

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Minutes of Meeting – December 3, 2004

Approved February 10, 2005

**I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements***Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair*

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Michael Brown reported to the committee on the following admissions-related topics:

“Near Misses” Studies

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), in response to a request from Assemblymember Carol Liu, is finalizing a study on the factors limiting eligibility for UC. There are concerns about the limitations of the report since it only presents data on a small subset of “near misses” (the report only presents data on the role of each eligibility requirement when all the other requirements are met). UC has submitted a response, indicating this and other concerns about the study, to CPEC.

Professor Tom Kane (UCLA) is planning to conduct a longitudinal study of the social costs that result from students nearly missing UC eligibility. UCOP's Student Academic Services unit is in the early stages of developing a database to support this study.

The Preuss School at UCSD was mentioned as an effort to expand access to UC. Vice Chair David Stern noted that the Center for Research on Educational Equity, Assessment and Teaching Excellence (CREATE) at UCSD conducted a study of the impact of the Preuss School environment on the academic outcomes of students (study available online at: <http://www.create.ucsd.edu>). The Preuss School admits only students who fit a specific low-income profile and these students are selected for admission through a lottery. The CREATE study compared the academic outcomes of students who applied and were accepted with students from similar backgrounds who applied but were not accepted to the Preuss School. The study found that the Preuss School and comparison group students achieved similar scores on standardized tests and similar GPAs, but that the Preuss School students had completed significantly more ‘a-g’ courses than the comparison group.

Regents Meeting

At their November 17-18 meeting, The Regents approved a 2005-06 budget plan, which consistent with the Compact Agreement with the Governor, included increases in systemwide student fees of eight percent for undergraduate students and ten percent for graduate students. The Regents also vetoed a proposal for the University to include a multiracial category on the undergraduate admissions application

### UC Students of Color Conference

BOARS Chair Michael Brown was invited to participate in a recent conference sponsored by UC's Student Association. At the conference, Chair Brown provided students with information on the reasoning behind the recent eligibility changes (increase in minimum GPA) and discussed various eligibility and admissions issues.

**ACTION: The BOARS January 7, 2005 meeting has been cancelled. The committee will consider rescheduling the January meeting or holding a two-day meeting in February.**

## **II. Consent Calendar**

**ACTION: The minutes of the November 15, 2004 BOARS meeting were approved with revisions.**

## **III. Creating a Strategic Vision of Admissions Policy**

**DISCUSSION:** The committee discussed the goals of admissions and the role of admissions policy and its relation to the University's mission. Themes that emerged from this discussion included:

- Meritocracy - most people think of admissions in terms of the idea of picking those students that are most deserving for admissions. The question is how do we define what "deserving" is and how can it be assessed/measured?
- Readiness – admissions policies should identify those students that are ready to do well in college classes. The question then becomes how do we define "readiness." Being ready to perform well in college is not based solely on being academically prepared – there is also a motivational aspect of readiness. How can readiness be evaluated? Do we consider admission tests or GPA to measure an academic baseline of readiness? How do we evaluate an applicant's level of motivational readiness? Just because a student hasn't had to overcome barriers to succeed in secondary school doesn't mean he or she does not have the motivational readiness to succeed in college.
- Public Mission - we are a state institution, so our admissions goals should include preparing future leaders who will benefit the state. There is also a realization built into a public institution that some people can't afford to attend a private institution. Knowledge is a public good and it is the primary purpose of a public university to spread knowledge through its research and teaching missions.
- Student Body – admissions seeks to identify a student body that will make the most of the opportunity to learn and that will make a contribution to the institutional environment.
- Balance – The Regents' Resolution RE-28 is a good place to start for admissions goals:  
*That the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.* <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/6031.html>

The art of admissions policy is determining how to balance these two ideas of talent/achievement and inclusiveness.

- Social Mobility – college admissions represents the pathway to the dream of social mobility. How do we provide hope and make this dream attainable to those with low social capital? How can our admissions policies send those kinds of messages? Is it reasonable to believe that the University can level the field of opportunity for those who’ve already had different levels of opportunity for their first 18 years of life?

#### **IV. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) Studies**

*Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions*

*Roger Studley, Principal Analyst, Student Academic Affairs*

**REPORT:** Analyst Roger Studley reported to BOARS on the status of research studies on the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. This research seeks to answer two questions:

- (1) How would the demographic characteristics of the pool of eligible students change if the ELC percentage were increased while maintaining the overall UC eligibility rate of 12.5%?
- (2) What has been the behavioral impact of the ELC program? Specifically, how many students have become eligible in the statewide context as a result of the ELC program? Additionally, how have newly eligible students performed at UC?

##### Question #1 – Demographic Characteristics Study

Two different analyses have been conducted on the demographic impact of expanding ELC from four to nine percent:

- (1) A preliminary study using SAT data and information on the 2001 cohort of public high school graduates
- (2) A revised study using CPEC eligibility study data and information on the 2003 cohort of public high school graduates

The preliminary research study indicated that increasing the ELC percentage would result in significant increases in the proportion of eligible students from underrepresented racial/ethnic minority (URM) groups and high schools with low Academic Performance Index (API) rankings. The revised research study, however, found that these increases in the proportion of eligible URM and low-API students would be much smaller than predicted by the first study.

Factors contributing to the differences between these two studies’ findings include:

- Data on high school “a-g” course completion and GPA
- The behavioral impact of the procedural change for ELC eligibility
- Sample size and composition
- Additional differences in data and methodology

**DISCUSSION:** The committee and consultants discussed possible ways to resolve the differences in the results of the two studies. Some of the inconsistencies could be resolved by analyzing the raw transcript data contained in the ELC database. These transcripts do not always include demographic information, but this information could be obtained by matching the transcripts with other databases (e.g., SAT database) that contain the needed information. Utilizing the ELC database has limitations because it only contains transcripts for the top ten

percent of students as defined by the high school. It was also suggested that a sampling of senior year transcripts could provide information on the completion rates of eligibility requirements.

#### Question #2 – Behavioral Impact Study

Due to a lack of time, discussion of this research study was postponed until the next BOARS meeting.

### **V. 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 preliminary results of the application filing period for Fall 2005 admissions. The application filing period ended on November 30<sup>th</sup> and the University received approximately 96,000 individual electronic applications (73,000 freshman applications; 23,000 transfer applications; and 350,000 applications to campuses). Last year UC received approximately 84,000 individual electronic applications. It is estimated that once the paper application numbers are included in the overall count, the University will have received over 100,000 admissions applications. Other preliminary information of interest includes:

- Approximately 30,000 applicants submitted electronic applications on the last day of the application filing period
- During peak application submission periods, the online application system handled 1,500 transactions per second
- The Merced campus received approximately 8,500 electronic applications

### **VI. Systemwide Academic Senate – Issues Under Review**

*Barbara Hoblitzell, Principal Analyst, Admissions & Outreach*

#### **A. Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC) Proposal**

**ACTION:** The draft BOARS' response to the SCIGETC proposal was approved with modifications.

#### **B. Proposal to Streamline Major Articulation**

**REPORT:** Analyst Barbara Hoblitzell provided the committee with a list of the “Top 20 Declared Majors on Applications for Undergraduate Admission – California Community College Students – Fall 2002” (distribution 3). Analyst Hoblitzell indicated that the overall intent of this proposal is to allow a student preparing for transfer in a specific discipline to take advantage of commonalities in major requirements across the UC campuses. Although conceptually this proposal may seem straightforward, there are a number of challenges for implementation (e.g., defining what constitutes a common major course requirement). It is not the intent of the proposal to force the campuses towards common requirements, but rather to promote articulation where common requirements exist.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members noted the following concerns about the Proposal to Streamline Major Articulation:

- The current language of the proposal states that the establishment of a streamlined major-preparation articulation agreement would deem a course or set of courses “as articulated for all UC campuses.” To clearly indicate that these agreements are articulated for a specified major only, the proposal should be revised to state that a course or set of courses will be deemed “as articulated for that major at all UC campuses.”
- The current language of the proposal requires a campus to create a campus-specific articulation agreement if it chooses to opt out of a systemwide major-preparation articulation agreement. The proposal, as it is currently worded, could mandate the establishment of a campus-specific articulation agreement even when no agreement is possible (e.g., the UC campus determines that the community college does not offer an equivalent course). The proposal should be modified so that it encourages campuses to create articulation agreements but that also does not force an agreement that it is not acceptable.
- Preliminary information should be obtained on the number of common articulation agreements for major-preparation requirements across four or more UC campuses that have the potential to become these new systemwide agreements. If this preliminary analysis finds that there are only a few potential systemwide major-preparation articulation agreements, the administrative costs to establish such agreements will likely outweigh any potential streamlining benefits.
- Details of how students and counselors will be informed of these agreements should be considered. Steps need to be taken to ensure that these systemwide major-preparation agreements are articulated in a clear and understandable way, and don’t just add another obscure layer to the existing array of articulation agreements.
- Policy needs to be established for how community college students already in the major-preparation transfer pipeline will be affected when a campus chooses to opt-out of a once previously accepted systemwide major-preparation articulation agreement. Will students who completed major-preparation requirements when the campus was participating in the systemwide agreement be given a window of time to receive major-preparation credit for courses completed under the previously accepted agreement?

**ACTION:** Analyst Kimberly Peterson will draft a BOARS’ response to the Proposal to Streamline Major Articulation.

## **VII. Subcommittee Reports**

### **A. Analytic Subcommittee**

*David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair*

**REPORT:** The BOARS Analytic Subcommittee held a teleconference yesterday to finalize the priorities for the analytic efforts of the committee this year. The main issue of discussion was whether or not to begin analysis of “inclusiveness indicators” this year rather than deferring the analysis to next year. The consensus of the subcommittee was to start the inclusiveness analysis this year, and the Student Academic Services (SAS) research unit agreed to add this item to the

research priority list. The next steps for the subcommittee will include discussion with UC ACCORD about the data they have available and the possibility of joint efforts in studying admissions inclusiveness.

### **B. Testing Subcommittee**

*Mark Rashid, Testing Subcommittee Chair*

**REPORT:** The BOARS Testing Subcommittee met for one hour after the last BOARS meeting. The immediate challenge for the subcommittee is to revise the eligibility index formula to reflect the new SAT and ACT tests. We currently do not have any data on how students will perform on these new tests, so the students' performance on the new tests will need to be predicted based on statistical patterns of performance on the old tests. The goal of this initial reformulation of the eligibility index is to capture the same set of eligible students as is captured with the current index. Other goals for the subcommittee will be to assess the degree to which the new tests are curriculum based and to evaluate the role of testing in assessing UC readiness, especially in the context of the changing secondary school environment.

### **VIII. Comprehensive Review Report**

*Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair*

*Nina Robinson, Director, Policy and External Affairs*

**REPORT:** BOARS Comprehensive Review Report for the 2004 admission cycle is slated for completion before the March Regents meeting.

**ACTION:** A draft comprehensive review report will be reviewed by the committee at the next BOARS meeting.

### **IX. Consultation with the Office of the President – Educational Outreach Office**

*Winston Doby, Vice President, Educational Outreach*

**REPORT:** VP Winston Doby reported to BOARS on the new direction the University's academic preparation programs are taking to serve California's educationally disadvantaged students. This new strategic direction was recommended by the Strategic Review Panel, a group of educational, business, and community leaders appointed by President Atkinson in September 2002 to examine UC's outreach programs. As a part of this new strategic focus, the University has begun to establish a network of statewide and regional alliances that draw on the strength of all educational segments and business and community organizations to work together toward the shared goal of improving student achievement and effecting systemic educational change.

As a part of these new efforts an operational definition of "educationally disadvantaged," that is in compliance with law, had to be created. Educational disadvantage has been defined as a combination of several contextual factors:

- Family Factors – includes socio-economic status, parental education level, English as a Second Language (ESL) status

- School Factors – includes the school’s Academic Performance Index (API) rating, college-going rate, proportion of certified teachers, and coursework offerings
- Community Factors – includes crime rates and the social capital of the community’s constituents

**DISCUSSION:** The committee asked about the overall goal of the University’s Academic Preparation Programs. VP Winston Doby indicated that the goal of these programs is for the University to work in partnership with other organizations to ameliorate conditions and factors that have been identified as reducing a student’s ability to succeed academically. The intended outcome from these efforts is that these students will be prepared for higher education in general, not just UC. The evaluation of the success of these academic preparation programs will be based on the extent to which they change the college preparation patterns of students.

VP Doby welcomed having an ongoing dialogue with BOARS and proposed that the committee, in its “relations with schools” role, consider serving as a faculty oversight body for the University’s academic preparation programs.

**ACTION: BOARS Chair Michael Brown will consult with Academic Council Chair George Blumenthal about the proposal for BOARS to provide oversight for the Academic Preparation Programs.**

**ACTION: Academic Council Vice Chair Cliff Brunk’s proposal, “Admission of Teacher Identified Students,” will be discussed at the next BOARS meeting.**

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

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst