

University of California Academic Senate
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Minutes of Meeting – February 6, 2009

I. Chair's Announcements – Sylvia Hurtado

Report: Chair Hurtado summarized recent Academic Senate news, including highlights from the January Academic Council meeting.

On February 4, Chair Hurtado, Mark Rashid, Michael Brown, and Mary Croughan formally presented the Senate's Admissions Reform Proposal to the Regents' Educational Policy Committee. The full Board of Regents voted to endorse the proposal on February 5. This Senate team also met earlier in January with the Assembly Higher Education Committee and three caucuses to discuss the proposal's diversity impacts. Chair Hurtado said one of the positive side effects of the process has been an improved working relationship among the Senate, President, and Regents, and a new respect for the work of BOARS. She thanked BOARS members for their efforts and acknowledged the efforts of Sam Agronow, Nina Robinson, and others in the Department of Student Affairs. Senate Chair Croughan added that the passage of the proposal is testimony to analytical and policy expertise of the Senate and UCOP and the collaborative strength of shared governance.

At the January Council meeting:

- Council [endorsed the President's Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan](#), and Regent Eddie Island challenged the Senate to consider additional steps the University might take to increase access, affordability, and diversity.
- Council approved the UC Davis School of Nursing proposal contingent on clarification of the School's financial sustainability plan, and endorsed a statement from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare supporting the resumption of employee and employer contributions to UCRP in April 2010, but also urging the President to resolve any negative effects of the re-start by raising faculty and staff salaries in 2010.
- Council decided to release for systemwide Senate review the question of expanding UC's Laboratory Science ('d') admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space science. Council felt a systemwide review would help resolve the issue.

II. Consent Calendar

1. January 9, 2009 meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur, Deputy Director of Institutional Research Sam Agronow, and High School Articulation Coordinator Don Daves-Rougeaux

Report: UC admissions policy has been featured frequently in the media as a result of the admissions reform proposal and the President's plan to curtail freshman enrollment, which asks campuses to reduce freshman enrollment by 2300 students systemwide and increase transfer

enrollments by 500. There have also been questions about a possible expansion of non-resident domestic and international student enrollment. Admissions directors are concerned about enrollment management next year because of the curtailment targets and uncertainty about how applicants will behave in a down economy.

The President recently announced a new initiative to strengthen transfer paths between the CCCs and UC/CSU, and increase the number of transfers admitted to UC. A high-level, inter-segmental committee, led by UCB law dean Christopher Edley and administrators from CSU and CCC, will oversee the effort. UC faculty who have been involved in transfer issues or who have an interest in that area may have the opportunity to participate on the Task Force.

Director Wilbur recently served as a moderator at a college readiness conference sponsored by the College Board, which will soon release its triennial report on the benefits of higher education. The College Board's new Score Choice reporting policy takes effect with the 2009 SAT; students will now be able to hold back release of their scores until they have completed their entire testing pattern, although UC is emphasizing that it will continue to consider only a student's best score.

UCLA, UCI, and UCSD are actively discussing shared review, which may have to be implemented in the same year as admissions reform.

Don Daves-Rougeaux, UC's new High School Articulation Coordinator, noted that two full time staff, four part-time retirees, and a handful of students processed over 21,000 high school course approvals this year. Although only one third of these courses were new, many existing courses include revisions, and staff must verify certain aspects of previously approved courses. Mr. Daves-Rougeaux said high school articulation has an important access and equity function, and he sees himself as a messenger and advocate for the University in the community – providing technical assistance to teachers and districts; presenting workshops and seminars on the articulation process; working to demystify the process; and communicating a message that UC wants to help, not erect barriers, particularly with respect to CTE courses. One of the biggest challenges facing the Articulation unit is the need to expand the capacity and expertise of its staff. He is also working on new ways to help charter and independent schools develop and adopt courses and to understand UC's course expectations. There may be a need to improve auditing mechanism to verify the quality of "adopted" courses.

Action: BOARS members will forward Chair Hurtado names of potential candidates to serve on the transfer task force.

IV. Next Steps for the Systemwide Review of EESS and the 'd' Requirement

Issue: Council will release for systemwide Senate review the question of expanding UC's Laboratory Science ('d') admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences. Chair Hurtado asked BOARS to consider next steps, including what information should be part of the review materials sent to campuses to help them make informed decisions.

Discussion: The Committee decided that it should develop a document outlining the pros and cons of the proposal. Discussion continued about the kind of evidence that should be included in

the EESS systemwide review. Several recommended steps include: BOARS should gather data on: 1) basic science courses that are prerequisites for Science and Engineering majors on all campuses (Extend the previous Davis study); 2) the fraction of biology, chemistry, and physics courses that are approved for 'd' compared to the fraction of EESS courses; 3) The number of EESS courses approved for 'g'; and 4) The number submitted as either a 'd' or 'g'. It was noted that UC Schools of Education or the State Department of Education should have information about credentialing requirements for teachers of EESS courses. A discussion ensued about the pros and cons of the proposal and the difficulty related to equity issues associated with stressed high school funding and curriculum reform that make it difficult to require a third year of science.

An alternative to changing the language in "d" is moving up and strengthening the EESS language EESS in the 'a-g' requirements could help meet the spirit of the proposal. We could also institute a trial period for EESS certification to determine how many courses really qualify and if it is necessary to change the "d" requirement..

Action: Bill Jacob, Juan Poblete, and Joe Watson will form a subcommittee to discuss the pro/con document and next steps.

Action: Don Daves-Rougeaux will gather data on EESS courses submitted for 'd' and 'g'.

V. Discussion of Draft Paper Comparing Predictive Validity of the CA Standards Tests and the SAT Reasoning - Samuel Agronow, Deputy Director, Institutional Research

Report: The paper, drafted by Deputy Director Agronow and educational researcher Catherine Horn, is intended to explore possible alternatives to the SAT test that might better predict college performance and success. It compares the California Standards Tests (CST) and the SAT in their predictive validity of the GPA of California public high school graduates after one year at UC.

In short, the paper demonstrates that for UC students the CST exams are similar (and sometimes more accurate) predictors of first-year college performance compared to the SAT. The CST also appears to be slightly less influenced by the socioeconomic status of the test takers than the SAT. Agronow and Horn also determined that an added writing component might improve the CSTs ability to predict UC GPA, as the SAT Writing exam currently does.

Deputy Director Agronow also noted that the SAT is a more general exam, while the CST tests a deeper body of knowledge across a broader variety of exams. California students receive individual scores from the CST, but they only count toward State accountability measures for the school. (The New York State University Regents administer a similar test that can, at the teacher's discretion, count as part of a student's the final grade.) Agronow and Horn analyzed data for the fall 2006 entering class, the first year with outcome data from the new SAT.

BOARS also reviewed examples of "inclusiveness indicators," which attempt to illustrate the gradual drop-off in UC eligible students at different stages of the K-12 to UC enrollment pipeline. For URM students in particular, the largest barrier between high school graduation and UC enrollment comes at the stage of completing all a-g and other eligibility requirements. BOARS' 2006 [Inclusiveness Indicators Report](#) is also available on the Senate website.

Discussion: The results are useful because they show there may be viable alternatives available to the University that can help it assess students more effectively and fairly. Some members felt that the CST, as an achievement test, is preferable to the SAT and other aptitude tests, because it is more closely aligned with the California high school curriculum, and students should be tested on what they have learned. Raising the stakes on a CST test that is being given anyway, for free, would also enhance access and fairness. Some students do not take the CST test as seriously as they do the SAT; and its correlation with the SAT might be even higher if it had more significance. At the same time, the CST is a high stakes test used to rate schools, calculate API, and assess teacher performance. As such, it drives curricula and instruction, sometimes to an extreme degree. That correlation would grow even more extreme if the CST were used in admissions. There was also a suggestion that CST scores be included on student transcripts as additional information for admissions departments. Finally, one member noted that UC should make increasing transfers a priority, but should also avoid making transfer the “ethnic path” to the University.

VI. C and D Task Force Recommendations – BOARS Vice Chair Bill Jacob

Issue/Report: BOARS reviewed revisions from the C and D Task Force to the mathematics (c) description in the [Guide to “a-g” Requirements](#). BOARS approved proposed revisions to area (d) in January. The revision incorporates suggestions made at the January meeting to leave in its present condition language requiring three units but strongly recommending four units of college preparatory mathematics. An ICAS task force working on a Statement of Competencies in Mathematics will not revise their work significantly based on the outcome.

Discussion: There was a suggestion to modify the 2nd paragraph to read “...for classes and disciplines with specific mathematical...”

Action: BOARS approved the (c) language.

VII. Report to The Regents About the New SAT

Issue: The College Board responded to BOARS’ follow-up request for information about the SAT Reasoning Test. BOARS and its Testing Subcommittee will use the information, along with additional predictive validity analyses, to help determine how well the SAT aligns with BOARS’ Testing Principles, for a report to The Regents.

Discussion:

- The College Board’s responses do not always show clearly that the SAT I aligns with BOARS’ Testing Principles. Questions remain about the test’s diagnostic function and how well it works for different groups.
- Despite UC’s emphasis on Comprehensive Review, the SAT, in practice, tends to become an overemphasized indicator of merit. Not requiring the test will lessen its high stakes, political nature.
- Shifting weight from the SAT to the GPA could put more pressure on high school teachers and lead to more grade inflation.

- Given the range and comprehensibility of the Testing Principles, it is unlikely that a single test could ever meet them. Why not allow students to submit a range of achievement indicators for consideration?
- How much “predictability” data should we incorporate into decision making? Predictability is important because campuses have an interest in not admitting students with a low chance of continuing into the second year. On the other hand, low predictability is a good outcome because it leaves open the possibility that students control their future. A student with high scores can still fail and a student with low scores can become an honors student. The test is to some extent “coachable.”
- BOARS should interpret its charge broadly; the report to the Regents is an opportunity to suggest policy alternatives. BOARS’ goal should be to provide the most honest, complete information possible to admissions committees for their comprehensive reviews.
- BOARS should gather data on the ACT with Writing. 30% of the 2008 entering class took both the SAT and ACT; 3% took only the ACT.

Action: The Testing Subcommittee will summarize what is known about the SAT and develop questions for ACT, Inc. - e.g., how do you give students feedback?; how race/class blind is the test?

Action: Sam Agronow will run predictability data on students who took both the ACT and SAT.

VIII. Enrollment Management Council

Issue: The President’s newly formed Enrollment Management Council brings together individuals from the Office of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate to evaluate and advise the president about short and long term enrollment options and their impact on the University. Chair Hurtado is a member of the Council. She invited BOARS to discuss enrollment principles, including those related to non-residents.

Discussion: Berkeley received permission to enroll 13% of new freshmen and transfers from the international pool next year (compared to 6% three years ago). The enrollment curtailment plan and Berkeley’s action impact access and more closely tie educational and economic issues, but there are other infrastructure and educational quality concerns with overcrowding.

Possible Principles:

1. Resident enrollments should be tied to state funding;
2. UC is an international university and needs an international student body, but international enrollment should not be used as a money maker to the detriment of resident access and the loss of UC’s character as a California university;
3. A significant portion of the non-resident fee should go specifically to help make UC more affordable to California residents;
4. Transfer targets should be for California residents only;
5. Non-resident domestic and international students should be expected to be more qualified than resident Californian students;
6. International students should not be used to obscure a lack of diversity in the enrolled population of California residents

Action: Draft comments for review

IX. Admissions Reform – Implementation and Next Steps

Issue: BOARS discussed next steps for implementation of Entitled to Review (ETR).

Comprehensive Review Policies:

Some campuses already have elaborate Comprehensive Review policies and procedures in place, while others require more development.. With the passage of the Admissions Reform policy, all campuses will become more selective and will need to expand the use of CR as part of their admission selection processes. Chair Hurtado asked members to review and assess their local CR policies, and if necessary, develop new or revised principles and guidelines in preparation for this new era in admissions, including guidelines for addressing achievement in the context of opportunity.

Look at the admissions and eligibility study workgroup report online. A [report](#) on comprehensive review and freshman admissions from the Ralph Bunche Center at UCLA

Director Wilbur noted that the admissions directors are hesitant to use the term “entitled to review,” because every applicant who pays an application fee currently is entitled to a review of some degree. They seek clarity and guidance about a number of issues, including what will be newly required under ETR and what ETR means in the context of Admissions by Exception (A by E). A by E will continue in its present form.

Action: Director Wilbur will contact admissions directors and pull together local CR guidelines and philosophies for BOARS’ review at the March meeting.

Communications Strategy:

The Regents want UC to develop clear communications vehicles about the new policy. UC must also communicate a clear message to counselors that nothing changes in terms of student preparation, and that current high school students who are not impacted by the new policy must continue to take the required Subject tests. Questions submitted to the UCOP website will be helpful in identifying first order concerns.

Other Pragmatic Issues:

BOARS needs to discuss guidelines for those campuses that may wish to recommend specific subject tests. Some campuses will need to decide how they want to approach admission of ELC students. Senate regulations will need to be modified to conform to the policy.

Action: BOARS will review draft revisions to Senate regulations in March.

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