

**University of California Academic Senate**  
**Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**  
**Minutes of Meeting – October 10, 2008**

**I. Chair's Announcements – Sylvia Hurtado**

**Report:** After brief introductions, Chair Hurtado welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the charge of the committee. She encouraged new and returning members to participate actively in meetings, and noted that BOARS conducts its work in the interest of the public good.

BOARS has had a significant impact on eligibility and admissions policy discussions over the last few years under the leadership of Michael Brown and Mark Rashid, who are available to consult with the committee this year on the eligibility reform proposal. BOARS is also fortunate to have excellent UCOP consultants working with the committee on a regular basis, and may invite other consultants and guests to discuss specific issues, as needed.

Three BOARS ad hoc subcommittees will work outside of regular committee meetings to develop recommendations on specific issues for the full committee's consideration:

- Admissions Testing – Peter Sadler (chair), Julie Bianchini, and Darnell Hunt
- Statistical Analysis – Robert Jacobsen, Bill Jacob, Sylvia Hurtado, and Sam Agronow
- Articulation and Evaluation – Bill Jacob (chair) and Juan Poblete

In addition, James Given will represent BOARS on the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) Board of Directors, and Peter Sadler will serve on the UC/CCC Transfer Advisory Board.

Chair Hurtado summarized some of the major goals and topics for 2008-09. In addition to eligibility reform, BOARS will discuss several 'a-g' issues – recommendations from BOARS' C&D Task Force; a-g course availability in California high schools; and a request that UC work with CSU to approve more career and technical education (CTE) courses. BOARS will also work with the Admissions Processing Task Force to further develop the Shared Review project, which is attempting to integrate more efficiency into application review processes, and will discuss principles for the enrollment of non-California resident domestic students. In addition, President Yudof is planning initiatives on K-12 education, CCC transfer, and college preparation issues, which BOARS may be called upon to consider.

The chair attended the September meetings of the Academic Council and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which passed a resolution in support of continued funding of ASSIST. ICAS is also developing a white paper on transfer admissions and discussing the work of the [Vasconcellos Legacy Project](#) to implement possible updates to the California Master Plan.

Finally, Chair Hurtado may occasionally call an executive session to discuss confidential matters, during which notes are not taken and students and consultants may be asked to leave the room. BOARS members who are unable attend a meeting should try to find an approved alternate with the help of their division.

**III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur, Associate Director of Admissions Research and Evaluation Samuel Agronow, and William Kidder, Special Assistant to the Student Affairs Vice President**

**Issue/Report:** Director Wilbur reported that UC will enroll a record number of undergraduates in 2008-09; all campuses have met their new freshmen and transfer enrollment goals; and the Office of Admissions is already planning for 2009-10. The President is committed to admitting all eligible applicants next year, although some individual campuses may offer space to fewer students. Predicting applicant behavior will be challenging, however, because the number of high school graduates is not projected to increase, but an increasing number of students are completing the a-g requirements. The national economic crisis may also prevent some students from securing loans. The Office of Admissions recently hosted six Counselor Conferences around the state, which were attended by over 5500 high school and CCC counselors. The conferences give UC the opportunity to connect with communities on issues such as eligibility reform and enrollment management.

UC will approve a record number of high school courses this year. A major focus will continue to be the development of academically rigorous CTE courses. UC has a California Department of Education grant to support this goal. The U.S. District Court ruled in August, that UC's course approval policies and procedures did not violate freedom of expression and religion in a case brought against UC by a coalition of Christian schools.

Director Agronow briefed BOARS about some improvements to UC [StatFinder](#), an interactive Web tool that provides data on undergraduate applicants, admissions, and enrollment. The next phase of the StatFinder project will be to provide additional data that is sortable by high school. Special Assistant Kidder briefed BOARS on UC's [decision to appeal](#) a recent District Court ruling against AB 540, which had exempted undocumented students who graduate from and attend a California high school for at least three years from paying out-of-state tuition rates.

### **III. Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility Policy**

**Issue:** The Board of Regents is currently reviewing the Academic Senate's eligibility reform proposal "Entitled to Review" (ETR). At the September Regents meeting, the President asked for updated projections on student profiles and increased application volume using 2007 CPEC data (ETR is based on 2003 data), before he makes a final recommendation to the Regents. Under the current proposal, students would gain ETR status by taking either the SAT Reasoning or ACT with Writing and completing 11 of 15 a-g requirements with a 2.8 or better unweighted GPA by grade 11. ETR students also earn a guarantee of referral admission if an index of test scores and honors-weighted a-g GPA place them within the top 9% of the state or if their GPA places them within the top 9% of their high school class.

**Report:** Director Agronow guided BOARS through the Office of Student Affairs' initial analysis of the 2007 CPEC data, which project a preliminary eligibility rate of 14.4% (subject to change based on the final CPEC report due in December). He noted that the 2003 data were based on 48 schools and 18,600 students, while the 2007 data are based on 158 schools and 68,200 students. The new projections replicate previous ETR simulations using the 2007 data. They also include comparisons of two possible minimum ETR GPA options – 3.0 weighted/capped and 3.0 unweighted – in addition to the current proposal's 2.8 unweighted. He emphasized that the data are preliminary.

He noted that for the ETR policy under review, the projections using 2007 data are generally consistent with 2003 projections, except that a larger group of students is captured in the ETR pool (24.2% of high school graduates as opposed to 21.7%) due to a higher rate of a-g

completion. Diversity in the ETR pool is also a little higher in the 2007 data, GPAs are similar, and test scores are slightly lower. There is an increase to the size and diversity of the pool of students identified as newly ETR and previously ineligible, between the 2003 and 2007 data.

Using a minimum 3.0 weighted/capped GPA for ETR status produces similar results to the 2.8 unweighted GPA, but projects a smaller pool (23% vs. 24.2%, but still higher than 2003), slightly reduced diversity, and slightly higher test scores and GPA. The third scenario, requiring a minimum 3.0 unweighted GPA, produces a much smaller ETR pool (20.9%) and further reduces the number of previously ineligible and URM students. The composition of the guaranteed portion of the pool is nearly identical in each of the three GPA scenarios.

BOARS also reviewed new projected estimates of application growth, systemwide and by campus, for each of the three GPA scenarios based on various application probability factors; a table showing the number and profile of 2004 freshman applicants to UC who were denied or admitted but not enrolled, and who have since reapplied to UC after enrolling at a CCC; and a table comparing persistence, graduation rates, and UC GPA by ELC status.

**Discussion:** Chair Hurtado said the new data reinforce the current proposal. She noted that the Master Plan requires UC to maintain a 12.5% eligibility rate. BOARS may need to propose a way to meet that target by the end of the academic year.

It was noted that traditional indicators of academic performance rise in the statewide “guarantee” pathway, while the ETR pathway relies more on Comprehensive Review evaluations that take into account other indicators of excellence not always captured in data. With ETR, previously ineligible students who might have given up on UC will now be encouraged to become eligible, which increases UC’s visibility and could help improve K-12 preparatory standards. It was noted that 9 by 9 expands the number students from some schools in the guaranteed referral admissions pool, but it also means that some schools will have fewer students in the pool. Director Wilbur noted that ELC is open to both public and private high schools.

Former Chair Michael Brown joined the meeting. He said there is some concern that moving to a 2.8 unweighted GPA could be perceived as lowering standards. He asked BOARS to produce a statement about the educational “pros and cons” of each GPA option. Senate Chair Croughan also asked BOARS to review campus procedures for comprehensive review to examine whether procedures are in place and how those processes can be strengthened given the possible changes.

It was noted that the range of projected application growth is not substantially different to what campuses might experience in a given year and may level off or decrease after 2010-11 as the college-going population declines. The application fees also generate revenues that help offset the cost of the review.

It was noted that GPA is a strong predictor of success. A recent Berkeley study found that unweighted GPAs are better than weighted GPAs as predictors for first year GPA and persistence. Favoring unweighted GPAs is also fairer to high schools that lack broad availability of AP/Honors courses. (The GPA “bump” is determined by dividing the honors/AP courses by the total number of a-g courses.) In general, BOARS did not favor the 3.0 unweighted GPA option. Differences with 3.0 weighted include the loss of 5000 people from the ETR pool and a little less diversity. A “pro” to the 3.0 weighted may be fewer applicants. One member said BOARS should make its GPA preference decision in the context of remaining in the original spirit of the proposal to “cast a wider net,” rather than what might be politically popular. Chair Hurtado noted that UC needs a strong public relations component to accompany any change to eligibility policy.

**Action:** Members will send comments over email about the pros and cons of the GPA options toward a draft memo to Council

#### **IV. Consultation with the Senate Leadership**

**Report:** Senate Chair Croughan thanked BOARS members for their service to the Senate. She said the shared governance relationship with the new president is strong, and the Senate is working with the UCOP external affairs unit to develop public relations messages about eligibility reform that explain the changes to the public clearly and openly. BOARS is encouraged to contribute to that effort.

The current budget crisis threatens a number of University priorities, and UC may face additional mid-year budget cuts. The President's [Draft Accountability Framework](#) is the first step toward establishing an annual report that tracks the University's progress in meeting key goals. Chair Croughan encouraged BOARS to provide feedback about areas of the framework that may not have been addressed or addressed inadequately; and areas where additional qualitative and/or quantitative analyses might be needed.

Finally, protocol requires BOARS members to communicate to the committee chair, who in turn should communicate all requests, including media inquiries, through the Senate chair. She asked members to assume that documents are confidential unless otherwise noted, and added that the analyst provides high level support and is available to draft agendas, minutes, committee memos and reports, to share institutional knowledge, and to help ensure proper protocol.

#### **V. Consent Calendar**

1. 2007-08 Annual Report
2. July 11, 2008 meeting minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the consent calendar pending a clarification in the annual report that membership in a federally recognized tribe is a classification in federal and state law that is distinct from race.

#### **VI. American Diploma Project**

**Issue:** California recently agreed to participate in Achieve Inc.'s [American Diploma Project](#), a national effort to increase the alignment of high school curriculum and standards with college and career success metrics in order to help better prepare students for college and eliminate remediation in postsecondary education. UC is looking for Senate members who teach introductory courses, particularly in Math and English, to attend the sessions.

**Discussion:** Director Wilbur noted that higher education, legislative, and business leaders have endorsed the project. She said CSU is actively involved, and if UC does not participate, it risks having new standards imposed that it may not support. One member expressed concern that the project may attempt to impose a pre-conceived concept of academic standards on UC. UC faculty should be front and center helping to drive the process.

## VII. Draft UC Accountability Framework

**Issue:** The draft accountability framework is a new effort to bring existing data tools together in one place to communicate to the public what UC accomplishes, to track the University's progress relative to its mission, and to help us identify areas for improvement.

**Discussion:** Members noted that the framework's purpose and audience could be clearer. Is it for the public, or is it intended for legislators and other public sector bureaucrats? There are two ways to communicate data – as absolute numbers or in comparison to a set of standards. The latter would be a more effective way to communicate accountability, but some of the data are not presented in a context that allows that kind of evaluation. The size of the report may also make it less accessible.

One big question the framework should illuminate is how well UC is fulfilling its core mission of serving the State of California by admitting the top 12.5% of public high school graduates and achieving representative diversity in its student body and employees. It should demonstrate ways in which UC may or may not be fulfilling its mission in these, and other areas. There was a suggestion for the Undergraduate Student Profile section (Section 4) to begin by presenting data on the racial, economic, and geographic composition of the state before moving on to show the corresponding demographic makeup of UC. The report discusses the important issue of racial and ethnic diversity and touches on socioeconomic diversity, but it does not discuss geographic diversity within California. There should be data indicating representation by county, or region or urban vs. rural. The framework might employ the geographic subdivisions used by CPEC to organize the state. There should be a separate section on staff demographics.

Indicators 4.5 and 4.6 of the Undergraduate Student Profile section on pages 90-93 provide data and trends for female students, but those data and trends should also be provided for males. In addition, Indicators 7.4 and 7.5 of the faculty section on pages 150-153 should provide data on both genders.

In Student Experience (Section 5), it would be useful to have an accurate depiction of the experience students have in the classroom over the course of a college career, particularly in light of the transformation in class size over time, which impacts the student experience and accessibility to certain majors.

In Undergraduate Access (3.7), there was concern about a bullet point noting that “In determining students' eligibility for UC, UC considers only grades earned in college preparatory (“a-g”) coursework completed in 10th and 11th grade.” This sends a message that senior year does not matter. The third sentence of Part II Section III should also be re-written to be clearer.

The framework should address postgraduate outcomes, including alumni satisfaction and success through some measure or measures that communicate the impact of a UC degree on the California economy and public good, to help communicate the “return rate” on public investment in UC. Possible indicators in this category might include employment rates, income after graduation, postgraduate work, and the percentage of UC graduates working in certain fields or sectors. Alumni giving rates are often used as a measure of satisfaction.

Much of the University's success is tied to external factors such as resource availability, particularly state funding. Some measures in the framework might take into account resources in calculating the outcome. Sustaining recent gains in diversity and retention rates, for example, will depend on outreach funding. There is a related concern that funding agencies demand accountability without providing the adequate resources to achieve goals. This might be expressed in data on per capita taxpayer spending over time on UC. The public may expect more from UC, but the question is whether we can do more with declining resources.

**Action:** The analyst will draft/circulate comments for review before the November 10 deadline.

### **VIII. Request for BOARS to Reassess the “d” Requirement for UC Admission**

**Issue:** Several times over the past three years, BOARS has commented on the possible expansion of UC’s “d” laboratory science admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS), each time declining the request. The Davis Division has now requested a formal Universitywide review of the question. The ‘d’ requirement is stated as “two years of laboratory science providing fundamental knowledge in at least two of these three foundational subjects: biology, chemistry and physics.”

**Discussion:** It was noted that EESS courses can be used to fulfill the area “g” elective requirement, and individual EESS courses can, and have been, accepted for ‘d’ if they also provide fundamental knowledge in at least one of the quantitative physical sciences. A geophysics course, for example, can deliver basic physics. UC has approved several of these courses for ‘d.’ They are also considered in comprehensive review.

Most BOARS members were not convinced that existing EESS courses should be an equal partner with chemistry, biology, and physics in ‘d’, because EESS, as a derived, integrative science, is not a foundational building block for science literacy on an equal footing with the experimental, observational sciences. The proponents of the ‘d’ modification argue that the California Standards include EESS, but the Standards also reveal significant quantitative difference between the thinking expected in EESS courses and what is expected in chemistry and physics courses. The latter are a significant notch up in intellectual demand.

It was noted that faculty want to assume all students entering UC have a minimum level of exposure to the basic sciences that has prepared them for college-level curricula. EESS courses are prevalent as 9<sup>th</sup> grade courses, but many are taught by teachers not trained in the field. One argument for adding EESS to the ‘d’ requirement is that it will encourage more students to major in EESS fields, some of whom will go on to teach high school. There has been a suggestion to increase the ‘d’ requirement from two to three years, but the concern with this is that many low resource or low API schools will not be able to meet the pressures of that requirement, causing additional negative consequences for access and opportunity.

On the other hand, one of the proponents’ arguments is that EESS courses provide an opportunity for students who might not otherwise take other science courses to become scientifically literate. EESS helps make science interesting and relevant to many students. In addition, it may provide a more holistic kind of reasoning that helps them better conceive issues like global warming. Is the purpose of ‘d’ to prepare college level science majors, or is it also intended to help ensure broad scientific literacy for non-science majors?

**Action:** Before drafting a response, BOARS will request more information about the characteristics of EESS courses that have been approved for ‘d,’ and the potential impact the change might have on under-resourced schools. The response will address the California Standards.

## **IX. Report to The Regents about the Alignment of the new SAT with BOARS' Testing Principles**

**Issue:** In 2003, The Regents provisionally approved UC's current testing pattern, pending a report about the extent to which the new SAT I aligns with BOARS' January 2002 "[testing principles](#)." Over the last two years, the BOARS Testing Subcommittee has consulted the College Board and other testing experts to assess the degree to which the goals are being met. College Board Representatives met with BOARS in 2007 to answer questions, after which BOARS drafted, but did not finalize or send, a set of follow-up questions.

**Discussion:** Chair Hurtado proposed removing the SAT Subject Test questions from the draft and engaging in a separate conversation with the College Board about the proposed elimination of the Subject test requirement. Sam Agronow noted that his [November 2007 study](#) for CAIR found that the new SAT Reasoning Test is more predictive of UC GPA than the old SAT, and the Subject Tests do not add substantially to the predictive validity. The Writing portion is the most predictive element. High School GPA is more useful in predicting student achievement because it is calculated on a more narrow and focused basis.

## **X. Systemwide Senate Review Items**

### **1. Policy on Reemployment of University of California Retired Employees**

**Action:** BOARS decided not to opine.

### **2. Request from the University Committee on Academic Freedom to change Senate bylaws and add UCAF to Council**

**Action:** BOARS approved the proposal and will send a brief memo of endorsement to Council.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 pm  
Minutes prepared by: Michael LaBriola;  
Attest: Sylvia Hurtado