

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA** **ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**April 3, 2009**

**I. Consent Calendar**

1. March 6, 2009 meeting minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the March minutes with minor changes.

**II. Announcements**

*Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

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

- Council endorsed a letter in support of California [Assembly Constitutional Amendment 7](#), proposed legislation that would exempt public education from the provisions in Proposition 209 that forbid the consideration of race, sex, or ethnicity in admissions and outreach. Council also approved a letter opposing State Bill 386, which would require CSU and CCC faculty (and encourage UC faculty) who adopt a new edition of a textbook within three years of a previous edition to justify the adoption by performing a cost-benefit analysis.
- Council approved a request from UCAAD to add “gender identity” to the first paragraph of the [UC Diversity Statement](#) to align the statement with state and University non-discrimination policies.
- UC is currently not planning to implement either furloughs or pay cuts, but the President has requested information about his options to ensure that he has a consultative policy review process in place if a decision is made to pursue them.
- Council released for systemwide Senate review [BOARS’ proposed amendments](#) to the Senate regulations governing freshman admissions. Council’s goal is to complete the review in time for final action at the June Academic Assembly meeting.
- Council approved BOARS’ proposed survey of UC departments offering introductory courses in science, mathematics, and engineering about their expectations for freshman preparation. UCLA’s Higher Education Research Institute will administer the survey.
- The President’s Enrollment Management Council had a first meeting to discuss short and long term enrollment options, including the need to balance the University’s goals and values around enrollment, diversity, and excellence with the reality of the current budget environment.
- Senate and University leaders met with the California Asian Pacific Islander Legislative Caucus to address its member’s concerns about the impact of UC’s new admissions policy on Asian-American access to the University. The hearing highlighted the need for UC to be responsive to different communities and to convey clear messages about its admissions and Comprehensive Review policy.

**Comments:** It was noted that the Enrollment Management Council should discuss the processes for enrollment planning and the key players involved on each campus. There was another

comment that Asians have fared well in UC admissions during the ten years that Comprehensive Review has been in place.

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

*Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur*

*Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow*

**Report from Susan Wilbur:** Director Wilbur reported preliminary admissions outcomes for 2009-10. Some campuses reduced the number of admissions offers due to budget constraints and all are implementing various strategies to meet their new enrollment reduction targets. Systemwide, UC was able to offer a place to all 58,600 eligible CA resident freshmen applicants –about 1,500 fewer compared to the year before, although there are 10,000 students in the referral pool compared to 8,600 a year ago. There were sizable decreases in offers at Davis, Irvine, and Santa Cruz, smaller declines at other campuses, and increases at Berkeley, Merced, and Riverside. Campuses are also concerned about the possibility of a larger than expected yield due to the national economic situation. The SIR deadline is May 1.

The application pool was unusually competitive this year, and many students who did not receive admissions offers had very strong academic credentials. Average GPA rose systemwide and on most individual campuses.

Despite mandates to reduce the number of admissions offers, all campuses were able to maintain their commitment to underrepresented, low-income, and first generation students, and students from low API schools. In fact, the proportion of admissions offers to underrepresented students has increased over the last three years. UC wants to expand transfer opportunities for Community College students and plans to increase their enrollment on all campuses. In addition, the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan will help make UC more affordable to students with family incomes below 60K, and families making between 60K and 100K will have a portion of the expected 9.3% fee increase offset as a result of the policy.

#### **Discussion:**

- There is a contradiction between, on the one hand, UC's message to students that they should be balanced in their academic preparation and should apply even if they do not have the very highest GPA, and on the other hand, the reality that campuses value GPA more highly than anything else.

**Report from Sam Agronow:** Deputy Director Agronow described new rules from the U.S. Department of Education for collecting racial and ethnic data and reporting them to the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). The rules take effect next year. They include a new multiracial category and a requirement that the first question on any survey be whether the respondent is Hispanic/Latino. The change may result in more Hispanics self-reporting as Hispanic and fewer individuals self-reporting as African-American.

Deputy Director Agronow discussed data projecting the proportion of ethnic groups in the ETR pool compared to the current eligibility pool. Asians are more likely than any other ethnic group to be UC eligible. Proportionally, there are many more non-Asians in the pool of students who are currently CSU eligible but not UC eligible, which is where many of the not previously UC

eligible students projected to be captured in the new ETR pool will come from. The bottom line is that because such a large percentage of Asian students are currently UC eligible, when the pool expands to include ETR, their gains in opportunity for review, when measured only as a percentage increase within their category, will not be as high as percentage increases in other categories where a much smaller percentage is currently eligible. However, to measure change in this way is misleading, because in terms of numbers of students, the gains in opportunity for review in actual numbers of Asian students is substantial; in fact, Asians will be represented in the ETR pool at nearly twice the rate of their proportion of the state population, something that is not anywhere near replicated by any other group.

#### **IV. Determining a Prescribed Course Pattern for ETR Status: the “ELC 11” vs. “Any 11”**

**Issue:** The new admissions policy requires students to complete a “prescribed” set of 11 a-g courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade to gain Entitled to Review status. BOARS discussed whether to define this as a specific pattern of courses that currently guarantees admission to the top 4% in the Eligibility in a Local Context program – “the ELC 11” – or to allow students to complete any 11 a-g courses. The Regents’ policy sets no specific curricular pattern for the expanded 9% ELC guarantee or the statewide 9% guarantee, making “Any 11” the default for those guarantee groups and ETR. BOARS must consider whether to extend the current 11<sup>th</sup> grade pattern from the top 4% to the top 9% in the new policy and also whether to extend it to the whole ETR pool. UC needs to include these final details in communication vehicles to high schools. Chair Hurtado noted that all of BOARS’ past simulations were based on an assumption that students would gain ETR status upon completion of the ELC 11 pattern by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade. The “ELC 11” pattern is:

- (a) History (1 course)
- (b) English (3 courses)
- (c) Math (2 courses)
- (d) Laboratory Science (1 course)
- (e) Foreign Language (1 course)
- (f) Visual/Performing Arts (3 courses)
- (g) Elective

**Discussion:** Director Wilbur added that the ELC 11 requirement of three English courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade could burden and disadvantage some otherwise strong students who must wait to complete two English courses in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade. Moreover, it may be unwise to introduce a new pattern to the general population at a time when high schools are laying off teachers and students are experiencing more difficulty accessing a-g curriculum.

Deputy Director Agronow reviewed new simulations comparing the projected ETR pool with the “any 11” and “ELC 11” scenarios. He noted that if the policy allows for an “any 11” course pattern, about 10% more students, including a higher proportion of underrepresented students, would be brought into the ETR pool, and about 2/3 of those students will have taken at least two English courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade. He projected that the “any 11” scenario would result in 8,664 more ETR students and between 2,300 and 5,000 more students in the applicant pool systemwide. UCLA would be most affected, with an additional 1,100 applications (low) to

2,300 applications (high). If an “any 11” pattern is used just for ETR and the ELC 11 pattern is used for the local 9% guarantee, a slightly higher percentage of students would receive a guarantee, presumably due to the statewide pathway.

It was noted that the new students brought into the ETR pool are unlikely to be admitted based on their projected credentials, but that the Any 11 option would be more cost effective and involve less transcript verification.

**Motion #1:** It was moved and seconded that the “ELC 11<sup>th</sup> grade pattern” be abolished and an Any 11 pattern be established for the attainment of both ETR status and the local 9% guarantee in the new admissions policy, although UC should continue to recommend that schools provide access to and students complete the pattern by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Discussion:** Some members supported the motion and a more flexible policy, noting that the 11<sup>th</sup> grade pattern is inconsistent with the spirit of admissions reform goal of reaching out to more students, and that UC should be removing roadblocks instead of erecting new ones. Other members thought it would be better to maintain the pattern at least for the expanded local 9% local guarantee, because for many students, the pattern is a recognizable standard and goal. Current ELC students receive a letter informing them of their status, which motivates them to attend UC. Moreover, it was noted that in the end, those students will still be ETR, and all students will still need to complete the full 15 course a-g pattern.

**Action:** The motion failed in a 5-5 vote.

**Motion #2:** It was moved and seconded that for consideration of the local ELC guarantee, the 11<sup>th</sup> grade pattern be modified to reduce the English requirement to two courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Action:** The motion carried in a 9-1 vote.

**Motion #3:** It was moved and seconded that students be required to complete any 11 a-g courses by the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade for Entitled to Review status.

**Action:** The motion carried unanimously.

## **V. Career Technical Education and ‘a-g’**

**Issue:** Director Wilbur reported that UC and CSU are under increasing pressure to help advance Career Technical Education (CTE) education in California high schools by accepting more CTE courses to fulfill the ‘a-g’ subject requirements for undergraduate admissions. BOARS also reviewed Director Wilbur’s discussion paper on the ‘a-g’ requirements and CTE, a set of draft principles to guide UC’s work in implementing and communicating the ‘a-g’ requirements, and a document drafted by Vice Chair Jacob outlining the purposes of the ‘a-g’ requirements from a faculty perspective. Related legislation, [SB 147](#), mandates CSU and encourages UC to accept all CTE courses that have met State Board of Education [Model Curriculum standards](#) for the ‘g’ elective requirement. UC leaders will be attending a legislative hearing on the matter in May.

Director Wilbur’s principles attempt to reconcile a number of competing goals and ideals around a-g and CTE and to define UC’s position, where possible. She said many UC faculty view the State CTE curricular standards, which were adopted in 2005, as too weak to ensure UC readiness. The principles state clearly that the purpose of a-g is to communicate the faculty’s expectations for academic standards they believe should define college readiness.

There are other complicated issues that are more challenging to reconcile. The a-g requirements are essentially intended to define the top 1/3 of students in the state, but some high schools use a-g as their default curriculum because they want all of their students to have the opportunity to be on a college preparatory track. UC wants to expand access and opportunity to higher education and a-g, including access to academically rigorous CTE courses, but UC is also concerned that expanding the number of a-g courses should maintain curricular rigor without presenting stresses on already overburdened schools.

UC has approved 6,500 CTE courses as being academically rigorous enough to satisfy a-g, but the Department of Education has a larger goal of 10,000, and there is a movement to encourage UC to develop new CTE curriculum for high schools. UC is not sure it can meet this goal and does not want to do so at the expense of excellence, and the principles make clear that UC wants to help schools strengthen their curriculum but UC is not responsible for developing high school curriculum. CTE advocates believe the a-g curriculum should do more to include CTE. They are also concerned that UC's requirements for academic rigor water down the career focused content in CTE courses. But at the same time, some of those advocates also believe that it is not appropriate for all students to pursue a higher education track.

**Discussion:** Chair Hurtado asked BOARS members to consider what UC might do to increase the availability of a-g and academically rigorous CTE courses.

- a-g should remain applicable and relevant to the goals of UC and CSU. Neither CSU nor UC should be pressured to admit students who normally would not be admitted to their systems.
- Increasing numbers of students are dropping out of high school, and CTE may very well be a good way to keep students engaged and interested in school, but forcing CTE into the a-g curriculum is not the most effective way to address a problem that has its origins in the K-8 years.
- UC's message should be that it cares deeply about career training, social mobility, and state economic development. UC could also help develop a model framework for a successful CTE course and work with teachers to ensure the default a-g curriculum is UC-quality.
- There are many excellent CTE courses approved for a-g that integrate strong academics with practical workforce preparation. At the same time, CTE coursework may in some cases be better suited to CSU majors, and there are limits; CSU and UC have a specific role in higher education and are not the best venues for CTE advocates to try to legitimize their goals.

**Action:** BOARS will try to schedule a half-day meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee in June to discuss a-g, CTE, transfer, and other common issues of interest.

## **VI. Next Steps for Area 'c'** *Vice Chair Bill Jacob*

**Issue:** BOARS did not adopt the recent C and D Task Force recommendation that 8<sup>th</sup> grade algebra no longer count toward the three course requirement for area (c), and that only math taken in grades 9-12 should count for area (c). However, Vice Chair Jacob noted that UC has been under increasing pressure to help improve high school math preparation and even to

consider a four-year math requirement. CSU has dropped its own four year math proposal for now, but BOARS should continue to consider the pros and cons of these and other policy options with the help of sound data and analysis. He said students who take three years of math in grades 8, 9, and 10 arrive at UC with a two-year gap in preparation and practice, which can be a barrier to their success in some majors.

**Discussion:** BOARS should gather data, including information about the success of students who have taken three years of math through grade 10 compared to students who take four years of math or three years in grades 9-11.

**Action:** Sam Agronow and Bill Jacob will continue to discuss the possible scope of an analysis, and Sylvia Hurtado will contact CSU colleagues to see if they have any relevant data and are interested in working with UC in an investigation.

## **VII. Next Steps for the System-wide Review of EESS and the ‘d’ Requirement**

**Issue:** Academic Council will release for system-wide Senate review the question of expanding UC’s laboratory science (‘d’) admissions requirement to include earth, environmental and space sciences (EESS). BOARS reviewed a draft letter to Council recommending a list of materials to be sent to campuses as part of the review. Vice Chair Jacob conferred with UCSB Divisional Chair and Council member Joel Michaelsen about the list and reported his approval.

**Action:** BOARS approved the cover letter pending small changes.

## **VIII. Comprehensive Review Guidelines and Policies**

**Action:** Chair Hurtado moved discussion of this item to the May meeting. She asked BOARS to become familiar with Comprehensive Review policies and procedures from other campuses, to consider how to better communicate CR policy, and to prepare responses to the following questions:

1. What provisions are in place at your campus for a CR process that will take into account the need for an individual review and the need to become more selective?
2. How does your campus review process ensure increased diversity and academic talent?
3. Based on reviewing other campus CR processes, what common activities do you think are possible to help make the processes more similar?
4. What activities can BOARS undertake as a group regarding CR? For example, do you think it would be helpful to hold a meeting of faculty and admissions staff to discuss best practices?

## **VIII. Non-Resident Enrollment Principles**

**Issue:** BOARS reviewed a draft memo to Council articulating a set of principles for the enrollment of non-resident undergraduates. The memo expresses concern about over-enrollment, educational quality, and California resident access in the context of the current budget crisis.

**Discussion:** Members suggested a number of edits and changes.

- It was noted that campuses should match enrollment to resources and carefully consider the impact of additional unfunded enrollment on educational quality before deciding to admit more non-resident students.
- Resident undergraduates should not subsidize the enrollment and financial aid of non-resident students, and to the extent that campuses generate NRT funds, those funds should support undergraduate programs and students in ways that enhance the excellence and availability of courses, academic programs, student services, and affordability for resident undergraduates.
- Fiscal considerations should not guide the review of files or admissions decisions on individual cases at any UC campus
- It was noted that \$90,472 is the mean parental income for CA resident freshman; \$155,438 for non-resident freshman, and \$133,952 for international freshmen.
- Diversity means different things to different people. In this context, it refers to under-representation and is better described as such. UC's enrollment policy should seek to increase representation of California demographic groups through the pool of freshmen applicants and transfer. However, the enrollment of international and non-resident domestic students should not obscure the extent to which this representation is achieved.

**Action:** Chair Sylvia Hurtado and Analyst Michael LaBriola will finalize and circulate the letter.

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