

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting – June 15, 2005

Approved October 13, 2005

I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements*Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair*Comprehensive Review Report

BOARS members were reminded that the committee will finalize its two-year Comprehensive Review report over the summer (via email and teleconferences). The report must be completed in time to be reviewed by the Academic Council before it is presented to The Regents in November.

Transfer Initiatives

At its May 11, 2005 meeting, the Assembly of the Academic Senate approved the implementing legislation for both the SciGETC (SR 478) and Major-Preparation Course Articulation (SR 477) initiatives. Academic Senate Chair George Blumenthal has specifically asked BOARS to monitor the implementation of SciGETC, and the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) has been asked to monitor the Major-Preparation Course Articulation implementation. BOARS and UCEP might also join together to proactively address issues and future directions related to transfer (e.g., develop "transfer eligibility").

College Board Meeting

Chair Michael Brown, Vice Chair David Stern, and Analyst Kimberly Peterson met recently with a small group of College Board representatives: James M. Montoya, Vice President for Higher Education; Peter J. Negroni, Senior Vice President for K-12 Education; and Kris Zavoli, Acting Assistant Vice President for the Western Region. Topics discussed included the National Merit Scholarship Program/PSAT, Advance Placement courses, new SAT, and College Board initiatives regarding access (e.g., "Springboard" curriculum program, new College Board 6-12 Schools).

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will provide BOARS with a list of the UC campus representatives to the College Board.

Civic Engagement Symposium

Several BOARS Members attended or gave presentations at a June 10-11 symposium, "Civic and Academic Engagement in the Multiversity: Institutional Trends and Initiatives at the University of California" (<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/events/civicacademic/index.html>). Sponsors of the symposium included Student Regent Jodi Anderson, the Student Experience in the Research University - 21st Century Project (CSHE) and the UC Office of the President. The conference included an assessment of the civic and academic engagement of undergraduate students at UC using the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) and national data, and a discussion on how civic engagement is currently integrated into teaching and research efforts and institutional priorities.

ACTION: BOARS Member Dick Flacks will present preliminary UCUES admissions-related findings at the next committee meeting.

II. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes

ACTION: The minutes of the May 6, 2005 BOARS meeting were approved with revisions.

III. Resolution on UC's Definition of Merit and the National Merit Scholarship Program

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

ISSUE: At its May 18, 2005 meeting, the Academic Council requested that BOARS draft a resolution on why UC should discontinue its participation in the NMSP. The draft resolution, if adopted by BOARS, will be brought before Council for consideration in June.

DISCUSSION: Chair Michael Brown reviewed the timeline of the committee's investigation into and actions regarding the selection process of the National Merit Scholarship Program. Members observed that the committee had carefully considered and investigated this issue. Concerns were raised, however, that even though the rationale for BOARS' position on the NMSP is clearly articulated, people who were not part of the committee's deliberations may still misinterpret the intent of BOARS' actions. There must be a clear distinction made between criticism of the NMSP and its selection procedures and criticism of students selected for the National Merit Scholarship. If UC chooses to discontinue its sponsorship of National Merit Scholarships, it must be stressed in the public message that: (1) BOARS and the University still honor individual student achievement and merit, (2) the UC campuses will continue to honor scholarship commitments made to students already awarded UC-sponsored National Merit Scholarships, and (3) students who choose to attend UC will still be eligible for corporate- and NMSP-sponsored National Merit Scholarships, as well as UC's own merit-based scholarships.

The following revisions to the resolution were suggested by BOARS members and endorsed by the committee:

- Add another "whereas" to the resolution: "WHEREAS UC campuses have been phasing out the role of National Merit Scholarship Program standing in their admissions and financial aid decisions."
- Add information to the background of the resolution about the fact that UC's public and private comparison institutions do not participate as institutional sponsors of National Merit Scholarships.

ACTION: The BOARS "Resolution on the Failure of the National Merit Scholarship Program to meet the Requirements of UC's Definition of Merit" was unanimously approved with the noted revisions.

IV. California Student Data Systems

A. California Student ID Tracking System

Charles Masten, Assistant Director of Admissions

REPORT: Assistant Director Charles Masten provided the committee with information on the California School Information System (CSIS) Student Identifier. In September 2002 California enacted Senate Bill 1453 in order to comply with the federal accountability standards defined in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB). This bill called for the creation of a statewide longitudinal database for tracking individual pupil performance over time. Every student in California that attends a public K-12 school will be assigned a unique CSIS student identifier, which will eventually connect to their entire K-12 educational record. UC has made plans to add the CSIS ID to the fall 2007 admissions application. Additional information on the CSIS student identifier is available at: <http://www.csis.k12.ca.us/library/statewide-identifier/default.asp>.

B. California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS)

Sam Agronow, Associate Director of Admissions

ISSUE: Associate Director Sam Agronow informed the committee of the possibility that “small schools” or academies within a larger high school might be assigned a special identifier in the future by the California Basic Educational Data System (CBEDS). CBEDS has agreed to consider adding a “small school” identifier if the University provides a working definition of “small schools” and a rationale for the need to specifically identify this school type.

DISCUSSION: Members noted the importance of UC having an accurate picture of a student’s high school environment given that for the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program, student achievements are evaluated within the context of the student’s “school.” Some students might be inadvertently penalized depending on how their school is identified. UC already considers separately magnet and regular students within a school – schools that have both a regular and a magnet component are treated as two separate schools for ELC purposes. By separating the magnet and regular students, neighborhood students are not disadvantaged because their school attracts students from beyond the school’s regular attendance zone. This policy, however, only applies to programs within a school that attract students from beyond the regular geographic boundary. Schools that breakup into academies or “small schools” are not considered separate entities under the current ELC policy.

The committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of alternatives for identifying these “small schools.” One possibility would be for each of the small schools to obtain their own individual national identifier or American Testing Program (ATP) code. The state, however, might not encourage such a practice because of various fiscal and accountability considerations related to No Child Left Behind reporting requirements.

ACTION: The Analytic Subcommittee will work with Associate Director Sam Agronow to determine how “small schools” should be defined and why identifying this school type is important for UC admissions and broader purposes.

ACTION: The policy question of which entities within a school might be treated separately for ELC purposes will be placed on the 2005-06 BOARS agenda for consideration.

V. Testing Subcommittee Report

Mark Rashid, Testing Subcommittee Chair

REPORT: The BOARS Testing Subcommittee met for a day-long meeting on June 6th. The primary issues considered at this meeting were:

- How to evaluate the new SAT and ACT tests for alignment with BOARS' testing principles (e.g., "curriculum basedness").
- Where to set the new Eligibility by Exam Alone score so that it is in alignment with the new testing pattern requirement.
- What does it mean for a campus or to indicate a "preference" for a specific SAT II exam? Some campuses have major programs (e.g., engineering) that have indicated a preference for a particular SAT II exam on their websites and in publications. The subcommittee would like to obtain more information from the campuses about their plans or processes for implementing such preferences.

ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will ask the Admissions Directors to report on their campus's SAT II preferences policies at the joint meeting with BOARS in July.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

A. Announcements and Updates

Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

REPORT: Director Susan Wilbur reported to the committee on the following topics:

Admissions Processing Contract

The University is in the final stages of selecting a new vendor for admissions processing. In the past admissions processing has been a two-step process involving multiple entities; however, with the new contract, UC will have a single, comprehensive vendor solution for admissions processing. The new system will be called the Centralized Admissions and Scholarship Application (CASA) and will be implemented in stages. Ideally this new system will allow campuses to expedite and streamline their admissions processes.

Fall 2005 SIRs

Director Wilbur also provided BOARS with the fall 2005 Freshman Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) data. This information will soon be posted on the University of California Office of the President website. Highlights of the SIR data include:

- Systemwide, SIRs increased 9.6 percent for fall 2005 and 3.7 percent for the full academic year (including winter and spring terms).
- This year 6,066 applicants were referred to Merced or Riverside for admission; 345 of these referrals (5.7%) accepted their referral admissions offer.
- Merced has received 870 freshman SIRs; 32 percent of these students are from referral pool admits.
- Systemwide, underrepresented student SIRs increased 12.7 percent; six campuses (Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and Santa Cruz) experienced increases in the number of underrepresented students filing SIRs for fall 2005.

B. Resolution in Honor of Asc. VP Dennis Galligani

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

In honor of Associate Vice President Dennis Galligani, who is retiring after 30 years of service to the University, and in recognition of his service as a consultant to BOARS, the following resolution was proposed for the committee's endorsement:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools expresses its respect, affection and gratitude to Dennis J. Galligani for his exceptional stewardship of Student Academic Services as Assistant and then Associate Vice President from 1990 to 2005 and his unfailing support of the Academic Senate and shared governance. He was true to his motto, "We are here to serve."

