

**University of California Academic Senate  
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**

**Minutes of Meeting  
May 7, 2010**

**I. Announcements**

o *Sylvia Hurtado, BOARS chair*

**April Academic Council and Academic Assembly Meetings:** Council approved two BOARS memos requesting the establishment of a Task Force to revise the Area ‘b’ (English) criteria, and 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. Council released UCPB’s [Choices Report](#) for systemwide Senate review and endorsed a UCPB/UCORP joint report on indirect cost recovery as well as a memo from UCEP recommending against changing or clarifying the definition of “Days of Instruction.” Council also nominated UCSC Chancellor and former Council Chair George Blumenthal to be the 2010 recipient of the Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate. The Academic Assembly approved Council’s nomination of Berkeley Professor Robert Anderson for 2010-11 Senate Vice Chair.

**ICAS Meeting:** The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates held its April meeting in Sacramento to coincide with UC Legislative Day. ICAS faculty met with staff from the Legislative Analyst’s Office to promote the importance of higher education and inform them about the work of ICAS and other intersegmental faculty coordinating efforts.

**Subject Test Guidelines for 2012 and Beyond:** In 2009, BOARS established guidelines for the use of SAT Subject tests in admission review after they become optional in 2012. The Guidelines state that no student should be disadvantaged for failing to take Subject tests, but that campuses can recommend up to two specific tests for schools and majors where they have been useful in assessing academic preparation and achievement or predicting college success. Students also may voluntarily submit Subject tests to help present their best case in comprehensive review.

Chair Hurtado asked members to determine, with the help of their admissions committee, which tests, if any, their campus will recommend. Director Wilbur noted it would be useful to have the information in time for fall 2010 counselor conferences. It will eventually be uploaded to the Preparing for Future Admission website.

**Action:** Chair Hurtado will send BOARS members a formal letter requesting the information.

**Holistic Review:** On Thursday, Chair Hurtado and Vice Chair Jacob met by phone with Provost Pitts, the Senate Chair and Vice Chair, and several UCOP administrators to discuss holistic review. Next week, Chair Hurtado will meet with the UCSD admissions committee to discuss the UCLA and UCB systems, and it was noted that UCI plans to discuss the potential adoption of a single-score holistic review process. Chair Hurtado has assembled a packet of materials to help campus discussions about holistic review, which includes sample read sheets and the principles driving the UCB and UCLA processes that she will forward after the meeting. She noted that holistic review helped UCLA address a crisis in diversity.

**Discussion:** It will be helpful for UCSD to hear which factors made a difference at UCLA and how UCSD can project change under a holistic system. UCSD will be disappointed if moving to holistic review did not result in more African-American enrollment.

Holistic review has to be presented as a fairer system. After campuses adopt the basic tool of holistic review, they can modify it to suit their local needs.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

1. Approval of the April 9, 2010 BOARS Minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the April minutes with a few minor corrections.

## **III. Consultation with UCOP**

Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs:

The Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs is closely involved in issues relating to admissions policy, student financial support, and campus life. Vice President Sakaki and Director Wilbur have been meeting with individual regents to discuss the new admissions policy, online course approval, and CTE. On May 19, they will speak to the Regents' Educational Policy committee about UC's efforts to increase the number of approved CTE courses, followed by a more detailed presentation to the full board in July. Vice President Sakaki recently met with a group of students to discuss recent incidents of intolerance at UC San Diego and to address some misunderstandings they had about UC admissions. She also spoke at a recent meeting of the UC African Black Coalition, which includes 700 African-American students from across the UC system.

Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions:

**2010-11 Admissions Data:** Preliminary data on Statements of Intent to Enroll (SIRs) show that most campuses have met their freshman SIR targets. UCR saw a large increase in yield, which the UCR representative said was due in part to increased faculty involvement in recruitment. Only UCD and UCSB will need to tap into their wait lists to meet enrollment targets. Both of those campuses approached admissions offers more conservatively this year to avoid over-enrollment. All campuses are reporting percentage increases in SIRs from underrepresented minority groups.

**Legislation:** There are two bills pending in the Legislature related to transfer. SB1440 (Padilla) would require the California Community Colleges to create associates degrees specifically for transfer to CSU, and AB2302 (Fong) would ask CCC, CSU and UC to develop a strategy for increasing the number of students who successfully transfer from CCC to CSU and UC.

**2012 Admissions Reform Webinar:** The Office of Admissions hosted the first in a series of webinars meant to educate staff about the freshman admissions reform policy scheduled to take effect in 2012 and to help staff communicate the key messages of the policy clearly and effectively.

Don Daves-Rougeaux, Associate Admissions Director:

The inaugural UC Curriculum Integration Institute will be held May 16-19 at UCLA. UC will work with groups of high school teachers there to develop courses that integrate mathematics curricula with the finance, business, and media arts industries. Courses that meet program status will be made available to high schools across the state. UC has applied for a grant to fund three additional events covering other disciplines, including English and history.

#### IV. Consultation with UCOP: Disparate Impact Data

- *With Nina Robinson, Director, Policy & External Affairs:*

BOARS reviewed two sets of data prepared by the Office of Institutional Research. The first shows admit rates by ethnic group for each campus and the ratio of the admit rate for each ethnic group compared to the highest admit rate within each campus, the latter noting instances of “disparate impact,” where the admit rate for a particular group is less than 80% the rate of the highest group. The second set of data shows applicants and admits by GPA and SAT quintile by ethnicity for each campus.

Vice President Sakaki noted that UCB and UCLA have disparate impact ratios for African-Americans of 58% and 57%, respectively, while UCI and UCSD have ratios of 49% and 45%. She said the more favorable outcomes could be due to the holistic systems in use at UCB and UCLA. The impact of holistic review at UCLA also can be seen by comparing the disparate impact ratio before UCLA adopted holistic review in 2006 (40%), with the ratio after implementation in 2007, when it shrank to 63%.

Director Robinson led members through the quintile distribution tables. She said the range of each SAT and GPA quintile differs by campus, because each has different applicant and admit pools. The differential distribution of applicants across quintile groups is the main driver of the total differential admission rates. At UCSD and elsewhere, the small number of African Americans applicants in the top quintile pool has a very high admit rate, but the vast majority of African Americans are in the lower quintiles. In fact, there are 20 times more Asian applicants than African American applicants in the top quintile. However, within each quintile at UCLA, the African American admit rate is higher than the average for that quintile, while at UCSD and other campuses, it is lower than the average in each quintile. This shows that UCLA is doing a better job of admitting from the full range of the pool across all quintiles, albeit at different rates.

UCSB has more Chicanos at the top of its applicant pool in the top quintile, and has a more equal distribution of admit rates for African-Americans and Chicanos compared to other groups, within each quintile

She said the overall selectivity of a campus makes a huge difference in the campus’ ability to select from lower quintiles. The data show the importance to capturing diversity of admitting from the full range of the applicant pool. Campuses that want to admit more African Americans will need to find a way to admit from the quintiles where they are concentrated.

**Discussion:** It was noted that some campuses not using holistic review (UCSB, UCD, and UCSC) have better disparate impact ratios than UCB and UCLA. In addition, the improved ratio for African-Americans at UCLA between 2006 and 2007 was not replicated for other underrepresented groups. Director Robinson said the other campuses are less selective than UCLA, UCB, UCSD, and UCI, and have higher overall admit rates. Certain comprehensive review factors favor certain groups, and holistic review appears to have less of a negative impact on African-Americans.

It was noted that the quintile tables illustrate the disparate impact problem more clearly than the disparate impact tables. The composition of the applicant pool has the most significant impact on the profile of the admitted class. It is reasonable to expect that disparate impact should not exist within each quintile, and UCSD may be able to adjust its practices to achieve a more equal distribution in each quintile by ethnicity, by, for example, changing the weight they currently give to low income and first generation status. At the same time, a number of factors contribute to disparate impact, including the number of competitive applicants in a particular pool. UCSB’s positive outcomes are rooted in their system and their investment in recruitment. Holistic review will not solve the larger problem, which is rooted in academic preparation and

outreach at urban schools. One member commented that it was disappointing that UC appears to be unwilling to invest effort and resources into increasing the pool of competitively admissible African-Americans.

**Action:** BOARS will incorporate a narrative about the tables into the report and include a simplified version of the tables, prepared by UCOP, as an appendix to the report.

## **V. Discussion of President Yudof's Request to BOARS**

**Issue:** In April, President Yudof asked BOARS to consider policy revisions that would require campuses to adopt more consistent admissions processes, including best practices based in holistic review on the most selective campuses, and to recommend a resolution about comprehensive or holistic review that will help project the new eligibility policy forward and increase the proportion of underrepresented groups on UC campuses.

**Discussion and Comments:** First, the letter should clearly define “comprehensive” and “holistic” review. Chair Hurtado said comprehensive review has three main elements: the use of multiple criteria to evaluate merit; the evaluation of school context and/or the context of opportunity; and individualized student review. The human read-based individualized review is the centerpiece of holistic review. It is also costly and has been identified by the least selective campuses as unnecessary. Some campuses incorporate individualized review into their non-holistic process. To most people, “holistic” means human readers arrive at a single score after reviewing the entire file. The President seems to believe that individualized human review, and perhaps the single score system, are of key importance to his goal of increasing diversity.

Despite their differences, campuses share the goal of ensuring a fair, just system that recognizes inequality. The question is whether holistic review meets these goals. The letter should address steps campuses are taking to recognize and address inequality as they become more selective and how campus processes will accommodate the more diverse pool under the new policy. It should state that BOARS wants every student, not just a small cohort, to be comprehensively reviewed, but that campuses, particularly the most selective ones, need the resources to do so.

There is no guarantee that moving to holistic review will change the dynamic and improve diversity, and a single score system may not be ideal for every campus. If campus principles and values remain the same, the outcomes will be no different. Policy should preserve local autonomy and values. For example, some campuses value an understandable and transparent weighting system, and the holistic system is less likely to meet those goals. Other campuses may decide to invest resources in outreach rather than on a human read to meet the same goal. UCSB's fixed weight system admits all ELC-eligible students and also has among the best outcomes for African-Americans in the system. It works in part because it is the only campus doing it, but also because it admits students who have the ability succeed in their local context. If UCSB continues its current model in 2012, it will accept nearly the entire top cohort of ELC 9% applicants based on a-g grades alone.

Campuses apply broad weights and factors to mass numbers of applicants, which may not account for the rare student with exceptional circumstances and promise who can be admitted independent of other criteria. The human read allows campuses to identify these few students, but some question whether the system should change to benefit this 1% segment. It was noted that some campuses place less value on the human read component and this can be changed.

One member said there is no major problem with comprehensive review and no need to change it, especially when BOARS is on the verge of producing a report that addresses the issues

the president has raised and that shows that campuses are committed to addressing his concerns within the evolving context of their existing systems. All campuses conduct a review of the entire file, albeit differently. The President is creating a dichotomy that does not exist.

It was noted that campuses do not always use or value the existing principles, such as marked improvement over time and those related to context, which are designed to reach the exceptional students. Chair Hurtado requested a subcommittee to assist with drafting a response to the President.

**Action:** BOARS members Susan Amussen, Juan Poblete, George Johnson and Bill Jacob will work together to draft a response to the President.

## **VI. Comprehensive Review Report**

**Issue:** A near final draft of the report was circulated to the committee before the meeting. Chair Hurtado asked members to focus on its descriptions of campus processes and characterization of how campuses are implementing CR. The report proposes four new comprehensive review principles: campuses should give more comparable weight between academic accomplishments and personal achievements to help distinguish competitive students; give priority to applicants who are eligible in the local context; consider standardized tests in context, and ensure rigorous reader training and oversight.

**Discussion:** It was noted that one of the best predictors of retention at UCR is participation in high school clubs. There was some concern about how the new principles would be implemented and/or monitored. The benefit of the holistic approach is that it allows campuses to account for the unusual or exceptional student. BOARS wants all campuses to have processes in place that allow them to identify exceptional students, whether it be holistic or some other system. The document will replace certain instances of “comprehensive review” to “individualized review.”

The report recommends that campuses provide more resources from the application fee to admission functions to help them implement a policy based on multiple criteria. Vice President Sakaki said UCOP is committed to supporting the admissions policy changes. UCOP also will provide campuses with a common read sheet beginning next year, so campuses will have access to more indicators to incorporate into their review processes.

**Action:** Tongshan Chang will provide updates to tables. BOARS will approve the final report over email. BOARS will review revisions to the Guidelines again at the June meeting.

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

BOARS reviewed draft responses to the first set of Commission on the Future recommendations and discussed each recommendation briefly.

**Action:** The committee approved the responses pending small edits.

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