

**Minutes of Meeting – December 1, 2006**

Approved January 5, 2007

**I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements**

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Mark Rashid welcomed the committee and reported on the following activities of the Academic Council and other items of interest:

- Academic Council Meeting. The November meeting of the Academic Council focused on budgetary issues: the approval by the Regents of the [University's 2007-08 budget proposal](#), the report of the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) on "[Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California](#)," and more transparent accounting of non-resident tuition funds that are distributed to the campuses.
- ICAS Meeting. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) is a voluntary organization consisting of representatives of the Academic Senates of the three segments of public higher education in California. This year ICAS is chaired by UC Academic Council Vice Chair Michael T. Brown; BOARS Chair Mark Rashid serves as a member. ICAS will be meeting next week and the agenda includes a brief informational item to apprise the other segments of BOARS' work on eligibility reform. An ICAS Workgroup is also being formed to examine the possibility of aligning the CSU GE-Breadth and Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) requirements. Part of this effort will include investigating IGETC Senate Regulation (SR 478) compliance issues at UC campuses.
- University Diversity Study Group. In July, The Regents agreed to form a group to study the current status of diversity at the University and the impact of Proposition 209. Regent Gerald Parsky and Provost Rory Hume are co-chairs of the University Diversity Study Group and the membership includes Faculty Representatives John Oakley and Michael T. Brown. At the Study Group's November meeting, a structure comprised of four subgroups was established:
  1. Undergraduate Student Eligibility, Admissions, Enrollment, and Persistence (chaired by Academic Senate Vice Chair Michael T. Brown)
  2. Graduate/Professional School Student Admissions, Enrollment, and Persistence (chaired by UCSC Acting Chancellor George Blumenthal)
  3. Faculty Recruitment, Hiring, Promotion, and Persistence (chaired by UCAAD Chair Gibor Basri)
  4. Campus Climate (chaired by Student Regent Maria Ledesma)
- VP for Student Affairs. Judy Sakaki, current Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at UC Davis, has been appointed Vice President for Student Affairs at the UC Office of the President, effective January 1, 2007.
- Transfer Specialist. BOARS is still in need of a volunteer to serve as the committee's Transfer Specialist. This person would serve as BOARS's representative to transfer groups, such as the Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer (ASSIST) Board of Directors.

**ACTION:** Any BOARS Member interested in serving as the committee’s Transfer Specialist should inform Chair Mark Rashid.

- Proposition 209 Symposium. BOARS Chair Rashid reported on continued interest in the recent symposium, “Equal Opportunity in Higher Education: The Past and Future of Proposition 209,” which was sponsored by The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity, and Diversity at Boalt Hall (UCB). The symposium focused on the consequences of Proposition 209, especially how it has affected student diversity in California higher education, and included papers coauthored by BOARS members and a panel discussion on UC freshman eligibility reform. Chair Rashid and other Academic Senate participants in the symposium continue to field questions from journalists, researcher, and others.

**DISCUSSION:** Committee members recommended engaging in further discussion, both within BOARS and with UCOP consultants and strategic communications staff, regarding how to effectively handle public relations issues as BOARS continues to move forward with developing an eligibility reform proposal.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

### **A. Approval of the November 3, 2006 Minutes**

**ACTION:** The minutes of the November 3, 2006 BOARS meeting were approved as written.

### **B. Proposals Under Systemwide Academic Senate Review**

**ACTION:** The committee elected not to comment on the list of items under systemwide Academic Senate review.

## **III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Admissions**

- Nina Robinson, Director of Policy and External Affairs

**REPORT:** Director Nina Robinson reported to the committee on the following admissions-related items of interest:

- Fall 2007 Applications. The application filing period for fall 2007 admission closed last night at midnight. Information on the number of applications will be provided at the January BOARS meeting.
- College Destinations Study. BOARS was provided with a draft study, “College Destinations for University of California Fall 2005 Freshman Admits” (enclosure 3). Using data from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC), this study examined the college destinations of 51,171 California resident freshman students admitted to at least one UC campus for fall 2005. Students admitted via the referral pool were not included in the study. Several selective private institutions, such as MIT, do not provide data to the NSC, so the college destinations of UC admits who enrolled at these non-participant institutions are not captured in this study. The college destinations of students offered UC admission and whose enrollment information was available follows:
  - 58.7 percent enrolled at a UC campus

- 14.4 percent enrolled at a CSU or CCC campus
- 9.0 percent enrolled at selective private colleges and universities
- 9.1 percent enrolled at “other” colleges and universities

**DISCUSSION:** Members speculated that reasons for UC admits choosing to attend a CSU or CCC campus might include a need to attend part-time, interest in majors not offered at UC, and financial or geographical constraints. It was noted that the “College Destinations” study indicates that underrepresented minority students, particularly African American students with strong academic credentials, were more likely than other UC admits to choose to enroll at private and/or out-of-state institutions.

#### **IV. UC Transfer Preparation Paths – Implementation Update**

- Eric Taggart, Director of ASSIST Coordination Site

**REPORT:** Director Eric Taggart presented a draft full implementation plan proposal for the Streamlining UC Articulation and UC Transfer Preparation Paths projects (enclosure 4). The implementation plan was outlined in nine parts: (1) identifying top majors, (2) expanding the transfer paths to all top majors, (3) annual review and update of transfer paths, (4) creating a database and computer system for the transfer paths, (5) connecting the transfer paths to CCC courses, (6) conducting the SR 477 (“Streamlining”) process, (7) developing new web-tools for students using <http://www.uctransfer.org>, (8) timeline, and (9) implementation costs.

The development and annual review of the transfer paths will be initialized and coordinated by UCOP staff and will utilize existing campus protocols in which campus articulation staff consult with faculty advisors and departments. Once the campus annual consultation and review process is completed, UCOP staff will prepare the final transfer path document for the website (<http://www.uctransfer.org>). One remaining issue is the development of a feedback mechanism to the CCC campuses to explain the reasons for a UC campus choosing to opt out of any “streamlined” articulation agreement. A proposal plan for a feedback mechanism is being develop for review by BOARS and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP).

**DISCUSSION:** Members asked how students will access the transfer paths information. Director Taggart informed the committee that the transfer paths for the first four majors are currently available online as PDF documents at <http://www.uctransfer.org>. There are also plans to eventually include the transfer paths on the ASSIST website (<http://www.assist.org>) and some funds provided through the state’s recent UC-CCC Transfer Initiative may be used to develop new technologies to support transfer. Members expressed concerns about the existence of multiple sites for transfer information, which may confuse students. It was also strongly recommended that the development of an interactive web-based tool for students to access the transfer paths, rather than relying on PDF documents, be made a top priority.

#### **V. UC Freshman Eligibility Reform**

At the November BOARS meeting, the committee agreed to explore the idea of creating an “Eligible for Review” (EFR) pathway for UC freshman admission (enclosure 5). Students who meet the qualifications for EFR status would be guaranteed a full and comprehensive review of their UC application at each campus to which they apply. The number of students eligible for

review would not be regulated, as no guarantee of admission would attend EFR status. In accordance with the requirements of the California Master Plan for Higher Education, UC campuses would select, from among their EFR applicants, the number of students that would lead to a systemwide admission rate of 12.5 percent of California's high school graduates.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee discussed several key issues that need to be addressed as an Eligible for Review proposal is developed.

### Master Plan

The committee discussed how an Eligible for Review policy would comply with the California Master Plan for Higher Education requirement that the top 12.5 percent of the state's high school graduates will be eligible for admission to the University. The Master Plan authorizes UC to determine its criteria for admissions eligibility, and the Regents have delegated the authority for making that determination, subject to their final approval, to the Academic Senate. The committee briefly debated whether the Master Plan requires that UC's eligibility policy be constructed solely with objective criteria that might allow calculation of whether or not a student is UC-eligible and therefore guaranteed admission to the UC system. Concerns were raised that UC will be perceived as breaking the Master Plan eligibility guarantee if it moves from a policy of defining the top 12.5 percent based on objective measures of past achievement at the point of entry towards a policy of defining the top 12.5 percent based on both objective and subjective measures of "promise" or future success at UC.

### Examination Requirement

Another major issue the committee discussed is whether or not an examination requirement should be maintained as part of an eligible for review pathway, or if exams should be made optional or eliminated as a requirement. Eliminating the exam requirement or making exams optional would require that campuses modify their comprehensive review processes. Comprehensive review processes would need to ensure that an applicant is not penalized for choosing to submit or not submit exam scores under an exam-optional eligibility pathway.

The committee began to brainstorm ways in which campuses might conduct fair and meaningful assessments of applicants under an exam-optional eligibility policy (e.g., various weighting schemes, allowing multiple ways for applicants to demonstrate competency in subject areas). It was noted that there is a precedent for evaluating optional exam scores during the comprehensive review process – applicants are not required to submit AP exam scores, but some UC campuses consider submitted AP scores of applicants as part of their selection processes. It was also noted that transfer applicants are not required to submit exam scores.

The committee debated evidence in favor of eliminating or making optional the exam requirement, as well as several reasons for maintaining an examination requirement. Members recounted that among those high school students that complete the subject ('a-g') requirements for UC freshman eligibility, failure to fulfill the SAT II examination requirement is the most common reason for these students not attaining UC-eligible status. Further evidence of the barrier to eligibility created by an examination requirement is the reduction in the number of eligible students resulting from UC's decision to enforce the requirement that applicants who are Eligible in the Local Context (ELC) must submit the required examination scores, even though they are not required to achieve a minimum score on the exams. Members also commented that exam scores are considered one of the few objective measures of student achievement, and

therefore, exams are viewed by many to be a key component of a fair admissions process. Grading practices differ by teacher and school, but exam scoring is standardized. Exam scores have also been shown to add to the prediction of UC GPA, although modestly.

The committee developed a preliminary set of analytical questions to inform the evaluation of the examination requirement. Members were interested in assessing whether or not exam scores provide information about applicants that is critical to making sound admissions decisions, and if so, do the gains achieved by this information outweigh the barriers created by the examination requirement? Members were also interested in evaluating whether or not admissions exams generated a significant number of false negatives. Members also suggested that a review should be conducted of the experiences of those institutions that have adopted exam-optional admissions policies.

**ACTION:** Members are asked to identify the most important issues related to the use of tests in UC admissions policy and provide a synopsis of these key issues to BOARS Chair Mark Rashid.

## **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Admissions Research and Evaluation**

- Sam Agronow, Coordinator, Admissions Research and Evaluation
- Kyra Caspary, Analyst, Admissions Research and Evaluation

**REPORT:** Director Sam Agronow and Analyst Kyra Caspary presented a draft analysis, “A Comparison of Measures Included in the UC Eligibility Construct with Other Variable Sets in Predicting UC GPA” (enclosure 7). The analysis examined variables from the UC application, beyond those variables currently used to determine eligibility (i.e., grades and test scores), and their contribution to the prediction of students’ first-year UC GPA. Variables analyzed for their impact on prediction of first-year GPA included grade trend, awards, AP exams, and “Percentile Ranks within High School” (ranks, among UC applicants from the same school, for grades, SAT exam scores, and number of ‘a-g’ and honors courses taken). Analyses were also conducted to examine how removal of variables associated with the SAT exams affected prediction.

Director Agronow and Analyst Caspary also presented a draft analysis, “A Comparison of Measures Included in the UC Eligibility Construct with Other Variable Sets in Predicting UC Persistence” (distribution 1). This analysis also examines variables from the UC application and their contribution to the prediction of students’ UC persistence (the student did not leave in academic difficulty after the first year).

**DISCUSSION:** Members noted the disadvantages of relying solely on UC GPA as the outcome variable used to evaluate the predictive power of eligibility requirements. For example, overall grade distributions of certain UC majors tend to be lower than those of other majors. Also, it is not possible for every UC student to receive a 4.0 GPA since classes are graded on a curve; however, it is possible for every UC student to persist and graduate.

Members made suggestions for further developing the analyses, such as controlling for demographic variables, using UC graduation as an outcome variable, and adding a model that shows the predictive value of an applicants’ total exam score. Members also expressed an interest in further examining whether exam scores are a reliable discriminating factor in cases where a student’s grades and exam scores are mismatched (i.e., low GPA and high exam scores). UCOP consultants noted that a study, which examined the performance of UC admits whose

SAT I scores were strong, but whose high school GPAs were relatively weak, had been conducted several years ago and reviewed by BOARS (“Diamond in the Rough” analysis).

**ACTION:** BOARS Analyst Kimberly Peterson will provide the committee with the previously conducted “Diamond in the rough” analysis.

## **VII. Analytic Subcommittee Report**

- David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair

**REPORT:** Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern reported on the subcommittee’s development of some preliminary analytic tasks to inform BOARS’ discussion of eligibility reform, in particular the creation of an “eligible for review” proposal:

- (1) Simulate the pool of students “eligible for review” as defined by various minimum criteria scenarios.
- (2) Simulate which of those students in the different “eligible for review” scenarios would likely apply to UC.
- (3) Simulate which of those students in the different “eligible for review” scenarios would likely be selected by various UC campuses.

**ACTION:** BOARS Members and Student Representatives are invited to send suggestions for additional analyses to David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair, for consideration.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.

Attest: Mark Rashid

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst

### Distributions:

1. UCOP Admissions Research and Evaluation, draft “A Comparison of Measures Included in the UC Eligibility Construct with Other Variable Sets in Predicting UC Persistence,” December 1, 2006

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**
**Attendance 2006-07**

		10/6/06	11/3/06	12/1/06	1/5/07	2/2/07	3/2/07	4/6/07	5/4/07	6/1/07	7/13/07
<b>MEMBERS:</b>											
Mark Rashid, Chair	Davis (Civil & Env. Eng.)	X	X	X							
Trish Stoddart, Vice Chair	Santa Cruz (Education)	X	X	X							
David Stern	Berkeley (Education)	X	X	X							
Jennifer Chacon	Davis (Law)	X	--	X							
John Whiteley	Irvine (Social Ecology) - Sept-Dec	X	Alt	X							
James Given	Irvine (History) Jan-Aug	X	Alt	X							
Sylvia Hurtado	Los Angeles (Education)	X	Alt	X							
Peggy O'Day	Merced (Natural Sciences)	X	X	X							
Peter Sadler	Riverside (Earth Sciences)	X	X	X							
Akos Rona-Tas	San Diego (Sociology)	X	Alt	X							
Daniel Weiss	San Francisco (Psychiatry)	X	X	X							
William Jacob	Santa Barbara (Mathematics)	X	X	X							
David Anthony	Santa Cruz (History)	X	X	X							
<b>ALTERNATES:</b>											
Hugh Roberts	Irvine (English)	--	X	--							
Duncan Lindsey	Los Angeles (Public Policy)	--	X	--							
Hans Paar	San Diego (Physics)	--	T	--							
<b>STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES:</b>											
Arshad Ali	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X	X							
Tina Park	Student Representative (UCLA)	X	X	X							
<b>EX OFFICIO:</b>											
John Oakley	Chair, Academic Senate	X	--	X							
Michael Brown	Vice Chair, Academic Senate	X	--	X							
<b>CONSULTANTS:</b>											
Samuel Agronow	Assoc. Dir., UCOP SAS	X	X	X							
Maria Bertero-Barceló	Exec. Director, Academic Senate	X	--	--							
Joyce Justus	Acting VP, Student Affairs	--	--	--							
Judy Kowarsky	Assoc. Director of Admissions, UCOP	--	--	--							
Nina Robinson	Director of Policy, UCOP SAS	X	X	X							
Roger Studley	Assistant Director, UCOP SAS	X	X	X							
Susan Wilbur	Director of Admissions, UCOP	X	X	--							

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**

**Attendance 2006-07**

		10/6/06	11/3/06	12/1/06	1/5/07	2/2/07	3/2/07	4/6/07	5/4/07	6/1/07	7/13/07
<b>GUESTS:</b>											
Kyra Caspary	Analyst, UCOP SAS	X	X	X							
Tongshan Chang	Principal Analyst, UCOP SAS	--	X	--							
Margaret Heisel	Assist to VP and Exec Dir, UCOP	X	--	--							
Eric Taggart	Director, ASSIST Coordination Site	X	--	X							
<b>STAFF:</b>											
Kimberly Peterson	Senate Analyst	X	X	X							
<b>Key: X = In attendance, -- = Absent, Alt = Alternate attended, T = participated via Teleconference</b>											