

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

I. Consent Calendar

1. February 6, 2009 meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the February minutes with minor changes.

II. Announcements – Chair Sylvia Hurtado and Vice Chair Bill Jacob

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

- Council elected UC Davis Professor Daniel Simmons 2009-2010 Vice Chair.
- President Yudof asked Council Chair Croughan to co-chair a task force, with the UCSB executive vice chancellor, to discuss creative ideas for responding to the budget crisis and preserving the short- and long-term financial health of the University. There is no plan currently to implement either furloughs or pay cuts, but all options are being discussed. Protecting the quality of UC's educational and research missions is the highest priority.
- The new State budget contains an additional \$50 million cut to UC, on top of the \$65 mid-year cut proposed by the governor in January, for a permanent \$115 million reduction in base program funding. The \$50m cut could be returned in April if the state receives enough unrestricted money from the federal economic stimulus package. The state also reversed a previously budgeted \$20m contribution to the UC Retirement Plan.
- Meetings will be held with the California Asian Pacific Islander Legislative Caucus to address its member's concerns about the impact of UC's new admissions policy.

Vice Chair Jacob attended via telephone the February meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which discussed CSU's proposal to increase its area 'c' admission requirement from three to four years in the hopes of increasing math preparation. Vice Chair Jacob noted that large numbers of students take three years in grade 8, 9, and 10 to fulfill the requirement, and do poorly in college. Requiring four years will not necessarily solve the problem, which has more to do with students starting algebra in grade 8 before they are ready, and stopping math after grade 10, leaving a two-year gap between their last year of math and college. Such a requirement may also present an additional stress to under-resourced high schools. UC should work with CSU to find a solution that meets the needs of both systems.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President - Interim Provost Lawrence Pitts, Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur, and Deputy Director of Institutional Research Sam Agronow

Report on Enrollment: Interim Provost Pitts said some campuses were planning to meet their new enrollment targets by under-admitting, and then admitting to their precise target from a larger than normal appeals pool. However, after preliminary admissions data from one campus

showed an adverse impact on diversity, President Yudof decided to ease the strict limits his curtailment plan had established. Admissions directors and campus administrators are meeting to discuss the best approach to the situation. The interim provost said UC still needs to align its enrollment with state funding. He asked BOARS to consider what methodology should be used in the future to arrive at a specific enrollment target for each campus – for example, a rank order list system used by professional schools. He also said UCOP is interviewing candidates for the new vice president for educational partnerships.

Director Wilbur added that the number of high achieving students in the UC applicant pool increased this year, so campus are selecting a fewer number of students out of a stronger pool. This is likely due to the economic downturn. There is also concern about the accuracy of yield prediction models this year. Other public universities have been reporting larger than expected increases in the number of students accepting offers of admission. Admissions outcome data will be available at the April BOARS meeting.

Discussion:

- Although the easiest way to arrive at a precise enrollment number is to focus on traditional measures of excellence, it should be possible for campuses to use Comprehensive Review to arrive at a precise target, but absolute precision is not possible, especially in a recession, and punishing campuses for not meeting a number is inappropriate.
- Campuses should develop a clear rationale for using Admissions by Exception.
- A centrally administered wait list system would add additional workload burden on an already overstressed staff, and may result in multiple wait list offers.
- Provost Pitts asked members' opinion about a match system (as is done in medical school) to more accurately determine enrollments. Most members thought this would involve more risk due to competing external private and public options for UC admits and aid offers. The economic situation is producing uncertainty nationally.

SAT Subject Tests: Director Wilbur invited BOARS to consider how campus policies and procedures for evaluating freshman applicants should be updated to reflect the new policy that removes the SAT Subject test requirement starting with the entering class of 2012. She distributed a chart comparing campus recommendations for specific SAT Subject tests and how each campus uses those tests to help select freshman applying to specific majors. If a campus recommends specific tests, it is usually for math and science majors. Some campuses have recommended them in the past but have not used them.

Discussion:

- No applicant should now be penalized for not taking SAT Subject tests, and campuses should limit recommended tests to two or less, as has been the practice.
- Students admitted to a campus are not always guaranteed entry into a specific major. Students who apply to certain majors recommending a Subject test will be disadvantaged if they do not take the Subject test, making any recommendation a *de facto* requirement.
- Some members said there should be policy guidance clarifying that students admitted to a campus have a right to enter their selected major, if there is space because it is not inappropriate for impacted majors to seek higher qualifications. Others felt that the new Subject test policy should apply only to admission to the campus, not to majors. It was also

noted that departments have other measures available to them for determining ability and students have other paths into a major.

Action: Chair Hurtado will draft a document for review.

Director Wilbur shared the revised ‘c’ and ‘d’ guidelines with the a-g guide Advisory Committee. Representatives on that committee from the California Department of Education expressed concern about the way the guidelines communicate UC’s expectations relative to the CDE standards.

Deputy Director Agronow said the project to make UCLA read scores and application data available to campuses in an easy-to-read form is in the design phase, and an upcoming version of the UC [StatFinder](#) database will allow the public to access data on individual CA high schools and Community Colleges. The new StatFinder will include a comparison tool and searchable data on graduation and retention rates and financial aid.

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 (EESS).

Discussion: BOARS discussed what materials should be sent to campuses for review in addition to the proposal and the BOARS position memo.

- Vice Chair Jacob prepared data on science course enrollments in CA high schools, credential requirements for CA science teachers, and background on college preparatory science standards and CA Standards Tests.
- Chair Hurtado proposed that the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute administer a web-based survey to all UC departments offering introductory courses in science, mathematics, and engineering fields to help get a system-wide picture of faculty expectations for high school student preparation.
- Sam Agronow provided data showing that 96% of UC applicants, admits, and enrollees who took science courses took biology, 93% took chemistry; 60% took physics; and 20% received ‘d’ credit for EESS.
- The December 2008 BOARS memo articulates the Committee’s position well. A ‘pro-con’ document may help facilitate discussion, but may be counterproductive to BOARS’ position. A BOARS cover memo should accompany the materials clearly explaining the sequence of the data and why each document is relevant to the review.

It was unclear to the committee what the question posed in the campus Senate review will be – an up or down vote on the specific language proposed by Davis, the BOARS position against changing the ‘d’ requirement, or request to opine. The Academic Assembly is the final policy arbiter, but should defer to BOARS to determine the language for clarity and to ensure the overall goals of A-G are met. Chair Hurtado will seek clarity on these points.

Action: BOARS agreed to send the survey with a background to Council for approval.

V. Admissions Reform – Senate Regulations

Issue: The Senate regulations guiding undergraduate admissions must be revised to conform to the new admissions policies approved by the Regents that will take effect for students entering in fall 2012. The campus admissions directors, Director Wilbur, and Chair Hurtado reviewed and edited a set of preliminary revisions drafted last year by former BOARS Chair Rashid. The proposed revisions include several mandatory changes required to align Senate policy with the new admissions policy. Other amendments to existing admissions regulations are intended to improve their clarity and/or alignment with current policy and practice.

Discussion: The Committee reviewed each amendment and regulation. Topics of discussion included:

- The type of international applicant who should have to take an additional test of English proficiency. It was decided that all international applicants for admission should require an approved examination to determine English language proficiency unless they come with satisfactory credentials from an institution in which the language of instruction is English.
- A recommendation from Chair Croughan that the regulations maintain the “ELC 11” – the currently prescribed pattern of 11 courses required for ELC status – as well as not prescribing a specific pattern for the 11 courses required for Entitled to Review status 11 by the end of 11th grade, to preserve flexibility.

Action: The final changes will be incorporated and forwarded to Academic Council for review.

VI. Report to the Regents about the New SAT

Issue: BOARS reviewed Deputy Director Agronow’s data comparing the predictive validity of the SAT and ACT, and a draft letter to ACT, Inc. with questions about the ACT’s objectives, reliability, predictive validity, alignment with college-preparatory curricula, and diagnostic value. The information will help the BOARS Testing Subcommittee write its report to the Regents about the alignment of the SAT with BOARS’ Testing Principles.

Discussion: The Agronow data shows that weighted-capped high school GPA is the best predictor of UC GPA for all groups. For some groups, the SAT Reasoning adds more to predictive validity compared to the ACT. For students who took both the ACT and the SAT Reasoning, the SAT adds more predictive validity. More female, underrepresented, and first generation students take both the SAT and ACT. It was noted that the ACT is considered to be a more achievement-oriented and curriculum-based test, while the SAT is more of an aptitude test that assesses critical thinking skills.

Action: The letter will be sent to the ACT.

VII. Summary of Comprehensive Review Guidelines and Policies

Issue: BOARS reviewed a collection of campus Comprehensive Review guidelines and philosophies. Director Wilbur said all campuses are already reviewing every application they receive regardless of eligibility status, but with the passage of admissions reform, all will become more selective and will need to expand the use of CR. 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.

VIII. Non-Resident Enrollment

Issue: In response to UC Berkeley's plan to enroll 13% of new freshmen and transfers from the international pool next year (compared to 6% three years ago), to help generate new revenues, the UCB Admissions Committee prepared a policy statement regarding non-resident enrollment. The statement raises concerns about the effect of increased non-resident enrollment on California resident access to UC and the effect of over-enrollment on academic quality. BOARS considered the possibility of developing and disseminating a systemwide statement of principles.

Action: Draft a BOARS memo.

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