

I. Announcements

- o *BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

General Announcements

The Academic Council released an [open letter to the UC community](#) about the recent campus protests over the Regents' decision to increase student fees by 32%. The memo expresses support for peaceful advocacy and decries student and police violence.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates wants to develop unified messages about the budget and other issues of common interest to the segments. The three Senate leaders will speak at a December 7 meeting of the Joint Committee of the Master Plan for Higher Education, which is evaluating the state's 50-year-old higher education framework.

The UC Commission on the Future Access and Affordability Working Group has met twice. Some faculty are concerned that the Commission is focused primarily on budget shortfalls, not necessarily on the goal of preserving access and affordability. BOARS may want to develop a set of principles for the review of the Commission and the Working Group and think about additional ways to engage proactively with those groups.

Discussion: Part of the Senate's traditional role is to stand apart and articulate principles and goals. The Senate will be challenged to ensure that these principles remain at the forefront of the conversation and are not lost in the panic over the budget crisis. Faculty must help move the public discourse away from a focus on the funding gap to the need to preserve the public mission and the political priorities of the state—i.e., funding for higher education vs. prisons. The Senate must also build alliances within the University and make common cause with CSU and CCC.

California's long-term needs, not the immediate budget crisis, should drive the Master Plan Commission. UC should focus on how it can help reshape California, not itself. UC can demonstrate its value to the state by assembling its best minds to help solve the crisis. BOARS should draft an inter-segmental statement about the choices before UC and the state and the consequences of the funding crisis on access and affordability. It will be crucial in such a statement to emphasize the economic and social impact of higher education and UC research on California's future. UC brings benefits not just to the individual, but to the general public and the common good. This public mission is what unites UC with California's future.

It was also noted that crowded classrooms may force students into default a five-year degree, which combined with rising fees, make attainment of a UC degree even less accessible.

Action: The statement of principles will appear as a topic on the January agenda.

II. Consultation with the Office of Admissions

o Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

Director Wilbur reported preliminary results from the 2010-11 application cycle, in which UC received a record 134k individual applications, representing a 5.8% overall increase, with 17% transfer growth and 2.4% freshman growth, including a 1.6% increase for California resident freshmen. Every campus received more applications. Merced led the way with an 18% increase, and UCR and UCSB also experienced significant growth. African-American applicants rose at both the freshman and transfer levels by the largest percentage of any group. The CA high school graduating class is expected to drop 1% this year as part of a long-term demographic decline trend that will continue to about 2017.

Admissions officers are concerned that budget reductions, staff furloughs, a trend of students applying to a more campuses, and centrally mandated admissions targets will all increase workload pressure this year. All campuses except Merced will be asked to decrease enrollment and meet specific targets, totaling 2300 fewer freshmen and 250 additional transfers systemwide. A larger number of transfer application also impacts workload, because they are more difficult and time-consuming to evaluate.

The Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) is discussing a wait list system and more score sharing to help campuses ease workload and manage enrollment more precisely. UCSB and UCSD will use UCLA's holistic scores this year for their second read, and all nine undergraduate campuses will join a transfer application shared review pilot program.

The Office of Admissions (OA) wants to streamline the \$3 million Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. UC estimates that the expansion of ELC from 4% to 9% in 2012 will cost \$1-2 million more to implement in its current form. UC pays a vendor to collect and analyze 43k+ high school transcripts and sends a letter to ELC-eligible students informing them of their status at the beginning of the senior year. OA believes that ELC will be less important at this stage under the new admissions policy, because ELC students will be guaranteed a comprehensive review and most will also be eligible under the statewide pathway. ELC is more important later, as a referral guarantee. OA wants to move the determination of ELC status to the referral pool determination stage, after the local CR evaluation. Under the new system, UC would continue to collect transcripts identifying students likely to be in the top 12% of their class and then invite them to apply with a note that the top 9% have a referral guarantee, but UC would no longer have to evaluate transcripts of students unlikely to apply. The costs are unsustainable in the current fiscal environment, and UC has to make tough choices. OA believes the plan will preserve ELC's quality and effectiveness.

Discussion: Members worried that the change could diminish the impact of ELC, including the diversity ELC provides. One of the principles embedded in ELC is that students at every school have a chance at UC regardless of SAT scores. ELC has a stimulating effect on students who may not have considered applying to UC if they had not received the letter at the front end of the process— particularly students who are not from a college-going culture or without access to good counseling. Moreover, some ELC students may no longer stand out in CR at the campuses that give a bump to ELC students in comprehensive review. ELC students are worth the risk, because they are used to finding ways of achieving. The letter from UC must continue to communicate the guarantee clearly and strongly.

Director Wilbur said she believes little will be lost in the proposed change and noted that the current process is also a burden on high schools. She suggested that UC could include a notation on applications that it had received an earlier transcript for ELC consideration. She said campuses could also use the within-school percentile rankings listed on the application or the UCSB model as possible proxies for ELC.

It was noted that not all campuses currently guaranteeing admission to the entire ELC 4% will extend that commitment to the ELC 9%. One of UC's main public messages is that UC uses school context in evaluations, but there could be a problem if the public perceives campuses as retreating from that commitment.

There was concern that freshmen and transfers are not always evenly prepared, and BOARS may want to evaluate the transfer admissions criteria to better align them with freshman processes. It was noted that transfer students have higher graduation and retention rates and GPAs than four-year students, but that transfers often need one or two semesters to catch up, and require an average of 2.6 years to graduate. UC's plan to increase the number of transfers could have unforeseen impacts on education systemwide.

Action: BOARS will collect transfer outcome data by campus and discuss transfer on a future agenda. BOARS will request and review ELC data in January.

III. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the November 13, 2009 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

IV. Consultation with the Office of Institutional Research

- o *Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow*
- o *Institutional Research Coordinator Tongshan Chang*

Deputy Director Agronow reported that the California Department of Education has submitted proposals for "Race to the Top" federal educational funding to support several intersegmental projects, including one to merge K-12 and higher education databases into a single P-20 database and another to expand the UC Transcript Evaluation Service to all CA public high schools.

2012 Admissions Index:

Coordinator Chang and Director Agronow distributed a second preliminary alternative for the new 9% statewide admissions index. The sliding index is based on GPA and standardized test scores and will be used to identify the top 9% of students for the statewide guarantee pathway effective for 2012 admissions. The proposed index employs a linear model. At the November meeting, BOARS reviewed an index based on a quadratic model using a GPA² term.

Deputy Director Agronow said the probability that students in the 9% guarantee pool will earn a 2.0 GPA is similarly high in both models. The linear model projects slightly more students from low API schools and URM groups, but this index is significantly less generous at the top and

bottom in terms of the SAT score cut-points at which an individual would be included in the index. For that reason, Director Agronow recommended the quadratic model as better for students because the SAT cut-off is already going up significantly.

Discussion: Members preferred the quadratic model. It was noted that BOARS has always preferred giving more weight to GPA over SAT, because GPA takes into account educational context, and that anyone who receives a guarantee should meet very high standards. Members noted that the published index should include the SAT score and the corresponding ACT score in a way that does not appear to prefer the SAT.

Action: BOARS passed a unanimous motion to adopt the quadratic index.

V. Request for Modification of UC Accreditation Policy to Reflect Current Accreditation Landscape

BOARS discussed a letter from Art Coleman, managing partner of EducationCounsel LLC, challenging a UC requirement that California high schools have WASC-accreditation to establish UC-approved ‘a-g’ course lists. Mr. Coleman asked BOARS to change the policy to encompass schools accredited by both WASC and other regional and national accrediting agencies.

Chair Hurtado noted that UCOP’s [‘a-g’ guide](#) does state this requirement, but Academic Senate policy does not mention WASC or any specific accreditation agencies, so no policy change is needed. Associate Admissions Director Daves-Rougeaux said the original policy mentioned WASC because at the time it was adopted, WASC was the only regional accrediting agency for secondary schools. He agreed to update and check language in all public accreditation documents to make sure they are updated to include a general reference to not only WASC but other agencies.

Action: Chair Hurtado will send a response to Mr. Coleman and the Office of Admissions will update language on the ‘a-g’ website and in other communications.

VI. Report to the Regents on UC’s Standardized Testing Pattern

BOARS reviewed the final draft of the report. In addition to its five immediate recommendations, the report now features three long-term admissions policy paths for BOARS to explore, including updating its 2002 Testing Principles.

Discussion: It was noted that the report provides a compelling set of arguments for how the SAT/ACT contributes to the validity of the eligibility determination on a systemwide basis for all students and the fairness on an individual basis in comprehensive review. Members suggested a number of clarifying edits and modifications. There was concern that the recommendation for UC to signal a preference for the ACT and increase the number of students who take it could confuse students, who will want to know if one of the tests will give them a better chance of admission, but it was noted that BOARS does prefer the ACT based on principles and outcomes. It was also noted that students can be coached to advantage for the SAT and that repeat testing improves performance, although a May 2009 National Association for College Admission Counseling [report](#) concludes that, on average, test prep courses yield only a modest benefit.

Action: A motion was made and passed unanimously that BOARS approve the report with the noted edits and modifications.

VII. Report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review

Updates to Statistical Data: BOARS reviewed admissions data on first-time freshmen from the [2003 report](#) on comprehensive review with Deputy Director Agronow to decide which of the analyses and tables from that report to update and reproduce. The 2003 data address selectivity, demographics, academic quality, matriculation outcomes, and measures of access and diversity, including low-income, first-generation college, and URM students, and students from low API high schools. All academic and demographic indicators include students from both public and private high schools except the indicator, “Students from CA low performing schools”.

It was agreed that the data in the new report should cover 2003 through 2009 and use full-year instead of only fall term data. The report should include data for all campuses. BOARS decided to retain all previous academic indicators, but noted that “Mean SAT II Math score” should be listed on a separate line with a footnote that UC no longer requires the test as of 2006.

In the Demographic Indicators group, “first generation college” should continue to be defined as neither parent having completed a four-year degree. Deputy Director Agronow noted that the cut-off for defining a “low-income” student in the 2003 report is a household income of \$30k. One possibility is to use the Blue and Gold Plan eligibility cutoff of \$60k, but it was noted that 60k is actually close to the average CA family income. It would be better to define “low income” as 2x the federal poverty level for a family of four. The federal poverty level is updated annually and would provide a consistent and easily adjusted measure. In addition, the income data should be reported as quartiles with the bottom quartile being low-income by this definition. In the 2003 report, the indicator “Students from CA low performing schools” is based on API rankings for CA public schools only. This indicator should now be based on total students. API 1-9 should be split into five groups: API 1-2; API 2-4; API 5-7; API 8-9, and API unknown.

For first-generation college, low income, and most of the other categories, the averages include students who did not answer the question, not just those who provided a valid answer. 6-10% of the files are missing parent education data, and 26-29% are missing income data. BOARS decided not to change this methodology. It was noted that data on underrepresented minority students are based on national domestic students only.

Finally, BOARS requested an update to the 2003 “No-Show” Study, which analyzes the college destinations of UC applicants who do not enroll at UC. The 2003 report focuses on the top third of the UC admit pool only, but the update will cover the entire admit pool as well as the top college destinations by ethnicity, and UC enrollment rates for the top, middle, and bottom third of the admit pool by ethnicity.

Comprehensive Review Challenges: One section of the report will discuss future challenges for comprehensive review, including the need to improve communication, transparency and understanding about CR; develop new efficiencies, increase collaboration, and implement shared review while maintaining respect for individual campus review and selection policies, processes, and values; meet ETR’s goal of casting a wider net; and cope with new enrollment restrictions

and increased workload. It was noted that campus differences are strengths of the UC system; CR captures the values and reflects the distinctiveness and unique strengths of each campus.

It was suggested that BOARS consider articulating the limits of local autonomy in comprehensive review—that is, which comprehensive review indicators, if any, should be systemwide requirements that campuses must consider, and which elements should be only recommended and/or up to campus discretion.

It was noted that UC leads the nation in the use of local context indicators. CR broadens the ability of campuses to judge individual talent and potential and capture the best and most diverse pool of students in the state. Under ETR, UC will be denying admission to a large number of students and will be challenged to communicate the reason for those decisions and provide feedback to students and schools about how to prepare for successful admission. It is ironic that the state is pressuring UC to reduce enrollment (through a reduction in funding) at a time when UC is trying to expand opportunity with ETR.

BOARS needs additional information from some campuses about the way they are implementing the 14 CR criteria, changes that have occurred since 2003, and quality control mechanisms.

Action: IRC will run the new data for the next meeting.

VIII. Systemwide Senate Review of Proposal for Differential Fees

Issue: BOARS reviewed a draft committee memo responding to a proposal for differential fees for engineering and business majors, along with data from the Office of Institutional Research about the demographic characteristics and persistence and graduation rates of freshmen and transfers intending to enroll in those majors and actually enrolled as upper division students in them. The memo incorporates discussion from the November meeting.

Chair Hurtado noted that the data show more underrepresented students in the pool of intended engineering and business majors than in the pool of students actually enrolled as upper division engineering and business students. Differential fees, depending on when they are instituted, will have a disparate impact on low income, first generation, and minority students.

Action: BOARS approved the memo pending several revisions suggested by members. The final memo will be submitted to Academic Council.

IX. Executive Session

BOARS met in executive session.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst
Attest: Sylvia Hurtado