

Minutes of Meeting – April 6, 2007**I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements**

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

REPORT: Chair Mark Rashid extended a welcome to new committee member, Duncan Lindsey, who will be serving as the UCLA representative this quarter. Chair Rashid reported to the committee on a number of recent actions of the Academic Council and other items of interest:

- Tobacco Funding of Research. On January 23, 2007, Regent John Moores sent a letter soliciting, on behalf of The Regents, the Academic Senate's input on several issues raised during the January Regents' meeting discussion of RE-89, a proposed policy to institute a Universitywide ban on the acceptance of research funding from the tobacco industry. Several members of the Academic Council, including BOARS Chair Rashid, comprised a working group that developed a "neutral" response to the issues raised in the Moores letter. The working group's response has been distributed to the Senate divisions and committees to assist in their responses to the review of RE-89. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/JO.RegentMoores.RE89.3.19.07.pdf>
- Earth and Space Sciences. BOARS, the Academic Senate, and members of the University leadership continue to receive pressure to explicitly include earth and space sciences (ESS) in the laboratory science ('d') subject requirement area. For example, the California State Mining and Geology Board recently submitted a resolution advocating for ESS inclusion in the 'd' requirement language. The ESS and other related 'a-g' inclusion advocacy efforts, such as career technical education (CTE) movement, seem to be motivated by misconceptions that if a particular area of study is not explicitly included in the UC subject ('a-g') requirement language, then courses in these areas (1) cannot be approved for 'a-g' credit, (2) will be eliminated from the high school curriculum, and (3) are devalued by the University.
- Campus Meetings. BOARS Chair Rashid continues to meet with campus admissions committees to discuss eligibility reform and learn of their concerns about the proposal. A meeting with the Berkeley committee has already occurred, and next week Chair Rashid will meet with the Santa Cruz committee. Meetings with the other campus committees have been or are in the process of being scheduled.
- Regents' Diversity Study Group. Yesterday the Undergraduate Subcommittee of the Regents' Diversity Study Group held a productive and well attended meeting. A number of experts were invited to make presentations to the subcommittee, including members of the College Board, the UC Academy in Los Angeles, and the Civil Rights Project.
- CSU Admissions Meeting. The June 1 BOARS meeting will include a joint session with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council. The meeting will occur on the CSU Fullerton campus.

II. Consent Calendar

- A. Approval of the February 2, 2007 Minutes**
- B. Approval of the March 2, 2007 Minutes**
- C. Approval to submit no committee response to the following proposals under Systemwide Academic Senate review:**
 - UC Regents Proposed RE-89: Adoption of Policy Restricting University Acceptance of Funding from the Tobacco Industry
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.RE89.0207.pdf>
 - Proposed UC Policy on Open Access
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.open%20access%20policy0307.pdf>

ACTION: The Consent Calendar was adopted as noticed.

III. Testing Subcommittee Report

- Jennifer Chacon, Subcommittee Chair

REPORT: Subcommittee Chair Jennifer Chacon reported to BOARS on the charge of the Testing Subcommittee this year (enclosure 3). One key task is for the subcommittee to undertake an analysis of the alignment of the new SAT Reasoning Test and BOARS' recommendations for the use of admissions tests at UC ("testing principles") (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/admissionstests.pdf>). These BOARS' principles recommend that admissions tests should:

- (1) Assess the level of a student's course mastery in college preparatory subjects.
- (2) Serve as a diagnostic function for students (identify academic strengths and weaknesses).
- (3) Serve as a prescriptive function for students (guide college preparatory choices).
- (4) Identify students likely to succeed at UC (predictive validity).

Subcommittee Chair Chacon also reported on the various requests for information that BOARS has submitted to the College Board, and the degree to which the responses received thus far have assisted in the subcommittee's analysis. The subcommittee will be meeting today after the BOARS meeting to review sample tests of the old and new versions of the SAT, as well as sample essays from the new Writing portion of the exam.

ACTION: Members should submit suggestions to Testing Subcommittee Chair Jennifer Chacon of experts in the field of testing that the subcommittee might consult.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Admissions

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur provided BOARS with preliminary data tables of the results for the fall 2007 freshman admissions cycle (distribution 1). Final admissions numbers are pending as some applications, such as some referral pool applicants, are still being processed. Highlights of this year's admissions data include:

- UC admitted a record number of freshman students for fall 2007. A total of 57,318 California freshman students were offered fall 2007 admission, a 3.8 percent increase in admitted students, compared to fall 2006. Overall, 77.4 percent of fall 2007 California freshman applicants have been offered admission to the University, compared to 78.2 percent in fall 2006. The slight decline in the admissions rate was anticipated because the minimum GPA required for UC eligibility increased from 2.8 to 3.0 for fall 2007 applicants.
- Universitywide, all racial and ethnic groups registered increases in the number of admitted students compared to fall 2006 outcomes: African American +10.2 percent; Asian American +1.8 percent; Chicano/Latino +10.0 percent; and White/Caucasian +3.5 percent.
- The University continues to offer admission to students from various backgrounds traditionally underrepresented in higher education: 38.2 percent of admitted California resident freshman are the first in their families to attend college, 34.8 percent come from low-income families, and 19.6 percent attend a low performing high school.
- Admitted students continue to take more college preparatory courses than are required and continue to earn high grades. The average number of yearlong 'a-g' courses completed is 23; the minimum requirement is 15 of these courses. The average GPA of admitted students Universitywide is 3.79.
- Approximately 4,100 UC-eligible students will be offered admission to a campus through the referral process. In fall 2006, the number of referral students was over 6,000.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed the increasing pressures on students to complete greater numbers of the subject ('a-g') requirements in order to be competitive for UC admission. It was noted that students often receive conflicting messages about how best to prepare for admission to UC. For example, during the UC counselor conferences, counselors are advised that the University is more concerned about level of achievement in the 'a-g' subjects than the number of courses a student has taken; whereas, the campuses often advise students to take as many 'a-g' courses as possible, and some campuses grant bonus points in the admissions selection process for the number of additional 'a-g' courses taken.

Committee members also raised questions about how the University's admissions processes and the publishing of campus-specific admissions outcomes data (e.g., average GPA and SAT scores of admits) might contribute to the perception that there is a hierarchical structure inherent to UC's nine undergraduate campuses.

ACTION: The differentiation in campus admissions and how it relates to the “One University” perspective will be a topic of further discussion at a future BOARS meeting.

V. Campus Admissions Processes

- Nina Robinson, Director Policy and External Affairs

REPORT: Director Nina Robinson informed the committee of some potential efforts to reform campus admissions processes. The UC Office of the President has been working with the campus admissions directors to examine possibilities for comprehensive review process reform in two areas:

- (1) Ensuring that the campus processes meet not just the letter, but also the spirit of UC’s comprehensive review policy.
- (2) Addressing issues related to efficiency, consistency and transparency of campus admissions processes.

Initial reform efforts in these two areas have included a study of best practices for evaluating applicants with respect to context, and the development of the new admissions processing system. More work could be done, however, to further reform comprehensive review processes. As demand for UC admission grows, the duplication of effort resulting from different campus processes becomes increasingly difficult to justify. Now may be an appropriate time to engage in discussion about the possibility of sharing some aspects of the applicant evaluation process.

DISCUSSION: Members stressed the need to maintain campus autonomy in admissions decisions as methods to enact greater processing efficiencies are considered. Members questioned how aspects of applicant evaluation might be shared given the variation in campus processes? It was noted that 72 percent of UC freshman applicants apply to Berkeley, Los Angeles, or both campuses, so one method for increased efficiency might be to provide the other UC campuses with applicant information derived from the Berkeley and Los Angeles read processes. The campuses could elect to use this information if desired.

ACTION: BOARS will engage in continued discussion of campus admissions processes and possible reform efforts at a future committee meeting.

VI. UC Freshman Eligibility Reform

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair
- Roger Studley, Assistant Director,

REPORT: Assistant Director Roger Studley presented follow-up simulations of four different definitions of an “Entitled to Review” (ETR) category of students (distribution 2):

- (1) Students who, at the end of their junior year, had (i) completed, with a grade of C or better, the 11 a-g courses required for ELC eligibility, (ii) achieved a 2.8 unweighted a-g GPA minimum, and (iii) taken the SAT I or ACT.
- (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, 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.
- (4) 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 ETR students, as well as the number and characteristics of the ETR-designated students who applied to UC ("lower bound" estimate of ETR pool). Data from the National Student Clearinghouse, which shows the number and characteristics of ETR-designated students who matriculated at any 4-year college, as well as those who matriculated at any 2-year college ("upper bound" estimate of ETR pool) were also presented.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that defining the "entitled to review" (ETR) pool of applicants based on information available from student transcripts (number of 'a-g' courses, GPA) builds on mechanisms already in place to evaluate students for the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. It was noted that currently about 17 percent of California high school graduating seniors apply to UC for freshman admission, and the simulations of the potential ETR pool provide an estimate of the range of additional applications that might result from adopting an ETR policy.

REPORT: BOARS Chair Mark Rashid highlighted modifications that were made to the draft eligibility reform proposal, and which are reflected in the current version distributed with the agenda (enclosure 4). These modifications include changing the title of the policy to "entitled to review" (ETR), solidifying the details of the ETR pool definition, and adding a summary and implementation section. Chair Rashid also outlined several components of a final proposal that need to be developed, such as the inclusion of language about maintaining campus autonomy in admissions decisions, narrative guidance about the Admissions by Exception policy, and projected numbers of additional applications that may result from the adoption of the ETR policy.

DISCUSSION: The committee continued its discussion of freshman eligibility reform and reviewed the current version of the draft proposal (enclosure 4). The initial focus of the discussion was aimed at ensuring agreement amongst members about the elements of the proposed "Entitled to Review" (ETR) policy (section I.), such as the minimum requirements for ETR status.

ACTION: Various clarifying amendments to the policy proposal (section I. "Entitled to Review") were recommended by members and accepted by the committee without objection.

MOTION: BOARS approve the proposal for a new eligibility policy, as outlined in section I. (“Entitled to Review”) of the draft eligibility reform proposal (enclosure 4) and subject to the clarifying amendments made by the committee.

The motion was seconded.

ACTION: The motion was approved by unanimous vote (10-0).

DISCUSSION: The committee reviewed the remainder of the eligibility reform proposal document (enclosure 4), which is comprised of additional information on the background and rationale for the proposal, as well as guidance to applicants and implementation strategies. Members made suggestions for further development of these aspects of the eligibility reform proposal documentation, such as:

- ▶ The strategy for modifying the applicant referral pool should be integrated more in the proposal, and should include information about the current problems with the referral pool process and the ways in which these problems may be addressed through the eligibility reform policy.
- ▶ Amendments to the Comprehensive Review Guidelines should not be proposed at this point, but rather BOARS should indicate that changes to the guidelines, such as those indicated in the draft proposal (section II.), will need to be considered once the eligibility reform proposal is adopted by the University.

Guidance was requested as to what documents related to the eligibility reform proposal should be shared with campus admissions committees at this time. Members felt the written proposal was not ready to be shared yet, but that an oral report on the policy proposal, as well as an updated version of the previously distributed “talking points” and documentation reflecting key supporting data, may be shared with campus committees and the Academic Council.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur was granted permission to seek feedback on the draft “Guidance to Prospective Applicants” (section 3) of the eligibility reform proposal from Katherine Edwards, Director of New Students Communications.

VII. Analytic Subcommittee Report – Inclusiveness Indicators for California Community College Students

- David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair
- Sam Agronow, Associate Director and Coordinator, Research and Evaluation

REPORT: Last year the BOARS Analytic Subcommittee, in collaboration with UCOP Admissions Research and Evaluation staff, developed a set of “inclusiveness indicators,” specifically designed to allow UC to monitor how well it is fulfilling its commitment to represent “all portions of the State,” with respect to gender, race and ethnicity, as well as socioeconomic and geographic dimensions of California’s population. Inclusiveness indicators for California high school seniors were developed and published last year (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/boars.indicators0606.pdf>). These

indicators will be regularly updated, and now work has begun on developing a similar set of “inclusiveness indicators” for California Community College (CCC) students (enclosure 5, distribution 3).

DISCUSSION: The types of data available from the CCC Chancellors office was described, as well as the difficulties in obtaining other data, such as socio-economic data, for CCC students. Issues with how to construct indicators similar to those constructed for high school students were also discussed. For example, what indicator for CCC students would be equivalent to ‘a-g’ completion for high school students? How should the state population segment for assessment of “inclusiveness” be defined (e.g., the state population that is age 22-29)? Should part-time CCC students be accounted for in the indicators?

ACTION: Development of UC inclusiveness indicators for CCC students will continue, and Associate Director and Coordinator Sam Agronow will consult with the CCC Chancellors office about acquiring additional data and other issues.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Mark Rashid

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst