

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

May 1, 2009

I. Consent Calendar

1. April 3, 2009 meeting minutes
2. BOARS Subject Test Guidelines for 2012 and Beyond

Action: BOARS approved the March minutes with minor changes. Members proposed a number of edits to the Subject Test Guidelines document, which the committee analyst will send to BOARS members over email for approval after the meeting.

II. Announcements

- o *BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

Report: Chair Hurtado summarized recent Senate news and business of interest to BOARS.

- The Senate is reviewing a proposed new Regents Standing Order that provides a framework through which the President could ask The Regents to declare a state of financial emergency and grant the President special authority to implement temporary furloughs or salary reductions at individual campuses or across the UC system. The President currently has authority to do the latter without consultation and the new process would involve consultation before action.
- The Regents and the President have expressed support for Proposition 1A, one of the May 19 Special Election ballot measures introduced as part of the February state budget resolution. UC leaders believe passage will not prevent further cuts to UC, but will soften the impact.
- The President estimates that 81% of UC students will not be affected by the planned 9.3% fee increase, in part because the federal economic stimulus bill increases funding to student financial aid (Pell grants), and provides new tuition tax credits. UC estimates that 56,000 current students will be eligible for the American Opportunity Tax Credit, along with 25,000 newly eligible students. The impact of increased fees is also dependent on funding Cal Grants at proposed levels.
- The Undergraduate Educational Effectiveness Task Force is exploring how UC can best respond to pressures from accrediting agencies to institute new accountability measures. The Task Force is developing a template that will help campuses develop and assess measures such as learning goals and outcomes.
- Academic Council hosted a joint half-day meeting with the Executive Vice Chancellors on April 29. The main topics were shared governance practices around the budget and campus planning processes, and the union representation of academic employees.
- There will be a systemwide Senate review of BOARS' Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment. Council wants to complete the review quickly so that decision-makers discussing enrollment targets can review them in June. UCLA's Higher Education Research Institute is preparing to administer BOARS' survey of UC departments offering introductory courses in science, math, and engineering about their expectations for freshman preparation.
- ICAS met with legislators and legislative aides in Sacramento in April. Senate and UC leaders hosted a meeting with Chinese-American groups to address concerns about the

impact of UC's new admissions policy on access to the University. The meeting helped clear up misunderstandings and highlighted the need for outreach.

- Chair Hurtado was invited to serve on the steering committee for a new multi-campus initiative led by UCB Law Dean Christopher Edley, which will be examining various P-16 education issues facing California.

Comments:

- The President and other senior UC leaders should subject themselves to salary reductions before imposing them on others.
- Data showing that UC admits a smaller proportion of out of state students than other state universities should not automatically indicate that UC has capacity to admit more, because these data do not provide a complete picture. BOARS should consider the fraction of in-state residents who apply and are admitted to each campus.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur*
- *Deputy Director of Institutional Research Samuel Agronow*

Report from Director Wilbur: Today is the deadline for prospective undergraduates to submit Statements of Intent to Register. The deadline for transfers is June 1, and the 10,000 referral pool students have until May 15. All campuses have admitted more transfer students in an effort to meet President Yudof's fall 2009 enrollment goals, although some campuses have had difficulty attracting a robust, well-qualified pool of transfer applicants and are concerned that they will not be able to meet their specific targets for either transfer or freshman admission. The national economy and pending student fee increases are additional "wild card" factors that add uncertainty to yield models. Final enrollment projections could change between now and the fall.

One campus implemented a wait list this year to help meet enrollment targets. Because there is ripple effect in student choice of campuses, UCOP would like to engage all campuses in a systemwide conversation about how such a system might be implemented and managed in the future. The Admissions Processing Task Force will discuss this at its next meeting.

Discussion: One member expressed frustration that one campus would implement a wait list while other campuses struggle to make new student enrollment targets. A wait list could potentially help all campuses meet their enrollment targets, but such a system should be implemented systemwide.

Report from Sam Agronow: Deputy Director Agronow described new data collecting and reporting requirements mandated by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Beginning next year, all racial/ethnic survey forms included in undergraduate and graduate admissions applications must include a specific two-part question, asking first whether the respondent is of Hispanic/Latino origin, regardless of race; and second, asking non-Hispanic respondents to select one of five racial categories. There is no opportunity for a Hispanic/Latino respondent to choose an additional racial category, so the change may result in more Hispanics self-reporting as Hispanic and fewer reporting as African-American. In fact, some institutions have already implemented the new format and are reporting significant African-American declines. In addition, individuals who select two or more groups independent of Hispanic are recorded only as "multi-racial," and will not count toward totals for their selected groups. This

will lower the percentage of minorities, particularly African Americans, because 25% of African Americans who apply to UC also check at least one other racial group box. IPEDS' rationale for the changes is unclear, and UC is not happy about the changes, but the requirement covers all postsecondary institutions, so any anomalies in the statistics will be consistent across institutions.

In addition to the two IPEDS questions, UC plans to ask a third UC-specific question that will allow UC to collect data as it has in the past. The third question will allow respondents to select from six racial categories and up to 40 subcategories. UC is looking for advice about these categories and also its options for collecting data on multi-racial persons. One option is to consolidate multi-ethnic reporting into single groups using rules that will maximize underrepresented minority numbers. For example, an individual selecting African-American and a second ethnic category would be counted as African American, and a person selecting White and Hispanic/Latino would count as Hispanic/Latino. Another option is to give proportional weight to each group selected by multi-racial persons.

Discussion:

- Multi-racial students should be accommodated and counted correctly. UC should ensure that the reporting recognizes what the individual considers themselves to be. Having multiple categories may be confusing and complicated for high school students.
- One of the main purposes of collecting racial and ethnic data is to intervene in instances where racism and classism may be preventing equal access to the University.
- UC should consider including space for students who wish to indicate membership in a federally recognized American Indian tribe.

IV. Understanding the Transfer Admission Path

- *Director of Admissions Susan Wilbur*

Report: Director Wilbur summarized some of the most important transfer-related issues facing UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges.

Prospective UC transfer students are guaranteed eligibility if they complete 60 semester units of transferable college credit with a minimum 2.4 GPA, including a specific 7-course pattern of lower division courses. Certain campuses and majors also seek specific lower division major preparation. UC is working hard to make the transfer path less confusing, but the process is still complex and difficult for many students. Those who do fulfill UC's general education and lower division requirements, however, are as successful as four-year students. Transfers have a 92% persistence rate, an 85% graduation rate, and graduate from UC, on average, in a little over 2 1/4 years. Many transfers aspire to attend UCB or UCLA, and UC is developing strategies to encourage students to consider other campuses.

The California legislature has asked UC and CSU to make room for more CCC transfer students, and to make the transfer and course articulation process between CCC and the other segments more efficient and effective. The President is committed to expanding the transfer path and is willing to consider steps such as reducing freshman enrollment to make room.

UC and CSU both want to simplify the transfer process, but each segment is invested in its own requirements for general education and lower division transfer preparation. In 1991, the three

segments created the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC, [Senate Regulation 478](#)) – a pattern of CCC courses intended to fulfill UC and CSU’s lower division general education and breadth requirements. Today, 82% of UC transfer students complete IGETC; however, CSU has replaced IGETC with its own general education requirement – CSU Gen Ed – and only about 5% of CSU transfers complete IGETC.

Course articulation is an annual two-step process. First, UCOP reviews the CCC curricula and identifies transferable courses. Individual UC campuses then establish articulation agreements with each CCC that are posted on the [ASSIST](#) website. [Senate Regulation 477](#) is one of UC’s attempts to streamline the articulation process. Another is [Transfer Preparation Paths](#), which aims to provide prospective transfers information about preparation requirements for specific majors that are both campus specific and that show differences and similarities across UC campuses, including details about minimum GPAs and required or strongly recommended courses. CSU is taking a different approach to articulation that is due in part to legislation. In response to State Senate Bill 1785, which asked CSU to simply transfer preparation so that qualified students are prepared to transfer to any of the 23 CSU campuses, CSU developed the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP). CSU took this mandate a step further by standardizing course descriptors for all campuses that specify what content should be in key core courses.

Director Wilbur also reviewed the status of an effort to develop a common course numbering system (“C-ID”) for lower division major preparation courses that could be used by all three segments. An intersegmental C-ID Task Force that includes BOARS member Robert Jacobsen is attempting to develop common course descriptors as a first step. She also noted that only 17 of the 110 CCCs provide 50% of UC’s Community College transfers. The online University of Phoenix is also an attractive alternative for many CCC transfers, particularly African-Americans.

