

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

November 13, 2009

I. Announcements

- o *BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

General Announcements

The October 14 Academic Assembly meeting gave faculty a chance to engage President Yudof on a range of issues. Chief Financial Officer Peter Taylor also attended the meeting to discuss the oft-repeated myth about a \$5.3b UC budget reserve.

On October 28, the Academic Council endorsed a [memo from UCFW](#) urging UCOP to communicate to the Legislature the consequences of inadequate funding on access and affordability. Council also reviewed proposed budget models for the UC Education Abroad Program. UCOP is attempting to transform EAP into a self-supporting enterprise funded by student fees, forcing EAP to close or consolidate some overseas study centers and implement differential fees.

The [report of the Academic Senate Special Committee on Remote and Online and Residency](#) has been released for systemwide review.

Achieve Inc. and the American Diploma Project

Five UC representatives, including Vice Chair Jacob, attended the October meeting of Achieve Inc.'s American Diploma Project, which is trying to bring states together to define standards for college and career readiness. Earlier in October, Academic Council supported BOARS' memo of concern about Achieve's proposal to use the CSU Early Assessment Program (EAP) test as a universal indicator of "college readiness" in California. It is expected that federal "Rise to the Top" funds will be available to states that have clear college readiness standards.

Vice Chair Jacob said the faculty involved in the project agree that K-12 should focus on improving curriculum and instruction, not developing more high stakes tests. Some faculty are also concerned that the EAP test is weak and ineffectual; only 17% of 11th graders who take the test score "CSU ready." However, CSU does see it as an effective way to encourage students to take a rigorous 12th grade program, and is disseminating an EAP-based curriculum to high schools. Interim Provost Pitts was also at the meeting. He commended CSU for its commitment to curriculum and instruction and said the EAP should be called a "course placement test for credit bearing work at CSU and CCC" rather than a college readiness exam. Faculty from the three segments agree that the CA Department of Education should disseminate the ICAS competency statements as the best college readiness standards.

Director Agronow noted that UCOP has requested EAP test results from the CDE for the 2007 and 2008 entering UC classes, which will allow UC to conduct predictive validity modeling.

Career Technical Education

A UC faculty steering committee is developing ten standardized CTE courses for universal adoption by California high schools to help meet the Department of Education's request that UC approve 10,000 academically rigorous CTE courses for 'a-g' by the end of 2011-12. UC's

strategy also includes giving strong existing programs ‘a-g’ status and disseminating models of strong CTE courses to high schools and career academies. Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux added that UC will host a “Curriculum Institute” in the spring to give teams of CTE instructors and faculty a chance to discuss ways of enhancing existing courses with CTE content.

Discussion: The UC Education Abroad Program is the nation’s gold standard for study abroad immersion. It is an academic program, not a student service. It is important that students from all backgrounds have the opportunity to study overseas, but this model will make study abroad less accessible for lower income students.

II. Consultation with the Office of the President

- o *Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow*
- o *Institutional Research Coordinator Tongshan Chan*

New ETR Analysis:

Director Agronow briefed BOARS on the implications and limitations of a new analysis of applicants and admitted students projected under the Entitled to Review policy compared to now, which UCOP has released to external groups, who were unhappy with an earlier forecast suggesting that the proportion of Asian American students admitted might decline, while the proportion of white students admitted might increase. Chair Hurtado asked BOARS members to inform themselves about the analysis and caveats in case questions arise on their campus.

Chair Hurtado noted that BOARS’ intent in proposing ETR was to remove some of the barriers to eligibility and broaden the pool of applicants campuses could consider under Comprehensive Review. Under the strict parameters of the current policy, some high achieving students are ineligible and will not be given serious consideration. With ETR, the notion of “eligibility” disappears, but the referral guarantee remains in the form of an expanded Eligibility in a Local Context, which guarantees a place for the top 9% in each high school, and a statewide index guaranteeing a space to the top 9% students statewide.

UCOP’s ETR projections have evolved as staff look more closely at the data. The original ETR projections were based on the 2007 CPEC eligibility study, which provides a good sample of California high school graduates. Importantly, however, there are differences between projected CPEC outcomes and the actual UC outcomes. CPEC weights its data to emulate the total population of CA public high schools, but the sample is not exact, and as a result it undercounts the number of applicants to UC and admitted students who enroll. The CPEC study did not scale up to total actual UC applicants.

The new ETR projections include about 10,300 people who were missing from the original. The difference is due to the use of the “Any 11” course pattern as a criterion for ETR eligibility instead of the ELC 11 pattern used in earlier projections. In addition, the new projection includes 900 more UC applicants found in the CPEC file, which scales to 4,000 more when weighted. For most of these people, the one barrier to inclusion in the ETR pool was a lack of additional test scores or not meeting the ELC pattern until after the 11th grade.

UCOP used these data in a logistical regression analysis to create a probability of individual students applying and being admitted to each of the ten campuses based on a large and a small

increase in applications. In the new simulation, the academic profile of admitted students improves on every campus. The proportion of white admits changes systemwide from 38.7% to 41.0% and the proportion of Asian admits declines from 34.9% to 32.8%. Latinos gain slightly and African-Americans decline. The big caveat to the data is that the estimates reflect past (2007) applicant and enrollment behavior and campus admissions practices, which do not necessarily project future outcomes. The CPEC data also do not include additional information that campuses use in CR processes to make decisions.

Discussion: There was concern that the data will be misinterpreted in the media. Public messages should include the fact that Asian-American students are expected to remain the most heavily represented group in both the potential applicant pool and the projected admit pool relative to their numbers among high school graduates. The ETR outcomes for male students appear much worse than for females, but it was noted that high schools give students grades and campuses can use CR criteria to achieve the balance they want to achieve.

The data show the critical reason for moving to ETR—to give UC a better admitted class. There was concern that that UCM and UCR might soon be unable to honor the referral guarantee, although the referral pool yield is very low at UCR (5%) and UCM (1%); UC should ensure the guarantee is honored and no campus is forced to reject high quality students.

2012 Admissions Index:

Historically, UC has used a sliding index based on GPA and standardized test scores to identify the top 12.5% of students for statewide eligibility. The index was last adjusted in 2004 and must now be modified to identify the top 9% of students for the statewide admissions guarantee pathway effective for 2012 admissions. Director Agronow said it may not be possible to maintain all of BOARS' past principles based on the 12.5% index for the 9% index—specifically, the same level of gender/ racial/ethnic diversity. On the other hand, the goal of achieving a 70% probability that members of the pool will earn a 2.0 GPA will likely be improved to at least a 90% probability.

Coordinator Chan and Director Agronow summarized preliminary alternatives for the new index and the methodology used in the simulations. The methodology employs 2007 UC enrollment data in a [curvilinear](#) regression model using high school GPA and SAT Reasoning/ACT scores to predict first year UC GPA outcomes. To calculate the probability of students achieving a 2.0 GPA, the model, using a curvilinear term to emphasize high school GPA, is applied to 2007 CPEC data on 350k CA high school graduates; it then ranks students on their probability of achieving a 2.0 GPA and selects the top 31k+ students for the 9% guarantee. The probability that a student admitted under the 9% guarantee will earn a minimum 2.0 GPA is at least 91.7% in this model. A range of minimum SAT Reasoning/ACT scores is calculated against the GPA minimum to meet the 91.7% cutoff probability, which forms the index detailing the admissions requirements. The new statewide index has significantly higher SAT scores because of the restriction to 9% of high school graduates and because of the elimination of the SAT II exams. It estimates that about 75% of students would come from high (API 7-10) schools. It is also less racially diverse than the current index. The ELC 9% selection, however, results in more racially diverse outcomes.

Discussion: Chair Hurtado said she hopes BOARS can adopt a new index by December so UC can get the information to students now to let them know how they can qualify for 2012. She asked BOARS to consider whether any other quantitative indicators should be added to the index

in addition to GPA and test scores. It was noted that the index could have a positive or negative impact on populations UC wants to capture outside of the 10.4% overlap between ELC and the statewide index. It may be important to include other variables to make the pools more homogeneous. It was noted that nothing in theory should prevent UC from achieving the same level of diversity as the current index, and the Committee requested that UCOP outline the pros and cons of the linear vs. quadratic models.

Action: Members will forward ideas for additional indicators to Chair Hurtado and Analyst LaBriola

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Chair Harry Powell

The administration agreed to remove a new consent button on the Open Enrollment website and draft a letter promising that nobody who had submitted the form would experience a change in benefits. The Senate was also successful in getting a proposal for differential fees for business and engineering majors removed from the Regents November agenda and onto the agenda of the Gould Commission.

Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons are participating in the President's [Post Employment Benefits Task Force](#) campus "listening tours." The Task Force is studying the continued sustainability of the UC Retirement Plan.

The [UC Commission on the Future](#) held its second meeting on November 12 in Oakland. The [Commission Roster](#) includes 20 voting members and six ex-officio members, including Senate and administrative leaders, regents, students, staff, and California business and labor leaders. Five working groups, populated by a combination of faculty, staff, students, regents and administrators, are looking at Size and Shape, Access and Affordability, Education and Curriculum, Finance, and Research Strategies.

The Gould Commission is a rare opportunity for the UC system to self-study. The President has promised the Senate a full review of the Commission's recommendations; nevertheless, the Senate is cautious because the work of the Commission overlaps considerably with its delegated authority. The Senate wants to ensure that the work proceeds according to principles of shared governance and respect for its authority and review processes. Chair Powell will encourage early Senate involvement and close interaction between the Working Groups and related Senate committees, so when the Commission delivers its recommendations for the 60 day review, the Senate is already familiar with the thinking and can respond quickly and effectively.

Topics will include how online education may be able to help UC meet demand for educational access and create new opportunities for cross-campus collaboration particularly as a way to leverage the diverse resources of the campuses for the benefit of the whole, for example, in language instruction. Regents Staff advisor Edward Abeyta has been looking at how universities can offer educational opportunities from "K through death" and at all times of life, perhaps through UC Extension.

Discussion: It was noted that the Commission should view affordability and social mobility as central to UC's core mission, not as something to strive for only as the business model allows. Chair Powell agreed that the Commission will be a failure if it does not discuss UC's impact on the public good. He said UC helps transform people into competent citizens with useful

knowledge; its state-funded research creates a tie to the state's interest in agricultural and other research benefiting the public, and its public service mission expands opportunity and access.

IV. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the October 2, 2009 BOARS Minutes
2. UCEP's proposal to repeal SR 764

Action: BOARS approved the Consent Calendar.

V. ICAS Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students

Issue: The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates has updated its *Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students*, which is intended to clarify the mathematics knowledge and problem-solving skills students need for college success, particularly for quantitative courses and majors. Vice Chair Jacob was a member of the ICAS committee that modified the Statement, which ICAS last updated in 1997. He said there were only a couple of substantial changes beyond small adjustments to the language. The new statement simplifies an outdated discussion about expected proficiency in technology; it deletes the Appendix on Calculus in the Secondary School; and it adds a new appendix referencing the California and National Council of Teachers Mathematics Standards. He said ICAS's document has little influence in California K-12 because the Board of Education has decided not to disseminate it. ICAS thinks the CA Standards are too weak and omit essential matter.

Action: BOARS voted unanimously to adopt the Statement.

VI. Systemwide Senate Review Items – Differential Fees

Issue: At its October meeting, Academic Council discussed a proposal to implement differential fees for Engineering and Business majors appearing as a discussion item on the Regents September agenda. Although it was subsequently removed as an action item from the Regents' November agenda, Council received letters on the subject from two committees and two divisions, including a suggestion from UCPB that BOARS look at the issue in terms of access. The issue has been referred to the Gould Commission.

Discussion: Students should have the freedom to choose a course of study without regard to cost. Differential fees would distort student choice and make academic planning more difficult. Many students would undoubtedly find a way to game the system—for example, by waiting until senior year to declare a major.

The fees would not necessarily be retained by engineering and business departments or courses and would not necessarily benefit upper division students in those majors. They would go to the Chancellor's discretionary fund.

The proposal could radically change the nature of the institution. The most insidious aspect is to introduce a private logic into a public university. It creates two classes of students, some that are contributing more to the collective good, which ultimately gives them more claim to the public

good that the university represents. It is essential that all student “citizens” are treated equally in the public university, and on the basis of knowledge, not their ability to pay. UC’s goal is to provide a broad education, not just a job for graduates. If UC accepts that the state is going to abandon funding, it leaves itself no choice but to look at financial models that treat the University as more of a private enterprise rather than something meant to produce a public good. It may lead the University and the public to put more resources into areas that are assumed to have the potential to be more revenue producing.

Higher student fees generally, and differential fees in particular, could impact UC’s ability to claim state resources. The state may view differential fees as an even less compelling reason to fund student support. In the long run, increasing public disinvestment from these critical majors and discouraging students from pursuing them with higher fees will discourage economic development and increase poverty.

It was noted that there are graduate differential fees; BOARS should clarify why this is inappropriate at the undergraduate level. Undergraduate instruction is part of general education, and students do not necessarily have to use their major to pursue a career. There was little support for a suggestion that UC raise graduate fees above undergraduate fees; UC is already at a disadvantage compared to other institutions in the support it can offer graduate students. It is difficult to evaluate the impact of differential fees on business students, because most campuses do not admit freshmen into business.

What do the demographic data say about the socioeconomic status, first generation status, debt burden and persistence rate of students who choose business and engineering majors? Would UC be disadvantaging already disadvantaged students?

Action: Analyst LaBriola and Chair Hurtado will draft a memo to Academic Council about differential fees based on the comments.

Action: BOARS opted not to comment on the Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force Report

VII. Commission on the Future Update – Access and Affordability Working Group

- *With Nina Robinson, Director, Policy & External Affairs*

Director Robinson briefed the committee about last week’s meeting of the [Access and Affordability Working Group](#). Chair Hurtado was unable to attend. She asked BOARS to suggest additional issues for the Working Group’s charge and to discuss the role of BOARS.

Nina Robinson: UCI Chancellor Michael Drake and Student Regent Jesse Bernal are the Access and Affordability co-chairs. Former BOARS chairs Michael Brown and Mark Rashid are also members. The Working Group will be discussing enrollment issues, including the scope and duration of UC’s enrollment reduction plan, fee/financial aid issues, and new models of educational delivery as a means to broaden access. The members want to coordinate efforts with other working groups with overlapping charges, and are concerned about remaining sensitive and responsive to campus and faculty input. They are also concerned that UC’s short-term budget issues should not drive radical change. Since there are faculty from almost every campus on each of the working groups, there is an opportunity to create a local community of people whose

interactions can help inform the process and foster communication. Chancellor Drake wants to develop a set of principles and goals defining an appropriate level of access. He has said that access and affordability are two of the components that set UC apart from other Universities.

Discussion: The Commission was formed because of the budget crisis, so it is starting from a position of wanting to find solutions to that crisis; however, in doing so, there is a risk that it will not view access and affordability as a central concern. The Working Group should remind people why access and affordability are central components of the public university and the UC identity. It was also noted that the questions in the charge seem too reactive. The Working Group and BOARS need address long-term questions, not just UC's response to short-term operational challenges. It was also noted that Merced is unhappy that the campus has a total of two faculty on the five working groups and that UC will need years to recover from the cascading effects of enrollment cuts across the three systems of higher education.

VI. Report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review

Issue: The Regents have asked BOARS to submit a retrospective report on comprehensive review by December 2009. After the October meeting, BOARS members submitted reports describing the extent to which their campus has implemented CR; changes since 2003; the publicly available information about the CR factors used in selecting students; how the campus weighs those criteria in the decision process; how it evaluates achievement in the context of opportunity; practices for assuring quality of reviews, including training and oversight, achieving efficiencies, and new innovations; and any evaluations the campus has conducted.

In 2003, only six campuses had Comprehensive Review procedures. Now all use CR, including Merced for Admission by Exception. Part of the report will focus on the campuses that have implemented CR since 2003. At the time CR was implemented, there was concern that academic quality would drop, but outcomes are good even though campuses are implementing CR differently. CR has allowed campuses to become more selective and to broaden their view of the applicant by looking at evidence of personal accomplishments, leadership potential, senior year rigor, and growth and change. It was noted that UCSB weighs geography differently than other campuses in a special "School Context" pathway that admits the top 3% of each CA public and private high school. UCD hopes to move to a holistic review model in the next few years.

Last year, UCSC decided to decrease the importance of CR and scale down the human read component of its review by 50% in favor of relying more heavily on GPA and test scores. Chair Hurtado said campuses that are becoming more selective should increase their use of CR to identify the best students.

CR will become more prominent with ETR; it is important that the report help demystify CR and assure the Regents and the public that the process is honest, accountable, and transparent. CR is based both on UC values and on individual campus values. Should BOARS define part(s) of the CR process that should be systemwide and other parts that can be left to the campuses?

The Statistical Analysis Subcommittee will lead an analysis of admissions outcomes since the 2003 Report. UCOP will compile updated data on selectivity, academic indicators for all ten campuses, academic quality, measures of access and diversity—e.g., low API, low income, first generation, URM— and matriculation outcomes.

BOARS should explore the use of data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Freshman Survey and The University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). The report should report application, admission, and yield data with respect to traditional academic indicators, which remains the primary basis of campus admission decisions.

Action: Follow up with campuses regarding gaps.

IX. Report to the Regents on UC's Standardized Testing Pattern

The report is nearly complete, but a few sections need to include specific citations with precise numbers. In addition, Chair Hurtado has modified the report's key recommendations slightly, including a recommendation to study the use of comprehensive indicators in place of the statewide eligibility index.

Discussion: BOARS should recommend the promotion of a broader, more effective public discussion about racial disparities in testing outcomes and how to minimize them. There was a brief discussion on the recommendations and members felt it was important to review the entire report again in December.

Action: Chair Hurtado will circulate the current draft to members over email after the meeting and a final draft will be included on the December BOARS agenda for final approval.

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