

Minutes of Meeting – November 3, 2006

Approved December 1, 2006

I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

REPORT: BOARS Chair Mark Rashid welcomed the committee and reported on the following activities of the Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate:

- University Diversity Study Group. In July, The Regents agreed to form a group to study the current status of diversity at the University and bring forth recommendations on how to improve diversity and support a climate of inclusion on all 10 campuses. Regent Gerald Parsky and Provost Rory Hume are co-chairs of the University Diversity Study Group and the membership includes Faculty Representatives John Oakley and Michael T. Brown. Work groups will be formed to look at various aspects of diversity at the University, as well as the impact of Proposition 209. Maria Ledesma, Student Regent and former BOARS Student Representative, met with the Academic Council in October to discuss plans for the study group and the Academic Senate's possible involvement with this effort.
- Tobacco Funding of Research. At their September meeting, The Regents considered the question of implementing a ban on accepting research funding from corporate sponsors associated with the tobacco industry. The Academic Senate was requested to advise The Regents on the matter in light of the recent court finding that tobacco companies have engaged in activities that violated the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act (RICO Act). Prior to the court's RICO finding, the Academic Senate had reviewed issues related to the tobacco industry and research funding sources and adopted a [resolution](#) on May 11, 2005, which stated the position that no unit of the University has the authority to prevent a faculty member from accepting research funding based solely on the source of the funds, but that also recognized The Regents as having the plenary authority to institute a policy to refuse research funding from a particular source. The Assembly of the Academic Senate reconsidered its previous resolution in light of the recent RICO finding, and on October 11, 2006, adopted a series of [three new resolutions](#) concerning research funding sources and the tobacco industry.
- Senate Regulation 695. The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) has proposed a new Senate Regulation 695, which outlines requirements for online courses to be counted for graduate degree credit and residency requirements. This proposal is currently being revised at the request of the Academic Council and will eventually be sent forward for systemwide Academic Senate review.
- Power of Ten. President Bob Dynes has announced a planning vision, conceived of as "the Power of Ten," to strengthen the notion that the University of California is not ten separate universities, but that we are "One University" with ten campuses.

- ▶ **Other Issues.** Other recent actions of the Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate concern the deterioration of [faculty salaries](#), the faculty's interaction with the UC-associated [national laboratories](#), and [non-resident tuition](#) for graduate students.

(Information about issues currently under systemwide Academic Senate review and final reports and recommendations of the Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate are available online: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/>.)

Proposition 209 Symposium

BOARS Chair Rashid and committee members reported on their participation in a [symposium](#), "Equal Opportunity in Higher Education: The Past and Future of Proposition 209," which was sponsored by The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity, and Diversity at Boalt Hall (UCB). The symposium focused on the consequences of Proposition 209, especially how it has affected student diversity in California higher education, and included papers coauthored by BOARS members and a panel discussion on UC freshman eligibility reform.

DISCUSSION: Since UC freshman eligibility reform was presented at the symposium in the context of Proposition 209 and the impact on the diversity of the student population, many people will mistakenly believe that making the University more representative of California's student population is the only motivation for reforming eligibility. BOARS' efforts to reconsider the eligibility construct is not driven by this narrow agenda, but is also based on other motivations, such as improving the assessment of an applicant's ability and potential to succeed at UC. BOARS members stressed that as the committee moves forward with developing a proposal for eligibility reform, it is important that the intentions of this effort are clearly communicated.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of the October 6, 2006 Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the October 6, 2006 BOARS meeting were approved as written.

B. Approval of BOARS letter to ICAS regarding CCC Academic Senate's Course Identification Numbering Project (C-ID) Conceptual Proposal

The BOARS letter to the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) regarding the California Community Colleges Academic Senate's Course Identification Numbering Project (C-ID) conceptual proposal was removed from the consent calendar for discussion.

