

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

December 3, 2010

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the November 5, 2010 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the November minutes.

II. Announcements and Updates

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

On November 22, the Academic Council passed a [resolution](#) supporting the President's recommended changes to post-employment benefits, which the Regents are expected to adopt at a special meeting in December. Council also discussed the systemwide Senate responses to the Council and UCLA recommendations on the future of UC, as well as the interim report of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC, and decided to forward the responses to the Special Committee with a request that it consider the responses in its final report.

In November, the Regents voted 15 to 5 to raise student fees. They are concerned about UC's funding situation and the possibility of mid-year cuts, and want campuses to get ahead of the "cost curve" by enhancing strategic sourcing efforts. Regent Kiefer also wants each campus to develop a philosophy of undergraduate education.

On December 1, the Academic Assembly discussed a Council-endorsed resolution from a Faculty Salaries Subcommittee that calls for an immediate 2% range adjustment to faculty salaries and a subsequent 5% increase in the form of a 3% range adjustment plus market adjustments equivalent to 2% of the faculty salary budget. The Assembly voted to refer the motion back to the Council for further discussion. Some members were concerned that the resolution might be perceived poorly just after a student fee increase, and that the money would be better spent if all of it were applied to the salary scales rather than across the board increases.

A BOARS-UCEP-UCOPE work group met to discuss whether UC should recognize the CSU General Education Breadth pattern for transfer to UC. It is unlikely that faculty will embrace CSU Breadth as currently structured and it is unlikely that CSU will change its requirement to IGETC alone, because CSU Breadth aligns well with their graduation requirements. Chair Jacob wants BOARS to consider a comprehensive review system for transfer applicants and will share the details of his proposal later. It was noted that some students are better off fulfilling major preparation requirements rather than IGETC to the letter.

III. Application Fee Revenue

Chair Jacob surveyed campus admissions directors about their budgets and found that there are wide funding variations across the system, both in levels of support and how they are reported. He also participated in a conference call with campus EVCs, where he communicated BOARS'

intent to establish a metric for proper funding of comprehensive review functions. The suggestion was not well received by all EVCs, who expect admissions costs to be funded by the amount reported to campuses (an average of \$9.50 out of the \$60 per paying applicant on some campuses) and who do not think BOARS' involvement in this issue is appropriate. Some EVCs were not aware that much more of the application fee does go to the campuses, but as part of the general fund, not as a line item.

Director Wilbur noted that UCOP treats the \$60 application fee as part of the UC general fund rather than as restricted money that must be used for admissions processing and outreach. Currently, UCOP collects the fee and distributes it to campuses and other entities across the UC system, including UCSF and ANR, in a single general fund pool according to established formulas. UCOP retains \$5 of the fee for systemwide application processing and systems enhancements. It reports only \$15 as a fee revenue line item to the EVCs. UCOP is implementing a new "funding streams" budget model next year in which campuses will retain all revenues they generate and UCOP will assess a flat tax to fund itself and systemwide functions. The intent of the change is to decentralize budget decision-making. UC expects campuses to fund admissions appropriately, but there will be no mandate or specific number communicated.

Senate Director Winnacker also investigated the uses of application fee revenue. She notes that the Campus Financial Schedules show the total spent for the "admissions" function plus the combined "admissions and records" function at UCOP is more than double the amount taken in as application fees. For 2008-09, the total application fee revenue was over \$22M, while the total spent on the nine general campuses in the "admissions" category was over \$32M. Chair Jacob said the numbers do not reflect what admissions directors are saying and that these categories include some areas, such as visitor centers, that do not directly support admissions functions.

Discussion:

- The new system should ensure a stronger correlation between the number of application and the revenue campuses receive.
- The funding streams model could weaken BOARS' capacity to influence the system from the center.

IV. Consultation with UCOP

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

Director Wilbur: In November, the Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) discussed score sharing and the wait list process. UC will share admissions decisions and scores with all campuses in early spring to help them with enrollment and yield planning. UC's intent is for campuses to use the wait list only to help them meet targets if they fall short using normal processes. Although some campuses are interested in sharing information about non-resident applicants, the APTF decided not to recommend a referral process for non-residents. About 87% of UC applicants apply to at least one of the four campuses implementing a holistic review

process this year; UC wants to increase that to 100% to meet the goal of giving all campuses access to at least one read score for every applicant.

The APTF wants UC to develop metrics to help measure the success of the eligibility reform policy. These may include measuring how well the policy expands the applicant pool, particularly into underserved populations; diversity outcomes in both the applicant and admitted pools; and outcomes for the 9x9 cohorts, both overall and in the referral pool. Initial outcomes will be available at the December 2011 BOARS meeting. Finally, APTF discussed systems enhancements including the new online transfer admissions guarantee application, and the new Eligibility in the Local Context process. Campuses have not decided yet how they will address the 9% ELC cohort, but will need to in the interest of communicating clearly about the policy. Counselors will also want to know which SAT Subject Tests campuses will recommend for specific majors.

Discussion:

- Last year, BOARS [recommended](#) against defunding the UC *StatFinder* website, which allows the public to view demographic, admission, enrollment, graduation, and retention statistics for freshmen and transfers by individual CA high school or community college. Director Wilbur confirmed that the provost decided that UC can no longer afford *StatFinder*, and that no new data will be added after fall 2009. UCOP's Decision Support System will be implemented by 2012 and provide similar data, although it will not be a public tool.
- The decision to defund StatFinder is a badly timed mistake. *StatFinder* can provide the public with outcomes from the new admissions policy and is important to UC's public relations and accountability efforts. UC needs a new system available before 2012 with public access capability.
- Campuses now have an incentive to under-enroll and use the wait list to meet enrollment targets. The wait list could create a two tier admissions system if it forces the weakest cohort of applicants to accept an offer at another campus.

Judy Sakaki: Demand for a UC education remains high despite increasing selectivity and cost. UC received a record 142,292 freshman and transfer applications for fall 2011 admissions through its new *applyUC* processing system. There were 106,000 freshmen and 36,000 transfer applications, a 5.7% and 6.8% increase respectively, and a 6.1% overall increase. All campuses experienced growth, led by UCSD, and there was a 31% increase in transfer applications at UCR. The number of domestic non-resident applicants rose by 9.2%.

ApplyUC saves the University millions of dollars by bringing previously outsourced processes in house. A new credit card processing procedure is also saving UC processing costs while resulting in more timely access to application fee revenue. The *ApplyUC* process ran smoothly, which pleased everyone in Admissions.

UC is convening transfer streamlining subcommittees from five disciplines to look at the possibility of making lower divisions transfer requirements more similar across campuses. The math and biological sciences subcommittees have met, and three more will meet in December.

Don Daves-Rogueaux: The second UC Curriculum Integration institute met in early November. It brought together high schools teachers to develop history, social science, and English courses

integrated with CTE content that can be approved for a-g. Out of 225 applications, UC selected 80 participants, who represented a diverse set of backgrounds from around the state. The next Institute will be held in May and will focus on math and laboratory science. Another goal is to involve Green Academies.

V. President Yudof's Resolution on Holistic Admissions

Issue: After the November meeting, BOARS responded to President Yudof's recommendations for undergraduate admissions. The President responded with a proposed *Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Admissions*, which he intends to present to the Regents at their January meeting. Chair Jacob said the resolution incorporates some language from BOARS' response and does not mandate a specific process.

Discussion:

- We appreciate the language allowing flexibility and about achieving "campus and university goals," but there is little evidence that holistic review is actually effective in meeting diversity goals. UCLA's success in increasing African-American admissions after moving to holistic admissions drives the perception that it will help other campuses; however, UCLA moved to holistic admissions at the same time that it began a major outreach effort in the African-American community and UCLA alumni implemented a new direct aid package for African-Americans. The resolution does capture the sense that holistic review is not a silver bullet, but we should not create an unrealistic expectation that it will radically change the diversity of the admitted pool.
- There was concern that the resolution could trample over the Senate's authority and give the President power to implement and define the meaning of single score and individualized review.
- Chair Simmons said the President does not intend to require campuses to abandon their local context admissions practices if they are successful, and the resolution will not prevent BOARS from fulfilling its historical role. BOARS is responsible for advising the Regents on admissions policy. The resolution can be seen as an implementation of the BOARS recommendations. BOARS should advise the Council about whether the resolution is appropriate. He and Vice Chair Anderson will stress to the Regents that single score holistic review is only one possible piece of a solution to a complex and difficult problem.
- Outreach is essential to achieving the President's goals and the potential implicit in holistic review and individualized review. Successes at UCSB and UCLA show that direct community outreach can have a tremendous impact on diversity.
- The penultimate BE IT RESOLVED clause should emphasize that the diversity goals articulated in the document can be best realized with enriched and focused recruitment and yield efforts, which will attract to UC the new talent envisioned by the eligibility reform policy taking effect in 2012. BOARS should also note that it is committed to actively analyzing and publicizing what is required to produce results.
- Excellence should be conceived not only as excellent performance but also the potential for excellence. Focusing only on the former neglects UC's mission of access and transformation.

- The admissions reform policy originated in BOARS and evolved over several years. There was give and take with the rest of the Senate and with the President over some of the details, both big and small. It was a faculty initiative, and unlike the resolution, is a policy. The resolution provides general guidance.

Action: A short response will be circulated to BOARS early next week and submitted to the Academic Council after final committee approval.

VI. Online Provider Criteria and Applicants

The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee (A&E) held a conference call in November to review new online provider and course applications for a-g certification. A&E did not approve the applications, and raised additional concerns. It wants BOARS to revisit its [2006 Criteria for Approval of Online Providers and Courses](#), and suspend current reviews and new applications pending the outcome of that review.

Subcommittee member Poblete asked to brief the full committee on the matter. He said A&E is concerned that the current policy does not ask questions of providers that are relevant to the rapidly evolving nature of the for-profit online industry, which is also a significant source of privatization. BOARS needs to examine more closely issues around academic integrity, quality control, accountability, access, and the opportunity gap. A&E wants to enlist the help of educators and experts in the field to help determine whether the current criteria and processes are appropriate. It thinks UC should suspend new applications until BOARS has a chance to review and renew the policy, and wants UC Counsel to opine on the legal ramifications of a moratorium. It supports UCOP's judgment, but also wants to ensure that the faculty are appropriately involved in setting the guidelines. The current policy is flawed, and the subcommittee fears influencing a radical paradigm shift in California education, and losing control over something they have yet to understand fully.

Chair Jacob asked the subcommittee to review all currently submitted provider applications and course submissions according to the current rules. BOARS has an obligation to assess them according to the existing criteria. A review of the provider criteria can begin after the backlog of current applications is complete. Vice President Sakaki added that delaying approval will put school districts and students in a bind. Some under-resourced schools need online courses to help their students fulfill the a-g criteria. Associate Director Daves-Rougeaux said he feels compelled to honor applications, and that the online providers are willing to answer additional questions faculty may have. His office will forward any additional questions to the providers and provide an analysis and report. He can help facilitate a discussion with school districts, online education experts, and other stakeholders. The central questions are whether the providers meet the current criteria and whether their courses meet the a-g criteria.

Other members expressed concern about the for-profit status of the providers. While online education can be an equalizing tool, we also need to consider the motivation of the providers. Some BOARS members said they were unable to opine without more information and direction from the subcommittee. Some said they feel unqualified to assess online education issues without

expert advice. It was suggested that BOARS consider limiting the number of a-g requirements that could be satisfied online.

Action: The Subcommittee will continue the discussion in break-out session.

VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee break-out

The A&E Subcommittee continued its discussion of online provider applications. Members acknowledged that BOARS lacks expertise about online education. It needs advice from experts (particularly those who have studied pre-college courses and providers), as well as educators and school administrators who understand how an online partnership program works in practice, to help define questions for and about providers, so it can make better decisions about the ability of providers to offer a-g courses and the quality of those courses.

The subcommittee wants to review data on courses that have already been approved, particularly demographic information about who is taking the courses and why, the completion rates for students who start online courses, and the grade distribution for online courses compared with traditional face-to-face courses.

More generally, A&E wants to understand the current role of online education in secondary education, as well as in California high schools, by reviewing data on user demographics, the effect of online education on the achievement gap and equality of access, and its impact on high schools and teachers. Which and what percentage of approved online courses do schools adopt? Who is eligible to take the courses? What percentage is taken on-site at the high school compared to the home? Do issues with access to home computers and high speed Internet exacerbate a digital divide, even if courses are taken at school as part of a partnership? How are issues of equal access addressed? What is the cost for the school, district, or individual? Do students/schools/districts need online offerings to offer a full a-g curriculum, and what courses are taken most often? How many students require online (or community college) courses to complete their a-g curriculum? Do online courses make it easier for districts to forgo hiring in hard-to-staff subject areas?

The subcommittee also identified broad questions about the extent of cheating and grade inflation in online courses and the possibility that students will shop around to determine which provider is most likely to give them a high grade; learning outcomes compared to traditional courses; how availability of online courses affects teaching quality in schools, and whether the for-profit status of online providers affects their ability to offer quality courses to students equitably. UC should build online a-g into outcome reporting and study the correlation of online course grades to student performance and success at UC.

There remains the question of whether UC is legally obliged to act on applications submitted under the existing policy. It was noted that BOARS should be concerned above all with safeguarding the academic integrity of the admissions process. The committee is potentially taking a very important stand. These new questions could be seen as an addition to the process not a radical modification.

VIII. Transfer Subcommittee break-out

The transfer subcommittee met to discuss the issue of UC recognizing CSU GE Breadth. Members agreed that this was not a realistic option given the conversation of the BOARS-UCEP-UCOPE work group. The group subcommittee then discussed the idea of moving toward comprehensive review of transfer applicants with the criteria being preparedness for a major and graduation in two years. In this process UC would set criteria that guarantee students a comprehensive review analogous to the process that will be implemented for freshmen in 2012. It could include AA degrees for transfer, current IGETC requirements, CSU GE Breadth and other major-specific criteria to be designed. It would not affect any current Transfer Guarantees. It was recommended that BOARS consider drafting a proposal to do this.

IX. Metric for Funding Comprehensive Review

Chair Jacob told the EVCs that BOARS wants to work with campus admissions directors to develop a metric to define the resources they will need to conduct a proper comprehensive review under the policy taking effect next year. He suggested to BOARS that the committee seek to define this metric in terms of human resources (for example, ensuring that there is one admissions counselor for every 3,000 applications, which is the metric used at UCLA.) He asked BOARS members to investigate how their campus funds recruitment, application processing, and yield work, and the dollar amounts and personnel their campus will need to implement the new admissions policy. What do campuses currently spend for human resources, and how much more will be needed to give a human read to every application?

Discussion:

- It would be helpful to know what proportion of the “admissions and records” expenditures in the Campus Financial Schedules relate directly to outreach and which relate to admissions evaluation and processing.
- The administration believes that single score holistic review can be done quickly and cheaply. But while it is possible to arrive at a single score quickly using a four or five point rubric, it could take significantly more time to generate a score using a ten point scale.
- Senate Chair Simmons said it would help to have information in hand at the January Regents meeting during the discussion of the President’s resolution.

Action: Chair Jacob will forward to members the list of questions he has already shared with the Admissions Directors. BOARS members should follow up on the questions above.

X. Ensuring the Success of ETR

Director Wilbur was asked to review procedures for determining the 9% statewide and 9% Eligibility in the Local Context cohorts.

UC will conduct a preliminary check for 9% statewide eligibility according to an index of the applicant’s test scores and GPA in a-g coursework taken in 10th and 11th grade. To determine

ELC eligibility, UC will collect transcripts for the top 15% cohort at each school and send them a letter stating that they have been identified as among the school's top students and encouraging them to apply. If they do apply, UC will match GPA information with the transcript to see if they qualify for the 9% ELC and tag that for the campus. Later, UC will analyze transcripts from 1/3 of high schools each year to update its records about average GPAs. The vendor will also send information about ELC segments of 1% each up to 9%.

Discussion:

- It is important to the success of the policy that a large proportion of ELC students not receive only a referral offer. But BOARS has to be prepared to respond if it does happen. There was a request for a model projecting where members of the ELC cohort are likely to apply.

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