

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

November 5, 2010

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the October 1, 2010 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the October 1 minutes.

II. Chair's Announcements and Updates

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

October Academic Council meeting: President Yudof announced the recommendations for post-employment benefits he plans to take to the Regents in November. The Regents are expected to act in December on what is essentially a modified "Option C" with an employee contribution of 7% or more. Council approved a [resolution](#) responding to the report of the President's Post-Employment Benefits Task Force that recognizes the need to focus on competitive remuneration for faculty and staff and opposes contributions exceeding 7% for current employees who stay under the current UCRP terms.

Council expressed concern about 49 proposals for professional fee increases or new professional fees that appeared on the November Regents agenda without Senate consultation. There is concern that the fees evidence a move toward privatization of the University. Students from the school of social work appeared at the Regents' Committee on Audit to complain about the lack of consultation about new professional fees in social work.

The 2010-11 State budget is favorable to UC considering the cuts being imposed on other State-funded programs. However, it still falls short of resorting the total \$637M cut to the UC base budget over two years. Council learned that the 2011-12 budget proposal will include tuition increases and \$72m in salary increases for faculty and non-represented staff.

President Yudof announced that he intended to send a resolution on holistic admissions to the regents in November. Chair Jacob was concerned because there had not been consultation with BOARS and others about the resolution. After conversations with the President, Provost Pitts, and others, the resolution was withdrawn and presumably another will go forward in January to allow BOARS time to respond to the President's August 16 letter. The President's letter indicated that there would be a preliminary discussion about holistic review in September, with a resolution in November, but no September discussion occurred.

Part of the Council meeting included a consultation with senior UCOP management and the campus Executive Vice Chancellors focused mainly on Council's recommendation that UC downsize the number of employees and implement a moratorium on construction. Chair Jacob distributed information to Council and the EVCs about 2012 admission changes, which included a note that successful implementation of the policy will require appropriate funding of

admissions offices and application fees revenue must be used for recruitment, selection, and yield work.

A BOARS-UCEP-UCOPE work group will meet to explore the possibility that UC recognize the CSU General Education Breadth pattern for transfer. The BOARS Articulation and Evaluation subcommittee should review the proposed Area b Task Force roster. The C-ID group still needs a BOARS representative. BOARS settled on a final version of the Office of Admission's recommended modifications to the [Guiding Principles for Comprehensive Review](#) over email.

Discussion: Vice Chair Anderson noted that the authority to produce admissions policy lies with the Regents, but they have delegated authority to the Senate, specifically BOARS, to directly advise them on admissions policy. The Regents are not obligated to adopt the BOARS recommendation, but shared governance requires that BOARS be consulted in the process. It would be a violation of shared governance if a resolution went to the Regents without being seen by BOARS. BOARS should send its response to Council, which will transmit it to the President for notice to the Regents.

It was noted that there is predicted to be an increase in high school graduates in a few years, and an increasing a-g completion rate. Reducing the student population would be politically difficult, and does not solve the budget crisis.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Susan Wilbur, Admissions Director*
- *Don Daves-Rougeaux, Associate Director, UG Admissions, Articulation & Eligibility*

Judy Sakaki: The Fall 2011 application cycle has opened and Apply UC is up and running. Chair Jacob will join Director Wilbur and Associate Director Daves-Rougeaux at the second UC Curriculum Integration Institute scheduled for November 7-10. The Institute will bring together high schools teachers to develop academically rigorous history, social science, and English courses integrated with CTE content that can be approved for a-g. Transfer continues to be a topic. Associate Director Brick is convening subcommittees from five disciplines to look at the possibility of making the lower divisions transfer requirements more similar across campuses. Provost Pitts will make a presentation on non-resident enrollment at the November Regents meeting. The Commission on the Future recommended that UC continue to offer a place to every eligible California resident and not displace residents with non-residents.

IV. President Yudof's Letter to BOARS re: Holistic Review

Issue: President Yudof has asked BOARS to consider his recommendations for undergraduate admissions, among them that (1) all campuses incorporate electronic read sheet data into their selection process; (2) all applicants receive an individualized review to the fullest extent possible; (3) all selective campuses develop a plan to use a holistic scoring system as part of the 2012 admissions reforms; and (4) campuses collaborate on generating holistic scores.

Chair Jacob said the President is thinking about the big picture and wants to ensure that policy can adapt to change over the long term. The 2012 admissions reform was a big step, but there are still issues to discuss to ensure its success. It is important for BOARS to develop a final response to the President at this meeting or shortly after.

Discussion: The President has committed to making read sheet data available to all campuses, and has asked for details about how they plan to use the information. Most campuses agreed that the read sheet will provide useful information about performance in context, although they vary in their plans to incorporate the data into review and selection processes. Davis will use read sheet data in individualized reviews this year, but the extent to which it implements individualized review for all applicants will depend in part on resources. San Diego will use read sheet data this year as part of a dual process experiment. UCSD applicants will receive a single-score holistic review along with the current fixed weight review, and selection will be based on the highest scores from both processes. Santa Barbara will need more resources to incorporate the read sheet into its current process. UCSB's local school context program is an important selection tool the campus wants to preserve. Merced has been using the read sheet to help assess students on the margins of eligibility for Admissions by Exception; however, the campus is unlikely to use A by E next year due to space issues and the need to address the referral pool. Merced expects to become more selective, and is developing a strategy for broader use of read sheet data. Irvine will use the UCLA holistic evaluation in 2011 and is adapting its selection processes accordingly. Riverside is proposing new criteria and weighting for 2011 admissions and may use the read sheet to evaluate the small pool of students that receive a human read. UCR is also studying graduation and retention factors and is concerned about the high cost of remedial math and English education. It found that the SAT is one of the best indicators of success in the remedial pool. UCSC is newly open to using the read sheet in selection. The campus also is considering moving to a holistic process and increased the emphasis on ELC status in selection. Berkeley tells its readers that they are not making admissions decisions, only approximating the likelihood of success at Berkeley. Additional read sheet information is incorporated into Berkeley's process during selection, including a detailed consideration of high school context.

Chair Jacob said BOARS should take an active role in improving and expanding the school context data provided to campuses in the read sheet; including, for example, information about schools with a bimodal learning environment (where the school is subdivided into smaller schools).

One member noted that Santa Barbara's unique school context practices are a selection decision, not a review decision. The Santa Barbara school context process focuses on who to admit, not about how to evaluate their qualifications. The President's letter focuses on review practices, not how campuses make decisions. Director Wilbur agreed that a distinction exists between the use of the read sheet in the evaluation stage and in the selection stage, and the President's focus is on the evaluation process.

Another member commented that the administration is frustrated by San Diego's inability to address campus climate effectively, and has linked holistic admissions to improving climate and diversity. However, San Diego is concerned that a holistic system could actually reduce the number of underrepresented minorities there by undermining the progress the campus has made

to incorporate diversity factors into its fixed weight system. Even the San Diego faculty who support consideration of non-academic factors do not believe that holistic review is a panacea for climate and underrepresentation. They support a more comprehensive approach. It was noted that holistic review failed to produce diversity in the engineering class at Berkeley this year. The undergraduate student representative also noted that students support a move to systemwide holistic admissions.

A campus's holistic system does not have to mirror the one used at Berkeley and UCLA, and several members suggested that a single holistic score could have value for the system if its scoring system made finer distinctions – perhaps through a ten-point range, not the five-point system used at Berkeley and UCLA – and would allow local values and culture to play greater role. Campus values differ, and ultimately the holistic process a campus adopts will adhere to its unique values and expectations for quality. However, there is concern that the President's letter suggests a "common rating system," which is inconsistent with this goal of maintaining local autonomy and flavor. Chair Jacob said the main purpose of sharing the read sheet and holistic scores is to inform campuses about the UCLA and UCB systems. He does not expect BOARS to support a single UC score.

Director Wilbur noted that the President is looking to BOARS for guidelines about individualized review for all applicants and about how to define "selective." She suggested that selectivity could be defined as a campus that denies more than 50% of its applicants. Chair Jacob said selectivity has come to be defined as all campuses except Riverside and Merced, but that is not necessarily the best definition in a changing world. He suggested defining a selective campus as one that expects to turn away students who qualify for the 9 x 9 guarantee.

BOARS's goal is to admit students with a high potential to succeed academically and to contribute meaningfully to the campus. The best way to achieve this is by broadening the consideration of academic performance beyond narrowly conceived indicators. Individualized review involves a human review of the application and consideration of many academic and non-academic factors, including achievement in context. It enables campuses to gain a richer and fuller sense of the talents and accomplishments of applicants. An individualized review does not necessarily have to involve a "holistic review" or result in a single score.

Campuses should strive to give every applicant an individualized review, and as they become more selective, increase the number of students given an individualized review. Committing to a human read for every applicant, even those who would be admitted on academics alone, can only help campuses, as long as there is funding to back it up. BOARS' original motivation for recommending individualized review will be lost if it applies only to a certain percentage of students. In addition, campuses would perceive individualized review as a waste of time if it did not add something (consideration of achievement in context) to the mechanical process.

One member expressed skepticism that Berkeley and UCLA readers are able to absorb all the read sheet information in a few minutes. It was noted by others that experienced Berkeley readers can assess the factors remarkably fast.

BOARS should resist any mandate to move all campuses to holistic review and instead support a diversity of approaches. Holistic review has advantages, including its flexibility and the ability to look at growth of the student over time, and holistic scores will become useful as campuses become more selective; however campuses should be allowed to rely on established methods of individualized review as the 2012 admissions reform is implemented, while they explore the possibility of moving to a holistic process. Moreover, a number of campuses are experimenting with parallel reads this year, and would prefer to decide about holistic pending the outcomes of those studies.

BOARS discussed how the response to the President should read in regard to each of the four items and agreed to approximate wording with the final wording to be settled over email once Chair Jacob has a draft for members to read carefully. In its response, BOARS will acknowledge the President's promise to fund new admissions efforts and state its intention to develop a metric that measures adequate resources for admissions and outreach. Some campuses may need to delay work due to their need to make a separate resource commitment to outreach and recruitment. BOARS will monitor the impact of ETR on the referral pool, and will consider the possibility that all campuses take a portion of the referral pool.

Action: Chair Jacob will draft a response that will be circulated to the committee for review and a vote over email.

V. Transfer Subcommittee (break-out)

- *With Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director for Transfer Policy*

Issue: A committee of BOARS, UCEP and UCOPE members will discuss whether UC should accept CSU GE Breadth to fulfill lower division transfer requirements in addition to IGETC, or attempt to unify the UC and CSU requirements. The BOARS transfer subcommittee also will consider this idea. Chair Jacob said the idea for a common transfer path to UC and CSU emerged from a Legislative Analyst Report, which also criticized UC for being inflexible. It has also been proposed by the California Roundtable.

Discussion: Associate Director Brick noted that IGETC and CSU Breadth have many curricular commonalities, but there are also significant differences. For example, IGETC does not include CSU Breadth's "Lifelong Learning" requirement, which includes courses in physical education, health, and self development. (An addition problem with Lifelong Learning is that UC does not accept some of the courses for transfer at all.) IGETC's Critical Thinking requirement includes a composition component, while CSU Breadth's does not; CSU Breadth will accept trigonometry for the Math requirement and will accept courses of an applied nature for the Arts and Humanities requirement; CSU requires an additional Oral Communication requirement for its students. Furthermore, there are differences within IGETC for students planning to transfer to CSU and students intending to transfer to UC. For example, the IGETC requirement for foreign language proficiency (not necessarily through CCC courses), is only relevant for students bound for UC. Finally, CSU Breadth includes a "category certification" option.

Most students transferring to CSU complete its GE Breadth, while most students transferring to UC take IGETC. It was noted that Community College counselors may steer a student to CSU Breadth or IGETC based on the student's interest, and other factors may help drive the choice.

In some ways, the problem of multiple GE patterns is unclear. There are good reasons to support a common requirement. A prospective transfer taking CSU Breadth who later decides UC would be a better fit would still be prepared for UC. Members also felt strongly that critical aspects of IGETC, particularly the foreign language requirement, should be maintained. It was suggested that UC could offer its own variances for students who want to take CSU Breadth; for example, a UC-only requirement for foreign language proficiency.

There was concern that accepting CSU Breadth could feed into UC faculty fears of declining student abilities. The change could open the door to more good students, but it could also bring in more unprepared students. BOARS and the transfer subcommittee should discuss the qualities of a prepared UC student. Other concerns and comments included whether community colleges offer enough of the courses UC wants, like statistics and whether UC should continue to deny performance and art for the Arts and Humanities requirement in IGETC.

The broader "problem" of transfer is also somewhat unclear. UC has met its enrollment targets for transfer students and offered a space to every eligible, who do as well as four-year students in terms of GPA, completion, and retention rates. Data about the problem are limited too. There is a sense that successful transfer students are arriving at UC or CSU with too many excess units, and there are reports of students being confused by the requirements. (A student focus group asked about the reason for excess units cited poor counseling, uncertainty about educational goals, and the need to take remedial course requirements, in addition to confusion about requirements.) In addition, as enrollment pressures increase, more transfers are applying to more campuses, including a CSU or more than one CSU as a backup. It was noted that the Legislature is taking a narrow view of the role of the CCCs when it criticizes low transfer rates.

VI. Systemwide Review of Academic Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University

Action: The draft will be circulated over email for discussion and final approval.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Bill Jacob