DISCUSSION: Director Susan Wilbur presented a brief overview of a previous attempt to establish a common intersegmental numbering system, the California Articulation Number (CAN), a course identification system for common core lower-division transferable, major preparation courses commonly taught on CCC and CSU campuses. UC did not participate in assigning CAN descriptors to its courses because of the uniqueness of campus's major requirements. CSU ended their participation in the CAN system last year. Analyst Kimberly Peterson noted that the CCCs have a state legislative requirement to institute a common course numbering system.

The committee expressed concerns about the potential for the C-ID course identifier to provide misleading information about the transferability of CCC courses for UC major preparation credit. It was noted that UC has its own efforts to provide better information to students about transfer major preparation, the “streamlining articulation” initiative, and that the C-ID effort might complement, but should not be allowed to supersede, this initiative.

ACTION: The BOARS letter regarding the C-ID proposal will be revised to reflect UC’s priority for ensuring the success of the “streamlining articulation” initiative.

III. Consultation with Office of the President – Admissions

- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur provided the committee with updates on the following admissions-related items of interest:

Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)

The review of student transcripts for Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) qualification was completed in September. Approximately 41,000 transcripts were reviewed, and of these students, just over 15,000 were deemed ELC qualified (in the top 4%) and approximately 21,500 were deemed to be on track for systemwide eligibility. All students whose transcripts were reviewed received the letters encouraging them to apply to UC and informing them of their status and the requirements they must complete to become ELC or statewide eligible for fall 2007 admission.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will present further information about the students evaluated for ELC qualification at a future BOARS meeting.

Articulation & Evaluation Subcommittee

The BOARS Subcommittee on Articulation and Evaluation will be holding its first meeting in December. A major issue the subcommittee needs to address this year is recent state legislation, [SB 1543](#), which requests UC and directs CSU to develop model academic standards for Career Technical Education (CTE) courses to satisfy the College Preparatory Elective (‘g’) requirement for freshman eligibility.

Centralized Admissions and Scholarship Application (CASA)

Implementation of the new admissions processing system, Centralized Admissions and Scholarship Application (CASA), is still moving forward. The new system has the potential to contribute to greater admissions processing efficiencies, information sharing, more accurate data reporting, and collaboration between campuses. The system was originally planned to be completed July 2007, but due to the technical complexity of this systems development effort, it is now more likely that CASA will be completed July 2008.

Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF)

The Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF), which has been focusing on developing ways to achieve greater admissions process efficiencies, will be meeting in December.

IV. UCLA Comprehensive Review Changes

REPORT: Alternate Representative Duncan Lindsey provided the committee with a brief history of the development of UCLA's initial comprehensive review process, as well as an update on the recent decision to convert to a more holistic review process for the fall 2007 admissions cycle. UCLA Acting Chancellor Norman Abrams has committed to providing the resources necessary to recruit and train the staff that will evaluate the UCLA applications this year.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Member David Stern informed the committee of the process the Berkeley campus has used, and which is being replicated by UCLA, to train admissions readers to evaluate applicants holistically and assign scores reliably. Campus comprehensive review processes and the need to properly resource these processes are becoming more important as the UC system increases its level of selectivity. Opportunities for systemwide collaborations and resource sharing should continue to be explored.

The committee discussed ways in which the current referral pool process for eligible freshman applicants is not necessarily operating in a manner that best serves campuses or applicants. The majority of applicants in the referral pool reject UC's offer of admission and instead choose to attend a CSU or another institution – for fall 2006, only 6 percent of the referral pool students accepted UC's offer of admission. Director Susan Wilbur informed the committee of a pilot program being considered by the Vice Chancellors of Student Affairs that would allow the Merced and Riverside campuses to contact likely referral pool students earlier in the admissions process. The timing of campus admit letters and the possibility of employing a rolling admissions process was also discussed. Any rolling admissions process would need to be carefully coordinated between the UC campuses, otherwise the individual campuses would end up competing against one another to send out admit letters first.

V. UC Freshman Eligibility Reform

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

DISCUSSION: At the October meeting, BOARS committed itself to actively pursuing reform of the UC freshman eligibility policy. A set of preliminary talking points on eligibility reform were generated following the October meeting:

1. BOARS has committed itself to fundamental reform of UC's eligibility construct.
2. In broad outline, BOARS is focusing on ways to expand the pool of students eligible for comprehensive review, beyond those now deemed UC-eligible.
3. Whether a guarantee of admission for some fraction of applicants, with its attendant referral pool, remains a feature of any proposed new policy is an open question at this time.
4. BOARS does not view expansion of the admitted class beyond the 12.5% level, or growth of the enrolled class above current projections, as integral to its discussion of eligibility reform.
5. BOARS understands and is sensitive to the fact that any new policy of the type now under discussion will entail additional cost.
6. BOARS is actively deliberating this subject. Following standard procedures, the divisions and their academic-senate committees will be consulted when a concrete recommendation takes shape.

The committee further discussed the idea of expanding the number of potential students visible to the University by creating an “eligible for review” pathway, in which applicants would be guaranteed a comprehensive review by the campuses to which they apply, and deemed eligible for admission to individual campuses via this comprehensive review evaluation. Students would qualify for this eligibility review by completing a minimum set of academic qualifications, such as earning a B- grade average in the required set of ‘a-g’ subjects. The University would continue to uphold the social contract and admissions requirements contained within the California Master Plan for Higher Education by maintaining a systemwide admissions rate of 12.5 percent of the state’s high school graduates.

As an “eligibility for review” pathway or similar proposal is developed, a number of questions need to be addressed by BOARS. For example:

- ▶ Should the current examination requirement be retained, made optional or eliminated altogether? If the examination requirement is eliminated or made optional, how will this effect campus comprehensive review processes and a student’s chance of admission if he or she chooses not to submit test scores under an exam-optional system? How would a change in the examination requirement be perceived giving the movement in K-12 towards a standards-based testing regime?
- ▶ Should some guarantee of admission to the UC system and a referral pool process be retained for some portion of applicants (e.g., systemwide admissions guarantee for ELC students)?
- ▶ Some policymakers will argue that UC is obligated to use only quantifiable criteria to define the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates eligible for the University under the Master Plan. How will an “eligible for review” pathway be explained in operational terms to students, the public, The Regents, and other interested parties?
- ▶ How do we explain the rationale for eligibility reform and how this effort relates to the University’s values and goals for admissions policy?
- ▶ How might any changes to the eligibility construct impact the resource needs of admissions offices and campus enrollments?

ACTION: BOARS Chair Mark Rashid will send members a request for feedback from their campus admissions committee about the potential impact of eligibility reform on their comprehensive review process.

VI. 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
- Tongshan Chang, Principal Analyst, Admissions Research & Evaluation
- Kyra Caspary, Analyst, Admissions Research & Evaluation

A. Admissions Statistics Overview

REPORT: Assistant Director Roger Studley informed BOARS of a [UC website](#) that currently provides freshman and transfer admissions data, and the plans for reorganizing the admissions data provided into a new “UC Admissions Almanac.” It is anticipated that the 2005 UC Admissions Almanac data will be available online early next year.

B. Report on Requested Eligibility Analysis #1

ISSUE: Measuring the gain in predictive accuracy from considering information that is included on the UC application but not included in the current eligibility formula.

DISCUSSION: The committee reviewed various analyses that indicate adding relative measures (e.g., class rank) and additional information from applications increases the power to predict UC performance. Members observed that these analyses seem to support the notion of reforming the eligibility construct to include the assessment of additional information beyond what is contained in the current eligibility index ('a-g' GPA and test scores).

ACTION: The Analytic Subcommittee will continue to work with UCOP Admissions Research and Evaluation staff on requested eligibility analysis #1.

C. Report on Requested Eligibility Analysis #3

ISSUE: Further analyzing racial/ethnic underrepresentation gaps.

DISCUSSION: The committee briefly reviewed various gap analyses for underrepresented minority students (African American, Chicano/Latino, and Native American), including proportions of gaps due to within school and between school differences for: completing 'a-g' courses, taking the SAT II, and applying to, being admitted to, and enrolling at UC. Members noted that for African American students, it appears that failing to take the required SAT II examinations is a primary reason for not attaining UC eligibility.

D. Report on Requested Eligibility Analysis #4

ISSUE: Testing for systematic differences in high school grading policies.

REPORT: Associate Director Sam Agronow provided an updated version of requested eligibility analysis #4. Analysis has shown that unweighted high school GPAs are higher in schools with higher Academic Performance Index (API) scores. BOARS was interested in examining to what extent this correlation between GPA and API is a reflection of actual differences in achievement, as opposed to different grading policies. To examine this question, both unweighted and weighted course grades in six subjects (math, history, chemistry, English, biology and physics) were compared for students from different schools who had the same scores on AP or SAT II exams in those subjects. This analysis was performed while also controlling for the socioeconomic status (highest level of parent education and parent income) of the students. The analyses show that moderate correlations between GPA and API decrease when controlling for SAT II scores and socioeconomic factors.

DISCUSSION: Members observed that students in academically stronger schools tend to receive higher grades, and that unweighted grades in honors level courses tend to be higher than unweighted grades in regular courses. It was noted that caution should be used when evaluating

grades as an achievement measure since a student's socioeconomic status seems to play a factor even in unweighted grades. Suggestions for refining the analyses were offered:

- Translate API scores to interquartile ranges.
- Control for the level of the course (honors versus regular course).

VII. New Business – Analytic Subcommittee Priorities

- David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair

DISCUSSION: Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern presented a proposed list of analytic priorities for the subcommittee this year. Suggestions for expanding upon the priority list included:

- Benchmark the criteria for freshman admission to other multi-campus higher education systems.
- Evaluate the significance of admissions test results for students from different educational contexts, and the reasons that some groups of students are not taking the admissions tests.
- Examine data and research about where underrepresented students, especially African American students, are applying to and enrolling in college.

ACTION: BOARS Chair Mark Rashid and Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern will work with the UCOP Admissions Research and Evaluation staff to develop plans and a timeline for the requested analytic tasks.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will provide the committee with the “College Destinations for University of California 2005 Freshman Admits” study.

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	X								
Trish Stoddart, Vice Chair	Santa Cruz (Education)	X	X								
David Stern	Berkeley (Education)	X	X								
Jennifer Chacon	Davis (Law)	X	--								
John Whiteley	Irvine (Social Ecology)	X	Alt								
Sylvia Hurtado	Los Angeles (Education)	X	Alt								
Peggy O'Day	Merced (Natural Sciences)	X	X								
Peter Sadler	Riverside (Earth Sciences)	X	X								
Akos Rona-Tas	San Diego (Sociology)	X	Alt								
Daniel Weiss	San Francisco (Psychiatry)	X	X								
William Jacob	Santa Barbara (Mathematics)	X	X								
David Anthony	Santa Cruz (History)	X	X								
ALTERNATES:											
Hugh Roberts	Irvine (English)	--	X								
Duncan Lindsey	Los Angeles (Public Policy)	--	X								
Hans Paar	San Diego (Physics)	--	T								
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:											
Arshad Ali	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X								
Tina Park	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X								
EX OFFICIO:											
John Oakley	Chair, Academic Senate	X	--								
Michael Brown	Vice Chair, Academic Senate	X	--								
CONSULTANTS:											
Samuel Agronow	Assoc. Dir., UCOP SAS	X	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	X								
Susan Wilbur	Director of Admissions, UCOP	X	X								
Roger Studley	Assistant Director, UCOP SAS	X	X								
GUESTS:											
Kyra Caspary	Analyst, UCOP SAS	X	X								
Tongshan Chang	Principal 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	X								

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