

**I. Welcome and Announcements***o BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

After brief introductions, Chair Hurtado welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the charge of the committee. BOARS helps establish the policies and principles that guide UC's selection of students and its relations with California schools and colleges, and it conducts its business in the interest of the public good. BOARS is a working committee; members are encouraged to participate actively in meetings and should expect to take on extra duties as assigned. BOARS is strongest when the independent voice of each member contributes to the deliberations and decisions of the larger committee. BOARS relies on empirical evidence and is fortunate to have excellent UCOP consultants advising it on a regular basis.

This year BOARS is expected to discuss implementation of the new admissions reform policy; two reports due to the Regents—one reviewing the extent to which the new SAT Reasoning Test aligns with BOARS' testing principles, and a retrospective on Comprehensive Review; the impact of budget cuts on admissions and enrollment functions, opportunities to increase efficiencies, and their repercussions for diversity and access; enrollment targets for freshmen, transfer, and non-residents; an effort to implement shared review of freshman applications across campuses; the 'a-g' requirements; and Career Technical Education (CTE). In addition, the Academic Council may ask BOARS to consider any systemwide issue that has implications for undergraduate admissions.

Two BOARS subcommittees will work outside of regular meetings to develop issue-specific recommendations for the full committee's consideration: the Subcommittee for Articulation and Evaluation (William Jacob, Juan Poblete, and one additional member) will address 'a-g' and college readiness issues; and the Subcommittee for Statistical Analysis (Sam Agronow and at least one BOARS member) will coordinate data requests and analyses. BOARS also sends a member to the UC/CCC Transfer Advisory Board, which discusses ways to enhance and improve transfer.

Chair Hurtado attended the September meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which is concerned about the impact of budget cuts on access to higher education; CSU is being forced to enroll 40k fewer students this year and suspend spring admissions' CCC is expecting 250k fewer students; and UC is expected to continue its enrollment curtailment plan as undergraduate over-enrollment tops 14,000.

Academic Council is concerned about the budget crisis and the impact of the furlough plan, and may entertain proposals for redefining instructional days, moving campuses toward a common academic calendar, and improving time to degree. The [UC Commission on the Future](#)—aka "The Gould Commission"—and its five Working Groups will discuss how UC can best serve the State and maintain access, quality, and affordability in a time of diminishing resources. The Commission has been asked to complete its work by March 2010, and any recommendation will undergo a systemwide Senate review. Both the Commission and Working Groups include Senate faculty. BOARS will be particularly interested in the Work Group on [Access and Affordability](#).

**Discussion:** BOARS should consider taking a more active and overt political posture by producing a document outlining the consequences of de-funding, higher fees, and increased privatization on public education access and diversity. More broadly, the Senate should consider conducting its own independent analysis of the topics the Gould Commission is exploring.

**Action:** Members interested in serving on one of the subcommittees will contact Chair Hurtado.

## **II. Consultation with the Office of the President**

- o *Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur*
- o *Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow*
- o *Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux*

**Director Wilbur:** The California Community College Transfer Task Force has completed its interim report. Its recommendations include strengthening ASSIST, aligning course numbering systems and academic calendars, and improving communication about the importance of the CCC system and the transfer path.

The 2011-12 application will include formal questions about American Indian tribal membership to help implement a 2008 BOARS [position paper](#) affirming that Selection Criterion 13 of the [Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions](#) allows an undergraduate applicant's membership in a federally recognized American Indian tribe to be one of many considerations in the admission review process. The Office of Admissions is also willing to work with campuses that want to incorporate it this year.

Director Wilbur covered four topics at a joint meeting between the Senate and UCOP Academic Affairs units: the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE); a possible UC collaboration with Achieve, Inc. and the American Diploma Project; Community College transfer articulation; and the Shared Review project.

Regarding Shared Review, campus admissions offices are under pressure to increase efficiencies and eliminate redundancies. Currently, each undergraduate applicant submits identical applications to an average of three UC campuses, who conduct separate reviews of every applicant, but due to ongoing budget cuts and the projected increase in application volume in 2012, the current system is unsustainable. Shared review will enable campuses to divide the work and share evaluation results and processes. The project is intended not only to build efficiencies into freshman admission reviews but also improve the quality and consistency of the process. The budget is a motivating factor, but improving the quality and consistency of the review is also important. One challenge to implementation is the reluctance of admission committees to adopt other campus' processes, weights, or criteria, although decisions will still be up to individual campuses. In the long run, however, campuses will need to adopt common evaluation criteria and goals. Shared Review will give campuses access to the same raw application data and allow them to apply it to local decisions. It will also help address the high degree of overlap in local processes. We need BOARS's help to encourage campus committees to embrace shared review.

On September 19, UC admissions directors and faculty attended a forum about the new admissions policy hosted by a Los Angeles Asian Pacific Islander community group concerned about the impact of the policy on API student access. UC also hosted its annual series of

conferences for high school and college counselors at five locations around California. Topics there included the admissions reform policy, UC's plan to reduce freshman undergraduate enrollment and increase transfer enrollment for a second year, the new area 'c' and 'd' guidelines, newly approved online providers, and plans to develop a admissions reform website. Counselors are very concerned about UC's rising fees.

The admissions application has been redesigned and will be implemented next year. The redesign should help UC collect more complete information and enhance the user experience.

ICAS wants to do more to monitor and respond to proposed legislation of interest to the three segments. One example is SB 147, a bill that requires CSU to accept CTE courses in fulfillment of the 'g' elective requirement, effectively bifurcating CSU and UC in the area of CTE.

**Deputy Director Agronow:** An Asian-American group requested an analysis of applicants and admitted students by UC campus projected under admission reform compared to now, which Deputy Director Agronow will bring to the November meeting. In addition, the newly redesigned UC [StatFinder](#) is up and running. Members were given a tutorial about how to use the database, which allows users to view demographic, admission, enrollment, graduation, and retention statistics for freshmen and transfers by individual California high school and community college.

**Associate Director Daves-Rougeaux:** High schools submitted 18,000 courses to UC for 'a-g' approval last year, 6,000 of which are new. President Yudof has agreed to meet the Department of Education's goal of approving 10,000 academically rigorous CTE courses for 'a-g' by the end of 2011-12. A UC faculty steering committee is also meeting to develop ten standardized CTE courses that can be adopted universally by high schools across California.

**Discussion:** One member said the budget crisis should not affect the application review process because the application fee should fully support the cost of the review, although it was noted that the admissions function actually gets only a fraction of the application fee.

### **III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

- Senate Chair Henry Powell and Vice Chair Daniel Simmons

Chair Powell thanked BOARS members for their volunteer service to the Senate. He said he welcomes the Office of the President reorganization as an opportunity to help new administrators understand the UC system of shared governance and the importance of UC's academic mission to the State, and noted that ICAS is considering how UC, CSU, and CCC can work together to advocate for higher education. He mentioned that the Senate hosted retreats in September for divisional Senate chairs and directors and systemwide Senate committee chairs and vice chairs, and that searches will soon be underway for a Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory director, UC Provost, and Executive Vice President.

The UC Commission on the Future held its first meeting in September. When the roster was first announced, the Senate expressed concern that undergraduate education was not strongly represented on the Commission and recommended adding three additional faculty as members. Regent Gould agreed to this request. The campus COCs and UCOC have also been working hard to produce nominations for the five Working Groups—Size and Shape of UC, Access and Affordability, Education and Curriculum, Funding Strategies and Research Strategies—and

those rosters and now being filled with faculty from all ten campuses and a variety of disciplines. The Commission's final report will be turned over to the Senate for systemwide review.

Vice Chair Simmons added that he wants to make sure the Senate is prepared to respond to the Commission's recommendations by developing a clear sense of the faculty's own positions and priorities for the future direction of UC.

**Discussion:** BOARS members want to ensure that BOARS' concerns and questions are addressed in the Commission and in the Access and Affordability Working Group as those bodies discuss the "Future of UC." Chair Powell encouraged BOARS to develop a set of suggested questions to complement the issues noted on the [Access and Affordability](#) website.

**Action:** Members will review the Gould Commission website, particularly the "issues to consider" draft document for the Access and Affordability Work Group and forward suggestions to Chair Hurtado or Analyst LaBriola about what might be missing from the charge or how its focus might be sharpened.

#### **IV. Report to the Regents on the New SAT**

**Issue:** In 2003, The Regents approved provisionally UC's current required testing pattern, pending a report from BOARS about the extent to which the new SAT I aligns with BOARS' January 2002 "[testing principles](#)." Over the last three years, BOARS and its Testing Subcommittee have consulted the College Board, ACT Inc., and various testing experts to evaluate the role of standardized testing and assess the degree to which these goals are being met. BOARS reviewed a near final version of a draft report prepared by the 2008-09 BOARS Testing Subcommittee, led by Professor Peter Sadler.

Chair Hurtado noted that although the Regents requested the report by the end of 2008, it was impossible for BOARS to meet that deadline because of the eligibility reform effort that consumed the Committee over the last two years and the fact that the new SAT was not implemented until 2006, which meant there were no data about student performance until late 2007 and national data in 2008.

She said BOARS' main reasoning in judging the use of tests was that the tests should not present an unusual barrier to UC, should be useful beyond simply sorting students by score by adding to UC's ability to predict success. The report focuses on the core tests, not the issue of SAT Subject tests, which campuses can only recommend, not require, under the new eligibility reform policy.

**Discussion:** Individual members relayed suggestions for both minor and more significant edits and clarifications. It was also noted that the report should make its main recommendations and intent more explicit: that is, to remove the provisional status of the SAT Reasoning Test; articulate the role of UC's testing pattern in the new eligibility reform policy passed by the Regents in February 2009; and identify possible new testing policy paths BOARS and UC should explore in the future—for example, placing less emphasis on the tests or adopting practices among the growing number of four-year colleges that have made tests optional. BOARS should also emphasize its preference for the ACT by mentioning the ACT first whenever both are mentioned.

**Action:** Chair Hurtado and Analyst LaBriola will revise and finalize the report based on the discussion, circulate the final version to the Committee for review and approval, and submit it to Academic Council for transmittal to the President and Regents.

## **V. Report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review**

**Issue:** There is a standing request to BOARS from the Regents for an annual report evaluating the effects and effectiveness of Comprehensive Review, with a comprehensive report due every five years. BOARS has not conducted such a review since [September 2003](#). It also prepared a first-year implementation report in [November 2002](#). 2008-09 Senate Chair Croughan and Secretary of the Regents Griffiths decided that it would be appropriate for BOARS to submit a comprehensive retrospective on CR by December 2009. If that review is positive, then a request could be made to submit updates on a less than an annual basis. BOARS reviewed a draft outline for the report:

**Section I** will provide an overview and analysis of admissions outcomes since the 2003 Report. This effort should be led by the Statistical Analysis Subcommittee and focus on academic quality, access and diversity, and matriculation outcomes of admits.

**Section II** will focus on current and best practices for maintaining the quality, consistency and integrity of the review process and provide evidence for whether those processes are consistent with policy and unrelated issues are not creeping into reviews. BOARS members should examine what their campus is communicating publicly about its implementation of the 14 Comprehensive Review factors in freshman student selection, and then talk with admissions directors and others to determine whether this is happening in reality – if campuses use every one of the CR criteria and if there is any deviation from them. Each campus should also detail any changes and developments between 2003 and today in campus processes or in the way they weigh criteria. Section II will also include a section on the holistic review process at UCB and UCLA; a discussion of campus practice for evaluating achievement in the context of opportunity, particularly school context, and how this is used to evaluate applications; and ways campuses are assuring quality and achieving efficiencies in the review process.

**Section III** will discuss challenges for comprehensive review, including the need to increase efficiency without sacrificing quality in an era of budget cutting, over-enrollment, and the onset of eligibility reform; pressures on campuses to move toward more uniform CR systems; and the need to maintain and increase diversity.

Chair Hurtado noted that at the time of the 2003 report, only six campuses had developed Comprehensive Review procedures. The new admissions policy will require all campuses to expand their use of CR and become more selective. The report is an opportunity for all ten campuses to assess their policies, determine what needs improvement, and, if necessary, develop new or revised guidelines to ensure that processes take into account the 13 CR criteria before ETR is implemented.

### **Discussion:**

- Not all Regents understand CR and many are concerned that the public does not understand it. The biggest misperception about CR is that it is purely subjective, and the report should address whether the fears and criticisms expressed at the onset of CR have proved to be true or unfounded.

- There should be a discussion of academic and demographic trends. It was noted that Berkeley has a higher retention rate under CR than before CR, but that the demographic outcomes are not always what the faculty want.
- BOARS should address the review of transfers in a separate report. The President is committed to the transfer path; still, there is a sense among some people that transfers “do not belong” on certain campuses. The most vulnerable groups are often targeted when resources become scarce.
- BOARS should explore the trend toward a higher proportion of women than men being admitted to and enrolling at UC. Is this trend a result of comprehensive review or a national trend that begins at the high school level or before?

**Action:** Analyst LaBriola will forward information already received from campuses. All BOARS members should respond to him with their reports by November 2. Joe Watson and Juan Poblete will assist Chair Hurtado with the section on challenges.

## **VI. EESS and Area ‘d’**

**Issue:** On a number of occasions over the past four years, BOARS has commented on the possible expansion of UC’s “d” laboratory science admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS). Last year, the Davis Division requested a systemwide Senate review of the question. Against BOARS’s advice, Council decided to release the proposal for review, but asked BOARS first to provide input into the documents that should be included in the review. Council also approved BOARS’ web-based survey to all UC departments offering introductory courses in science, mathematics, and engineering fields. BOARS now discusses the status of the survey and whether additional materials should be included in the review. Chair Hurtado said members should educate themselves about the issue because they are likely to be lobbied at their division and/or called upon to answer questions.

Vice Chair Jacob described the materials being proposed for the review. He said the purpose of ‘a-g’ is to ensure that students arrive at UC prepared for any entry-level course. BOARS’ position has been that the faculty believe sufficient background in at least two foundational sciences—biology, chemistry, and/or physics—is necessary to ensure proper preparation; however, EESS courses offered in 9<sup>th</sup> grade do not provide adequate background in these disciplines to be approved for area ‘d’, although it is possible for UC to approve an EESS course for ‘d’ if it has this content, and an EESS course can always count toward the area ‘g’ elective. EESS proponents cite the status of EESS in the California Science Standards and the National Science Standards, but the former does not include particularly strong science content and the latter is about overall scientific literacy, which is not the same as UC preparation. There would be major access and resource implications in a move to three required area ‘d’ courses. At the same time, BOARS is sympathetic to the need to improve 9<sup>th</sup> grade EESS courses and more generally encourage interest among young people in science and issues like global warming.

The survey was intended to help get a system-wide picture of faculty expectations for high school student preparation, but the response rate was low. Only 31 department chairs out of 112 responded. BOARS members agreed that the Committee should report the full survey results.

**Action:** BOARS approved the memo and list of materials. Chair Hurtado will try to solicit a few more responses from department chairs before sending the materials to the Senate office.



## VII. ACHIEVE Inc. and the American Diploma Project

**Issue:** BOARS discussed concerns about a push to make CSU's Early Assessment Program the standard of college readiness in California. Interim Provost Lawrence Pitts also joined the meeting.

**Report:** Vice Chair Jacob noted that [Achieve, Inc.](#) is an organization sponsored by the National Governor's Conference that promotes K-12 student achievement. One of their ventures is the American Diploma Project (ADP), which wants to help states align their college and career readiness expectations in math and English and design tests consistent with these expectations. 37 states are signed on to ADP, and UC is a member of the ADP California team, along with other CA colleges and universities, the Department of Education, and the Governor's Office.

No Child Left Behind requires each state to establish a set of college and career readiness standards for K-12 curriculum. Achieve, Inc. has its own set of standards that it has been comparing to each state's standards. Earlier this year, Professor Jacob and Senate Chair Croughan informed Achieve, Inc. that their assessment of the California standards did not take into account the fact that UC and CSU determine college readiness by the 'a-g' requirements and the ICAS Competency Standards. Achieve responded by incorporating the ICAS Standards into their comparison rubric; however, only the "testable" standards held in common by ADP and ICAS actually align.

On September 16, former Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction Scott Hill and PACE Director David Plank proposed that California use the EAP as a statewide test of college readiness, require it of all high school 11<sup>th</sup> graders, and incorporate it into the state accountability model. This would mean that students who pass the EAP are assumed to be ready for credit-bearing work at UC. (High schools currently give the EAP exam in grade 11 and students who score high enough are excused from taking CSU's entry level remediation test.) Federal money will be available to states that adopt the tests as part of their standards, although there will be no single national test.

There are several problems. UC faculty determine UC college readiness standards, but faculty have been involved only marginally in the process so far. Second, there are not sufficient data yet to understand the EAP's value, and the data that do exist show that the EAP is not relevant to placement at UC because it does not add a lot to predictive validity for success. Moreover, the EAP does not offer the same information as UC's AWPE test, which is very useful in identifying students who need English remediation; and the EAP is not seen as sensitive to English Language Learners. Using the EAP as the universal standard of college readiness in CA could lead to lower student preparation and high school standards because it could mislead students and schools into thinking they do not need UC-level preparation to get into UC, and could encourage teachers to begin teaching to the EAP test. At the very least, the test will be useless to UC, but there is an additional concern that all public higher education could eventually be required to use the exam for placement and admissions. The EAP is fine as a course placement exam to reduce remediation in CCC and CSU, but not as a high stakes "college readiness" exam.

Vice Chair Jacob will attend the meeting in late October where the EAP proposal is likely to be approved. Director Wilbur added that CSU is currently doing an analysis of the EAP. She said the ADP proposal is likely to go forward and recommended that UC help shape the conversation.

Provost Pitts agreed that UC should consider how it can collaborate in a productive way, while continuing to articulate a vocal defense of the California approach.

**Discussion:** It was noted that BOARS should stay vigilant about what the test is attempting to identify. Is it trying to improve standards and preparation or is it really a way to move some students into a non-college track? UC should request more detailed information before expressing comfort about this. Further, there was expressed concern that the 11<sup>th</sup> grade was too late for students to improve eligibility for UC. Earlier in the high school career is necessary so that students have the required 11 'a-g' courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade.

-----

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