

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting – Friday, October 6, 2006

Approved November 3, 2006

I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

BOARS Chair Mark Rashid welcomed the committee and chaired the meeting. After the welcome, members of the committee and other attendees introduced themselves.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

- John Oakley, Chair, Academic Senate
- Michael T. Brown, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
- Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate

REPORT: Academic Council Chair John Oakley and Vice Chair Michael T. Brown welcomed the committee members and thanked them for their service in the systemwide Academic Senate. BOARS was informed of some of the issues before the Senate and University this year, such as continued issues related to executive compensation, leadership development efforts, graduate student support, and the UC Study Group on University Diversity. Chair Oakley emphasized the importance of the Academic Senate's role in shared governance during this critical time for the University.

BOARS members, student representatives and consultants were informed of their roles, as well as the policies and procedures for the operation of Systemwide Academic Senate committees. This and other useful information is provided in the "Guidelines for Systemwide Senate Committees" (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/chairsguidelines.html>).

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. It was stressed that UC travel policy now requires that all *Travel Expense Vouchers (TEVs) must be submitted within 21 days after completion of a trip*. Due to budgetary and fiscal restraints, TEVs received after the 21 days limit will not be reimbursed. UCLA Travel Center reservation procedures for Senate travelers and detailed information about Systemwide Senate travel policies and reimbursement procedures are available online at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/as.travelregs.0607.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.

Committee 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. Simplified agendas and approved minutes are also posted on each committee's public webpage.

III. Consultation with Office of the President – Admissions

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur distributed a number documents to BOARS, including information on the UC Score implementation, news coverage of BOARS' consideration of a policy for approving online providers of courses to satisfy UC's subject ('a-g') requirements (see Agenda Item VI.A), and state legislation ([SB 1543](#)) regarding standards for career technical education courses to satisfy the College Preparatory Elective ('g') subject requirement for eligibility. Director Wilbur also provided a brief oral report on the following items:

- The UC Counselor Conferences this summer seemed to be quite successful and counselors were provided with useful information on the minimum GPA requirement changes, the UC Score, and the transfer articulation streamlining initiative.
- BOARS' proposed task force to draft revisions to the mathematics ('c') and laboratory science ('d') subject requirement guidelines has been approved and will be funded by the Provost.
- The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) recently approved a proposal to conduct a university eligibility study for 2007 high school graduates. UC has expressed concerns about the methodology of the previous eligibility study and is working to ensure the faculty have input regarding the methodology of the 2007 study.
- Access to UC's fall 2007 online admissions application was made available yesterday. Although completed applications will not be accepted until November 1st, as of last night over 1,200 prospective applicants started an online application.

IV. UC Transfer Preparation Paths – Implementation Update

- Margaret Heisel, Associate to the VP for Student Affairs and Executive Director
- Eric Taggart, Director, Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) Coordination Site

ISSUE: BOARS and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) have been charged by the Academic Senate to work with UCOP Student Affairs to develop implementation guidelines and procedures for the Streamlining Major Preparation Articulation policy ([SR 477](#)) and SciGETC ([SR 478.B\(2\)b](#)).

REPORT: Executive Director Margaret Heisel and Director Eric 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 also satisfy the legislative requirements of recently chaptered California Senate Bill 652 ([SB 652](#)). The Preparation Paths are intended to identify and better communicate both commonalities and differences in lower division major requirements across all UC undergraduate campuses.

Preparation Paths for Psychology, Biological Sciences, Chemistry and History majors were finalized this summer and made available online in September (<http://www.uctransfer.org/>). Work has also begun on development of Paths for five additional majors: Business/Management, Computer Science, Economics, English and Physics. A comprehensive implementation plan, which will include plans to create Paths for all other top UC campus majors and a mechanism to implement the opt-out provisions in SR 477, is being developed by UCOP and will be proposed to BOARS and UCEP in November. Further status reports will be presented to BOARS and UCEP throughout the year.

DISCUSSION: Executive Director Heisel and Director Taggart informed BOARS that roughly one-third of undergraduate students come to UC through the transfer process. CSU enrolls the greatest percentage of California transfers, private postsecondary institutions enroll approximately 19 percent of the state’s transfer students, and UC enrolls approximately 17 percent.

Members questioned why UC does not enroll a greater proportion of the state’s transfer students. It was indicated that the recent state budget cuts have impacted the numbers of transfer students because of fee increases, campus enrollment constraints, and cuts to academic preparation funding for UC community college counselors. Director Heisel reported that the California Community Colleges (CCCs) have also suggested that UC needs to establish a greater presence on their campuses. Members asked about UC efforts to increase its presence on CCC campuses and improve transfer rates and were informed of the following:

- UC is working to set annual transfer enrollment targets and identify and communicate with potential transfer students earlier in the educational pipeline.
- The University is working jointly with the CCCs through a transfer advisory board (UC/CCC TAB) to identify problems and craft plans to address issues (e.g., introduce a greater degree of standardization of UC campus transfer admissions agreements, establish data sharing agreements that will better enable UC to target various student populations).

- A California Community College Transfer Initiative, which received \$2 million in new funding in the 2006-07 state budget as a result of efforts by Assembly Speaker Fabian Nunez, is being developed jointly by UC and CCC. The initiative funding will be used to create a “virtual transfer center” to provide advising and academic support to students preparing for transfer to UC. The focus of the effort will be on community colleges with historically low transfer rates to UC.

V. UCLA Comprehensive Review Changes

- Sylvia Hurtado, BOARS Member

REPORT: Member Sylvia Hurtado briefly reported on recent changes to the UCLA comprehensive review process. At the end of September, the UCLA Academic Senate voted to adopt, on an experimental basis, a more “holistic” model of comprehensive review of applicants, similar to the process currently used by the Berkeley campus. One key change in the UCLA process is that each application will be read and considered in its entirety, rather than having different sections evaluated by different readers. This new comprehensive review process will be implemented for the upcoming fall 2007 admissions process.

DISCUSSION: The committee discussed the issue of individual campus actions having an effect on other campuses within the UC system. Given that UC campuses draw from the same limited pool of “eligible” students, changes in admissions processes and targets on one campus can significantly impact the admissions yield of another. Members recommended that BOARS engage in further discussion of how campuses might better work together as a system to achieve common admissions goals. It was also suggested that the committee should review data on UC campus admissions overlaps, in addition to data on those UC admits that choose to attend other institutions.

VI. Subcommittee for Articulation and Evaluation – Proposals

- Trish Stoddart, BOARS Vice Chair and Articulation & Eval. Subcommittee Chair
- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

A. Policy Recommendation: Criteria for Approval of Online Providers and Courses to Satisfy Subject (‘a-g’) Requirements

ISSUE: The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee has developed, in collaboration with UCOP Student Affairs staff, a policy recommendation for BOARS approval that would establish criteria for granting “program status” to online providers of courses to satisfy the subject (‘a-g’) requirements for eligibility.

Currently UC has an interim policy in place for ‘a-g’ certification of online courses. Online courses are approved for subject (‘a-g’) requirement credit if: (1) offered by the UC College Prep (UCCP) online program or PASS/Cyber High program, or (2) certified by the high school principal, by being listed on the student’s transcript, as comparable to other college preparatory courses offered at the school site.

The proposed policy would establish a new two-step process for approving online courses as satisfying the subject ('a-g') requirements for eligibility:

1. Approval of an online provider as meeting the criteria for "program status." These criteria include requirements for accreditation, teacher credentials, curricular development, assessment proctoring, student-teacher interaction, and other aspects of the learning environment.
2. Approval of courses offered by an online provider that has been granted "program status." These courses will be reviewed by UC faculty using the existing 'a-g' guidelines that have been approved by BOARS (<http://www.ucop.edu/doorways/guide>).

DISCUSSION: It was noted that there is an ever increasing number of online course providers and high school students who take online courses. BOARS members recognized the need for establishing a policy that would allow online providers to obtain 'a-g' certification for their courses while also assuring a certain level of quality in the student learning experience.

MOTION: BOARS adopts the policy recommendation for approval of online providers with the stipulation that BOARS review the policy again within 5 years.

The motion was seconded.

ACTION: The motion was approved by unanimous vote.

B. Proposed Revisions to History/Social Science ('a') Requirement Guidelines

ISSUE: The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee has proposed revisions to the history/social science ('a') requirement guidelines, to make the guidelines more explicit, for BOARS' approval.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members raised concerns about the clarity and purpose of the revisions to the history/social science ('a') requirement guidelines. Of most concern was the last phrase of the proposed revisions, and it was suggested that this phrase could be eliminated.

ACTION: The "Proposed Revisions to History/Social Science ('a') Requirement Guidelines" are to be sent back to the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee for modifications to address BOARS' concerns.

VII. UC Freshman Eligibility Reform

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

DISCUSSION: Over the past several years, the concept of UC eligibility has come under scrutiny by BOARS and others. A number of concerns with the current eligibility construct have been identified:

- Eligibility artificially constrains the population of high school students that are even visible by UC and removes viable students from admissions consideration.

- Using limited information - GPA and test scores - to initially filter applicants may not be the best way to optimize the selection of students that will perform well at UC or fulfill the goals of admissions outlined in the Regents' "[Policy on Undergraduate Admissions](#)":

The University seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University's eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socioeconomic backgrounds characteristic of California. (May 20, 1988)

- The eligibility determination is impacted by a student's behavior and not just their ability or achievement (e.g., failure to take one required exam renders a student ineligible).
- The examination requirement creates a barrier that eliminates a significant portion of potential eligibles, even among potential ELC-eligibles, who do not have a minimum test score requirement, but only need to have completed the required exams.
- Eligibility is unattainable for some students regardless of motivation or ability (e.g., some California public high schools do not offer the full compliment of 'a-g' courses).

The committee was presented draft working papers developed to catalyze BOARS' discussions of eligibility reform. A number of proposed ideas for restructuring aspects of the eligibility construct were discussed, such as:

- Establishing eligibility thresholds at which some applicants would be guaranteed admission to the UC system and other students would be guaranteed consideration for admission to the system through a comprehensive review.
- Using other measures of achievement (e.g., class rank) and additional information about an applicant (e.g., recommendation letters) to determine eligibility.

BOARS members noted the likely difficulties the committee will face in developing, advocating for, and implementing eligibility reform. The importance of engaging campuses committees, admissions staff, and other key parties in early discussions about reform efforts was stressed. Despite the potential obstacles, BOARS members agreed to actively pursue reform of the freshman eligibility policy.

VIII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Admissions Research and Evaluation

- Sam Agronow, Associate Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation
- Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation
- Kyra Caspary, Analyst, Admissions Research & Evaluation

A. Admissions Statistics Overview

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred and will be addressed at a future meeting.

B. Report on Requested Eligibility Analyses #1

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred and will be addressed at a future meeting.

IX. University Diversity Study Group

- Nina Robinson, Director of Policy and External Affairs

REPORT: Director Nina Robinson provided the committee with information about the establishment of a Study Group on University Diversity. The study group was established in response to the Board of Regents' decision to sponsor a study of the impact of Proposition 209 on the University and develop recommendations to support efforts to increase diversity and foster a climate of inclusiveness. Director Robinson announced that work groups will be established to specifically examine different topics and report their findings to the Study Group. These topics include undergraduate admissions, graduate admissions, faculty diversity, and campus climate. BOARS members were encouraged to volunteer or submit nominations, from both inside and outside the University, to serve on these various work groups.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Mark Rashid

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)

Attendance 2006-07

		10/6/06	11/3/06	12/1/06	1/5/07	2/2/07	3/2/07	4/6/07	5/4/07	6/1/07	7/13/07
MEMBERS:											
Mark Rashid, Chair	Davis (Civil & Env. Eng.)	X									
Trish Stoddart, Vice Chair	Santa Cruz (Education)	X									
David Stern	Berkeley (Education)	X									
Jennifer Chacon	Davis (Law)	X									
John Whiteley	Irvine (Social Ecology)	X									
Sylvia Hurtado	Los Angeles (Education)	X									
Peggy O'Day	Merced (Natural Sciences)	X									
Peter Sadler	Riverside (Earth Sciences)	X									
Akos Rona-Tas	San Diego (Sociology)	X									
Daniel Weiss	San Francisco (Psychiatry)	X									
William Jacob	Santa Barbara (Mathematics)	X									
David Anthony	Santa Cruz (History)	X									
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:											
Arshad Ali	Student Representative (UCLA)	X									
Tina Park	Student Representative (UCLA)	X									
EX OFFICIO:											
John Oakley	Chair, Academic Senate	X									
Michael Brown	Vice Chair, Academic Senate	X									
CONSULTANTS:											
Samuel Agronow	Assoc. Dir., UCOP SAS	X									
Maria Bertero-Barceló	Exec. Director, Academic Senate	X									
Joyce Justus	Acting VP, Student Affairs	--									
Judy Kowarsky	Assoc. Director of Admissions, UCOP	--									
Nina Robinson	Director of Policy, UCOP SAS	X									
Susan Wilbur	Director of Admissions, UCOP	X									
Roger Studley	Assistant Director, UCOP SAS	X									
GUESTS:											
Kyra Caspary	Analyst, UCOP SAS	X									
Margaret Heisel	Assist to VP and Exec Dir, UCOP	X									
Eric Taggart	Director, ASSIST Coordination Site	X									
STAFF:											
Kimberly Peterson	Senate Analyst	X									

Key: X = In attendance, -- = Absent, Alt = Alternate attended, T = participated via Teleconference