

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
ACADEMIC SENATE
Minutes of Meeting
January 8, 2010

I. Announcements

- o *BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

The Academic Council endorsed BOARS' report to the Regents on [Admissions Tests and UC Principles for Admissions Testing](#) and forwarded it to President Yudof. Chair Hurtado added a table to the report that compares the predictive value of high school GPA, the SAT-I, the SAT-R, and SAT subject tests for UC freshmen GPA.

The UC Commission on the Future Access and Affordability work group reviewed a draft set of admissions and financial support principles at its most recent meeting. The work group wants to use principles in its review of specific proposals that provide a clear set of non-negotiable values but also allow for future flexibility.

Senate Chair Powell noted that the Academic Council met with several working group co-chairs and has invited Regent Gould to a future meeting. Chair Powell hopes to engage the Senate in active consideration of the issues before the Commission rather than wait for systemwide review of the final recommendations. Council is hosting its biannual joint meeting with the chancellors in April and will announce the next Senate vice chair and the 2010 Oliver Johnson Award recipients in the spring.

Chair Powell also chairs the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, whose highest priority this year is promoting unity across the segments, particularly with regard to advocacy in Sacramento and interaction with the Joint Commission on the Master Plan for Higher Education, which is evaluating the state's 50-year-old higher education framework. ICAS met with Assembly Member Ira Ruskin, who chairs the Joint Commission, and sent him a memo urging the Commission to stand behind the principles of the Master Plan.

Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons released a statement in support of a proposed amendment to the California Constitution that would provide the state's public higher education institutions with funding equivalent to ten percent of the budget. A recent [Guardian \(U.K.\) article](#) notes that between 1996 and 2004, the percentage of California 19-year-olds attending college dropped from 43 to 30 percent.

Discussion: There was a suggestion that BOARS send Assembly Member Ruskin a statement about the importance of the Master Plan, comprehensive review, eligibility in the local context, outreach, and a rigorous a-g high school curriculum. Chair Powell asked BOARS to send the statement through Academic Council.

II. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the December 4, 2009 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

III. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee (A&E) Meeting

- o *BOARS Vice Chair Bill Jacob*

A&E discussed changes to the algebra requirements for an Associate's degree; concerns about the integrity of Community College online courses used to fulfill transfer requirement; the need for UC and CSU to agree to a common general education transfer curriculum pattern; a proposal to grant transfer credit in physical education and health for military service; implementation of changes to area c and d language and potential updates to areas a and b; and a proposal to require students to fulfill the area c requirement in grades 9-12.

IV. Consultation with the Office of Admissions

- o *Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions*
- o *Samuel Agronow, Deputy Director, Institutional Research*

Director Wilbur distributed preliminary application results for 2010-11. UC received 134,000 individual applications, representing a 5.8% increase from 2009-10. Freshmen applications increased by 2.4%, and transfers by 17%. Applications from California resident freshmen grew 1.6%, while the number of California public high school graduates was flat. The number of students applying to more than one UC campus increased slightly.

Merced experienced the most growth at both the freshman (17.5%) and transfer (49.5%) levels, and for the third straight year, all campuses saw sizable increases in transfer applications. All campuses experienced increases in low-income and First Generation College students. The number of applications from African-Americans also increased dramatically, although this may be due partly to recent changes in data collection and reporting requirements.

The increase in applications may reflect anxiety and spill-over pressure from CSU's decision to cut courses and reduce enrollment by 40,000 and a desire by students to cover their bases. In addition, CSU has closed spring term to transfers this year. President Yudof will ask all campuses except Merced to meet specific targets to achieve a systemwide reduction of 1,400 freshmen and an increase of 750 transfers.

Deputy Director Agronow reported that the provost has decided to cut \$300k in funding for [StatFinder](#). No new data will be added after February 8, when the contract ends, although StatFinder will be maintained online. The final update will include applicant and enrolled student data from fall 2009 and longitudinal information about retention and time to degree. StatFinder will not be "out of date" until August 2010, when the next update would have been scheduled. Deputy Director Agronow added that he has accepted the position of Director of Institutional Research at St. Mary's College. His last day at UC will be February 7.

Discussion: Table 9 of the application data should include the number of high school graduates alongside data about the application rate in each area. The report also should look at the representation of each ethnic group at UC relative to their population in pool of high school graduates and in the state overall.

Members were unhappy about the elimination of funding for StatFinder. Provost Pitts said the intent is to transform StatFinder into a cheaper in-house operation, not eliminate it, but IR&C cannot take this on right now, so a single year of data will be omitted temporarily. Members noted that StatFinder is critical to UC's public relations and accountability efforts, and defunding the project conflicts with UC's stated commitment to transparency and accountability. StatFinder will also be important to the success of ETR. It is a way to communicate to the new pool of potential students information about the typical preparation of successful applicants from their school. StatFinder allows the public an easy means of accessing data about trends over time, and it will be more important than ever for the public to have accurate, up-to-date information after ETR takes effect in 2012. Once StatFinder is defunded, it will be more difficult to re-fund and re-establish momentum for the project.

V. Proposal to Modify Eligibility in the Local Context

BOARS discussed a proposal from the Office of Admissions to streamline the \$3 million Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. The Committee also reviewed studies showing that ELC students have a high level of academic achievement and engagement. Currently, UC pays a vendor to collect and analyze 43k+ high school transcripts to identify ELC-eligible students and sends them a letter at the beginning of senior year informing them of their status. A recent RFP to expand ELC from 4% to 9% in 2012 garnered a single \$4.1 million bid. Several vendors withdrew after UC said it would not allow vendors to off-shore the work.

Director Wilbur said ELC's cost is unsustainable. Moving the ELC determination after the local comprehensive review evaluation to the referral pool stage will save money and preserve ELC's quality and effectiveness. Under ETR, ELC will be more important later in the process as a referral guarantee; most ELC students will be eligible under the statewide pathway and all will be guaranteed a comprehensive review if they apply. UC will ask high schools to identify on transcripts students in the top 12% of their class and then invite those students to apply with a note that the top 9% have a referral guarantee.

Discussion: Members worried that the change could diminish the stimulating effect of the ELC program and the diversity it provides UC. ELC is essential to the spirit of ETR and the goal of expanding access to low-income and First Generation College students. ELC brings students to UC who may not have applied if they had not received early notification about their guaranteed status. The expanded ELC will be more important than ever in capturing diversity because the new statewide index establishes a very high bar. Without an effective ELC program, diversity could decline, and this will be blamed on ETR in general rather than to the change in implementation of ELC. UC has an obligation to encourage ELC students to apply.

It was noted that five campuses, including Davis, rely on early ELC determination to admit the ELC subgroup automatically without comprehensive review. The expansion is a potential workload and funding problem at Davis because ELC is at the front end of the admissions process there.

BOARS recommended that UC collect transcripts identifying the top 15% of students in each high school, and send a letter to those students noting that their chances of admission have

increased, encouraging them to apply, and communicating the 9% guarantee clearly and strongly. When UCOP forwards applicant information to a campus, it should include an ELC notation, using a measure to identify the likelihood of being in the top 9%. Student Affairs is to return with a plan to identify ELC students to aid review processes. .

Action: A motion to adopt this plan was made and seconded. BOARS voted by a vote of 7 in favor, 2 against, with one abstention.

VI. ETR Modeling

Chair Hurtado said some Asian-American community groups are asking UC to overturn the new eligibility reform policy. They point to simulations projecting declines in the admission of Asian-American students and some underrepresented groups, and increases in white student admits. In a memo to BOARS, former BOARS Chair Mark Rashid noted that the assumptions of projected applications were out of proportion and recommended a re-analysis. BOARS also received a letter from a UCB professor asking the committee to defend the models. President Yudof maintains that ETR is fair and appropriate, but he also wants BOARS to continue studying the matter.

Chair Hurtado said some people have not understood the shift from eligibility to an emphasis on comprehensive review and selection. The goal of ETR is to remove the bright line of eligibility and capture talented students who had previously been declared ineligible for technical reasons. CR is a broader way of looking at students and their achievements. In developing the policy, BOARS analyzed many indicators projecting potential shifts in the applicant and admit pool. These projections are based on potential applicant behavior, and are highly speculative with a high margin of error. It is difficult to predict which students individual campuses will admit under comprehensive review and which of those students will choose particular campuses. In all scenarios, the proportion of Asian-American students remains very high. Students from schools with college going cultures will adapt and be successful.

Provost Pitts announced that UC had received word from a civil rights organization that it intends to file legal action against the University unless the policy is overturned.

Discussion: Deputy Director Agronow said he wants to create a model that everyone agrees is methodologically sound. Provost Pitts said he believes that another analysis with alternative modeling will not necessarily help UC get across its message about the purpose of the reform.

