

**Approved Minutes of Meeting
November 15, 2004**

I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

REPORT: BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown reported to the committee on the following topics:

Study Group II: The first meeting of the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group II is scheduled for December 13. A significant portion of the agenda will likely be dedicated to long-range admissions planning topics. BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown and Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal and Vice Chair Clifford Brunk will represent the Academic Senate on this Study Group.

High School Summit: State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jack O'Connell recently hosted a High School Summit, "High Expectations for All Students." BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown participated on a panel with several school district administrators on, "Rigorous Courses, Access and Student Achievement." Asc. Vice President Dennis Galligani reported that his office would be conferencing with members of the California Department of Education (CDE) regarding the outcomes of the High School Summit and the next steps that UC and the state can take regarding rigorous coursework issues. Director Susan Wilbur reported on her attendance at sessions on CSU's new Early Assessment Program, which gives high school juniors an option of taking a college readiness exam in English and mathematics. The exam provides feedback on the student's college preparedness and recommends, if the student does not achieve a certain level on the exam, a remedial course to be taken during the high school senior year. UCOP is currently assembling information on this new assessment program.

ACTION: BOARS will discuss the CSU Early Assessment Program during the committee's joint meeting with CSU Admissions Advisors in April.

CPEC Studies: There are currently two California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) studies taking place that are of interest to BOARS:

- *"Moving the Goalposts" Study* – this report on the effects of changes in UC's eligibility requirements is currently being revised. UC Regent Velma Montoya, UC's representative to CPEC, has been an effective advocate of the University's position on and concerns about this study.
- *"Near Misses" Study* – this study is aimed at identifying those students that barely miss eligibility and examining the factors that are associated with these "near misses." Chair Michael T. Brown is conferencing tomorrow with Adrian Griffin, CPEC Senior Policy Analyst, to learn more about this study.

ACTION: UC's finalized response to CPEC's "Moving the Goalposts: The Potential Effects of Changes in the University of California's Admissions Requirements" report will be distributed to BOARS for information when available.

Asc. Director of Research Search: There is a currently a search being conducted for an Associate Director of Admissions Research in the UCOP Student Academic Services office. BOARS Vice Chair David Stern is a member of the Associate Director search committee. Interviews with candidates will begin in the coming weeks.

Tomás Rivera Policy Institute: On October 26th, the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute released its fifth annual report on minority admissions at the University of California. The study, "The Reality of Race-Neutral Admissions at the University of California: Turning the Tide or Turning Them Away," indicates acceptance rates for underrepresented minorities have continued to significantly fall in recent years. UC's response, which questions the strength of the report's findings, is currently being drafted.

ICC Transfer Subcommittee: The Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC), the implementation arm of the California Education Roundtable, has a Transfer Subcommittee that focuses on issues of facilitating transfer. This ICC Transfer Subcommittee will meet in December and Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal and BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown are both members of this group.

II. Consent Calendar

ACTION: The minutes of the October 8, 2004 BOARS meeting were approved as written.

III. ASSIST Board of Directors Meeting

Dennis Focht, BOARS Representative to ASSIST Board of Directors

REPORT: Member Dennis Focht reported on his attendance as the BOARS representative at the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) Board of Directors meeting in October. ASSIST is the State's official repository of articulation agreements between California Community Colleges and UC and CSU campuses. The Board of Directors, which is made up of representatives from each of the public postsecondary educational segments, oversees development and establishes policy for ASSIST. A coordination office based at UC Irvine and directed by Eric Taggart manages the daily implementation and project operations of ASSIST. The overall aim of ASSIST is to make articulation between the universities and community colleges more transparent, and does so in part by offering an online transfer planning system for students. Further information about ASSIST can be found online at www.assist.org.

Director Susan Wilbur reported that this year transfer applicants using UC's online application would be able to directly link to and access ASSIST when entering their course information. It is anticipated that this new function will improve the accuracy of the application information and expedite transfer evaluation.

IV. Systemwide Academic Senate – Issues Under Review

A. SCIGETC Proposal

ISSUE: The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) has asked for the review and approval of a proposal to establish a Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC).

DISCUSSION: BOARS members were supportive of the proposal's goals of improving the preparation of students and simplifying the transfer process; however, the committee also identified a number issues with SCIGETC:

- Unlike IGETC, the SCIGETC proposal does not chart out a complete program for students to satisfy all of their general education requirements. Transfer students having completed SCIGETC may arrive on a UC campus and find that it is unclear how to adequately satisfy the final two courses of their general education requirements. This problem arises in that the courses comprising both IGETC and SCIGETC do not directly articulate with the sets of general education courses required by each campus and its colleges and schools.
- Certification of IGETC completion is the responsibility of the last California community college a student attends prior to transfer. SCIGETC, on the other hand, offers only a tentative certification of completion at the time of transfer. The workload and responsibility for certifying completion of the SCIGETC program would then fall upon the university campuses.
- It is unclear from the language of the proposal whether SCIGETC would apply to all high unit requirement science and engineering majors or just to certain major programs in these areas. The proposal indicates that faculty in the physical and natural sciences have participated in the development of SCIGETC, however there seems to be a lack of involvement by engineering faculty.
- It seems that focusing at the major program level, rather than creating systemwide major preparation curriculum, would be a more appropriate and successful way to improve transfer students preparation for high unit requirement majors.

ACTION: Analyst Kimberly Peterson will solicit further comments from the members on the SCIGETC proposal and draft a BOARS response for committee approval at the December meeting.

B. Streamline Major Articulation Proposal

ISSUE: The Systemwide Academic Senate committees have been asked to review a proposal to Streamline UC Major Articulation.

DISCUSSION: Initial reaction of BOARS members to the Streamlining proposal yielded several questions and concerns:

- The biggest issue in implementing this proposal is how a common major is defined. There is increasing diversity of specializations within some majors, which could further complicate the ability to reach an agreement about a common major across campuses.

- The proposal requires that when a campus opts out of a systemwide major articulation agreement it must create a campus-specific major articulation agreement. What if the community college does not have any equivalent course for major preparation articulation? This could end up mandating campus articulation agreements when no agreement is possible.
- This proposal could decrease campus motivation to pursue articulation agreements with community colleges – the campuses might choose to depend on the identification of systemwide agreements rather than proactively develop their own.
- This proposal might present false expectations to the community colleges and the state that UC can and should find commonality across campuses in its majors and major preparation requirements.

ACTION: Executive Director Margo Heisel will provide BOARS with a list of UC's top 20 majors.

ACTION: Further discussion on the UC Major Articulation Proposal will be slated for the December BOARS agenda.

V. Comprehensive Review Report

Nina Robinson, Director of Policy and External Affairs

ISSUE: BOARS annual report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review is slated for presentation at either the January or March Regents meeting.

REPORT: Director Nina Robinson provided the committee with a draft conceptual outline of and example data tables for the Comprehensive Review Report. The longitudinal data provided in the report allow for statements about how comprehensive review has or has not changed admissions outcomes. For example, this year BOARS will be able to report data on student performance while at UC. The themes of the report provide the context for analyzing this data. Possible themes for this year include the relative stability of the comprehensive review process, the oddities of the 2004 selection process (e.g., the Guaranteed Transfer Option), and a national trend towards hyper-competition in admissions.

DISCUSSION: Members provided suggestions for additional contextual themes and data to examine for the report:

- It is standard practice for most selective institutions to use some form of comprehensive review. Provide information on why these other institutions choose to use this type of admissions selection process.
- Provide empirical data that show the value of comprehensive review (e.g., how it helps better predict various academic outcomes).
- The amount of weight the different comprehensive review factors are playing in admissions selection outcomes should be examined. This would allow BOARS to make a definitive statement as to whether academic factors play a greater role in admissions decisions than non-academic factors. BOARS, as the body responsible for developing admissions policies, should know what role these different factors are playing in admissions decisions over time.

- Data should be provided to show how comprehensive review distributes the eligible pool of students across campuses throughout the university system.

ACTION: Vice Chair David Stern and Director Nina Robinson will discuss possible ways to quantitatively show the gains of implementing comprehensive review.

ACTION: BOARS members are asked to send Chair Michael T. Brown recommendations for additions to the Comprehensive Review Report and comments on the report's conceptual outline.

ACTION: At the December meeting BOARS members will review a draft of the committee's Comprehensive Review Report and Director Nina Robinson will present data on comprehensive review outcomes, including the weight of admissions factors and the distribution of eligible students across campuses.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Academic Services

Susan Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur reported to the committee on the following topics:

Fall 2004 SIRs: Director Susan Wilbur provided BOARS with Fall 2004 Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) information that will soon be posted on the UC website. The UC administration is currently discussing how best to release this annual information on SIRs since there are concerns that the customary release of the information, which occurs in a piecemeal fashion as the data is obtained, doesn't provide a well-rounded picture of the applicants.

UC Notes: A copy of the latest *UC Notes*, a regular publication of the Student Academic Services office, was distributed to the committee. This most recent issue contains an article of interest, "Choosing the Right Course: College Prep, Career Tech or Both?"

Online Applications: The University has already received nearly 5,800 online undergraduate applications for admission. Compared to the same time last year, this represents an increase of 20% in the volume of applications.

Referral Process: UC is committed to finding space in the University for all eligible applicants. In the past those eligible applicants who are not offered admission to a campus during the selection process have been referred to a nonselective campus. Last year was the first time that the Riverside campus was unable to accept all referral students except those in the engineering majors. Also, last year the Guaranteed Transfer Option (GTO) was used as a proxy for referral. Although it is currently unclear how the referral pool will be handled this year, the University has clearly stated that it will not offer another GTO. The process for referral this year cannot really be determined until the University has more information on campus enrollment goals and the number of applicants.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will report on the process for the referral pool at the March BOARS meeting. BOARS will examine data on the flow of referral students at this meeting.

Counselor Conferences: A summary of the participation rates of high schools and community colleges in the 2004 UC Counselor Conferences was provided. Of note, the low Academic Performance Index (API) high schools attended the conferences at lower rates than the high API schools. The Admissions Directors have begun discussing how to better reach out to the low API schools.

VII. Report of the Analytic Subcommittee

David Stern, BOARS Vice Chair and Analytic Subcommittee Chair

SAS Research Agenda: Director Susan Wilbur presented a broad overview of the Student Academic Services (SAS) office admissions research agenda for 2004-05. This research agenda includes non-BOARS related research projects that SAS is committed to conducting on a regular basis. Staff size and resources limit the amount of research work the SAS office can perform, so the research agenda must be prioritized. Proposed priorities for the BOARS research agenda this year are: (1) predictive validity studies, (2) honors, AP and 'a-g' coursework availability studies, and (3) Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) studies. Studies on "inclusiveness" indicators are also slated.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will present a preliminary summary of the 2004 ELC cohort data and high school study at the December meeting.

ACTION: The Analytic Subcommittee will hold a teleconference prior to the December BOARS meeting to prioritize and clarify the analytic agenda for this year and provide feedback on the draft ELC work plan.

High School Types: Director Susan Wilbur reported on a presentation at a recent meeting of the Admissions Directors on the increasing diversity of high school types and educational options. The Directors were stunned by the reality of secondary education today. We have built our understanding of secondary education on the model of the comprehensive high school. Though this continues to be the dominant school model, even comprehensive high schools are beginning to change rapidly (e.g., LA Unified announced it will divide all secondary schools into smaller learning communities). These changes in high schools raise questions about our admissions processes and the criteria we use to evaluate an applicant's secondary school experience. The University currently has guidelines about the content of our 'a-g' course requirements, but there are no guidelines on evaluating a course's instructional methodologies, delivery modes, or the learning environment.

Vice Chair David Stern provided the committee with a draft document, "The Varieties of California Public High School Experience," which outlines the types of information that is available on students in various high school settings. Vice Chair Stern expressed concerns that our ignorance about the universe of high school experience calls into question the University's criteria for admissions eligibility. If we don't seriously examine and increase our knowledge of the variety of secondary school types, the University's admissions policies may only be relevant to an increasingly smaller portion of state population of high school graduates.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will provide BOARS with the matrix of secondary school types developed by the California Department of Education (CDE).

Inclusiveness Indicators: Vice Chair David Stern provided the committee with a draft document, “Equal Privileges Therein: Notes on Measuring the Degree to which UC Represents ‘All Portions of the State’”. This document proposes a way of structuring some of BOARS’ analysis of “inclusiveness indicators” and the extent to which UC students are drawn from the state population. UC would use these indicators of inclusiveness to measure the degree of over- or under-representation of various segments of the state population.

VIII. Creating a Strategic Vision of Admissions Policy

Due to a lack of time, this item was deferred until the December meeting.

IX. Consultation with Academic Senate Office

George Blumenthal, Academic Senate Chair

Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Academic Senate Executive Director

ISSUE: Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal was invited to answer questions about the role and authority of BOARS and the divisional senate admissions committees.

REPORT: BOARS is the Systemwide Academic Senate committee specifically charged with developing and reviewing admissions policy. When BOARS develops a recommendation for admissions policy, the proposal is transmitted to the Academic Council to be acted on, and if appropriate, these recommendations are then brought before the Academic Assembly and eventually the Regents for consideration and approval. For example, the changes to eligibility BOARS developed last year were reviewed and approved by the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, and finally the Regents. This is the standard review process for University policies that are developed by senate committees. Sometimes the Academic Council might deem that certain decisions coming from BOARS do not require this formal review process. For example, earlier this year BOARS adopted a “Position Statement on Admissions Selection Criterion #14 and Geographic Preferences.” This statement acted as an interpretation of the *Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*, a policy for which BOARS, as the originator of the policy, has the authority to provide interpretation.

At the campus level, there is a tendency for the role of the divisional senate admissions committee to get confused with the role of the admissions/financial aid office, Chancellor and other campus administrators. The local administration may make suggestions to the senate for admissions policies, however, Regents Standing Order 105.2 clearly states that the authority to “determine the conditions for admission” lies solely within the purview of the Academic Senate. The administration does not have this authority to establish admissions policy. It is appropriate for the local senate admissions committee to be open to and consider input on admissions policy from the administration, and ideally the local administration would also be open to suggestions from the senate for items that are under their purview.

There are some issues where the role of the senate is more ambiguous, such as in the setting of campus enrollment targets. The setting of enrollment targets is arguably a budgetary question, and therefore falls under the purview of the administration; however, Standing Order 105.2 also authorizes the Academic Senate “to select a committee or committees to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget.” It is within the authority of the divisional senate to determine which of its committees (e.g., Planning and Budget, Admissions) should provide feedback to the campus administration regarding enrollment targets or other budgetary matters.

DISCUSSION: One member asked about the relationship between BOARS and the divisional admissions committees. The committee was informed that systemwide policies developed by BOARS would trump any divisional admissions policies. BOARS also has the right to examine whether divisional admissions policies and procedures are in compliance with systemwide guidelines and policies. A Division, however, has the right to appeal to the Academic Council and request review of a systemwide policy.

Members expressed concerns that the administrative consultation process with the divisional senate committees is often uneven and not very systematic. Members were informed that to overcome this, the senate and its committees should request timely consultation on issues of interest and importance. Ideally, the consultation process would be arranged so that the senate may submit a written response and recommendations to the administration. This allows the senate to officially record its opinion, and it also allows the administration the opportunity to provide a response to the senate indicating the reasons for its final decision on the issue.

ACTION: A summary of the discussion regarding divisional senate admissions committee authority will be provided from BOARS to the divisional committees.

X. Consultation with the Office of the President – Budget Office
Lawrence Hershman, Vice President of Budget

REPORT: Lawrence Hershman, Vice President of Budget, provided BOARS with information on the following admissions-related budget topics:

Comprehensive Review Funding: Funding was allocated to the campuses for comprehensive review when this new admissions selection process was instituted. The Chancellors have also made a commitment to ensure the costs of comprehensive review are funded on their campuses. The funds obtained from the recent application fee increase will be returned to the campuses, and it is anticipated that these monies could be used to fund the comprehensive review process or other admissions-related costs if needed.

Enrollment Targets: The University’s undergraduate enrollment targets are based on a complex negotiation of multiple factors:

- *Universitywide Enrollment Projections* – projections based on the estimated number of California public high school graduates (based on Department of Finance projections, which show the number of public high school graduates peaking in 2011-12 and then flattening) and estimates of the UC participation rate, continuation rate, and number of transfer students. Current projections indicate UC will enroll approximately 210,000

FTEs in 2010-11, a student population more than double the enrollment in 1970 (100,000 FTEs).

- *Campus Enrollment Projections* – projections based on campus Long Range Development Plans (LRDPs), academic plans, physical capacity and enrollment history.
- *Student Level Ratios* – proportions of enrolled students at the lower division, upper division and graduate/professional levels.

State Funding/Budget Compact: The University uses a formula to estimate the funding needed for enrollment growth based on the cost of adding each additional student (marginal cost of instruction). Historically these projected enrollments have been fully funded by the state; however, due to the state's recent fiscal crisis UC was called on to reduce enrollments for 2004-05. Governor Schwarzenegger signed a budget compact agreement with UC in May, which represents a phased plan for state funding of the University for the fiscal year 2005-06 through 2010-11. The compact includes an agreement for the state to fund enrollment growth of 5,000 FTE per year and gradually implementing full funding for all campuses' summer enrollments.

DISCUSSION: The committee expressed concerns about what will occur if the Governor's Compact Agreement with the University is not upheld by the state. VP Lawrence Hershman assured the committee that it is clear the governor intends to honor the Compact. The governor will present his budget, including any funding for the Compact Agreement, in January; however, the legislature might not pass the state's final budget until as late as the end of 2005. The uncertainty of the final budget poses a significant problem for the University in terms of admissions – UC will be admitting students in April without knowing the exact level of funding the state will provide for these new enrollments. The University is considering a number of different options for dealing with this budget uncertainty (e.g., staggered enrollments). The committee asked about the connection between UC's budget allocation and the number of students eligible for admission. VP Hershman indicated that the University honors the dictates of the state's Master Plan in its admissions and budgetary decisions, however the mechanism by which the budget plays a role in the admissions process was not clarified.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst