

**University of California Academic Senate**  
**Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**April 9, 2010**

**I. Announcements**

- o *Sylvia Hurtado, BOARS chair*

The joint Academic Council/chancellors meeting on April 7 included presentations on University/industry partnerships, community relations and outreach, and shared governance. Chair Hurtado noted that the increase in UC Riverside's American Indian and Latino population is the result of a concerted strategy of community outreach and cultivation.

Council approved the distribution of UCPB's [Choices Report](#), which is intended to help frame the systemwide discussion about current budgetary choices and trade-offs. By week's end, Council will also be releasing for review a proposal to expand the area (d) laboratory science admission requirement to include Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences, along with BOARS' recommended packet of review materials.

After a series of racist and anti-gay incidents on two campuses, the Regents and President Yudof pledged to take steps to improve climate and diversity. The President also asked the Academic Council and BOARS to recommend revisions to UC's admissions policy that may help improve the situation.

Chair Hurtado and former BOARS Chair Mark Rashid recently provided written responses to California Assemblyman Eng's questions regarding the rationale behind UC's new admissions policy.

**II. Consent Calendar**

1. Approval of the March 5, 2010 BOARS Minutes

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

**III. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee Requests**

- o *BOARS Vice Chair Bill Jacob*

**Issue:** The A&E Subcommittee asks BOARS to endorse memos to Council advocating two projects: 1) the establishment of a Task Force to examine and revise the Area 'b' (English) criteria, and 2) the establishment of a BOARS, UCEP, UCOPE work group to consider whether UC should recognize CSU's General Education Breadth transfer pattern in addition to, or in place of, the IGETC pattern.

**Discussion:** Given the importance of academic literacy to UC access, it is important for area (b) language to be relevant and up-to-date. At least one second language acquisition expert should be included on the area (b) Task Force, considering the large number of English language learners in CA high schools. Director Wilbur noted her support for the GE Breadth transfer initiative.

**Action:** BOARS approved the two memos unanimously.

#### **IV. Proposed Plan for UC Participation in C-ID**

**Issue:** In 2006, BOARS endorsed the California Community College Academic Senate's proposed Course Identification Numbering Project (C-ID), which is intended to fulfill state legislative requirements to establish a common course numbering system for lower division major courses offered in the community colleges, reduce the labor of articulation, and make it easier for CCC students to be sure that the courses they take match major requirements. UC agreed to participate, but has not successfully found faculty to join intersegmental work groups to review the content of lower division courses in various majors and agree on the components of course descriptors. CSU, on the other hand, is making progress. Student Affairs has volunteered to take the lead in identifying UC faculty in the requested departments who are knowledgeable about articulation. They are asking the Senate for official endorsement/adoption of the proposed approach.

**Action:** BOARS endorsed the plan.

#### **V. Consultation with UCOP**

*Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions:*

**2010-11 Admissions:** BOARS reviewed preliminary 2010 freshman admissions outcomes. Director Wilbur said UC did well in attracting and admitting a broadly diverse class, despite an extremely competitive and "hyper-selective" year, budgetary challenges, and enrollment cuts. UC is pleased with the outcomes; however, they would have been even better with better funding.

The overall admission rate was 71.6%, down from 72.5% in 2009. UCSB and UCB became significantly more selective, while selectivity at UCI and UCSC eased slightly. The admission of students from underrepresented ethnic groups increased to 28.3% of the systemwide total, up from 26.9% in 2009 and 25.1% in 2009. There were URM increases at almost every campus. The proportion of admitted CA residents decreased slightly, from 88.5% of the total in 2009, to 86% in 2010, although the number of admitted residents was about the same. Some individual campuses did show more significant changes in the resident/non-resident mix—Berkeley's admitted class consisted of 73.2% CA residents, down from 86.4% in 2009. Systemwide, 38.5% of admits are first generation college, and 39.4% are from low-income families.

Almost 11,000 students will receive an offer of referral admission to Merced and/or Riverside, and 10,712 students have been offered a place on a campus wait list. The number of students on those lists range from a few hundred at Berkeley (offered only to non-residents) to 5,000 at Davis. UC will know the full impact of the wait list at the end of May.

**Discussion:** There was some concern that wait lists and early notification contradict a stipulation in the Comprehensive Review Guidelines that campuses observe a "common notification period" for informing applicants of their status. The system of early notification used by some campuses does not honor the intent of comprehensive review for admission and denial. BOARS should seek a middle ground between selectivity and inclusiveness. It should not be a point of pride for a public university system to tighten access.

*Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux:*

UC has received 20 applications from a variety of individual instructors and teams of instructors for the Career Technical Education curriculum integration institute schedule for May at UCLA. Articulation staff also have been meeting with Partnership Academy program representatives.

## **VI. Discussion of President Yudof's Letter to the Senate Regarding Implementation of Holistic Review on Selective Campuses**

**Issue:** In preparation for BOARS' consultation with President Yudof, members discussed the need to clarify the objectives driving the President's request that BOARS recommend revisions to policy that would require campuses to adopt more consistent admissions processes, including best practices based in holistic review on the most selective campuses.

Chair Hurtado noted that the President is committed to broadening access, and he respects the work of BOARS. He is particularly concerned about African-American admissions. UC leaders also want to ensure that campus processes are considering environmental factors such as the high school profile. She said BOARS has an obligation to ensure that the faculty's priorities and values underlie admission policy.

**Discussion:** BOARS has an opportunity to strengthen the systemwide framework of admissions policies and procedures, but it is important for BOARS to clearly define its goals for admissions outcomes, in addition to the evaluation methods and factors it wants campuses to use. UC places a high value on low-SES and achievement in context. Campuses are already implementing several aspects of holistic review. Sharing a single holistic review score will require broad agreement about the values underlying the score.

The President's proposal applies to the more selective campuses. Since UC Riverside is already the most diverse campus, it would see little diversity pay-off, but very significant costs, in moving to holistic review.

The point-based/formula system creates the impression that very few school context factors are taken into account. The advantage of holistic review is that it is not a point-based fixed weight system. It is difficult to extract contextual information from the application without reading it.

It was noted that there are many possible paths to the President's objectives that might be less costly. For example, UCSB uses a fixed weight system that admits all ELC-eligible students and also has among the best outcomes for African-Americans in the UC system.

BOARS should make sure the President understands that holistic review involves much higher labor and time costs. Admissions offices would need to have access to more of the \$60 application fee.

## **VII. Consultation with President Yudof and Provost Pitts**

BOARS met with President Yudof and Provost Pitts in Executive Session.

## **VIII. Follow-up Discussion**

BOARS should address and respond both to the specific UCSD problems and to the systemwide policy issue. Holistic review works well for UCLA and UCB, but it is not a cure-all for diversity and climate problems. We cannot solve discrimination and racism with an admissions policy, and it is unclear what factors UC could take into account in a holistic review system that would increase the number of African-American admits, as campuses cannot consider race.

Establishing “proxies” for underrepresented ethnic groups, such as API rank and income, may not work in California, because there are many poor Asian and white students in the state.

UCSD values an understandable and transparent system. The campus is open to adjusting its processes, but it wants to remain true to its current values and realistic about the difference small adjustments would actually have on outcomes. Recruitment and academic preparation are two fundamental problems driving ethnic admissions disparities. Disparate impact appears in the educational system well before college. Although UC cannot control this, it can make a difference through outreach.

BOARS should consider establishing a high academic threshold as a floor beyond which academic factors take on less weight and other factors take on more weight in the decision. It was noted that to faculty, moving a campus from, for example, an average 3.01 to a 3.09 GPA or adding 10 points to the average SAT score may not seem particularly important and certainly not relevant to diversity goals, but to administrators, these goals and their potential effect on the campus’ *U.S. News* rankings, are appealing. UC might do more for diversity by refusing to play along with such rankings.

UC needs a transparent, publicly defensible policy. BOARS should consider a stronger systemwide admissions policy framework that preserves a space for campus autonomy and freedom, but that establishes specific systemwide values for agreed upon factors—including GPA, ELC status, and school context.

Honoring the public nature of UC means UC should strive to be an engine of social mobility and an aspirational model of society where talented people from diverse backgrounds come together to produce knowledge.

## **IX. Suggested Modifications to the Freshman Admissions Guidelines**

**Issue:** BOARS reviewed several proposed modifications to the Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. Chair Hurtado said the Guidelines outline principles and values; they do not mandate that campuses use a specific process.

**Discussion:** BOARS can signal the need for more systemwide commonality by modifying language in the Guidelines from “can,” to “should” or “must.” At the same time, BOARS should not do anything that would prevent campuses from implementing their own best practices.

New wording was proposed for Guideline 5: “While fully complying with the Guidelines, faculty on individual campuses can develop practices that are sensitive to local campus values.”

A wording change also was proposed for Guideline 8—from “No applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review,” to “All applicants must receive a comprehensive review before a final decision is rendered,” and adding “No applicant will be denied admission without a human read of his or her file.”

Some members felt BOARS should recommend the return of the entire application fee to the campus for outreach and admissions purposes. Others wanted to recommend better funding for outreach and academic preparation programs generally, without explicitly tying the application fee to that funding. It was noted that the number of admitted students who have participated in an academic preparation program is declining, although these students have a great chance of success at UC.

ELC admits are more diverse, do better academically, and are retained at a greater rate than non-ELC admits. Giving preference to ELC-eligible students produces particularly good outcomes at UCSB, which uses a 3% local guarantee pathway for every school in the state, and UCD, which guarantees admission to all of the ELC 4%. In rewriting the Guidelines, BOARS should encourage campuses to continue valuing ELC in the move to 9%. A new Principle 9 was proposed: “Campus selection criteria should value students being identified as eligible in the

local context (ranked by UC as being in the top 9% of their class at the end of the junior year). BOARS will work with campuses to collectively assure that the 9% ELC pool is distributed across all campuses and that no subgroup of ELC (e.g. low API Schools) is disproportionately assigned to one or two referral campuses.”

**Action:** BOARS will review the Guidelines again at the May meeting.

## **X. Comprehensive Review Report**

Members reviewed the first two sections of the report. Chair Hurtado will circulate three additional sections after the meeting, and she asked members to focus on the descriptions of campus processes and her characterization of how campuses are implementing CR. She said the CR Report should support changes in the Guidelines and also meet the President’s goals.

**Discussion:** What are the criteria BOARS wants people to use to assess how well comprehensive review is working? And what is BOARS’ explanation for whether outcomes—grades, test scores, retention, diversity, low income, first generation enrollment—are good, bad, adequate or inadequate?

Average parental education in California has increased, so it is remarkable that UC still draws so many first generation students and has been increasing their numbers between 2003 and 2009.

If the report includes a disparate impact analysis on the racial demographics, it should use it for other indicators like first generation and SES. The report should recommend that campuses add a measure of personal accomplishment.

**Action:** Members will review the next sections of the report with an eye to the campus processes section.

## **XI. UC Commission on the Future Initial Set of Recommendations**

The first set of Commission on the Future recommendations has been released for Senate review. The committee discussed the recommendations briefly. One or two members volunteered to contribute draft paragraphs about specific recommendations.

**Action:** Analyst LaBriola will compile and circulate feedback. BOARS will review again in May.

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

BOARS reviewed a draft memo responding to UCPB’s position paper. The memo is based on BOARS’ discussion at the March meeting.

**Action:** BOARS approved the memo.

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