

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

**Minutes of Meeting (teleconference)**

**Monday, December 12, 2005**

**10:00a.m. – 1:00p.m.**

**I. Executive Session**

[Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.]

**II. Research on Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)**

- Roger Studley, Assistant Director, SAS

**REPORT:** Assistant Director Studley reported on the results of his draft report, *Research on Eligibility in the Local Context, Part II*. This report presents analysis of a different data set than what was used in the ELC report, Part I (November 2005), namely student-level data on SAT-takers from the 2004 cohort of California public high school graduates, supplemented with test score data from ACT and the College Board, and augmented with UC admissions data and data from the administration of the ELC program. College Board 2004 outcome data, however, is not yet available and will be added to this report in the near future. Overall, similar results were obtained from this data set as compared to the results contained in the November ELC report: that raising the ELC percentage would improve representation of disadvantaged students, and have a small impact on underrepresented students; and the overall number of newly ELC-eligible students would be fairly modest, and are predicted to have lower SAT II scores. Please see agenda enclosure 1 for the full report and results.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members discussed with Assistant Director Studley and Director Wilbur the report's methodology and findings. Members agreed that the issue will be further discussed at the January BOARS meeting.

**ACTION:** Assistant Director Studley will:

- (1) provide diagnostic reports as requested by Chair Brown (i.e., comparing characteristics of ELC database with those of the College Board database);
- (2) provide the Maston Report, which was issued following the ELC program's inaugural year;
- (3) correct the label at the top of table 4;
- (4) incorporate additional data exploring results with a 6% ELC expansion percentage; and
- (5) incorporate all relevant outcome data into the *ELC Report, Part II* when it becomes available.

**ACTION:** Director Wilbur will provide for BOARS the "encouragement letters," signed by President Dynes, which were distributed to those ELC-eligible students falling between the 4 and 10 percent ELC bands.

**ACTION:** The draft ELC report, Part II, and related issues raised here will be further discussed at the January BOARS meeting.

### **III. Update: Handling Applicants with Incorrect Test Score Patterns**

- Sue Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, SAS

**ISSUE:** Director Wilbur provided a report to the committee regarding potential operational issues surrounding the first year-implementation of the new examination requirements instituted to coincide with the new admissions tests being offered by ACT and the College Board. Director Wilbur expressed concern for those students who may not have taken and submitted for fall 2006 admissions purposes the correct test score pattern, that is, two SAT II subject tests covering two different ‘a-f’ subject areas, and not submitting a score for the SAT II Math Level one subject test. Accordingly, Director Wilbur presented a few options for BOARS to consider in approaching this matter, including the concerns of campus admissions directors and Admissions by Exception policy considerations.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members discussed the matter at length, questioning the appropriate decision-making channels and the authorizing authorities involved with this issue.

**ACTION: Director Wilbur will work with Chair Brown concerning next steps in discussing these issues with UCOP administrators.**

### **IV. Campus Reports: Comprehensive Review**

- BOARS members

**REPORT:** BOARS members reported on Comprehensive Review procedures and practices used at their respective campuses. Members had been asked to provide the following information:

1. A summary report on their campus’s Comprehensive Review process.
2. The policy rationale for the campus Comprehensive Review process.
3. Information about the types of Grade Point Averages used in the campus Comprehensive Review process.
4. Whether the campus evaluates “academic rigor” or “strength of schedule” of applicants, and how these factors are measured.

**DISCUSSION:** Members discussed commonalities among the campus reports, and raised possible paths to move forward in the Comprehensive Review policy.

**ACTION: The campus reports on Comprehensive Review will be further discussed at the January 13, 2006 BOARS meeting.**

### **V. Class Rank**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

**ACTION: This issue will be postponed to the January 13, 2006 BOARS meeting for further discussion, and paper copies of the associated Class Rank literature review materials will be distributed to BOARS members prior to the meeting.**

**Meeting adjourned at 1:00p.m.**

Attest: Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

Prepared by: Michelle Ruskofsky, Committee Analyst