BOARS agreed that it should not retract previous models. Any new model should include error bands, at least in an appendix, to provide a better sense of how substantial the uncertainties are. BOARS should acknowledge and emphasize the difficulty of predicting outcomes and emphasize that it will continue studying the issue up to and after 2012. The controversy gives BOARS an opportunity to explain the purpose of ETR: to open the door to UC more widely, encourage academically strong students to apply, and remove discouraging barriers. The policy will make the best students available to UC and allow campuses to select from among them using comprehensive review. UC should be less defensive. Any policy change may impact some groups. Legislators should hear that the expansion of ELC to 9% means that nearly 90% of California high schools will double the number of students guaranteed admission.

Asian-Americans are heavily represented at UC. Opening the door more widely may reduce their numbers because the number of potential students to be admitted is smaller. The real impact may be on African-Americans, and BOARS must find ways to improve their preparation and address disparate impact, if it emerges. But UC is for all students, and a policy should not be considered bad simply if it suggests a potential increase in white students. There is a risk that continued constraints on UC enrollment could reduce diversity, which will get wrapped up in the public's perception of ETR.

Campuses should consider applying federal disparate impact standards to judge how well they are achieving diversity, and adjust CR practices accordingly. UC should consider incorporating letters of recommendation and interviews into the process. BOARS should develop a series of strategies to ensure ETR works.

Chair Powell noted that ETR has been criticized both as an end-around Proposition 209, and conversely, as something that will decrease diversity. He said BOARS can say proudly and confidently that ETR will cast a wider net and increase access. UC needs to provide as much reassurance as possible to the public and legislature that it is trying to improve the admissions process in an honest way. The response to Professor Wang articulating BOARS's position and intentions should be addressed to a broad audience and circulated through Academic Council.

Chair Hurtado said that in light of impending changes to admission policy as they relate to the goal of increasing the diversity and quality of the applicant pool, each BOARS representative should discuss with their admissions committee procedures that will help them meet the Regents' mandate to "enroll a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California." Each campus should consider the character of applicants they want to capture in their comprehensive review processes and the extent to which they are incorporating the 14 criteria in those processes.

Action: Juan Poblete, Joe Watson, Bill Jacob, and George Johnson will work together to draft a response from the committee.

Action: BOARS requested the alternative projection model based on Professor Rashid's memo, and suggestions from the committee.

VII. Report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review

BOARS reviewed a draft of the Comprehensive Review report due to the Regents. The Office of Institutional Research provided data on enrollment trends for California admits between fall 2003 and fall 2008, and statistics on first-time freshmen covering selectivity, demographics, academic quality, matriculation outcomes, and measures of access and diversity.

Chair Hurtado noted that the data show a rising demand for access with a growing number of low income and First Generation College students seeking and gaining admission since 2003. All campuses have become more selective, and there has been an increase in URM students despite significant application growth and competitiveness. It was noted also that URM students in the top third of the admit pool who do not choose to attend UC are more likely than other students to attend private selective universities. Stanford, USC, and Cal Poly-SLO enrolled 1/3 of all UC-

admitted students who chose not to go to UC.

The report should note and explain campus-specific anomalies and differences, and address notable and unusual systemwide trends such as the declining number of applicants and admits who have participated in academic preparation programs, the low admit rate for African Americans, and the declining number of ELC applicants. Members can help by reviewing the data from their own campuses and pointing out trends—e.g., the sharp rise in African-American applicants and admits at UCSB between 2007-08 and 2008-09, which was the result of intensified outreach efforts. The report should communicate the tension between the goals of selectivity and inclusiveness and note that the importance of “inclusive excellence,” a concept that is gaining traction among many institutions of higher education.

BOARS members also can help compile the campus-specific information about the CR process; information about how each campus assures the quality and integrity of the process, with special detail from the three campuses that did not have CR in 2003; and information about how each campus evaluates student achievement in the context of opportunity. The report should dispel myths, including the idea that CR is a subjective, “soft” review. Readers will want information about whether CR gives UC successful outcomes in terms of graduation, retention, and first year GPA. Note that the students campuses admit are not necessarily the ones who enroll. Finally, the report should include a read sheet in the appendix, data on referral pool yield, and a slope graph comparing the application and admission rate.

Action: Members will review the data from their own campuses and point out trends and explain anomalies.

IX. Executive Session

BOARS met in executive session.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst
Attest: Sylvia Hurtado