Discussion:

It was noted that 40% of UCLA graduates, for example, entered as transfers, but faculty know little about this admission path. BOARS should increase its focus on transfer to help promote more awareness.

To improve transfer, CSU and UC must improve communication and learn more about the others’ views and goals. If CSU and UC could align their general education requirements, it would help simplify the guidelines and give more CCC students an opportunity to be considered at both systems. This is a good moment with the new UC/CSU/CCC Joint Transfer Initiative. UC competes with CSU for some of the best transfer students. If it is easier for students to transfer to CSU or if the transfer path to CSU and UC are too different, UC and students lose an opportunity. With the expanded pool in ETR, this crisis could worsen.

Transfer students are generally very motivated, but transfers who come to UC with a GPA of less than 3.0 are more likely to struggle academically, and it seems likely that campuses may have to admit more low-GPA transfers given the higher transfer admission targets. UC has a responsibility to help these students succeed. BOARS should develop best practices for supporting transfers, particularly those who arrive with low GPAs.

Action: BOARS will discuss transfer issues in its joint meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee on June 5.

Action: The Committee will draft best practices for supporting transfers.

V. BOARS' Report to the Regents on the New SAT

Issue and Background: BOARS Testing Subcommittee Chair Peter Sadler briefed BOARS on preliminary recommendations included in a draft report to The Regents on the new SAT and ACT admissions tests. In 2003, BOARS recommended that beginning with the 2006 freshman class, UC would accept on an interim basis scores on the new ACT with Writing or the SAT Reasoning tests (being modified at that time in response to the Testing Principles) in satisfaction of UC's core test requirement. BOARS agreed to complete a comprehensive review of the new tests and their alignment with [BOARS' Testing Principles](#) by 2008. This transition plan was approved at the [July 2003 Regents meeting](#). He said BOARS put the new SAT on "probation," but was more convinced that the new ACT was close enough to the principles that it did not need a probationary period. However, the Regents' charge to BOARS includes the possibility of examining the ACT and admissions testing generally.

The draft report states that the SAT Reasoning and ACT with Writing tests meet BOARS' principles better than before, but still do not meet them fully; it adds however, that it is unlikely for any national, norm-referenced test to be capable of meeting those principles completely. Professor Sadler added that the Testing Subcommittee has included an historical review of the development of the tests and the evolving views of BOARS and the Senate to show that the current recommendations are not a big departure from the past. He suggested that BOARS might question the principles themselves or the structure of the testing pattern.

Discussion:

General Comments: One member suggested that the report not begin by claiming the SAT I adds little predictive information about potential college success when the SAT I adds about as much predictive validity as high school GPA. Curriculum-based tests like the SAT II are less biased than aptitude tests, and BOARS would make a strong statement that it believes in achievement tests and aligning testing with curriculum by adopting the SAT Subject tests. Chair Hurtado noted that changes in College Board testing made it unlikely that we could go that route, and currently failure to fulfill the SAT II requirement is the most common reason for students not attaining UC-eligible status. The elimination of this requirement is a central aspect of admissions reform, and the report will not recommend bringing back the Subject tests. However, the report should address why BOARS chose to eliminate the SAT II requirement in the ETR policy.

The General Value of Standardized Tests: It is incorrect to suggest that standardized tests do not matter or do not add value to admissions decisions, because the tests help inform people making those decisions. In addition, the absence of a standardized test pattern would lead to more grade inflation in high schools, so the SAT helps protect teachers from what would be increased pressure to give higher grades. Standardized tests also provide students and schools with a uniform reference point that is independent of a particular school's grading system or any associated biases. It would be useful to see data showing that criterion-referenced tests are more predictive than norm-referenced tests.

SAT vs. ACT: Some members expressed support for switching to the ACT or at least encouraging students to take the ACT. They were impressed that ACT, Inc. conducts a National Curriculum Survey every three years, is more curriculum-based than the SAT, and includes a Science component. It was noted that the ACT over-predicts for some minority groups but these

differences may reflect poor schools and other social factors that have nothing to do with racial bias in the tests. On the other hand, members noted that the SAT I became more valuable and predictive when it added a writing component, only 30% of UC applicants take the ACT, and transitioning to the ACT would involve an extensive public relations effort. It was also noted that a new [study](#) by Atkinson and Saul Geiser criticizes the ACT for becoming more SAT-like. Switching to the ACT could make it more difficult for UC to compare itself to its competitors, most of which use the SAT. Finally, if BOARS recommends against keeping the SAT, it should be certain about a viable alternative, which it is not certain at this time. Before BOARS makes any decision about keeping or dropping the SAT, it should study ACT outcomes more systematically.

The California Standards Tests (CSTs): The CSTs are free, curriculum-based subject tests taken by all California high school students. There was a suggestion that UC seek to have CST scores reported on student transcripts in order to experiment with using those scores to help make admissions decisions. However, a number of problems and concerns were noted: current law prohibits the use of the CSTs for college admissions purposes; CST exam conditions are poor, their security is questionable, and many students do not take them seriously; the tests are already high stakes for teachers and increasing the stakes could hurt schools and teachers; and the tests were designed to align with state standards, which do not necessarily align with UC's goals or a-g. Finally, the CST issue is ancillary to the specific charge of the current report and should be studied and addressed separately.

Other comments:

- To make it easy for the non-expert lay reader to understand, the report should summarize clearly the philosophy behind each type of test, and define acronyms and technical terms in their first usage. It should identify what the SAT is designed to measure, what UC uses it for – both in terms of predictability and admissions – and how well it accomplishes these things.
- The next version of the report should include predictive data about the SAT alone, high school GPA alone, ACT alone, and combinations, as well as a clear statement about what BOARS is seeking in terms of an acceptable level of predictability.

VI. Joint Meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee

Issue: BOARS discussed the agenda for the June 5 half-day meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Committee. Possible topics include Career and Technical Education, transfer, the role of a-g, and the requirements for area (c).

Discussion: It was suggested that UC ask the CSU group for their perception of UC's efforts on intersegmental issues and their assessment about how UC could be more helpful. There was a request for data on the socioeconomic diversity of the UC transfer population in preparation for the meeting.

Action: Director Wilbur will gather data on transfer diversity.

VII. Comprehensive Review Guidelines and Policies

Issue: Comprehensive review will become more important when admissions reform is implemented in 2012. However, not everybody understands what comprehensive review is, and some have asked why policies and practices differ across campuses. The shared review project

may also be implemented in 2012, and it raises additional questions about how comprehensive review procedures might be made more similar, efficient, and cost effective.

It is expected that all UC campuses, but especially UCM and UCR, will have more applications to review and will become more selective with ETR. UCM currently uses comprehensive review only sparingly, to reject applicants. It is still developing a CR process, but knows more resources will be required to implement comprehensive review for all applicants.

Chair Hurtado noted that there is little or no guidance about how much local variation there can or should be in CR procedures. Part of the intent of the reform was to give more authority to campuses to define talent, and BOARS should encourage a practical amount of difference, but the practices are too different in some cases. How much difference should be allowed, encouraged, and/or eliminated? Should campuses give consistent weight to CR factors? To what extent will campuses with CR systems in place need to redefine them, and how will BOARS ensure that the implementation meets the intent and spirit of the ETR reforms?

It was suggested that each campus committee develop a guiding philosophy, and work with their admissions directors to review several cases from a spectrum of applicants to observe and learn more about CR. BOARS meanwhile, should produce a set of practical guidelines for the CR process to help ensure and promote proper implementation of the admissions reforms.

Action: Chair Hurtado, Vice Chair Jacob, and Juan Poblete will draft guidelines for review at a later meeting.

VIII. Purposes of a-g Document

o BOARS Vice Chair Bill Jacob

BOARS reviewed a revised version of the draft document. Several suggestions were made for further clarifications. One was to clarify that UC faculty do not define a-g standards arbitrarily; rather, they take into consideration the state of the art within each specific discipline that is needed to enable readiness and success in a field or discipline.

Action: Vice Chair Jacob will circulate a revised draft before the June meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst

Attest: Sylvia Hurtado

Distributions:

1. BOARS Transfer Briefing
2. Senate Bill 1785- legislation authorizing CSU's lower-division transfer patterns
3. Top Feeders: Transfer admits to UC from California Community Colleges 2007-08