

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Minutes of Meeting – March 2, 2007

Approved April 6, 2007

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

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chairs

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

- Joint Meeting with EVCs. The February Academic Council meeting included a joint session with the campus Executive Vice Chancellors. One of the main issues discussed was senior management job slotting and related concerns about stratification between the campuses.
- UCAAD. The Academic Council has approved the addition of the chair of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD) to the Council membership. This proposed membership change will be put forward to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for final approval.
- ELC Math Requirement. Last year BOARS approved a proposal to modify the number of units of the mathematics requirement that must be completed for ELC-qualification (see Info Item A). This proposal was endorsed by the Academic Council at their February meeting.
- Tobacco 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. In addition, Regent John Moores sent a letter on behalf of the Regents to solicit further Senate input on issues raised during the January Regents' meeting discussion of the RE-89 proposal. Several members of the Academic Council, including BOARS Chair Rashid, are working to develop a response to the Moores letter. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.RE89.0207.pdf>
- Career Technical Education (CTE). Recently BOARS Chair Rashid, Admissions Director Wilbur, and Legislative Director Rivas met with Assemblymember Jean Fuller and her staff to discuss CTE curricula and UC's efforts to be more inclusive of these types of courses in our 'a-g' course approval guidelines. Chair Rashid also recently participated in, together with BOARS Member David Stern, a visit to the Arthur A. Benjamin Health Professions High School in Sacramento. This visit was organized by ConnectEd, a center sponsored by the Irvine Foundation with the goal of expanding academic pathways that will prepare students for both college and career (<http://www.connectedcalifornia.org>). Benjamin is a "theme" high school, which focuses on preparing students for health sciences careers while also providing all students with a full complement of 'a-g' courses.

## **II. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes**

**ACTION:** The minutes will be distributed for approval at the April BOARS meeting.

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

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

**REPORT:** Director Susan Wilbur reported to the committee on several meetings she has attended regarding career technical education (CTE) and UC's subject ('a-g') requirements for admissions eligibility:

- Multiple Pathways Presentation. The UCLA Institute for Democracy, Education and Access (IDEA) sponsored a conference on February 13 in Sacramento, which was attended primarily by legislators and legislative staff. Fifteen papers were presented around the idea of utilizing a "multiple pathways" approach in education, which integrates both college preparatory and career technical education (<http://www.idea.gseis.ucla.edu/>).
- Other Meetings. Director Wilbur continues to participate in various meetings with CTE lobbyists, legislators and other interested parties to explain UC's 'a-g' course approval process and how CTE courses can gain approval through that process.

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

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

**REPORT:** Associate Director Sam Agronow presented supplemental results of the following analyses:

- A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Prediction of UC GPA
- A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Prediction of Two-Year Success

These analyses examine factors from the UC application, beyond those currently used for the eligibility determination, and their ability to predict UC success, as defined by first-year UC GPA or whether or not a student left UC in academic difficulty after their second-year at UC. At the request of BOARS, supplemental analyses were conducted which (1) excluded students who were Eligible in the Local Context (ELC) and (2) excluded students who were ELC and students with high test scores. Despite the exclusion of these two groups of students from the analysis, the patterns of results were similar.

**DISCUSSION:** Members commented that these and other regression analyses that the committee has reviewed continue to show that the ability to predict UC GPA is small and the predictive power that SAT scores add is only of minor significance. Others noted that these analyses show that using an applicant's complete high school record in a more

context dependent manner is a more effective way to judge a student's potential for UC success.

**REPORT:** Assistant Director Roger Studley presented simulations of three different definitions of 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.
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 meeting CSU's 2003 eligibility requirements.

For each of these three different scenarios, simulations were presented on the number and characteristics of the pool of EFR students, as well as the number and characteristics of the EFR students likely to apply to UC. Once data are available from the National Student Clearinghouse, simulations will be presented on the number and characteristics of EFR students likely to attend any 2- or 4-year college.

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

**DISCUSSION:** The committee continued its discussion of freshman eligibility reform and reviewed a draft proposal. Items of discussion included:

### Examination Requirement

The committee discussed several possible modifications to the current examination requirement, such as (1) making test score submission completely optional, (2) making test score submission optional for some applicants (e.g., ELC students), or (3) eliminating the SAT II Subject exam requirement while maintaining a core examination requirement (i.e., the ACT with Writing or SAT Reasoning Test).

Some members expressed concerns about proposing elimination of the core exam requirement before BOARS has completed its evaluation of the new SAT Reasoning Test. Others felt that the committee had compelling educational arguments in favor of eliminating the test score requirement. If the core examination requirement is maintained, there was general agreement that UC should continue to provide an Admissions by Exception (AbyE) pathway that allows outstanding students, who may not present test scores, to still apply and be considered for admission to the University. Efforts to systematize and better publicize the AbyE admissions pathway to potential students should also be made.

Despite differences in opinion about maintaining the core examination requirement, the committee generally agreed that a proposal to eliminate the SAT II Subject examination requirement should continue to be pursued. It was noted that UC is the only public institution that requires subject examinations of its applicants, and that approximately one-third of California high school graduates take the SAT core examination while less than 15 percent take the required SAT II subject examinations. Elements of the two most

predictive subject exams, the SAT II Writing and SAT II Math, have also been integrated into the new SAT Reasoning Text.

#### Comprehensive Review Guidelines

The committee briefly discussed the need to modify aspects of the Comprehensive Review Guidelines in order to accommodate greater flexibility in the eligibility policy and bring about UC admissions reform. If campuses continue to use their current comprehensive review processes, the admissions outcomes will likely remain the same in spite of the broadening of the pool of potential admits that might occur under a reformed eligibility policy.

#### Referral Pool

Some campuses are concerned that eliminating the guarantee of admission to the UC system currently provided to all “eligible” applicants would in turn eliminate the referral pool thereby reducing the ability of non-selective campuses to meet their enrollment targets. Members suggested that an applicant referral process could be implemented as part of the eligibility reform proposal. For example, the application could include a checkbox that applicants could select to permit their application to be shared with other UC campuses. Since the eligibility reform proposal will broaden the potential pool of admits, it is also likely that non-selective campuses will receive more applicants.

#### Master Plan

The committee discussed how a reformed eligibility policy would comply with the California Master Plan for Higher Education requirement that the top 12.5 percent of the state’s high school graduates will be eligible for admission to the University. The Master Plan authorizes UC to determine its criteria for admissions eligibility, and the Regents have delegated the authority for making that determination, subject to their final approval, to the Academic Senate. The committee debated whether the Master Plan requires that the top 12.5 percent of students be defined using universal methods that are applied to all California high school graduates, whether or not they apply to UC; or if the Master Plan would permit UC to define the top 12.5 percent in a collective manner, based on the judgments of individual UC campuses of those students that apply to and are deemed qualified for admission.

#### Proposal Development

The committee members generally agreed that the following three components should be included in BOARS’ eligibility reform proposal:

1. The creation of an “eligible for review” or “entitled for review” (EFR) policy, which would replace the current statewide eligibility pathway, and would expand the pool of students considered for admission beyond the notional 12.5 percent. Only applicants that are Eligible in the Local Context (ELC) would continue to have a guarantee of admission to the UC system.
2. Applicants would be required to submit core examination scores in order to be considered for admission under the EFR policy. An Admissions by Exception (AbyE) pathway would remain, which would allow students who do not submit test scores to still be considered for admission; however, the University would not be obligated to review applications that are submitted without test scores.

3. The Comprehensive Review Guidelines would be modified or supplemented to more explicitly address the proper use of test scores in admission decisions.

**ACTION:** The draft eligibility reform proposal will be revised and discussed further at the next BOARS meeting.

**VI. Testing Subcommittee Report**

- Jennifer Chacon, Testing Subcommittee Chair

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

**ACTION:** BOARS Members are asked to read the “2007 Testing Subcommittee Agenda” and send their responses and suggestions to Subcommittee Chair Jennifer Chacon.

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