

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting - September 24, 2004

Approved 10/25/04

I. Welcome and Member Introductions*Michael Brown, BOARS Chair*

BOARS Chair Michael Brown welcomed the committee and chaired the meeting. After the welcome, members of the committee and consultants introduced themselves.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Draft Recommendations for Guidelines and Procedures Governing the Academic Senate's Role in the Development of a New UC Campus and for Granting Divisional Status to a New Campus.

ACTION: BOARS elected not to comment on this proposal.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office*George Blumenthal, Chair, Academic Senate**Cliff Brunk, Vice Chair, Academic Senate**Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

REPORT: Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barcelo provided the committee with an overview of the policies, procedures and role of the Systemwide Academic Senate Office:

Role of the Senate Office

Members were informed of the administrative support the Academic Senate Office provides to the committees. The Executive Director is the chief administrative officer of the Senate and is responsible for implementing policies and allocating resources in a manner that best serves the Senate as a whole. It is the role of the Committee Analyst to facilitate the work of the committee, which includes responsibility for drafting the committee's recommendations and reports.

Travel Policies and Procedures

The Systemwide Academic Senate will reimburse travel expenses for members (or their alternates) serving on Academic Senate committees. Travelers are responsible for their own travel arrangements. Flight reservations should be made through the UCLA Travel Center, which allows the traveler to obtain state fares and allows the Senate Office to make payment for the airline ticket using the direct billing system, thereby relieving the traveler of any financial burden. UCLA Travel Center reservation procedures for Senate travelers and detailed information about Systemwide Senate travel policies and reimbursement procedures is available online at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/travelregulations0405.pdf>.

Senate Source

The *Senate Source* (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/news/source>) is an online publication for the University of California faculty published by the Systemwide Academic

Senate. Issues are published bi-monthly during the academic year and include coverage of current Senate issues and links to related reports.

Academic Senate Website

Each of the Academic Senate's standing committees has a dedicated page on the Senate's website (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/>). The page contains the committee's bylaw, roster, meeting dates, resources, and resolutions and recommendations that have been approved or officially received by the Academic Council. In July 2004, the Academic Council approved a website publication policy for committee webpages (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/chairguideappa.pdf>). Beginning in fall 2004, simplified agendas and approved minutes will be posted on the public committee webpages. Password protected sites for all standing committees will be phased in according to available resources. On these protected committee websites, members will be able to access full agendas and minutes, draft documents, and other sensitive materials.

REPORT: Senate Chair George Blumenthal and Vice Chair Clifford Brunk informed the committee of some of the issues before the Systemwide Academic Senate this year:

- Long-range planning and budgetary issues
- DOE National Laboratories bid
- Research issues: Senate oversight and review of the California Institutes for Science and Innovation (Cal ISIs); research funding restrictions or "strings"
- Admissions-related issues: AP/Honors grade point bump; transfer
- Graduate and professional education issues: applied doctorates; graduate student funding
- Academic personnel issues: the Step VI barrier; consideration of electronic publications in the personnel review process
- Faculty Welfare issues: UCRS funding; health insurance costs; phased retirement proposal; fee waivers for employee dependents

IV. Chair's Announcements and Updates

Michael Brown, BOARS Chair

REPORT: BOARS Chair Michael Brown reported to the committee on the following topics:

Subcommittees

This year BOARS has four subcommittees that will be instrumental in developing proposals for the committee in a number of areas:

- Admissions by Exception Subcommittee (Chair TBA) – will complete the development of guidelines for the implementation of University policy on Admissions by Exception.
- Analytic Subcommittee (Chair David Stern) – will be charged with crafting research studies to support BOARS' policy considerations.
- High School Subcommittee (Chair Michael Brown) – will continue to manage issues with the a-g requirements, including the development of a plan for the periodic re-approval of courses.
- Testing Subcommittee (Chair Mark Rashid) – will help the committee evaluate the new admissions tests and develop guidelines on how the new tests should be judged and weighted. It is expected that this year BOARS will craft and apply guidelines for the evaluation of test content.

Study Group II

The Eligibility and Admissions Study Group is expected to continue its work next year with a similar membership of Regents, Senate leadership (including the Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair, and BOARS Chair), students, and administrators. The group will meet twice a year.

Regents Meeting

At their September meeting, The Regents approved a proposal to increase to 3.0 the minimum grade point average (GPA) required for students to be Eligible in the Statewide Context or Eligible in the Local Context for freshmen entering the University in Fall 2007. This proposal was a revised version of the Academic Senate's July recommendation to raise the minimum GPA to 3.1 to reduce eligibility rates in order to meet the Master Plan target of 12.5%. The President made the decision to revise the proposed GPA change after additional discussion and analysis underscored questions originally raised in the Senate's June report about the difficulty of projecting precise eligibility rates due to changes to the University's test requirements in 2006 and the impreciseness of the CPEC eligibility study. This inability to project precisely the numeric effects of an increase in the GPA to 3.1 raised the possibility that UC could "overshoot" its Master Plan target, and therefore the President instead proposed raising the GPA minimum to only 3.0 (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/sep04/304.pdf>).

V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Academic Services

Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President, Student Academic Services

REPORT: Associate Vice President Dennis Galligani reported to the committee on the following admissions-related budgetary topics:

Academic Preparation ("Outreach")

During the 2003-04 academic year, state funding for academic preparation programs was cut in half. In this year's budget Academic preparation received only an additional 12 percent cut in spite of earlier proposals to eliminate state funding completely in this area.

Enrollment

The University's projected enrollment growth will be fully funded by the state this year. UC has no plans to offer a Guaranteed Transfer Option (GTO) as an admissions option in the future.

Financial Aid

This year there may be some difficulties in the funding of financial aid since only 20 percent of the increased undergraduate student fees will be returned to financial aid. In 2005-06, the return to aid will increase by up to 33 percent.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Academic Services

Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur reported to the committee on the following items:

High School Summit

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Jack O'Connell, is sponsoring a High School Summit, "High Expectations for All Students," to discuss how to raise expectations for students

by providing a rigorous and standards-based curriculum. The conference will be held October 25-26 in Sacramento (<http://www.cde.ca.gov/nr/re/et/yr04hset1025.asp>).

Counselor Conferences

The five counselor conferences for Fall 2004 have just been completed. Over 3000 counselors attended the conferences, which took place at: Riverside, Irvine, Santa Barbara, Berkeley, and Fresno (<http://www.ucop.edu/sas/counselorconference/welcome.html>). Each of the conferences this year had a focus group component, which gave the University an opportunity to receive firsthand information directly from the counselors. Some of the questions directed to the counselors during the focus groups were:

- What would you like us to know about your school, or your students, that you don't think that we currently know?
- Are there UC policies that are obstacles at your high school?
- Do you have any recommendations for improvement of our communications?
- Do you have any insight or perspective on UC's difficulties in recruiting African-American students and how to reverse this trend?

One issue that arose during the focus groups was how the University defines applicants who graduate from high school with a significant number of transfer unit credits (e.g., Middle College High School students that complete an associate's degree while in high school).

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will provide BOARS with written summaries of the focus group discussions at the next meeting.

VII. Emerging Trends in High Schools

Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

Roman Stearns, Special Assistant to the Director of Undergraduate Admissions

REPORT: Special Assistant Roman Stearns made a presentation to the committee on emerging trends in high schools (distribution 4). Currently there is a noticeable trend for large comprehensive high schools to break up into smaller learning communities, especially in urban areas. These smaller learning communities tend to be characterized by more individualized instruction, innovative uses of time and space, and a thematic or applied approach to learning. Since UC admissions policies tend to be based on the large, comprehensive high school, they are often perceived as being quite rigid and therefore not "friendly" to nontraditional high schools.

Director Susan Wilbur reported that seminars would be conducted in November with the UC Admissions Directors to raise their awareness of small learning communities and nontraditional school environments.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed whether there is a correlation between the Academic Performance Index (API) ranking of a school and its decision to break up into smaller learning communities. It was indicated that high API ranked schools, which are usually large comprehensive suburban high schools, seem resistant to changing their existing structure. Members also examined the possible disadvantages of the small school movement, including smaller schools' difficulties in offering a broad range of 'a-g' and honors courses, and the danger of these schools inadvertently becoming a form of tracking.

The committee also discussed the difficulties in identifying home school applicants. Although a code was added to the UC application, the numbers of home school students identified are unreliable since many of these students align themselves in a nontraditional way with a school for application purposes (e.g., register in an independent study program). One member expressed concerns that UC might be overlooking potentially talented and disciplined applicants because as home schooled students they may conduct more focused and specialized studies in comparison to the students from traditional high schools who engage in a more generalized, wide-ranging curriculum.

The move towards more nontraditional high school environments raises some complex questions related to admissions:

- How can the University better analyze and understand these learning environments?
- Should the University consider allowing demonstration of subject area competency as opposed to course completion requirements?
- How could the University avoid inadvertently disadvantaging applicants from these nontraditional environments?

ACTION: BOARS will include the topic of nontraditional school environments on the agenda for the joint meeting with the Admissions Directors this year.

VIII. Proposed Revisions of the Guide to ‘a-g’ Requirements

Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

Roman Stearns, Special Assistant to the Director of Admissions

ISSUE: In response to questions and concerns that were raised last year by high schools and others outside the University, the BOARS High School Subcommittee has proposed revisions to the Guide to ‘a-g’ Requirements to better clarify UC’s course expectations.

DISCUSSION: Members expressed concerns about the examples provided for the alternative laboratory sciences courses in the ‘d’ requirement section of the proposal. The committee agreed that these examples might convey a broader acceptance of courses than is implied. The difficulty in providing examples is that courses with similar titles may vary widely between high schools in actual course content. A motion was made to amend the proposal by deleting the examples provided for alternative laboratory courses.

ACTION: The motion to amend the proposal by deleting the examples of alternative laboratory courses in the ‘d’ requirement section was approved.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the proposed revisions to the Guide to ‘a-g’ Requirements as amended. The motion was passed by a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed, and 1 abstention.

IX. Geographical Preferences in Undergraduate Admission Policy

ISSUE: Questions have arisen as to whether or not UC campuses should employ some form of local admissions preferences, and whether or not selection criterion #14 of the *Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions* allows for such local admissions preferences.

DISCUSSION: The following key questions and concerns about geographic preferences in admissions were identified and discussed by the committee:

- Does the practice of offering geographic preferences bring something to a campus that it wouldn't have otherwise?
- What goals might be achieved by practicing geographic preferences in undergraduate admissions?
- Should UC campuses serve the entire state or focus primarily on their respective regions in the fulfillment of their admissions and teaching missions?
- What sort of balance is appropriate between serving the interests of the local community and serving the interests of the state as a whole?
- What equity issues are involved in the practice of geographic admissions preferences?
- What are the different ways in which geographic preferences could be or are currently applied to admissions?

ACTION: BOARS will discuss the intent and clarity of language of Selection Criterion #14 at the next committee meeting.

X. Proposal for the Strategic Reexamination of Admissions and Eligibility

Michael Brown, BOARS Chair

ISSUE: One of the tasks to be undertaken by the committee this year will be the formulation of a strategic vision of admissions in the contemporary context and a reexamination of policy from the vantage point of that vision.

DISCUSSION: Members made suggestions for agenda items that would help guide the committee's reexamination of the University's admissions goals and policies:

- Academic preparation issues – How can we ensure that the students we admit have received the necessary level of academic preparation for college? Which students aren't doing well academically at UC and what do we know about them? How do the characteristics of failing students relate to our admissions policies?
- Admissions as a systemwide, not a campus-specific issue – Quantitatively what does it mean for a campus to accept students across the whole range of eligibility? To what degree does this occur on each campus? As the University moves towards more campuses practicing selective admissions, how will this affect the referral pool?
- Quality and excellence – The University has a fiduciary responsibility to maintain quality, but what do we define as quality and excellence? How can we think more broadly about how the University defines the top one-eighth of California high school students?
- Inclusiveness issues – How can we think more broadly about and develop indicators of inclusiveness? How can we assist the demographics of UC to converge with the demographics of California?
- Transfer issues – California is above the national average in the number of 18-24 year olds that attend college, but below the national average of the number that complete a bachelor's degree. How can we better facilitate transfer from the community colleges through our admissions policies?
- University mission – What is the University's mission and what is the role of admissions policy with respect to that mission?

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Michael Brown
Committee Analyst

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson

Distributions:

1. BOARS committee webpage and public meeting agenda for September 24, 2004
<<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/>>
2. 9/20/04 email from University Counsel Maria Shanle to Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barcelo re: Public Access to Minutes
3. 9/23/04 Regents' meeting PowerPoint presentation slides, "Academic Senate Recommendation Regarding Freshman Eligibility Requirements"
4. 9/24/04 BOARS' meeting PowerPoint presentation slides, "Emerging Trends in High Schools"