

**University of California Academic Senate
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**

Minutes of Meeting – November 14, 2008

I. Chair's Announcements – Sylvia Hurtado

Report: The University's budget situation continues to worsen with the recent announcement of an additional \$65m mid-year cut in State funding. The Regents will consider a proposed 2009-10 budget at their November meeting. The budget does not include funding for year two of the faculty salary plan, but does include a \$10 million allocation for graduate student support. The Regents will vote on the Academic Senate's eligibility reform proposal in January 2009, and President Yudof is talking with legislators and other key players about the proposal. Academic Council reviewed BOARS' draft "pro-con" document comparing various eligibility reform GPA scenarios and recommended that BOARS continue to support the minimum 2.8 unweighted GPA approved by the Assembly. BOARS' comments about the draft UC Accountability Framework were submitted to Academic Council, and the search for a new UC Provost continues.

Chair Hurtado had a conversation with College Board Vice President James Montoya about the proposal to eliminate the SAT II Subject test requirement. Vice President Montoya's view is that SAT Subject tests allow students from schools without AP and Honors courses to show what they know and allows non-English speakers to demonstrate expertise in a language. He said the College Board will do its best to respond to BOARS' follow-up questions about the extent to which the new SAT aligns with BOARS' testing principles and goals, by December.

II. Consent Calendar

- July 11, 2008 meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the minutes pending minor corrections.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur and Special Assistant to the Student Affairs Vice President William Kidder

Report: Susan Wilbur reported that the President is currently committed to finding space for every eligible applicant for 2009-10 admissions, but the budget environment presents many challenges, and some individual campuses are considering reductions in freshman admissions. She is strongly advocating against cuts in Community College transfer admissions. The 2009-10 application filing deadline is December 1.

CSU recently announced that it will be unable to offer space to all eligible applicants. The system is expected to declare "impaction," which authorizes each CSU campus to use supplemental admission criteria, including priority admission to local applicants. It is unclear what effect this will have on UC, which is already overenrolled by between 10,000 and 11,000 students systemwide. She added that UC continues to make progress in the approval of academically rigorous Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses, with 6500 courses approved this year in various areas of a-g. UC will provide BOARS with preliminary applicant pool information in December.

Special Assistant Kidder noted that the Office of General Counsel released a resource guide for administrators about diversity and Proposition 209. "[Enhancing Diversity at the University of California](#)" includes eleven examples of permissible activities.

There was a comment that the diversity guide should mention UC's obligations under Federal Affirmative Action regulations. Another comment was made that UC should rethink its commitment to admitting every eligible student without appropriate funding from the State.

IV. Achieve Inc., and the American Diploma Project

Issue/Report: Director Wilbur attended a meeting of the Achieve Alignment Institute to discuss the [American Diploma Project](#), an initiative of the National Governor's Association intended to help states align K-12 standards, tests, and data systems that will better prepare students for college and career success. Participants included representatives from California, Florida, and Illinois, three states that are supposed to collaborate in an "alignment institute" with the ADP. Most segments of CA higher education were represented, and all have signed on to the initiative, but UC has not made any specific commitments yet. The California contingent discussed the need to identify preparation gaps, build more coherence in the California Content Standards, improve the Early Assessment test 11th grade students may take to help them assess readiness for CSU, and CA State bill 946, which encourages Community Colleges to align assessments with CSU. Achieve also wants to promote Algebra II as a high school graduation requirement, and there is interest in using the California Standards Test (CST) as an eligibility assessment tool. Director Wilbur said UC would not consider the latter until it has access to CST data. The next meeting of the Alignment Institute is in March and the work is expected to wrap up by January 2010.

Discussion: There were concerns that California's educational system is becoming more racially segregated in opportunity and achievement and that the Diploma Project is operating on an underlying, but simplistic belief that standards, assessment, and "accountability" alone will lead to reform and solve fundamental problems with instruction and learning. Moreover, designing academic standards around testing may not align with what kids really need to know and how they learn. UC faculty should be at the table helping to drive the process, and BOARS should think about how it can be more proactive by producing data, creating awareness, and having an impact beyond the traditional requirements of the committee. It was also noted that California needs to improve its data collection system, and BOARS should consult UCOPE about campus remediation data.

V. Request for BOARS to Reassess the "d" Requirement for UC Admission

Issue: BOARS reviewed a draft committee memo regarding the requested expansion of UC's "d" laboratory science admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS). Two EESS courses approved for Area d were included in the agenda packet.

Discussion: The committee felt the memo conveyed the basic consensus of BOARS, although it should more explicitly acknowledge the proponents' point that EESS courses are an effective way of engaging high school students in Science, and that such courses have a significant role to play in helping to make Science interesting and relevant to many students, particularly "holistic thinkers," students interested in social conditions, as well as women and diverse populations. BOARS agreed to explore further how to better foster early broad interest in the Sciences, particularly among groups underrepresented in the Science fields.

At the same time, most EESS courses are inadequate for 'd,' which asks for the development of knowledge and reasoning skills in the basic sciences as preparation for university level science courses. as articulated in the "a-g" guide and expressed by University faculty in their

prerequisites for freshman Science courses, EESS courses do not provide preparation equivalent to that of biology, chemistry, and physics courses that satisfy the ‘d’ requirement. The level of reasoning fostered in typical ninth grade EESS courses is different from that found in the basic tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade sciences, and that background is what faculty are seeking, a view that is articulated in the a-g guide. As such, EESS courses should not be an equal partner with chemistry, biology, and physics in ‘d’, because ninth grade EESS is not a foundational building block for UC courses. It was noted that ninth grade 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.

Action: BOARS’ memo will be finalized and circulated for comment, with final approval at the December meeting. Director Wilbur will provide an example of an EESS course approved for g.

VI. Report from C and D Task Force

Issue: BOARS reviewed draft revisions from the “Area C & D” Task Force to the mathematics (c) and laboratory science (d) descriptions in the [Guide to “a-g” Requirements](#). The charge to the intersegmental Task Force was to clarify the language so that high schools have a better understanding about what UC is looking for. The Task Force is advisory to BOARS, which will make the final decision about the language.

Report: Vice Chair Jacob noted that the Task Force reviewed the California Content Standards and the ICAS Statement on Competencies in Mathematics to help formulate the revisions to Area (c). The most significant new recommendations for (c) are that the three Area (c) mathematics courses must be completed during 9th, 10th, 11th, or 12th grades (Recommendation #5) and that Geometry must be one of the three courses. He recommended that BOARS adopt all of the Task Force recommendations except the restriction to grades 9-12, which could be construed as contrary to the State’s new 8th grade algebra requirement. 8th Grade Algebra can count for Area (c).

Discussion: The goal of the new 8th grade algebra requirement is to increase math achievement, particularly among students who are currently on a non-college track. The concern is that the success rate for 8th grade algebra is very low, and less than a quarter of students currently meet a bar the governor wants them to meet in three years. It was suggested that UC require all junior high and middle schools to submit 8th grade algebra courses for approval to help ensure they have sufficient rigor to count for Area (c). Noting workload concerns, an amendment to this recommendation was made for another entity such as the high schools to evaluate the rigor of 8th grade algebra courses.

The statement appearing in both the Area (c) and (d) revisions – “While these Standards can be a useful guide, coverage of all items in the Standards is neither necessary nor sufficient for adequate preparation” – is confusing and should be clarified.

Action: William Jacob and Robert Jacobsen will provide a set of clear recommendations (stated as action items) for BOARS’ review and approval in December.

VII. Update on the Shared Review Project

Issue/Report: Last year, two subcommittees of the Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) comprised of BOARS faculty and admissions directors met to devise a system that will allow campuses to share reviews of freshman applications. The former UC Provost conceived the

project as a way to improve efficiencies and save money. The subcommittees drafted two protocols for processing, extracting, and distributing application information centrally. The first would generate a score or set of scores from a holistic, human read of the application, based on the UCB and UCLA systems. The second would generate a set of “machine” scores based on an automated algorithmic assessment of various Comprehensive Review factors in the application.

Director Wilbur noted that “holistic” is a way of reviewing an application that takes into account everything about a student’s record, including achievement in the context of one’s learning environment and opportunities. UCB and UCLA arrive at a single holistic score, while other campuses use a point system to produce a set of scores. UCLA hosted a holistic review training session in August for admissions officers and faculty, and is developing a process for sharing fall 2008 application read scores with other campuses for free, beginning in January 2009. Campuses should develop a protocol for working with UCLA. She said in June, the “machine” read subcommittee identified possible algorithms and discussed analytic work that needs to be done before moving forward.

Director Wilbur outlined a timeline for next steps: by spring 2009, BOARS will review machine read data analysis and holistic score outcomes and the APTF will write a report for local committees to review; by December 2009, campuses will decide about participation; and in fall 2010, the plan will be implemented for fall 2011 admissions.

Discussion: The two efforts should complement and inform each other and there should be formal engagement and consultation with campus admission committees. The data will help campuses make good decisions about students on the margins to help them predict who will be successful. Local campuses should still have the option to decide how to use the data, and BOARS should look at what each campus did after the first year and create a model for best practices.

VIII. Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility Policy

Issue: BOARS reviewed new simulations of student profiles and increased application volume for “Entitled to Review” based on updated CPEC weights. The most significant changes since October are a lower estimated number of high school graduates, a lower official CPEC eligibility rate (now 13.4% instead of 14.4%), and a lower number and proportion of graduates captured in the ETR pool (now 22.9% instead of 24.2% in the 2.8 unweighted GPA scenario). The numbers are subject to change based on the final CPEC report due in December. The President also requested projections for a third minimum GPA scenario – 2.9 weighted/capped, and three new tables projecting admitted students for each scenario. Finally, BOARS reviewed its draft “pro-con” memo comparing GPA scenarios, and a pro-con chart developed by UCOP.

Report: Senate Chair Croughan said there is support for a 3.0 weighted minimum GPA among people who believe the public will view that baseline more positively. A January Regents vote is still expected, and the President plans to meet with leaders and new members of the Legislature to bring them up to speed. The President also supports an effort to track application fee funds to ensure they cover all review and admissions expenses, an effort to strengthen local comprehensive review practices, perhaps through a best practices conference, and an effort to allow BOARS to monitor the data each year and recommend future adjustments accordingly.

Director Agronow joined the meeting by phone. He said the CPEC study changed due to several factors; most importantly, because the original projections underestimated graduates of continuation high schools. He said his projections of admitted student are based on 2007 admit

behaviors. They assume ETR students with the 9x9 guarantee who applied in 2007 would apply again, and those who are among the 9% ELC but not previously eligible will apply.

Discussion: Moving from a 2.8 unweighted to a 2.9 weighted minimum GPA projects small diversity gains, in part because a 2.9 weighted GPA, *on average*, is a lower academic achievement bar than a 2.8 unweighted GPA, and some populations are more likely than others to attend high schools with AP/Honors course availability. There is concern that a move to a weighted GPA could disproportionately affect students at schools that offer few or no Honors and AP courses. One member noted that BOARS should be careful not to underweight the fact that the vast majority of schools offer AP/Honors courses. Tweaking the selection criteria is less important than addressing two basic goals – improving student preparation and capturing students away from competing institutions. Another noted that it would be useful for BOARS to highlight the extent to which the 3.0 weighted capped GPA scenario depends on the wide availability of AP/Honors courses and the effect of missing AP/Honors availability. It was mentioned that comprehensive review can take into account both the availability of AP/Honors courses and whether students took advantage of their availability.

The overall position of the Committee was to support the current proposal and the 2.8 unweighted minimum GPA. This scenario will provide a larger, more diverse pool of potential ETR applicants, will be more easily calculated by parents and students, and will help level the field for students at the California high schools that do not offer AP/Honors courses. (One BOARS member did favor the 3.0 weighted/capped scenario. This member notes that students at high schools with AP/Honors availability could be disadvantaged under an unweighted scenario, and the use of an unweighted GPA could add confusion because the weighted/capped GPA is calculated already for the 9x9 guarantee, and some students may have to calculate two GPAs.)

It is wrong to conclude that AP and Honors course-taking will not be considered under an unweighted GPA for ETR. The 2.8 minimum is only a starting point that triggers consideration of multiple factors, including the availability and non-availability of AP/Honors, in comprehensive review. AP and Honors remain fundamental to UC admission.

BOARS decided not to weigh in on pros and cons for the 2.9 scenario and also questioned a number of claims and assumptions in the UCOP pro-con document, recommending several revisions so that it would accurately complement the ETR proposal and provide a united message. Finally, the Committee noted that it would be useful to see finer grain differences for groups with small numbers and requested tables with an extra decimal point.

Action: A revised pro-con memo will be finalized and circulated. Sam Agronow will forward a new set of tables with the extra decimal place added

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

Distributions:

1. SFGate article: CSU plan would turn away many B students
2. Office of General Counsel: Enhancing Diversity at the University of California