

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**June 5, 2009**

**Part I: Joint Meeting with the CSU Admissions Advisory Council (AAC)**

**Attending:**

BOARS: Sylvia Hurtado (UCLA); William Jacob (UCSB); James Given (UCI); Darnell Hunt (UCLA); Peter Sadler (UCR); Joseph Watson (UCSD); Juan Poblete (UCSC); George Johnson (UCB); Pei-te Lien (UCSB); Cynthia Pineda-Scott (Graduate Student, UCLA); Susan Wilbur (Director of Admissions); Don Daves-Rougeaux (Associate Admissions Director); (Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

AAC: Steven Stepanek (CSU Northridge); Sandra Cook (San Diego State); Kathleen Kaiser (CSU Chico); Thomas Krabacher (Sacramento State) Fred Hornbeck (San Diego State); James Davis (CSULB ASI Chief of Staff); James Blackburn (Director of Enrollment Management Services, CSU Office of the Chancellor); Lori Varlotta (Vice President for Student Affairs, CSU Sacramento)

**I. Welcome and Announcements**

BOARS Chair Hurtado welcomed the eight CSU Admissions Advisory Council members in attendance. She noted that BOARS was pleased to have the opportunity to brainstorm with them about issues of common interest and concern, including Career and Technical Education, transfer, the role of a-g, the requirements for area (c), the state budget situation, and past and pending legislation. AAC Vice Chair Steven Stepanek added that the AAC shares BOARS' concerns about these issues. Chair Hurtado noted that she attended an ICAS meeting in Sacramento with legislators who indicated that proposals with budget implications would likely be deferred. Despite the uncertain, shifting environment, UC and CSU have an opportunity to make progress.

**II. Career and Technical Education**

**Issue:** BOARS and AAC discussed the state's request for UC and CSU to do more to accept CTE courses and potential CTE legislation that could divide CSU and UC on 'a-g' alignment. Both systems are under pressure from the legislature and CTE activists to accept any and all CTE courses as fulfilling the general elective ('g') subject requirement for undergraduate admission, regardless of the course's academic content or relationship to major preparation.

**Discussion:** CTE activists are concerned that the requirements for academic rigor in CTE courses dilute their career-focused content and ultimately lead to fewer CTE courses in high schools. Some CTE advocates also believe that is not appropriate for all students to pursue a college track. They also connect industry concerns about a lack of skilled workers to an overemphasis on a-g in high schools, and believe that CTE could help address the high school drop-out problem. More high schools are using a-g as their default curriculum because they want all students to have the opportunity to pursue college, but CTE advocates are concerned that this will push CTE out of schools altogether. Some also believe CSU and UC have fundamentally different undergraduate education missions and their admission requirements should therefore differ, with CSU having a more polytechnic focus.

In the 1980s CSU moved closer to the UC eligibility model, prescribing the specific high school courses that will count for a-g. Since then, the number of CTE courses offered in high schools also declined, in part because schools shifted resources to other disciplines, and staff and equipment requirements for CTE courses grew more expensive.

Proposed State Bill 147 (DeSaulnier), would require CSU and strongly urge UC to accept all CTE courses that meet CA Board of Education standards as fulfilling the ('g') requirement. It was noted that CSU, like UC, is opposed to approving CTE courses for a-g without academic content, but CSU is more vulnerable to legislation than UC. Having different requirements for CSU and UC would confuse schools and students, and most high schools do not have the resources to maintain separate a-g lists.

Director Wilbur noted that UC opposes SB 147 because students and schools should hear a single message about college academic preparation and will benefit from having a single standard. There are already many CTE courses approved for a-g at UC and CSU that integrate strong academics with practical workforce preparation. UC has approved 6,510 such courses, the majority of which are approved for 'g,' 'f', and 'd', but cover all areas. UC is committed to approving more CTE courses, and it understands the need to make progress quickly and improve communication about the issue.

UC has a seven point plan to increase the number of approved CTE courses to 10,000 by 2011-12. The plan includes three collaborative efforts: 1) Working with [ConnectEd](#) to develop curricular frameworks for 15 academic pathways that integrate a CTE and college prep focus; 2) working with CSU to identify CSU majors that UC does not offer to identify new opportunities for CTE linkages; and 3) working with other CTE focused constituencies—e.g., [California Partnership Academies](#) and [ARCHES](#) in enhance CTE curricula in the schools. UCOP's other strategies include: 4) working more directly with high schools; and 5) high school teachers to promote CTE focused curricula, and developing internal process improvements to expedite the review process: 6) course rubric templates for schools to submit with a CTE course approval request; and 7) automatic program approval for certain pre-packaged curricular programs—e.g., [Project Lead the Way](#). UC has a 550K grant from the CA DOE to help fund these efforts.

It was noted that CSU and UC have allowed CTE advocates to define the debate about the purpose of CTE and a-g. CTE advocates want to improve labor force preparation and are concerned that some students are not being served by the college track. UC and CSU need to communicate that they support a multiple pathways approach to CTE courses that serves students who are sure they want to pursue a technical career and those on a college track. They need to sell a-g as a way to ensure that students have access to both pathways and to define approved CTE courses as those that combine practical skill development with core knowledge. UC and CSU should also highlight the overlap between the systems to defend the idea of keeping them aligned. One member noted CSU's responsibility for teacher preparation under the Master Plan, although UC and CSU share a common fate with regard to teacher preparation.

It was noted that UC and CSU place a heavy emphasis on the need to adhere to the 1960 Master Plan, but this hierarchical model was instituted in much different social and budgetary context and may now be outmoded. When the Master Plan was written, it was assumed that only 1/3 of

students would go to college, but now expectations are different. 65% of high school graduates enter a post-secondary institution nationally.

Predating the Master Plan is a constitutional commitment to provide tuition free public education, which the state has long abandoned, and the current budget crisis proposes unprecedented cuts to CA higher education. 112 school districts are expected to have budget deficits by July 1, and The budget crisis is forcing districts to eliminate guidance counselors, summer school, and other programs. The state must look closely at how its future higher education funding model is developed or implemented.

UC and CSU should also realize that some fraction of students will not attend college. One of the main goals of CTE should be to prepare those young people for jobs after high school, and it is part of the faculty's responsibility to focus attention on which CTE courses and programs lead to reasonable salaries. CSU and UC should also recognize that there is a place in high schools for CTE courses that correspond specifically to vocational preparation, but they are not the ones the systems will recognize for a-g purposes.

## **II. "Purposes of 'a-g'" Document**

**Issue:** The committees reviewed a document drafted by BOARS Vice Chair Jacob outlining the purposes of the 'a-g' requirements from a faculty perspective, the process of reviewing and changing the guidelines, and the role of BOARS and UC Admissions in sustaining a-g lists. Part of the genesis of the document was the lobbying efforts by CTE advocates and other groups to expand the a-g framework. Now legislation threatens intersegmental alignment and cohesion. He noted that maintaining a common set of a-g requirements for both systems is a shared goal and UC wants to be responsive to CSU.

**Discussion:** The committees agreed it would be helpful to have a clear statement about the purpose of a-g and a way to communicate messages about CTE.

- The document speaks about college readiness and critical thinking, but a-g also helps students "learn to learn," giving them the crucial capacity to navigate the fast-changing knowledge-based global economy that drives the modern world. The purpose of a-g is to prepare students for a variety of career paths in the new economy.
- The document should make clear that imparting a skill set is one of the main purposes of a-g.
- Some criticize CSU for defaulting to the UC admissions requirements and not actively developing requirements that meet its needs. The document should add "...and the California State University" to any mention of UC to emphasize that CSU and UC are partners, and note that UC is responsible for high school a-g and CSU has assumed responsibility for general education articulation transfer.
- Some students who complete the a-g pattern still arrive unprepared to do college level work and require remediation.

**Action:** Add specified revisions discussed in the meeting and circulate the document to CSU who will circulate it to the full AAC in September and other groups.

### **III. Transfer Issues**

Director Wilbur noted that the California legislature has asked UC and CSU to accept more Community College transfer students and to make the transfer and course articulation process more efficient and effective. The UC President is committed to expanding the transfer path to UC. Earlier this year, he and the leaders of CSU and CCC convened an intersegmental transfer task force to discuss strategies for increasing transfer, streamlining articulation, and communicating more effectively with students, schools, and counselors. The Task Force has met twice and will issue a report in August.

There is a push for CCC to award more AA degrees, but the components of such a degree do not necessarily qualify a student for transfer admission. CSU campuses are working with their primary regional CCC feeder schools to increase transfer rates. Vice President Varlotta noted that Sacramento State is sending math and English faculty to college preparatory classes at certain feeder schools to help make sure that potential transfer students understand that they need the LDTP, not the AA degree to transfer.

CSU developed the Lower Division Transfer Pattern (LDTP) as a way to simplify transfer preparation so that qualified students are prepared to transfer to any of the 23 CSU campuses. The LDTP is essentially a “Transfer AA”; however, the CCCs are unhappy about the volume of articulation agreements it requires them to maintain. As a result CSU is focusing the LDTP on higher yield majors and reducing the number of transfer patterns.

The CCCs have an interest in allowing students to take many courses, but UC and CSU want transfers to arrive prepared to do upper division work and to complete a major in two years. Many students arrive at CCC without clear goals, but CCCs do not have sufficient advising capacity to help students make smart early choices. All segments should consider how to encourage potential transfers to consider their goals so they take the right units for transfer. More generally, the segments need to improve communication to learn more about the others’ views.

It was noted that the CCC system is California’s higher education workhorse, but its most poorly funded segment. CCCs have a dual role of preparing students for transfer and for work, but the additional pressure to be a transfer conduit and the attendant budget squeeze is forcing them to drop some technical courses that align more with the latter mission. If California is serious about improving educational opportunity, it should re-examine its higher education funding structure.

BOARS Vice Chair Jacob also noted concern about the state’s new push to require 8<sup>th</sup> grade algebra and about students who may fulfill the (c) requirement by taking math in grades 8, 9, and 10 and arrive at UC with a two-year gap in math preparation. He asked if CSU is pursuing a 4-year math requirement for a-g. Director Blackburn responded that CSU is not because such a requirement would severely damage CSU’s Master Plan eligibility targets, as fewer students would be eligible for CSU with 4 years of mathematics.

## **Part II: BOARS Meeting**

### **I. Consent Calendar**

1. May 1, 2009 meeting minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the May 2009 minutes.

### **II. Announcements**

- *BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado*

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

- Academic Council completed its review of a proposed 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 furloughs or salary reductions at individual campuses or across the UC system. Council declined to endorse the policy but forwarded suggested modifications to the President. He currently has authority to implement pay cuts and furloughs without consultation, but the new policy institutes a consultative process with the Senate in the event of an emergency.
- Council endorsed a UCFW [Task Force on Investment and Retirement report](#) recommending a plan to ensure adequate funding for the UC Retirement Plan.
- UCOP estimates that the Governor's May 26 proposed budget revisions will result in a net state funding reduction to UC of \$619M, or 19%.
- Council endorsed a UCEP recommendation that funding be maintained for the Student Experience at a Research University and its biannual survey, the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES).
- The Academic Planning Task Force discussed the success of the collaborative exchange of transfer admission data (CTAD) project, which allows campuses to share reviews of transfer students who applied to more than one UC campus. The project started in 2004, and had been a paper process until the implementation of a new UC Davis online tool this year. It is helping expedite the review of transfer applications on several campuses. It has been easy to use the system for transfer admission, which is highly rule based, but there are lessons that can also be applied to freshman admissions.
- Chair Hurtado attended a meeting of UC leaders and the Asian Pacific American Legal Center to discuss concerns about the impact of admissions reform on the Asian-American community. There was a suggestion that UC increase its visibility in the Asian media. It was also noted that different segments of the Asian-American community have differing levels of support for admissions reform.

### **III. Modifications to Academic Senate Admissions Regulations**

BOARS reviewed comments, questions, and suggested changes resulting from the systemwide Senate review of BOARS' proposed modifications to Senate regulations governing undergraduate admissions. The committee also reviewed a draft memo summarizing BOARS'

response to each suggestion, either to incorporate a change or to explain its rationale for leaving it unchanged. Chair Hurtado noted that many changes involved minor typographic and style issues, others required more substantial consideration, and still others require advice from BOARS. There are also new language changes to the regulations related to Advanced Standing.

One division opposed BOARS' proposed new Regulation SR464 codifying the Admission by Exception (A by E) policy instituted by the Regents in 1990, noting that the policy had not undergone Senate review and therefore should not be added to the Regulations. Chair Hurtado noted that Council reviewed and approved [Implementation Guidelines](#) for A by E in 2005 and that UC policy on A by E has a long history with periodic revisions adopted by the Regents.

**Discussion:** It is important to include specific language about the 9x9 index because the regulations should reflect what the Senate approved, the new index is one of the most important features of the reform, and BOARS has the ability review the index on a regular basis and modify it if necessary. One member also noted that it was important to introduce an ASR on A by E as existing policy, as campus admissions committees determine how to handle A by E in the future.

**Action:** BOARS approved the changes. Committee Analyst LaBriola and Chair Hurtado will finalize the documents and prepare a cover letter for the review of the full committee.

#### **IV. Project S.O.L.: Secondary Online Learning**

- with Patricia Gándara, co-director of [The Civil Rights Project](#) at UCLA

BOARS convened in the UCOP videoconference room to learn more about [Project S.O.L.](#), a bi-national initiative to improve access to a-g courses for California high school English language learners. UCLA Professor Patricia Gándara leads the project, which is funded by the Mexican government and private U.S. foundations. Lourdes Guerrero, who works with Professor Gándara, was also present.

Professor Gándara noted that 30% of English language learners in California schools are in secondary schools. At least 120,000 of those students are Spanish dominant and most have been in the United States three years or less. Many have a solid educational background from their country of origin and could normally take a-g-level coursework in California, but lacking Spanish language curricula, they are forced to take remedial level math and science, and only 30% ever graduate from high school. Project S.O.L. is a drop-out prevention program, but it also aims to increase the number of students who graduate from high school and move on to college.

Project S.O.L. is working with teachers and counselors in four districts in San Diego, Los Angeles, and the Imperial Valley to integrate Spanish-translated curriculum into math and science courses taught in English so that Spanish dominant students can have access to an a-g curriculum. Project S.O.L. wants to see if teachers who are non-native Spanish speakers can navigate the curriculum to help native speakers learn and fulfill a-g. Project S.O.L. is working with 120 students this year, and plans to double its cohort next year. The curriculum is free. It was originally developed for online use to enable students to learn independently; however, most students targeted by Project S.O.L. are not in a position to learn independently, so schools are being asked to incorporate the curriculum into classroom instruction twice a week. Organizers

also want to employ a tutor from the Mexican Department of Education to help students online. They are also considering a service-as-needed model as an alternative to the cohort model. The program's major expense is the professional development of teachers and counselors.

Project S.O.L. will measure outcomes by tracking persistence, graduation and a-g completion rates of the Project S.O.L. students compared to other district students, although this may be difficult because many immigrants are transient. She noted that the Mexican government is aware of the negative perceptions of Spanish speaking immigrants to the US and therefore has a political interest in providing access to education.

Director Wilbur noted that UC will certify the Project S.O.L. curricula for a-g as long as it is equivalent to other courses being taught in the school and only delivered differently. High schools should submit courses to UC in the normal fashion. After UC approves a course for a-g, any school can offer it. It was noted that [University of California College Prep](#) (UCCP) has already been working with the Mexican government to align online Mexican secondary school curricula with California standards, which has been approved for a-g.

**Discussion:** Chair Hurtado thanked Project S.O.L. organizers for working to expand educational opportunities to otherwise forgotten students. By creating an aligned curriculum, Mexico and UC have made an important investment that will help students in both Latin America and the US. She noted that BOARS is interested and open to new innovations and ideas. There was a concern about the new pressure the budget is placing on schools and their ability to provide access to a-g, as well as ongoing pressure on teachers to help students pass the CAHSEE exam.

## **V. Report to the Regents on the New SAT**

**Report:** BOARS Testing Subcommittee Chair Peter Sadler briefed BOARS on a revised draft report to The Regents on the use of standardized admissions tests, which incorporates comments and suggestions from the May BOARS meeting. He said the main change is to make more explicit statements about the use of tests that parallel the organization of the [BOARS' Testing Principles](#)—outlining their usage, design, and oversight. The report describes the role of tests in each major pathway to UC eligibility and admission, their societal and economic burden, how readers use test scores in comprehensive review and selection, and why the Subject Test requirement was eliminated as part of the eligibility reform proposal—due to their role in excluding students rather than their role in predictability.

The report notes that the SAT Reasoning and ACT with Writing each makes a good faith effort to meet the BOARS principles, and each has succeeded in adding some predictive power, but at the same time, it is probably impossible for any national, norm-referenced test to meet those principles completely.

He said the eligibility index addresses an element of fairness that requires everyone to be treated the same, while selection addresses an element of fairness that requires everyone to be treated as individuals. Testing adds a social burden, but test scores can also add fairness in that test score discrepancies relative to GPA and other indicators are a way to flag the file for extra attention in Comprehensive Review. The use of both GPA and test scores in prediction is highly redundant,

but that redundancy is necessary to maintain a balance between the social burden of the requirement and the benefit of added fairness to the individual. Therefore UC may need the tests.

The report does not explicitly recommend that test scores be optional, but it says UC should weigh the consequences of joining the growing number of four-year colleges that have made them optional. The report recommends that the BOARS principles prefer tests that are curriculum-based and scored by achievement standards. It says UC should signal to applicants that it considers ACT scores at least as insightful as SAT-R scores, and suggests that UC should consider whether a new system of shared holistic scores would render the eligibility index redundant.

**Discussion:** UC should consider recommending the ACT over the SAT. 1/3 of UC applicants already take the ACT, so there should be enough data to secure reliable statistics about it. One simple way to elevate the ACT is to put it first in any written reference to “ACT or SAT.”

There is only a small difference between the predictability of high school GPA and SAT scores, which argues for maintaining both measures in admissions decisions. We should also not forget that standardized tests provide students and schools with a uniform reference point that is independent of a particular school’s grading system or any associated biases. California is large and diverse. Without the SAT or ACT, UC would lose its modeling capability and high schools would begin to engage in more grade inflation. If admissions criteria are decided without tests purely at the local level, the public may lose confidence in UC’s admissions decisions.

One member noted that blaming alleged biases in the tests help let poor performing schools and individuals off the hook. The SAT is a reasonable predictor of success in the University. Doing well on the test is primarily a matter of preparation.

There was a suggestion that the Committee use [Google Docs](#) in the final editing process.

**Action:** Peter Sadler will solicit changes and revisions to incorporate into a new draft for the next meeting.

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