

**University of California Academic Senate**  
**Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**  
**Minutes of Teleconference Meeting**  
**March 5, 2010**

**I. Announcements**

- o *Sylvia Hurtado, BOARS chair*

Board of Regents chair Russell Gould came to the February Academic Council meeting to discuss the progress of the UC Commission on the Future. Regent Gould noted that the Commission's first and second phase recommendations (released in March and June, respectively) would go before the Regents in July, but he agreed to "sunshine" ideas as they emerge to help ensure adequate Senate consultation time. Chair Hurtado will share recommendations from each of the Commission's working group with BOARS as they are released. Senate committees may need to continue working through August.

Senate Chair Powell noted that a second timeline has been established for the final development, dissemination, and review of recommendations from the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force about the future of UC health and pension benefits.

In early February, Chair Hurtado met with the Los Angeles African-American Alliance, which includes representatives from the NAACP and Urban League, UCLA Black alumni, and other community leaders, to discuss eligibility reform, the recent simulations projecting applicants and admits under ETR, and the admission record of African-American students. It was a positive meeting. The Alliance agreed to help develop a communication plan about the policy change targeted to their communities. In addition, Mark Rashid, Chair Powell, and Associate Vice President for State Governmental Relations Steve Juarez met with California Assemblyman Eng, who has been a vocal critic of ETR. Assemblyman Eng asked UC to respond in writing to several questions.

BOARS member George Johnson attended a meeting at UC Berkeley featuring Asian American speakers criticizing ETR, and attempting to build support against implementation of the new policy. The group's strategy is to focus on the guarantee and is beginning to conflate the issue with privatization fears and a recent spate of racial incidents at UCSD.

UC Director of Institutional Research Dettman was open to BOARS' suggestion of an expert panel to conduct a study of retention and academic performance outcomes and that UCOP institute a standing report of retention rates and predictors. It was suggested that UCEP and undergraduate deans be involved in discussing such a report for their use. Chair Hurtado reported she had already spoken briefly with UCEP Chair Williams.

Vice Chair Jacob attended the February Academic Assembly teleconference. The President expressed dismay at the recent racial incidents at UCSD and pledged to explore ways to improve climate and diversity. Chair Hurtado noted that some UCOP administrators are interested in encouraging campuses to move toward holistic review as a way to show UC's commitment to diversity. Director Wilbur added that UCSD has agreed to explore a broad variety of admissions models, including holistic review, but has been clear that such decisions are a faculty prerogative.

She said campuses are individually reviewing and adapting processes that result in more positive outcomes and that meet local needs.

**Discussion:** BOARS' communication strategy for ETR should focus on its strengths and benefits, frequently asked questions, and common misconceptions. BOARS members would benefit from talking points. It was noted that the [UCOP website](#) has an FAQ section.

UCLA has made advances in academic excellence and diversity using holistic review, but so have other campuses using other forms of comprehensive review. It may be premature to insist on greater use of holistic review without understanding how it will increase minority enrollment, while ignoring the need for academically developmental outreach in the African-American community.

Outreach to specific communities (and outreach funding) is essential if UC wants to increase diversity in the applicant pool and improve yields of diverse and talented students. Outreach is the best bang for the buck. In addition, more resources should be directed to admissions from the \$60 application fee for outreach and reader training.

Racial climate and representation are interlinked, although broader climate issues of institutional commitment to diversity need to be addressed, too.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

1. Approval of the February 5, 2010 BOARS Minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the February minutes.

## **III. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

- o *BOARS Vice Chair Bill Jacob*

Vice Chair Jacob described three key issues the A&E subcommittee wants to address in the coming months.

1. BOARS members with particular disciplinary expertise can help Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux and admissions staff review a cross section of new online provider applications for 'a-g' course offerings at the high school level.

**Action:** Brenda Stevenson, A. Katie Harris, and Susan Amussen volunteered to help.

2. An MOU between the California Community Colleges and Kaplan University specifies that CCC students will be allowed to earn credit for online courses taken through Kaplan and that UC and CSU will accept them for transfer credit. It was noted that after UC approves a CCC course for transfer, the delivery method could change without UC's knowledge. BOARS should consider requiring CCC to disclose all on-line courses that could be taken by a UC applicant, and all online providers to adhere to the same criteria. BOARS' discussion of online courses should encompass both transfer and freshman admissions

**Action:** BOARS will review Director Wilbur's briefing papers on online education.

3. BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE should discuss whether UC should accept some form of CSU's General Education Breadth pattern for transfer, in addition to or in place of, the IGETC pattern. Director Wilbur said UC and CSU articulation officers are working on a document that displays the similarities and differences between IGETC and CSU GE. A preliminary version of the document may be available to BOARS by April.

#### **IV. Consultation with UCOP**

*Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions:*

**2010-11 Admissions:** Campuses are wrapping up freshman admissions offers, and preliminary outcomes will be available by April. UC is anticipating media interest in the new wait list system, as well as admission outcomes from UC San Diego and for non-residents.

**Communications Plan for ETR:** The Office of Admissions is developing a school- and student-centered communications plan for the admissions reform policy. The plan includes three ETR websites. One focused on policy-related issues; another speaking to prospective students and their parents; and a third targeted to high school counselors and administrators that will include the new admissions index and a statewide "guarantee" calculator. UC also is developing a series of Webinars to educate UC admissions staff about the new policy and an outreach strategy for groups that are interested in presentations on the policy and may benefit from additional help.

President Yudof will send a letter to high schools this spring, and may speak at a few high schools to publicize the expansion of ELC and the importance of academic preparation.

*Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux:*

Articulation staff met with Professor David Stern and a representative from the Department of Education about a pending Partnership Academy program status application that will soon be forwarded to the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee. UC's Career Technical Education curriculum integration institute will take place at UCLA in May. UC will change language in the 'a-g' guide website and other publications as soon as possible to ensure the language is neutral with regard to accrediting agencies, and staff have constructed a letter in the event questions arise. Finally, UCSD asked that 'a-g' guide language mention engineering courses as an option in the 'd' subject category.

**Discussion:** BOARS should add a recommendation to the comprehensive review report about funding for outreach and communication. BOARS would like to participate in the Webinars on admissions to get better informed and to give feedback.

#### **V. UCPB Position Paper on Differential Fees and Non-Resident Tuition**

UCPB's position paper connects some of the issues being discussed in the Senate and by the UC Commission on the Future working groups—differential fees by major and campus, non-resident enrollment, and non-resident tuition (NRT). UCPB supports efforts to reduce unfunded enrollment to zero and increase non-resident enrollment as capacity permits. UCPB is concerned that differential fees could undermine the notion of UC as "one university" and argues that NRT is a differential that has this effect, because individual campuses have unequal capacities to recruit and generate revenue from non-residents. The paper also suggests that NRT revenues should be pooled centrally and redistributed in support of systemwide priorities. BOARS has already weighed in on non-resident enrollment and differential fees by major.

**Discussion:** It was noted that differential campus fees could encourage the public to make judgments about the quality of individual UC campuses, which would lock in tiering and hurt the younger and developing campuses, making it more difficult for them to recruit excellent faculty and students and rise in status and excellence as UCI and UCSD, for example, have been allowed to do.

It was noted that in its July 2009 *Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment*, BOARS assumes that the number of non-resident undergraduates will increase. BOARS supports enrolling non-residents insofar as UC can maintain its Master Plan commitment to residents, in the context of appropriate enrollment funding from the state. It might be time for BOARS to consider supporting a specific cap for non-resident enrollment. COP's new policy creates an incentive for campuses to increase non-resident enrollment by giving them specific NRT targets and allowing them to keep NRT revenues. Some campuses are talking about doubling or tripling the number of non-residents they admit, but campuses vary in their capacity to attract non-residents.

Until there are no unfunded students in the system, BOARS should support in principle some limited amount of pooling or a surcharge on a portion of NRT revenues, which should support the system as a whole to help prevent the widening of campus differentials or be directed to other campuses to help increase non-resident enrollment to support their resident students and benefit instruction. BOARS should reiterate Point 7 in the July 2009 memo:

“Undergraduate NRT revenues should continue to fund undergraduate programs and students in ways that enhance, or at least maintain the availability and quality of courses and academic programs, student services, and financial aid for resident undergraduates. Campuses have flexibility in the use of NRT funds for other aspects of their budget, but we encourage its traditional use for academic areas as when it remained part of the general fund allocation.”

**Action:** Committee analyst LaBriola will draft a memo for review at the April meeting.

## **VI. Comprehensive Review Report**

**Discussion:** The report should highlight the successes and achievements of comprehensive review, but not shy away from identifying its shortcomings, criticizing some aspects of what campuses are doing, and articulating where campuses are relative to the progress they want to make.

BOARS should articulate a principle that “no student will be denied admission without a comprehensive review” (this is already true) and consider extending it to “no student will be admitted without a comprehensive review,” which is more difficult as not all campuses are doing this and lack the resources to do so.

Campuses are charged with achieving the most talented and diverse student body as possible on the basis of academic and personal accomplishments. These factors are not mutually exclusive, so the report should evaluate academic and diversity indicators independently and in tandem to illustrate the notion of “inclusive excellence.” For example, UC Davis improved academic indicators at the same time that it increased representation from lower-ranked API schools.

Systemwide, there have been increases in URM representation in both the applicant and admitted pools, but the rates match do not necessarily match. There is a gap and the gaps differ among campuses. One of BOARS' articulated goals should be to keep this gap as narrow as possible and as consistent as possible across campuses (perhaps less than 5%).

One of UC's goals is to be broadly representative of the California high school graduating class, so the report should compare all applicant and admission trends, including those for ELC applicants, in the context of the California high school graduate pool. The Office of Civil Rights says there is disparate impact on a minority group if members of that group are selected at less than 80% rate compared to another group. It was noted that there is a new [CPEC report](#) projecting higher education demand until 2019. BOARS

Director Wilbur noted that UC provides campuses with a large amount of information about school context. To the extent that it can, BOARS should encourage campuses to use school context variables in a more nuanced and strategic way—looking at not only API ranking, but also number of available honors courses and percentile ranking. Additional measures of school context are now available for campuses to use in reviewing student files.

The report should address the extent to which campuses use human reads and why some campuses have limited human reads in the overall evaluation. A lack of resources is an issue at many campuses, and at Merced, human reads are used only to deny admission.

The report should make the case for better resourcing. BOARS should recommend increased funding for admissions processes as well as outreach and communication, noting specifically that more of the application fee should be returned to the campus for these purposes.

Increasing the similarity of campus processes would make comprehensive review easier for the public to understand, but campuses value their autonomy and a campus's individual educational goals help determine the amount of weight it applies to each comprehensive review factor. The goal of transparency is important, and the report should make the case that there are multiple ways to make comprehensive review processes more transparent. At a minimum, campuses should communicate their educational values and general criteria to the public. The stated goal should be to increase common areas of assessment while allowing campuses to maintain and develop individual ones.

**Action:** Tongshan Chang will create a graph showing California high school graduate trends. Chair Hurtado will circulate a new draft for review over email.

-----  
The meeting adjourned at 12:15 pm  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Sylvia Hurtado