

**University of California Academic Senate**  
**Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**  
**Minutes of Meeting – May 2, 2008**

**Attending:** Mark Rashid, Chair (UCD); David Stern (UCB), James Given (UCI), Jeannie Oakes (UCLA), Peter Sadler (UCR), Joseph Watson (UCSD), Daniel Weiss (UCSF), William Jacob (UCSB), David Anthony (UCSC), Michael Brown (Chair, Academic Senate); Arshad Ali (Graduate Student Representative, UCLA), Samuel Agronow (Associate Director, Admissions & Outreach-SAS); William Kidder (Special Asst. to VP, Student Affairs); Nina Robinson (Director, Policy & External Affairs, SAS); Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

**I. Chair’s Announcements – Mark Rashid**

Chair Rashid reported that early concerns about Senate involvement in the presidential search notwithstanding, the search was successful, and UC President-Designate Mark Yudof is expected to begin work in Mid-June. Academic Council is optimistic that his hire will signal a fresh start for shared governance relationships at the University. Chair Rashid may meet with the new president during the summer as part of an admissions policies and practices briefing team.

At its Legislative Day in Sacramento on April 2, the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met with legislators, legislative aides, and lobbyists to discuss the state budget situation and the decline in higher education funding. Legislators told faculty that they are looking to the three segments of higher education for new ideas about how to fix the revenue situation. Chair Rashid said higher education is stronger when the three segments work together, and UC needs to do more to communicate the impact of faculty research on the State. ICAS is also developing a transfer issues tutorial. There are concerns in Academic Council about the impact of the state budget deficit, currently projected at \$20 billion, on the ability of UC to continue functioning as a “Ten Campus-One University” system.

Chair Rashid summarized the status of the Shared Review Initiative, described in Section VI of these minutes. He also discussed a meeting he had with faculty at UC Riverside to answer questions about BOARS’ eligibility reform proposal. Some faculty at UCR are concerned about the possible impact of the proposal on retention rates in entry-level science and math courses and the potential that a greater number of less qualified students would be admitted to UCR.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** BOARS deferred approval of the March minutes to the June meeting, pending several corrections.

**III. BOARS’ Revised Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility – Member Reports**

**Issue/Report:** BOARS members summarized progress and outcomes to date in local reviews of the Committee’s Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility. If Academic Council votes to approve the proposal at its May meeting, Assembly would vote in June, and if approved there, the Regents would be noticed in July.

**San Diego:** The Admissions Committee endorsed the proposal, expressing appreciation for BOARS’ goals and objectives and for its response to concerns UCSD raised in the initial review.

In particular, the Committee noted its satisfaction that the proposal does not impact campus selection criteria. At the same time, the Committee has a lingering concern that the expanded pool could hurt good students from high API schools, feels additional justification is needed for the 5%/12.5% ratio; and believes it would be useful to see data on outcomes from the University of Texas ELC system and their implications for UC.

**Los Angeles:** All opening campus committees voted to support the proposal, noting that it will maintain or increase current quality while broadening the pool to include a more diverse representation of high schools and students, and that it could influence high schools to be more accountable in their educational practices. Reviewers also cited a number of concerns about possible negative effects of the realigned guarantee on campuses that do not meet enrollment targets, and the usefulness of the SAT II to the school of Engineering.

**San Francisco:** The Senate Coordinating Committee voted unanimously to support the proposal, although there was some concern about moving from a weighted 3.0 to an unweighted 2.8 GPA requirement. More generally, that change represents a potential public relations concern, as there is limited appreciation in the general public, and even among UC faculty, for the difference between a weighted and unweighted GPA.

**Santa Cruz:** The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid voted to endorse the proposal. Its members believe the revision addresses their previous concerns about the elimination of the guarantee, the expansion of ELC, and a lack of emphasis on the effective use of Admissions by Exception. They are concerned that the presentation of the proposal may be confusing to the general public, however, and suggest highlighting the prominence of the expanded ELC.

**Berkeley:** All three reviewing committees support ETR and the elimination of the SAT II requirement. The Diversity committee supports the entire proposal as written. CEP supports the broad aim of the proposal, but wants implementation to proceed more slowly along a more relaxed timeline with careful monitoring of results. CEP also recommends a minimum SAT I score for ETR status. The Committee on Admission, Enrollment, and Preparatory Education also wants to proceed more slowly, fears the term “Entitled to Review” carries a negative connotation, and believes more evidence is needed for why the 5%/12.5% ratio is most advantageous. Finally, some are concerned that low API schools do not have enough strong students, and there is a general desire for sending clear, convincing messages about the reasons for the changes.

**Santa Barbara:** The Admissions Committee, Undergraduate Council, and Divisional Executive Council all voted to endorse the revised proposal. There were a few concerns noted about retention within the new ETR cohort, and the possibility that good students from strong schools could be disadvantaged. Messages should communicate that UC is still very much open to strong students who are not in the 12.5% ELC cohort. There was also a suggestion for UC to design its own standardized admissions test to replace the SAT altogether.

**Riverside:** The Executive Council is preparing a final report that will reconcile the opinions of the three reviewing committees. The Undergraduate Council is enthusiastic about the proposal in terms of its impact on fairness, intelligent selection and quality. And because the admissions staff is concerned that they may not be able to meet targets, UGC notes that they would welcome a gradual phase-in of the proposal. Preparatory Education and CEP have concerns about the impact of the expanded ELC on rates of student success and retention. CEP has concerns about implementation costs.

**Irvine:** All six reviewing committees on the Senate Cabinet support the proposal. The cost of implementation is the only issue that is a concern to some of the committees.

**Davis:** The Davis representative was not present at the meeting, but Chair Rashid noted that Davis is reporting tepid support for the proposal.

**Merced:** Chair Rashid noted that he received a memo from the Merced representative indicating strong support at that campus for the proposal.

**Discussion:** There was a comment that BOARS will not have access to 2007 CPEC data before September 2008. The CPEC data is the only source of information about students who do not apply to UC, and there was a question about how the new data might impact the projections included in the current study. It was noted that the Senate and the University should emphasize ETR over the 12.5%/5% guarantee structure in public messages. Senate Chair Brown added that the proposal ensures that the faculty control the process through which they select their students. He said if the proposal passes Council, he hopes BOARS representatives will turn their attention to the need to educate and inform campus Assembly representatives, some of whom do not sit on Senate committees.

#### **IV. BOARS Resolution on Maintaining the Reality of Stewardship**

**Issue/Report:** In February, BOARS adopted a resolution expressing concern about the effect of UCOP restructuring on the ability of BOARS and UCOP to carry out their responsibilities and functions. Council members were sympathetic, but ultimately did not endorse the resolution because they felt it focused on the needs of a single committee, while many Senate committees depend on UCOP support, particularly for data collection and analysis. Council felt a broader resolution would carry more weight. Council also wants to stay informed about the restructuring process, so UCOP administrators are hosting two briefings for interested Committee and Division Chairs on May 5 and 9.

**Discussion:** Senate Chair Brown said because UC admissions policy resides with BOARS, the Committee has a uniquely critical need for access to data and analytical support. He hopes Council can act on a revised resolution in May. Director Agronow noted that existing data analysis units at UCOP may coalesce into a single unit, which could end up sharing a diverse range of analytical activities beyond just admissions. It is not clear how such a move might deplete UCOP staff and/or impact the work of BOARS and other Senate committees. Director Robinson added that the current restructuring is the most radical she has seen at UCOP.

#### **V. Briefing from UCOP Office of Admissions – *Nina Robinson, Director, Policy and External Affairs***

**Report:** Director Robinson distributed a summary of 2008 freshman admissions data. She said managing the largest pool of applicants and admitted freshmen in UC's history in the context of the state budget crisis is a challenge, but the University will honor its commitment to all eligible students. Without new enrollment funding however, it may not be able to meet the same commitment next year. She said there are good outcomes both in terms of student quality and diversity, and preliminary data on transfer admissions will be available in mid-May. She will keep the Committee informed and updated.

#### **VI. Shared Admissions Review – Reports from the Common Read Workgroup and the UC Comprehensive Machine Score Workgroup**

**Background report:** Chair Rashid reported that in November 2007, the Office of Student Affairs was asked to devise a system that would allow campuses to share reviews of freshman applications as an efficiency and cost saving measure. The Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) proposed a scheme in which two scores would be generated from a centralized processing system - the first a holistic, human read of applications modeled on the ones used at Berkeley and Los Angeles; the other a “machine” score based on an algorithmic assessment of various Comprehensive Review factors. Concerns arose, however, that the administration was developing the project as a mandate to campuses and without sufficient Senate faculty input. BOARS concluded that these “read protocols” constitute admissions policy and therefore require significant Senate involvement. Senate and administrative leaders agreed to form two work teams composed of BOARS faculty and administrators to develop each protocol and submit the final products to the Senate for systemwide review. The work teams met on April 7 and include, in addition to campus admissions directors, BOARS members Sylvia Hurtado (co-chair), David Stern, and Daniel Weiss, and Director Robinson on the holistic read team. The “machine” score work team includes Mark Rashid (co-chair with Director Agronow), Bill Jacob, and Joseph Watson. Chair Rashid said he believes the process now has an appropriate level of Senate involvement, although there remains some uncertainty because the project’s direction depends in part on the incoming president. Student Affairs Vice President Judy Sakaki also assured Chair Rashid in an email that she expects campus participation in the process to be voluntary, although she said she expects the final product will be one that campuses will want to use.

**Holistic Read Work Team Report:** David Stern, Daniel Weiss, and Director Robinson reported that the Holistic Score work team is still discussing whether to align and how to align the UCLA and UCB holistic ranking systems. The work team believes that in order for a centralized system to work, UCLA and UCB will need to agree on a set of criteria for holistic scoring and a method for distributing those scores to other campuses. There is agreement that the read score distributed to campuses should distinguish which students among those with weaker UCB/UCLA read scores could be admitted at another UC campus. Some work team members agree it would be useful to see a single holistic ranking, while others envision a system of distinct holistic sub-scores, which would provide separate sub-rankings around common characteristics, such as leadership. The campuses have different approaches to norming, and there is a question about whether aligning scores will require the read process to have sustained, face-to-face interaction between UCLA and UCB readers to ensure consistency, or whether the read could be distributed through some electronic mechanism. It was noted that UCB and UCLA are concerned about changing established functions and finding new resources to implement the system, but that UCB has agreed to incorporate some elements of the UCLA process as a pilot project next year. Another possible approach is to average the scores of separate UCLA and UCB reads. It was noted that the holistic ranking systems at UCB and UCLA incorporate quantitative/algorithmic data in addition to information from the essays.

**“Machine” Score Work Team Report:** Mark Rashid, Bill Jacob, and Director Agronow reported that the Machine Score work team supports a system that would use raw application data to generate a number of numeric sub-scores for as many of the 14 Comprehensive Review categories as possible. Some data can be assessed algorithmically, but certain factors, evidence of leadership potential or a disability, for instance, require a human read. There was discussion about modifying the application in a way that would allow more of the desired data to be captured as potential indicators for further investigation by human readers. There was also agreement that the scores should add value to the process for everyone and that campuses would

be provided with the algorithms and the raw data, in addition to the sub-scores resulting from the algorithms.

**Discussion:** There was a concern about possible consequences, financial or otherwise, of a campus deciding to opt-out, and a concern that campus administrators would expect campuses to accept shared review read outcomes and allocate resources in a way that would force the use of the system. Members agreed that BOARS should continue to pursue refinement of the protocols without letting go of the principle of voluntary participation and campus autonomy. It is important for campuses to be stakeholders in processes that generate new systems, and there should be more discussion about how campuses will use the data. The Senate should also be sensitive to the effect of policy changes on staff workload. One member suggested that BOARS invite the President-Designate to a future meeting.

**Action:** Chair Rashid asked BOARS representatives to collect feedback from campuses about the proposed machine score, as well as the usefulness of a holistic score, what that score would look like, and how important it would be to have a single score as opposed to two or more scores.

## **VII. Draft Proposed Amendments to the Senate Regulations Pertaining to Eligibility and Admissions**

**Issue:** If BOARS' Eligibility Reform Proposal passes through the Council, Assembly, and Regents, Senate regulations pertaining to admissions policy will ultimately have to be revised to conform to the new policy. Chair Rashid developed preliminary draft revisions to Regulations 410 – 468, which not only address the proposed eligibility reform policy, but also overhaul all freshman admissions regulations to increase the clarity of the language and its alignment with current policy and practice.

**Discussion:** BOARS members suggested additional edits and clarifications. Admissions Director Wilbur also submitted comments in a separate email.

- It was noted that in SR 410, “Publish” or “review, and revise as needed” is better than “revise.” to the campuses of the University of California. There was a suggestion to add language from SR 462 to 410.
- SR 417 should state more explicitly that an application must be submitted for admission.
- SR 418 should indicate that the Office of Admissions also determines the *process*.
- SR 419 should refer to the process specified by the Office of Admissions.
- SR 424.A. There was a question about how to address the California HS Proficiency Exam.
- SR 424.B. There was a suggestion to move this exception paragraph to Article 6, because it is related to campus selection.
- SR 428. There should be clarification about clearing “D” and “F” grades; course validation through taking an advanced course in areas of sequential knowledge; and course validation through subject test scores or other means. Voice should also change from passive to active.
- SR 440. This exception allows for admission by exam alone. There should be language indicating *as stipulated by the Office of Admissions*.
- SR 450. Insert “the equivalent of” before “15 standard secondary units” or replace “unit” with “course.”
- SR 462. There was a suggestion to add similar language to SR 410 or under Chapter 1 (stipulate that students are admitted to, or enrolled at a campus of the University of California for freshman standing) and to re-write 462 as “Selection of students for admission.”

- SR 466. It should specify who decides if a campus has remaining space for admission.
- SR 468. It should also refer to “publication” of the index as in SR 410.

**Action:** Chair Rashid will share new updates revisions with the committee at a future meeting.

### **VIII. BOARS’ Review of UCAAD’s Proposed Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140**

**Issue:** BOARS reviewed the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity’s proposed amendment to Senate Bylaw 140, replacing “Affirmative Action” with “Equity” in the committee’s name.

**Discussion:** BOARS members were not opposed to the name change, but some members found it difficult to make an informed judgment based on the materials presented. They wanted to see an expanded justification before opining more definitively. It was unclear to one member, for instance, why the term “affirmative action” no longer applies to UCAAD’s charge. It was noted that if UCAAD does elect to provide an expanded rationale, BOARS would appreciate some clarification on whether, and how, UCAAD's charge would change. One member suggested that the change might be a signal that the committee now sees gender issues as a more central part of its charge.

**Action:** BOARS will submit comments to Academic Council.

The meeting adjourned at 4pm  
Minutes prepared by: Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Mark Rashid

#### **Distributions**

1. Email from Judy Sakaki
2. 2008 Freshman Admissions to the University of California