ACTION: The BOARS resolution to honor Associate Vice President Dennis Galligani was approved unanimously.

VII. Principles for Evaluating Eligibility Requirements

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

REPORT: Chair Michael Brown informed the committee of the latest revisions to the draft "Principles for Evaluating Eligibility Requirements." The goal is to develop a set of principles that BOARS can use to guide its evaluation of the appropriateness of the various individual components of the University's eligibility requirements (e.g., Honors Level Course GPA bump). Although BOARS articulated a set of eligibility principles last year, those principles focused on guiding changes to how the top 12.5% for eligibility is determined, not the evaluation of the individual components that comprise the eligibility requirements.

DISCUSSION: The committee recommended that the draft "Principles for Evaluating Eligibility Requirements" be combined with the previous eligibility principles document and background information to create a single, comprehensive document on the nature of UC eligibility. It was suggested that this eligibility principles document should also begin with an introduction that explains that UC eligibility is defined as the "top 12.5%" by the Master Plan and why the University supports the concept of "eligibility." Members made a number of recommendations for principles and ideas that might be included in this eligibility principles document:

- Include the fundamental principle that eligibility is a *systemwide* determination.
- Recognize that the eligibility construct is currently based on a narrow set of indicators of past academic achievement.
- Acknowledge the other important eligibility-related access provisions contained within the Master Plan: students who don't fulfill UC's freshman eligibility requirements have a second chance to demonstrate their readiness and transfer to the University; there are other components of the California public higher education system – the California State University (CSU) system and California Community Colleges – that provide valuable postsecondary educational opportunities for students.
- Relate eligibility to the idea of "building a class" and the educational goals UC seeks to achieve in offering undergraduate education.

ACTION: BOARS Chair Michael Brown and Member Dick Flacks will revise the draft eligibility principles.

VIII. Role of Honors Level Courses in Admissions

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

Sam Agronow, Associate Director, SAS

Roger Studley, Assistant Director, SAS

ISSUE: Senate Regulation 424 currently allows a grade point advantage for admissions purposes for a limited number of “honors level” courses:

Grades in up to 4 units of certified honors level courses, a maximum of two of which can be taken in the 10th grade, from the areas of history, English, advanced mathematics, laboratory science, and language other than English, will be counted on the scale A=5, B=4, C=3. Grades in all other units will be counted on the scale A=4, B=3, C=2.

As part of the committee’s general review of eligibility components and in response to the final report of the Academic Senate’s AP/Honors Task Force, BOARS is currently reassessing the appropriateness of this policy for calculating GPAs for UC eligibility.

DISCUSSION: The committee reviewed additional data analyses and information related to the Honors Level grade bump policy. One member indicated that the compelling reasons for eliminating the Honors Level grade bump policy may not be data driven, but will likely be based primarily on educational principles and policy concerns. Discussion returned to Asc. VP Dennis Galligani’s suggestion that BOARS develop a set of principles specifically for the purpose of evaluating the Honors Level course grade bump policy (see March 18, 2005 minutes). One member proposed that developing a more general set of principles on how the GPA should be constructed for UC eligibility might be more useful than developing a set of principles specific to evaluating the Honors Level grade bump policy.

ACTION: Member Mark Rashid and Chair Michael Brown will draft a set of principles for the calculation of the GPA for UC eligibility.

ACTION: Further discussion of the Honors Level grade bump policy will be scheduled for the July BOARS meeting.

IX. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)

Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

Judy Kowarsky, Associate Director, SAS

REPORT: Associate Director Judy Kowarsky reported on the possibility of conducting an ELC expansion-related analysis using fall 2005 admission data. An analysis using fall 2005 data, although limited, could examine differences in application and enrollment rates of students that received an “ELC” letter and students that received a “Qualified on Track” letter. By examining the admissions behavior of students at the margins of ELC, such an analysis could provide some information on how academically similar students are impacted by receiving or not receiving an “ELC” letter.

ACTION: Associate Director Judy Kowarsky and Chair Michael Brown will further discuss the possibility of conducting a limited ELC analysis using fall 2005 data.

ACTION: The BOARS ELC Subgroup will continue to explore the possibility of conducting a systemwide ELC expansion pilot program.

Meeting adjourned 4:00 p.m.
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by
Kimberly Peterson
Committee Analyst