

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Meeting Minutes – March 7, 2008

UCOP Room 5320, Oakland, CA

I. Chair's Announcements

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**

BOARS Chair Rashid welcomed members and consultants to the meeting, and offered the following announcements:

BOARS Eligibility Reform Proposal-Related Activities: Chair Rashid attended a legislative briefing in Sacramento on February 14, at the invitation of Senate Education Committee staff members. Chair Rashid reported on the BOARS proposal, and fielded questions from those present. Chair Rashid also reported on an encouraging discussion he had with Paul Kanarek, the owner of the Kaplan franchise in Southern California. Mr. Kanarek is a huge supporter of the BOARS proposal, and has offered his assistance in advocating for its passage.

Academic Council February 27: The Council approved BOARS' revised eligibility reform proposal to be distributed for systemwide Senate review, with responses due back from committees and divisions by May 2. A majority of Council members noted that BOARS' summary memo and the revised proposal were very responsive to the first round of review.

BOARS Subcommittees: The 'c & d' task force met on February 28 to continue its work to bring greater specificity to the "c" and "d" subject-area language in the "a-g" guidelines. BOARS will likely review their work product in June. Also, the Articulation and Evaluation subcommittee met on February 29 to review the area 'g' subject language, as well as issues related to the online coursework provider policy.

BOARS May Meeting: BOARS Chair Rashid is considering whether to reschedule the May 2 BOARS meeting due to some potential scheduling conflicts. This matter will be decided over email following today's meeting.

II. Consent Calendar

- Minutes of the February 8, 2008 BOARS Meeting
- BOARS Resolution on Maintaining the Reality of Stewardship
- BOARS elects not to opine on the following issues under systemwide Senate review:
 - Proposed Transitional Leave Policy for Senior Management Group
 - Proposed Revisions to the Code of Conduct for Health Sciences

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar via unanimous consent.

III. Shared Admissions Review

- **Nina Robinson, Director, Policy & External Affairs**

• **Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions**

ISSUE: BOARS is continuing to explore the UCOP Shared Admissions Review initiative, and has invited Director Nina Robinson to provide an overview of the initiative, and next steps in the process.

PRESENTATION: Director Robinson provided BOARS members with a PowerPoint presentation (also distributed to members), which covered the following topics: a review of the charge from Provost Hume; the goals/impetus for Shared Review; results of recent UCOP analyses; results of the Admissions Processing Task Force meeting of February 21; and next steps. Director Robinson also emphasized the following points:

- The role of faculty at the local level is essential, and she will work to make sure that UCOP and the faculty work together towards the same goals.
- The Berkeley/Los Angeles and San Diego models are not offered as “proposals,” but as “thought experiments.” The assumption right now is that the campuses, under any model that may be adopted, would use scores to sort applications; and not to make final admissions decisions.

DISCUSSION: BOARS members held a lengthy discussion about the shared review initiative, especially concerning its goals/impetus and how the process has evolved. Members focused on the decision-making authority of the campuses, making sure that a uniform score or admissions decisions process would not be mandated by UCOP. Some expressed measured support for the development of a UC machine score, but noted misgivings for what might happen with that score later in the process. Director Robinson reported that much more work needs to be done regarding the components of a possible machine score that would reflect UC systemwide admissions values. The components of the machine score, in this case, would all be passed on to the campuses for their use as they determine. BOARS members noted that public perception here is important, and that such scores must be made understandable and transparent. One member reported that BOARS must closely examine the relationship between a possible machine score or comprehensive score, and the goals of the revised BOARS eligibility reform proposal.

Other members then asked many detailed questions about the machine score analyses. Associate Director Sam Agronow reported that the Admissions Processing Task Force will be further evaluating the machine score, including the addition of other categories such as grade trends, and leadership participation, beyond just income, education and API scores. One BOARS member expressed concerns about the student perception of a systemwide machine score – that students will compare their scores to others’, and wonder why they did not get admitted to UC with a higher score. Also, the production of a systemwide machine score may imply that there is only one good way to admit students in this manner. Another member pointed out that shared review may indeed increase efficiency, which could lead to increased pressure in the future to cut out additional admissions processing steps at the campuses during lean budget years. BOARS members then brainstormed the areas in which BOARS could take a lead role in the development of the shared review initiative, including the determination of which personal characteristics UC admits should have, and how those characteristics should be incorporated into this process. In closing, Chair Rashid stated that the shared review initiative is an extremely important issue to BOARS, and there appears to be little time to make final decisions. BOARS members and their divisional colleagues should remain active and assertive on this issue.

IV. BOARS’ Revised Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility Policy: Follow-Up Issues

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**
- **BOARS Members**

A. Senate Regulations

ISSUE: Implementation of the BOARS proposal, if passed by the Academic Council and Academic Assembly, will require multiple changes to the Senate Regulations. If BOARS decides to propose amendments to the Regulations, the proposed amendments would be sent to the Academic Council and would require full systemwide Senate review as well as eventual passage by the Academic Assembly. Today, BOARS will review what changes to the Regulations would be necessary, and decide next steps in the process.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Rashid noted that this issue is complicated in terms of timing, and the unknown outcome of the Senate review process currently underway for BOARS' revised eligibility reform proposal. Chair Rashid would prefer to make wholesale revisions to the eligibility-related provisions of the Senate regulations in order to align them with current admissions practices. To get started, Chair Rashid will need to discuss these plans with the UC Rules and Jurisdiction Committee chair. BOARS members then reviewed enclosure 4 of the agenda packet, which is a draft document detailing selected provisions of the Senate Regulations pertaining to admissions and eligibility. Members noted the multitude of outdated regulations and inconsistent language that would require revision. Members also suggested reviewing current guidelines and policy, such as the Comprehensive Review Guidelines, internal admissions guidelines, and Regental policy, to make the language consistent.

ACTION: It is the sense of the committee that the Senate Regulations related to eligibility and admissions should be entirely rewritten to reflect current admissions policy and practice. BOARS Chair Rashid will consult with UCR&J, and begin drafting amendments to the Senate Regulations for eventual review by BOARS.

B. General Discussion Regarding BOARS' Revised Eligibility Reform Proposal

ISSUE: BOARS members wished to discuss strategies for presenting the revised BOARS proposal to their divisional committees.

DISCUSSION: Most members noted that it would be very helpful to create a PowerPoint presentation on the revised proposal, as well as a talking points document that could be shared with campus colleagues. BOARS members then discussed the main issues they anticipate will be raised during this round of review, and how to respond.

ACTION: BOARS Chair Rashid will develop slides and/or a talking points document for BOARS members' use in presenting the revised eligibility reform proposal at the campuses.

V. Profiles of UC Eligible Applicants vs. Ineligible Applicants

- **Sam Agronow, Associate Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation**

ISSUE: Chair Rashid requested these analyses in preparation for the drafting of BOARS' revised eligibility reform proposal. Associate Director Agronow will review the analyses with BOARS today, since we did not have time at the February BOARS meeting to hear the presentation.

REPORT: Chair Rashid began by noting that during the first round of review of the BOARS eligibility reform proposal, many constituencies reported their belief that the eligibility construct was aimed at targeting certain populations of students, but there was no evidence that those students were actually interested in attending UC. The analyses that Associate Director Agronow has prepared look at those students who are interested in UC (actual applicants), and students within the applicant group who are also deemed ineligible. BOARS is interested in

knowing why they are ineligible. Associate Director Agronow then reviewed the analyses with BOARS members.

DISCUSSION: Many BOARS members noted that the ineligible applicants would appear to benefit from an outreach program that assists them in realizing how to become UC-eligible. Committee members noted that on average, the ineligible students were not as academically qualified. Those students within the 75th percentile, however, are actually good students yet 89% of them were denied admission. BOARS members expressed their hope that the revised BOARS proposal will at the very least make these students visible to the campuses for admissions purposes. One member requested more information about ineligible students that were admitted to UC in order to gain a better sense about what the campuses saw in their student profiles to offer admission. BOARS members then thanked Associate Director Agronow for his great work in developing the analyses for BOARS' use.

VI. 'G' College Preparatory Elective Course Requirement – Career Technical Education (CTE) Draft Language

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**
- **Bill Jacob, BOARS Articulation & Evaluation (A&E) Subcommittee Chair**
- **Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions**

ISSUE: The Articulation and Evaluation (A&E) Subcommittee has now finalized the draft 'g' language for BOARS' review and approval. This is an urgent matter not only for UC, but especially for CSU since their deadline for submitting standards for accepting Career Technical Education (CTE) courses under Senate Bill 1543 (Alarcon) is July 2008. UC is only "requested" to create these standards, but recognized the importance of leading this effort for both itself and CSU, so that both systems remain aligned with respect to college-preparatory coursework requirements.

REPORT: Director Wilbur reviewed with BOARS members the draft CTE 'g' elective language developed by the A&E Subcommittee. She noted that the number and quality of CTE courses at California high schools are increasing dramatically, so the timing of this new 'g' language is ideal. A&E Subcommittee Chair Jacob also added that the new 'g' language not only adds CTE standards, but also cleans-up the entire 'g' elective area in the 'a-g' guidelines. The language is now more clear and easy to understand for all. Lastly, Director Wilbur applauded BOARS and the A&E Subcommittee for their forward-thinking work and the development of a great proposal.

ACTION: BOARS members unanimously approved the revised 'G' College Preparatory Elective Course Requirement language as submitted by the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee. Undergraduate Admissions Director Wilbur will distribute the new language to appropriate parties within UC and CSU, as well as state officials and legislators.

VII. Earth, Environmental & Space Sciences

- **Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair**
- **BOARS Members**

ISSUE: BOARS Chair Rashid and the entire BOARS committee has recently received a petition from faculty within the Earth, Environmental and Space Sciences (EESS) discipline requesting that BOARS revisit the issue of adding EESS to the area 'd' science requirement.

DISCUSSION: BOARS Chair Rashid reviewed with BOARS members the current arguments offered by the EESS community in favor of this proposal, which are nearly identical to the arguments offered when BOARS reviewed this issue and declined to act in 2004. Chair Rashid cautioned BOARS members that the renewed EESS petition may come up at the campuses, and that they should be prepared to answer questions. Members then discussed the contents of the petition. Most noted that the arguments in the latest petition are not new, and they did not make a strong case for adding a EESS requirement to the area 'd' science requirement. Members were also wary of the timing of the petition's arrival, which was two days before the meeting of the 'c & d' task force. Lastly, Chair Rashid reminded BOARS members about the Senate review process – that this petition would need to be developed into an actual proposal, and be presented to the Academic Council in order for any further action to occur.

ACTION: none.

VIII. BOARS Executive Session

- Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair
- BOARS Members

Note: Minutes, aside from action items, are not prepared for this portion of the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Mark Rashid

Minutes drafted by:
Michelle Ruskofsky
BOARS Analyst

Distributions:

1. PowerPoint Slides re: Shared Admissions Review.
2. Draft Status Report: Admissions Processing Task Force – Development of Common UC-Wide Admissions Processing.
3. Corrected Chart re: Profiles of Fall Term UC Eligible Freshman Applicants vs. Ineligible Applicants with HS GPA ≥ 3.20 – California Residents Only.