided through the proposed “UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways” (e.g., an advanced tool that generates a list of majors at UC campuses where a student, based on the courses already taken, is on-track for transfer).

ACTION: BOARS approved the concept of the preliminary “UC Transfer Preparatory Pathways” approach for implementation of SR 477 and 478.

VII. Analytic Subcommittee Report

- David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair
- 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 revised samples of school-based and household-based indicators on inclusiveness. These revisions were based on feedback received at the last BOARS meeting.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members provided additional feedback on the draft indicator sets and made suggestions for improvement of the displays of the inclusiveness measures (e.g., providing more descriptive labeling of charts, using consistent color assignment of bars across the charts). It was suggested that clear explanations of the indicators, how they were constructed, and their purpose should accompany any publication of the information.

ACTION: Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern will draft explanations of the indicators.

VIII. Articulation & Evaluation Subcommittee Items

- David Stern, Articulation & Evaluation Subcommittee Chair

Laboratory Science ('d') Requirement

The committee reviewed draft language clarifying the Laboratory Science ('d') Requirement policy in the 'a-g' implementation guidelines. BOARS Member Peggy O'Day, who was unable to attend the meeting, provided written comments on the proposed language. Discussion focused on the problems of aligning the UC subject ('a-g') requirements for admission with state standards for high schools, the knowledge and skills necessary to ensure a minimum level of preparedness for UC, and major preparation requirements. The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee is at the beginning stages of considering moving towards a more standards-based approach to the subject ('a-g') requirements.

ACTION: The clarifying amendments to the Laboratory Science ('d') requirement section of the 'a-g' guide were approved with one amendment.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst