

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting – May 25 & 26, 2006

Approved July 14, 2006

I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

REPORT: BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown informed the committee of the following items:

- Proposition 209: In view of the upcoming 10 year anniversary of Proposition 209, the "California Civil Rights Initiative," Student Regent Designate Maria Ledesma is pursuing a study of the effects of the state constitutional amendment on UC students, faculty and staff.
- President's Summit on Faculty Diversity: A group of UC senior administrators, faculty and Academic Senate leaders met on May 23, 2006 to discuss the recommendations of the President's Task Force on Faculty Diversity (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/2006/may23.html>).
- May Revise Budget: The May Revision to the state budget makes small adjustments to the governor's budget proposal for the University of California. Key changes include a proposed augmentation of \$1 million, on a one-time basis in 2006-07, for faculty recruitment and start-up costs supporting an expansion of nursing programs; and a \$3.8 million reduction in the 2005-06 budget related to final enrollment levels (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/2006/may12.html>).

II. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the April 14, 2006 BOARS meeting were approved as written.

III. Consultation with Director of Admissions

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur reported to the committee on various admissions-related items, including:

Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs)

Campuses are submitting freshman SIR data today, but preliminary numbers indicate 3 campuses are over their enrollment targets (Davis, Irvine and San Diego), 3 campuses met their enrollment targets (Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Cruz), and 3 campuses are under their enrollment targets (Merced, Riverside and Santa Barbara).

DISCUSSION: Student Representative Eric Barba presented the committee with a letter from the UCLA African Student Union expressing concerns about the decline in numbers

of African American students admitted to and enrolling at UCLA. This year UCLA had more African American applicants (2,157) than in the past 5 years, however only 210 of these students were admitted – the lowest number of African American admits at UCLA in the past 7 years.

SAT Score Decline

A preliminary estimate of the UC eligibility rate for fall 2006 California public high school graduates indicates the decline in applicants' average SAT test scores did not shift the UC eligibility rate below the 12.5 percent threshold specified in the California Master Plan for Higher Education.

IV. CALPADS Project Update

- Sam Agronow, Associate Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation

REPORT: Associate Director Sam Agronow reported to the committee on his attendance at a California Department of Education meeting on the development of the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS). This system will include transcripts, test scores, demographic and other data from all California public high schools. Features of CALPADS may eventually allow UC to make more efficient determinations of eligibility, examine the linkages between high school course outcomes and UC course outcomes, and understand more fully the context of the school and students' learning environment. The system is planned to be operational in 2009-10.

DISCUSSION: The possibility of including an identifier in CALPADS for “small schools” and “small learning communities” was discussed. BOARS expressed support for such an identifier since the data would broaden the understanding of the school environment in which the student performed.

V. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)

A. Research Update – Mathematics ('c') Requirement Analysis

- Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation

REPORT: In order to be designated “ELC-qualified,” and therefore receive consideration for ELC eligibility, students must currently complete a minimum of 11 units of the subject ('a-g') requirements for eligibility by the end of their junior year of high school. Three of these 11 units must fulfill the mathematics ('c') requirement. An analysis studying the effect of reducing the end of junior year ELC mathematics ('c') requirement from 3 units to 2 units, while either reducing the total number of required units to 10 or keeping it at 11 was presented to the committee.

The simulations indicate that reducing the mathematics requirement to 2 units while maintaining a total of 11 required units would increase the number of “ELC-qualified” students by approximately 1,200. As a result, about 200 students that are currently ELC eligible would be replaced in the pool by students who would become newly ELC

eligible (table 2). The resulting overall characteristics of the pool of ELC eligible students would not change significantly.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members noted that reducing the mathematics unit requirements for ELC consideration at the end of the junior year does not eliminate the requirement for students to complete the full 15 unit subject ('a-g') requirement pattern, including 3 units of mathematics, by the time of high school graduation, to become ELC or statewide eligible. Mathematics is the only subject where the full unit requirement must be met by the end of the junior year in order for a student to qualify for the ELC program. It was agreed that a policy of requiring the completion of 2 units of mathematics by the end of the junior year would bring the mathematics requirement in-line with other 'a-g' subject requirements for ELC consideration, specifically requiring one less unit at the end of the junior year than is required by the time of high school graduation.

MOTION: To qualify for ELC consideration, no less than 2 units of the 11 'a-g' course units upon which ELC qualification is based must fulfill the mathematics ('c') requirement.

The motion was seconded.

ACTION: The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

B. Response to Academic Council

ISSUE: BOARS has been charged to report to Academic Council on the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program's effects on the overall distribution of UC students, and the possible role of ELC in long-term admissions planning.

ACTION: Assistant Director Roger Studley will provide BOARS with an annotated version of his April 14, 2006 ELC research presentation to the committee.

ACTION: Chair Michael T. Brown will draft a brief report summarizing BOARS' studies and findings on the ELC program to date. This report will be presented to the committee for approval and communication to the Academic Council.

VI. ICAS Work Group on SciGETC Implementation

- Bob Reilly, BOARS Member and UC Academic Senate Representative to SciGETC Work Group

REPORT: Member Bob Reilly provided an update on the activities of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Work Group on the Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SciGETC) Implementation. One major issue that is currently under consideration by the group is how to determine what majors are declared SciGETC-eligible majors. The UC Academic Senate Regulation, SR 478, permits the SciGETC exceptions to be granted to "...students intending to major in the physical and biological sciences," but the specific majors that will fall under this category

remain to be determined. Another issue being faced by the work group is the mechanism through which SciGETC-eligible students are certified. The SciGETC provision in SR 478 places this certification responsibility on the community colleges:

The last-attended community college must certify that the student has substantially completed the articulated lower division courses for the major and that the student has completed the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum except for (i) one course in Arts and Humanities and (ii) one course in Social and Behavioral Sciences.

VII. UC Transfer Preparation Paths – SR 477 (Streamlining) and SR 478 (SciGETC) Implementation Update

- Margaret Heisel, Associate to VP for Student Affairs and Executive Director
- Eric Taggart, Director, ASSIST Coordination Site

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: Executive Director Heisel and Director Taggart provided the committee with an update on the progress of developing *UC Transfer Preparation Paths*, a proposal for implementation of SR 477 that will better communicate the specific courses at every community college that students can use to meet lower division requirements for UC majors and campuses. *UC Transfer Preparation Paths* will:

- Provide students with general descriptions of each major;
- Identify all lower division degree requirements that are common across UC campuses;
- Identify all additional academic requirements at each UC campus;
- Describe any additional criteria (e.g., GPA, minimum grades) that students must achieve to be selected for admission at each campus.

Preliminary paths for Psychology and Biological Sciences majors were presented. These major paths, as well as those for Chemistry and History majors, will be finalized this summer and posted for students in September. An expansion plan for all other top majors will also be developed by September. Further status reports will be presented to BOARS in September and throughout next year.

ACTION: Members are asked to send informal feedback on the preliminary major paths to ASSIST Director Eric Taggart.

VIII. Transfer Legislation Update

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair
- Todd Greenspan, Educational Relations Director
- Margaret Heisel, Associate to VP for Student Affairs and Executive Director

REPORT: A status report was provided to the committee on four pending state bills that address segmental transfer issues:

- AB 2168 (Liu) – Common Core Curriculum: Replaces the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and CSU General Education-Breadth Requirements with a “single common core curriculum” for general education for transfer.
- SB 652 (Scott) – Lower Division Major Preparation: Seeks to have UC adopt a common lower division major preparation framework similar to the Lower Division Transfer Preparation (LDTP) program legislated for CSU in 2004. UC is working with the author to amend the bill to reflect the *UC Transfer Preparation Paths* effort.
- SB 1709 (Scott) – College Opportunity Act of 2006: Seeks to increase college-going rates in California, in part by having the postsecondary segments develop plans for improved completion rates, work on plans to improve transfer pathways for community college students, and prepare annual reports on various data measures related to specified policy goals.
- SB 1769 (Escutia) – Systemwide Articulation Agreements: This bill was amended and no longer pertains to transfer.

IX. Guest Consultation – Educational System Alignment Efforts

- David T. Conley, Professor, Educational Policy and Leadership, University of Oregon, and Director, Center for Educational Policy Research (<http://cepr.uoregon.edu>)

REPORT: Professor David T. Conley reported to BOARS on national efforts to clarify the definition of college readiness and better align college admission standards with high school curriculum standards. Professor Conley described his work on several projects, including:

Standards for Success (2003)

“Standards for Success,” was a three-year national study sponsored by the Association of American Universities (AAU) and The Pew Charitable Trusts. The goals of the project were to:

- Identify the knowledge and skills necessary for success in entry-level university courses and to state these findings in a way that would allow high school instruction and state assessments to better align with college success.
- Analyze state high school assessments to determine how well they align with the identified knowledge and skills necessary for college success.

The study led to the development of the “Understanding University Success,” a set of college success standards that were distributed to every high school in the nation. “Understanding University Success” describes the college success standards for six disciplines: English, mathematics, natural sciences, social sciences, second languages and the arts. Each discipline has two types of standards:

- Foundational Skills: Habits of mind that enable students to succeed in college and to get more out of their college education (e.g., inquisitiveness, critical and analytical thinking).

- Academic Content Standards: Understanding and mastery of fundamental (for general education) and specific/higher level (for major concentration) content knowledge that helps maximize the probability of success in entry-level university courses.

(For more information: <http://www.s4s.org/cepr.s4s.php>).

Washington Alternative Assessments (2006)

The Washington state Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is sponsoring a pilot project to determine the feasibility of and how best to implement a “Collection of Evidence” model to act as an alternative assessment for students who do not pass the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). The pilot currently includes twenty high schools that will work with students who did not meet one or more standards on the WASL to compile work samples in reading, writing, or mathematics. Each student will submit a collection of work samples that will be reviewed by a panel of educators in the spring of 2006. (For more information: <http://www.s4s.org/cepr.ospi.php>).

Alignment Audits (Ongoing)

High school course content is being analyzed to determine how well courses align with college success standards in different subject areas. One dimension of analysis for this project is an evaluation of high school course syllabi. Through the syllabi audit process, it has been found that most high school syllabi do not contain sufficient course content to allow for an accurate determination of what is being taught. As a result, an online “Syllabus Generating Tool” has been created to assist schools in developing consistent syllabi and to compare them against specified standards.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed with Prof. Conley the problems associated with establishing a set of expectations and standards without providing the necessary support and resources for high schools and students to attain them. BOARS also informed Prof. Conley of a proposal from the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee to add greater specificity to the descriptions of the subject (‘a-g’) requirements (see Agenda Item X). The committee was advised to consider the following if it chooses to proceed with this proposal:

- Avoid creating a detailed “laundry list,” but rather concentrate on identifying “big knowledge” standards
- Acknowledge and link to any standards that are currently in place and that work
- Involve high schools in the development of the communication of the standards
- Show how UC is responding to and incorporating these standards specifications in its own educational activities (e.g., teacher training efforts).

X. Proposed Subject (‘a-g’) Requirements Task Force

- David Stern, Chair, Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee presented BOARS with a proposal to establish a task force charged to rewrite the descriptions of the mathematics (‘c’) and laboratory science (‘d’) requirements contained within the ‘A-G’ *Guide*. The new descriptor language is intended to clarify how the subject requirements exceed the high school curriculum standards established by the state.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members were generally supportive of the task force proposal. A number of suggestions were made regarding the composition of the task force (e.g., inclusion of a representative from San Jose Unified) and the charge of the task force (e.g., identification of potential barriers to implementation). It was noted that this task force should be seen as a first step in an overall effort to clarify the subject ('a-g') requirements. If the task force is successful, additional groups may be empanelled to rewrite the descriptions of the other subject requirements. Any changes to the 'A-G' *Guide* descriptions must be approved by BOARS.

ACTION: The concept of the Subject ('a-g') Requirements Task Force was unanimously approved. A revised proposal will be presented to BOARS in June for final approval.

XI. Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Vice Chair

A brief history of the Academic Senate's review of the Honors Level bonus grade point policy was presented:

- Recommendation to Regents (1999): The Honors Level bonus point policy was reconsidered in 1998-99 by BOARS and the Academic Senate. In March of 1999 The Regents considered an Academic Senate-approved recommendation that the bonus point given to Honors Level course grades be reduced from a full point to one-half point. At that time The Regents endorsed two proposals from the Academic Senate (ELC and the VPA requirement), but elected to send the honors bonus point reduction proposal back to the Academic Senate for further consideration.
- Task Force Report (2004): The Academic Senate empanelled an AP/Honors Task Force to reconsider the Honors Level grade point policy in 2003, and a final report was issued in the winter of 2004. In its report, the Task Force issued a split recommendation: half of the membership recommended reducing the grade bonus from a full point to one-half point, and the other members recommended eliminating the bonus grade point in the determination of eligibility.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed the issues and difficulties that have accompanied the Academic Senate's evaluation of and recommendations regarding the Honors Level bonus grade point policy during the past eight years. Although there is consensus within BOARS that the bonus grade policy is educationally unjustified, concerns about potential unintended consequences of eliminating the Honors Level bonus have been expressed by the campus admissions committees, admissions directors and others. BOARS members noted that a significant amount of energy and political capital would be required to bring about the elimination of the bonus point policy. Devoting significant resources to this one proposal could interfere with the committee's work to fix other problems with the eligibility construct.

It was suggested that efforts to reconsider or "tweak" specific elements of the UC eligibility determination, such as the Honors Level bonus grade point policy, must be viewed in the larger context of BOARS overall re-examination of the eligibility

construct. The University's eligibility construct should operate on a set of established principles, and current and future elements of the eligibility construct should be evaluated for concurrence with these principles.

MOTION: BOARS does not propose eliminating the Honors Level bonus grade point policy for UC eligibility at this time. BOARS will issue a report summarizing the committee's findings and conclusions regarding the Honors Level bonus grade point policy. The report will include identification of the problems associated with implementation of a recommendation to eliminate the Honors Level bonus grade point policy, and notification of the committee's intention to focus on an overall evaluation of the eligibility construct.

The motion was seconded.

ACTION: The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

ACTION: Chair Michael T. Brown will prepare a draft report on BOARS' review of the Honors Level bonus grade point policy.

ACTION: Time will be devoted on the June and July meeting agendas for BOARS to discuss and develop action plans for an evaluation of the UC eligibility construct.

XII. Comprehensive Review Report

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

DISCUSSION: The committee briefly reviewed historical admissions data and discussed possible additional information for inclusion in the report on Comprehensive Review, Fall 2004 – Fall 2006. Suggestions for developing the report included:

- When presenting the historical UC admissions data in the report, it is important to note the dates of key events, such as the adoption of Proposition 209, the implementation of comprehensive review, and initiation of selective admissions practices for each campus.
- The report should be written in an expository manner, allowing the numbers to primarily speak for themselves.
- The campuses should be asked to respond to key questions, such as what the comprehensive review policy has meant for their campus admissions processes, in terms of benefits and unintended consequences.

ACTION: Chair Michael T. Brown will prepare a draft Comprehensive Review report for BOARS review in July.

ACTION: By the end of the summer, a request will be sent from BOARS to campus admissions committees for responses to questions related to the Comprehensive Review process and outcomes.

XIII. Science and Mathematics Initiative Group (SMIG)

- Trish Stoddart, BOARS Member and Divisional Representative to SMIG

REPORT: BOARS Member Trish Stoddart presented an update on the activities of the Academic Council's Science and Mathematics Initiative Group (SMIG). The group has been developing a proposal, for the Academic Council's consideration, for on-going administration, oversight and implementation of the Science and Mathematics Initiative.

Meeting adjourned 2:30 p.m.
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst