

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Minutes of Meeting – April 15, 2005

Approved May 6, 2005

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

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred. BOARS Chair Michael Brown will send the committee members announcements via email.

**II. Consent Calendar**

- A. Approval of BOARS March 18, 2005 Meeting Minutes

**ACTION: The minutes of the March 18, 2005 BOARS meeting were approved with minor modifications.**

- B. Approval of SCIGETC: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 478

**ACTION: The proposed amendment to Senate Regulation 478 – SCIGETC was approved.**

- C. Approval of Streamlining UC Course Major Preparation Articulation Policy:  
Proposed New Senate Regulation 477

**ACTION: The proposed new Senate Regulation 477 – Streamlining UC Course Major Preparation Articulation Policy was approved**

- D. Approval of UCAAD Addendum to the Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions

**ACTION: The committee approved the receipt and inclusion of the UCAAD report as an addendum to the Report of the Task Force on Graduate and Professional School Admissions.**

**III. Consultation with Office of the President – Student Academic Services**

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

**REPORT:** Director Susan Wilbur provided BOARS with preliminary data tables of the results for the Fall 2005 Freshmen admissions cycle. The University will publicly release this information to the media on Tuesday. Highlights of this year's admissions data include:

- 50,017 freshmen were admitted to the UC system, a record number of freshmen admit offers and an increase of 4,881 from last year. The systemwide overall admit rate also increased; 76.3 percent of Fall 2005 freshman applicants were offered admission, compared to 73.3 percent in Fall 2004 and 75.8 percent in Fall 2003.
- Every campus reported making more freshman admission offers this year compared to last year. The Merced campus initially offered freshman admission to 5,958 applicants.

- The overlap in campus admissions offers increased, so students are more likely to receive multiple admissions offers.
- For the referral pool, Riverside has offered admission to engineering majors (866) and Merced has offered admission to all students in the referral pool (about 6,000). The take rate for referrals has historically been about 5 percent.
- All racial/ethnic groups experienced systemwide increases in the number of students admitted. Underrepresented students, as a proportion of total systemwide freshman admits, also showed slight gains; however URM students are still being admitted at rates below the overall mean.
- Systemwide admit rates for students designated as having low socio-economic status (first-generation college and low family income) decreased slightly this year from Fall 2004.
- The academic quality of admitted freshman continues to remain outstanding; the average number of a-g courses taken by admits continues to be well above the minimum requirement.
- Several geographic regions experienced increases in terms of the number of admits, including significant gains for Northern California and the San Francisco Bay Area. Although greater numbers of students from the Central Valley were admitted, there was a decline in the admit rates from this area.

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked a number of questions about the admissions information for Fall 2005, including:

- Has there been a decline in the overall population of first generation students that would account for the slightly lower admit rates for these students this year? The committee was informed that UC actually experienced a small increase in first generation students in the systemwide academic profile this year.
- Is there a way in which information, such as the academic and demographic characteristics, could be obtained about those students that are eligible but do not apply to UC? The committee was informed that it has been estimated that approximately 80 percent of the eligibility pool applies to UC. Most information about the pool of eligible students is based on CPEC's eligibility studies, which have a number of limitations.

The committee also discussed a recent LA Times article that reported UC had admitted fewer students with low SAT scores for Fall 2004 than it did for Fall 2003. The article implied that this change had been motivated by public allegations that UC campuses had been admitting students with low SAT scores in a back-door effort to increase enrollments of underrepresented minority students in violation of state law. Members noted that Fall 2004 was an anomalous admissions year because of the state budget cuts and subsequent Guaranteed Transfer Option (GTO); and therefore, any trends in the characteristics of admitted freshmen might not accurately reflect overall UC admissions trends. It was also noted that the mean SAT score changes slightly every year, which might relate to differences in the SAT average of UC's admitted students from year to year. Director Susan Wilbur indicated that her office is currently examining data for the applicants and admits to the UC system from 2003-05 to identify and analyze any systemwide or campus trends in regards to SAT scores. The committee agreed that this type of SAT score trend analysis might be appropriate for inclusion in the Comprehensive Review Report, especially given the concerns that have been raised about this issue.

**ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will present BOARS with the analysis on SAT score trends when it is completed.**

#### **IV. Testing Subcommittee – Fall 2006 Eligibility Index Presentation**

- Mark Rashid, Testing Subcommittee Chair

**REPORT:** At the March BOARS meeting, the committee approved the Testing Subcommittee's proposal to implement a "UC Score" Eligibility Index for Fall 2006. At that meeting, UCOP consultants expressed concerns about the difficulty to prepare, in such a short timeframe, strategic communication of the Eligibility Index with the added UC Score test score conversion. The subcommittee agreed to work with UCOP staff to develop a set of Fall 2006 Eligibility Index public presentation options for BOARS consideration, including one with and without the "UC Score" element. Testing Subcommittee Chair Mark Rashid provided the committee with these two alternate presentations of the Fall 2006 Eligibility Index.

Recently, however, the Provost, in consultation with the Council of Chancellors, made the decision that the University will not use a "UC Score" Eligibility Index for Fall 2006 admissions communications. The UCOP administration has expressed support for the concept of developing a UC Score in the future, but concerns about a lack of adequate time to prepare a public explanation of the UC Score calculation prompted the decision to halt its adoption for this coming year.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee questioned the process the administration followed to reach a decision to not use BOARS' "UC Score" recommendation for the Fall 2006 Eligibility Index. Objections were raised regarding the lack of adequate consultation with BOARS before a final decision had been made. The committee should have been given the opportunity to address the concerns of the Provost and administration before the draft BOARS "UC Score" worksheet was presented to the Chancellors and before a final decision was reached.

Members also voiced concerns about the context in which the Provost and Chancellors examined the draft "UC Score" worksheet. Were they aware of BOARS' reasons for pursuing a common index for test score concordance? Was there comparison with the current publication of the Eligibility Index? VP Winston Doby informed the committee that the decision was based solely on the fact that the University would not have a chance to adequately field test the "UC Score" concept in advance of its publication.

#### Fall 2006 Eligibility Index

The committee questioned how the administration planned to present the Fall 2006 Eligibility Index since the current Index must be modified to accommodate the new testing pattern. VP Doby informed BOARS that it had been decided the simplest approach would be to prepare two separate indices, one for SAT takers and one for ACT takers, for Fall 2006 admissions. This would eliminate the need for applicants to convert their test scores. The committee explained that such an approach was arithmetically impossible since ACT takers are also required to submit scores from two SAT II exams. These applicants will still need to convert their ACT test scores to an SAT or common score scale.

Members indicated that the presentation of the Fall 2006 Index might resemble the non-UC Score Eligibility Index presentation option the Testing Subcommittee had prepared for BOARS'

consideration. A number of recommendations for improving this document were suggested by committee members. The committee reminded the consultants that whatever presentation is developed for the Fall 2006 Index will still need to be field tested. BOARS should also review the communication before it is finalized.

#### Fall 2007 Eligibility Index

The committee discussed whether a “UC Score” Eligibility Index should be pursued for Fall 2007. It was generally agreed that moving towards a neutral score scale for admissions tests was an important first step for BOARS long-range goals for admissions (e.g., creating a heterogeneous testing environment, lessening the perceived preeminence of the SAT).

Members made a number of suggestions for the field testing that would need to be conducted in order to move forward with a “UC Score” Index:

- Students who participate in the field testing may not be familiar yet with SAT/ACT score reporting, and therefore should be provided with an explanation and sample score reports as part of the field tests.
- Different format options (e.g., separate worksheets for ACT and SAT) should be presented.
- The field tests should be designed to obtain information on the reaction to the “UC Score” concept as well as whether those tested are able to accurately calculate their eligibility.
- The field tests should gather information on the types of tools (e.g., online calculator) that would be most helpful to applicants and the public to understand the Eligibility Index.
- The field tests should be constructed in consultation with BOARS and/or the Analytic Subcommittee.
- The standard of “transparency” in eligibility is often crippling to the University. The field tests should examine how constituencies respond to various levels of complexity.
- Constituencies that should participate in field tests include: students, high school counselors, academic preparation staff, and non-English speakers.
- Field tests could be conducted at the UC Counselor Conferences and as part of summer Academic Preparation programs.

Testing Subcommittee Chair Mark Rashid presented the following motion for the committee’s endorsement:

MOTION: BOARS will work with UCOP staff to devise and undertake a set of field studies with the objective of understanding the reaction of various constituencies to a UC Score in advance of the Fall 2007 admissions cycle.

**ACTION: The motion for BOARS to pursue a “UC Score” Eligibility Index for Fall 2007 was approved unanimously.**

#### **V. Comprehensive Review Report**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Michael Brown presented the committee with a recommendation to expand the Comprehensive Review Report to include two years of admissions information (Fall 2004 and Fall 2005 admissions data). This two-year framework is being proposed because this year’s report has been significantly delayed, but such a format might also be continued in future years to allow for a fuller analysis and presentation of admissions data. The proposal for a two-year Comprehensive Review Report will also need to be accepted by members of The Regents,

administration and Senate. The anticipated timeline for the report is to have it completed and approved by BOARS and the Academic Senate in time for the November 2005 Regents meeting.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members concurred that combining two years of data was a reasonable approach for the Fall 2004 Comprehensive Review Report, especially since 2004 was such an anomalous year for admissions because of the state budget cuts and GTO. It might also be confusing to release Fall 2004 report at this time since data on Fall 2005 admissions has just been released.

It was noted that reporting on an annual basis was important in the first years when Comprehensive Review was instituted; however, now due to the relative stability of the process, it may be more constructive to move to a two-year reporting format. This could allow for a more meaningful and in-depth analysis, and other admissions-related studies (e.g., UCUES analyses) could be presented to the Senate and Regents in alternate years.

The committee provided with bullet point observations of the admissions data for the Fall 2004 Comprehensive Review Report. Members are asked to provide feedback on these observations and the types of data and discussion that should be included in the report. As part of BOARS further consideration of what additional information might be included in the Comprehensive Review Report, the committee was also provided with draft disparate impact data (ratio of minimum to maximum admit rate by ethnicity) for 1995-2004.

**ACTION:** Analyst Kimberly Peterson will send an electronic draft of the “Observations on Comprehensive Review Tables” for committee members’ feedback.

## **VI. Admissions by Exception Guidelines**

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred. BOARS Chair Michael Brown will discuss with the AbyE Subcommittee and BOARS as to what should be presented to the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group about the committee’s progress in developing Admissions by Exception guidelines.

## **VII. General Examination of UC Eligibility**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

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

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

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst