

**University of California Academic Senate
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Minutes of Meeting – December 5, 2008**

I. Chair's Announcements – Sylvia Hurtado

Report: Chair Hurtado reported that the Academic Senate's eligibility reform proposal will be reviewed at an early February meeting of the Regents. Chair Croughan and President Yudof have met with State legislators and other key players about the proposal, and the President has begun to articulate a preference for the 3.0 weighted/capped minimum GPA scenario.

At the most recent Academic Council meeting, members expressed concern about Regents "Item J1," a proposed \$2 billion revenue bond issue intended to finance seismic upgrades and other construction projects. Council also spoke to the architects of the draft accountability framework, discussed a proposal from the Davis division to grant the dependents of Senate faculty members a 50% reduction in undergraduate fees, and endorsed a request from the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity for the appointment of a UCAAD representative to the Regents' Diversity Study Group Implementation Team. The President told Council that he is considering a possible enrollment cap to help address a shortfall in state funding.

Council also endorsed a letter supporting the transition of the UCRP Advisory Board to the UC Pension Benefits Board. Vice Chair Powell noted concern about a possible state ballot initiative that would move control of the UC pension system from the Regents to a different body. The Task Force on Investment and Retirement is discussing a counter initiative.

Vice Chair Jacob attended the most recent meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), where Community College faculty discussed state budget cuts that are forcing the CCCs to cut enrollment by 62,000 and a proposal to allow several CCCs to adopt an Accelerated Schools model. The CSU faculty want to meet with BOARS to discuss the role of Career and Technical Education courses in the a-g requirements as well as ways to better articulate the purpose of a-g. Several ICAS members are drafting a white paper about cross-segmental transfer admission requirements.

II. Consent Calendar

1. November 14, 2008 meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur, Associate Admissions Director Sam Agronow, and Special Assistant to the Student Affairs Vice President William Kidder

Report: Special Assistant Kidder reported that he has accepted an offer to become the Assistant Executive Vice Chancellor at UC Riverside beginning in January 2009. He is looking at possible next steps for implementing BOARS' recent [position statement](#) affirming that membership in a federally recognized American Indian tribe is consistent with Selection Criterion #13 as a consideration in undergraduate admissions. He said CPEC's final report will be issued formally at a December 9 meeting, and noted that CPEC's access and equity committee is issuing a series of reports on different freshman populations, starting with LGTB students.

Associate Director Agronow reported that the “machine” score subcommittee of the Admissions Processing Task Force is meeting December 9 to consider which data elements and metrics to include in the shared review protocol. He said predicting enrollment outcomes will be particularly difficult this year due to enrollment cuts at CSU. Phase 3 of the [StatFinder](#) project will be available by February, and will allow users to view demographic, admission, enrollment, and outcome statistics by individual high school and CCC.

Director Wilbur reported that Associate Director Agronow is also leaving his current position to take a job in the newly constituted Institutional Research unit, which consolidates all existing UCOP data gathering functions related to admissions, personnel, financial aid, business, and other areas. She said it is unclear exactly how BOARS will be supported in the future, but she is advocating strongly for maintaining the analytical capability BOARS needs to carry out its duties.

She noted that the 2007 CPEC study reports UC’s overall eligibility rate as 13.4% and CSU’s as 32.7%. UC eligibility rates for African-American and Latino students increased slightly since the last study in 2003; they are, for UC and CSU respectively, 29.4% and 50.9% for Asians; 14.6% and 37.1% for Whites; 6.9% and 22.5% for Latinos; 6.3% and 24% for African-Americans. President Yudof’s message at the CPEC meeting will be that UC has successfully aligned its eligibility rate with the Master Plan target without harming diversity, but also needs to do a better job.

Director Wilbur noted that the UC application filing deadline for 2009-10 ended December 1, and preliminary data indicate a slight increase in the number of freshman applications, which is likely attributable to more students fulfilling the a-g requirement. She will present a final report at the January meeting.

IV. Non-Resident Domestic and International Enrollment *–with Nina Robinson, Director, Policy and External Affairs*

Issue: BOARS discussed current policy and practice for the enrollment of international and domestic non-resident students. Questions arose over a recent memo from UCOP asking campuses to set separate admission targets for state supported resident undergraduates and fee bearing non-resident undergraduates.

Report: Director Robinson said the policy outlined in the NRT memo is not new. Campuses have always built non-resident tuition (NRT) revenues into their budget plans, but the state recently began setting new enrollment targets for UC based only on state-funded students, and over time, UC developed an NRT revenue shortfall. The UCOP budget office used to collect NRT revenues and redistribute them to campuses, but now campuses keep the NRT revenue they receive, and UCOP tells them exactly how many state-supported students they must enroll and how much NRT they must generate to meet targets.

UC has an informal agreement with the Legislature to draw 95% of the systemwide UC undergraduate body from California residents, although there is also an understanding that this ratio will not necessarily apply on all individual campuses. (The number is closer to 8% at UCB and UCLA). Language in the Master Plan also suggests that non-resident applicants be held to a higher admission standard. Admissions directors have been asked to adhere to these ratios; to not prefer a non-resident student over an equally well qualified in-state student; and to avoid using state funds to recruit out of state students.

Some campuses want to increase enrollments of non-resident undergraduates and transfers far beyond the traditional ratio, and there is concern that the NRT memo could be misinterpreted as a call to campuses to increase out of state enrollments or could work as an incentive for them to do so. Enrolling a geographically diverse student body has a legitimate educational value, but it could also have the effect of decreasing California resident access to UC.

Discussion: Enrollment practices should be guided by clear educational values and goals. UC sees itself as a global presence, so it is natural for campuses to want to enroll students from many different parts of the world. At the same time, UC has to seek a balance between the benefits of having a broad range of international backgrounds on campus, and the potential harm international enrollment has on California residents, particularly diverse populations who want access to UC.

There was little support in BOARS for setting strict percentages, but acknowledgment that over-enrollment impacts educational quality. Members expressed concern about the possibility of having fiscal considerations guide admissions decisions and a system that forces campuses to generate NRT revenue to fund budgets. Informal agreements about limiting enrollment of non-residents might not carry much weight if there are still fiscal incentives to enroll more of them. California residents are paying for UC; they should have the benefits of UC, and the state contribution to in-state enrollments should be equivalent to the number of students actually enrolled. The push to increase international enrollments at the transfer level will almost certainly result in passing over domestic students for international students. Undergraduate NRT revenue should be used to fund undergraduate programs, not out of state graduate students. It might be useful for BOARS to consult with UCEP and CCGA about this issue.

V. Consultation with President Yudof about Enrollment and Eligibility Reform

Issue: The enrolled undergraduate population at every UC campus exceeds state funding provided for each student, which amounts to over-enrollment of 11,000 students systemwide. All campuses and some Regents have expressed concern about UC's continued ability to enroll large numbers of unfunded students and the impact of over-enrollment on educational quality.

Report: President Yudof joined the meeting. He said he wants to see total enrollment increase and loathes any decision that might reduce access and opportunity for California students, but it is impossible for UC to continue absorbing new students without funding. Moreover, it is likely that UC will be unfunded for enrollment growth in coming years, and will see its enrollment problems persist as continuing students move through the pipeline. The President is proposing that UC reduce its entering resident freshman class by 2000 students systemwide and increase the CCC transfer class by 750 students. The targets vary for each campus and he will expect campuses to hold to those targets. The proposal will send a message that UC needs more funding, but has taken steps to increase access for CCC transfers, who are key to increasing diversity and access. The President said that in the long run, UC has to do a better job of enrolling transfer students and he is assembling a task force to discuss ways to give UC a larger presence on CCC campuses.

The President is developing a proposal for a new financial aid guarantee program to help cover fees for needy students. The program will help communicate a clear message, particularly in underserved communities, that a UC education is within reach. More details will follow at a later date. He has also been working with other national university leaders to draft a proposal for

a higher education investment act, which will propose the addition of a higher education facilities component to the federal government's economic stimulus bill.

Finally, the President thanked BOARS for its hard work on eligibility reform. He said he has made a decision to recommend the 3.0 weighted/capped minimum GPA scenario to the Board of Regents, which he believes will garner near unanimous support with the Board. He said unity on the minimum GPA question is better, but BOARS should feel free to express its own view based on what it thinks is the most appropriate standard.

Discussion: Members noted that the President had made a reasonable and compelling case for reducing the size of the freshman class and increasing transfer enrollment. There was concern about a possibility of campuses decreasing freshman resident enrollment but increasing non-resident domestic and international enrollment, and how such an increase would be explained to the public and the legislature. The President said UC is a California institution and he does not expect that non-residents would replace residents in any substantial numbers. One member noted that UC should focus on a dual strategy of increasing diversity – not only through transfer, but also through the pool of freshmen applicants. It was also noted that the financial aid guarantee program should take into account assets in addition to income, and a comment that using international and out of state students to make up for funding deficiencies employed the logic of privatization.

Action: BOARS will compile comments that Chair Croughan will forward to the president.

VI. Academic Senate Eligibility Reform Proposal

General Update: Chair Croughan and former BOARS Chair Rashid are meeting with legislators and legislative aides to answer questions about the eligibility reform proposal. They have also written op-ed pieces responding to some of the groups and individuals who have spoken out against the reform. The President has met with newspaper editorial boards across the state. Vice Chair Jacob reported that a couple of other more extreme but well-organized groups are deliberately spreading inaccurate and misleading information about the proposal. There is a new [eligibility reform website](#) on the UCOP homepage that includes FAQs about the reform.

BOARS ETR GPA “pro-con” Document: BOARS reviewed final changes to the document and members made additional suggested clarifications. The memo will note that although BOARS favors the 2.8 unweighted GPA scenario, each of the proposed scenarios is far superior to the current system, but that the simulated GPA ranges, while all individually acceptable, show slight differences on the impact of diversity between 2.8 and 3.0.

Responding to CSHE paper: Former UC Director of Research and Evaluation for Admissions and current [Center for Studies of Higher Education](#) (CSHE) Fellow Saul Geiser, wrote a paper criticizing the Senate's eligibility reform proposal; specifically, the proposed elimination of the SAT Subject Test requirement. BOARS reviewed a response to the paper co-authored by former BOARS Chair Mark Rashid, current BOARS Chair Hurtado, former Academic Senate Chair Michael Brown, and Sam Agronow. An accompanying memo from Chair Hurtado requests that the response be posted on the Senate website and sent to the CSHE and posted alongside the paper on the CSHE website. The authors of the response feel the work of BOARS and Senate has been misrepresented in the Geiser paper.

Discussion: Members agreed that it would be inappropriate for BOARS to engage directly with critics outside the University, but UC does need a coordinated media effort to comprehensively and strategically respond to misinformation. The UCOP website is a good start, and it would be nice to include a statement that BOARS has thoroughly examined the GPA pros and cons and include a short paragraph to the FAQ list about why UC is no longer requiring the Subject tests. The response to the Geiser paper needs a press release of its own that clearly distills the key points.

Action: BOARS endorsed the pro-con memo pending several minor changes and the response and memo regarding the CSHE paper.

VII. Letter to the College Board and Report to the Regents on the new SAT

Issue: BOARS reviewed a draft letter to the College Board with follow-up questions about the new SAT Reasoning test. The Committee hopes the response to the letter will help it determine the extent to which the new SAT aligns with BOARS' January 2002 "[testing principles](#)," for a report to the Board of Regents.

Discussion: It was noted that the new SAT Reasoning Test is more predictive of UC GPA than the old SAT, and the Subject Tests do not add substantially to predictive validity. One member suggested adding a question to the letter about how the new writing section of the SAT adds value to predictive validity. Chair Hurtado asked the BOARS Testing Subcommittee to think about analyses it might need to draft a report. It was noted that it may be impossible for any test to meet all the criteria set by BOARS, but that there should be more discussion about what BOARS wants the tests to do – for example, what value does any standardized test add to high school GPA if it is not to adjust for differences in high school GPA and help us better understand the GPA, and is predictability better for different groups with the new SAT?

Action: BOARS endorsed the draft letter.

VIII. Request for BOARS to Reassess the “d” Requirement for UC Admission

Issue: BOARS reviewed a draft committee memo regarding the requested expansion of UC's “d” laboratory science admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS).

Discussion: BOARS felt the memo conveyed the basic consensus of the Committee, and there were suggestions for minor corrections.

Action: BOARS endorsed the memo for submission to Council. Director Wilbur will provide examples of an “average” EESS course, and one approved for ‘g.’

IX. Letter to Academic Council re: Reorganization of UCOP and Need for Continued Data Support for BOARS

Issue: BOARS reviewed a draft letter to Council expressing concern that the reorganization of the Departments of Academic and Student Affairs will result in the loss of critical expertise that has helped BOARS successfully explore policy alternatives and solutions in admissions.

Discussion: It was noted that UCOP's support has helped BOARS develop fully informed responses to eligibility, equity, and access challenges facing UC, as well as insight into alternatives it may not have considered. It was also noted that the new IR unit is not well resourced, the broad data-reporting functions consolidated in the new unit could be spread too thin, and the work of BOARS is not optional and must appropriately supported. Preserving analytical capability specifically for the Office of Admissions is critical as BOARS evaluates the need for further eligibility reform, and undertakes the shared review project.

Action: BOARS approved the memo.

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