

**University of California Academic Senate
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Minutes of Meeting – June 6, 2008**

Attending: Mark Rashid, chair (UCD), Sylvia Hurtado, vice chair (UCLA), David Anthony (UCSC), James Given (UCI), William Jacob (UCSB), Jeannie Oakes (UCLA), Peter Sadler (UCR), David Stern (UCB), Joseph Watson (UCSD), Daniel Weiss (UCSF), Susan Wilbur (Director, Admissions), Samuel Agronow (Associate Director, Admissions & Outreach-SAS), William Kidder (Special Asst. to VP, Student Affairs), Nina Robinson (Director, Policy & External Affairs, SAS), Roger Studley (Assistant Director, Admissions), Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

I. Chair's Announcements – Mark Rashid

Report: UCOP is undergoing a massive restructuring to increase efficiencies and re-focus its mission inward and upward in support of the president. In May, administrators briefed Senate committee and divisional chairs about the effort, including plans for a new Instructional Research Unit that will bring data collection, analysis, and reporting under a single division. The Senate supports many aspects of the reorganization, but is also concerned about losing institutional memory and the continued ability of the Senate to access data and carry out its functions and responsibilities.

Council decided to set aside a proposed resolution on “maintaining the reality of stewardship,” originally put forward by BOARS, which expressed concern about the effect of the restructuring on the Senate, noting that the Senate leadership interacts frequently with the administration on the topic.

The Governor’s May state budget revision restored approximately \$100 million to UC’s budget over cuts that had been proposed in January, but it still leaves UC more than \$300 million short of the operating budget proposed by the Regents last fall. President-Designate Mark Yudof begins work on June 16, and has signaled that among his first priorities will be continuing the restructuring and rebuilding UC’s state funding base.

Chair Rashid announced that William Jacob has been asked to serve as BOARS vice chair for 2008-2010. He also noted that longtime BOARS consultant Roger Studley is leaving UCOP at the end of June. He said Assistant Director Studley has provided the Committee with outstanding, expert analytical support. BOARS members also expressed their thanks and gave Mr. Studley a round of applause.

II. Consent Calendar

1. March 7, 2008 meeting minutes
2. May 2, 2008 meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar pending the addition of the March attendance record to the March minutes.

III. Report of the Undergraduate Work Team of the Regents Diversity Study Group – William Kidder

Issue: Special Assistant Bill Kidder summarized the [report](#) of the Undergraduate Work Team of the Regents Study Group on Diversity. The report was presented in May to the full Board of Regents along with a report on “disparate impact” in admissions.

Disparate Impact Report

Special Assistant Kidder noted that UC Counsel Charles Robinson and Student Affairs Vice President Judy Sakaki prepared and presented the report *Race, Sex, and Disparate Impact* to the Regents in response to an earlier Regental request.

He said that, in the context of UC admissions and scholarship decisions, disparate impact refers to differences in outcomes by race, ethnicity, or gender where intentional discrimination does not necessarily exist, but where there is nonetheless a discriminatory result. Title VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act prohibit federally funded agencies from engaging in practices that have the “effect of” disparate impact discrimination by ethnicity or race. Title IX has similar language prohibiting gender discrimination. There is a three-part test to determine if a practice resulting in disparate impact violates federal law: the practice must change if it creates a substantial disparity, *and* it is not educationally justifiable, *or* a legitimate educational justification is present but there is nonetheless an alternative practice that is equally effective at meeting the institution’s educational goals while resulting in a lesser degree of disparate impact. He noted that the “4/5th rule” often helps determine if a disparity exists – that is if a group’s proportionate representation is 80% or less than that of the highest group. He said courts usually defer to institutions about their educational goals and the viability of alternatives. Federal law and the three-part test are still valid within the context of Proposition 209.

Two UC case studies help illuminate disparate impact. The first is the [2005 decision](#) to end funding support of the National Merit Scholarship Program. Because the NMSP awards revealed a disparate impact for URMs, because the reliance on PSAT scores for the awards was inconsistent with comprehensive review principles, and because the Regents and Chancellor’s scholarships had lower disparity outcomes, those two alternatives were seen to be better funding targets than the NMSP. The second case study involves the 1997 UCB School of Law entering class, the first class post-SP-1, which included very few URMs. The disparity prompted the Office of Civil Rights to launch a disparate impact compliance review. The authors of the Race, Sex and Disparate Impact review some likely causes of disparate impact in the School of Law’s admissions procedures and conclude that, in retrospect, there were equally effective alternatives that lessen disparate impact

Undergraduate Diversity Work Team Report

Special Assistant Kidder summarized some of the key findings of the Work Team, which was led by Senate Chair Michael Brown. UC loses a proportion of URMs at each stage between 10th grade and freshman enrollment, most strikingly in the fulfillment of the a-g pattern and SAT testing requirements. There is a persistent disparity between URM and White/Asian eligibility rates over time and a widening opportunity gap in higher education for URMs, whose UC enrollment rates lag their proportions in California high schools. African-American admission rates are particularly low over time and across campuses. There are also persistent gaps by race in a-g completion rates, and severe inequalities, also tied to race, in the availability of AP courses, Honors courses, and counselors in California high schools. The report notes that overall, about 20% of California’s high schools produce about half of UC freshman admissions offers. The Work Team recommends paying more attention to diversity, particularly through the transfer admissions pathway, increasing academic preparation funding, increasing the number of qualified high school counselors, and implementing a new UC eligibility construct. Finally, UC’s financial aid and scholarship systems should be made more competitive for URMs.

Discussion: Special Assistant Kidder noted that after the presentation, several Regents expressed a sense of urgency about the diversity situation at UC. There were calls for UC to do more by, for example, setting targets and timetables or by sending different messages. Several Regents also expressed concern about the pace of the Senate’s eligibility reform effort and challenged the Senate to complete its review by July.

BOARS member David Stern called for a vote on the following resolution regarding the [inclusiveness indicators](#): “BOARS urges the Office of Undergraduate Admissions in collaboration with BOARS to update the inclusiveness indicators on an ongoing basis.”

Action: The Committee voted unanimously to adopt the resolution.

IV. Briefing from the UCOP Office of Admissions – Susan Wilbur

Report: Admissions Director Wilbur updated BOARS on several Office of Admissions projects and reported outcomes from the 2007-08 admissions cycle.

She said President Dynes sent a memo to state legislators indicating that UC has taken steps to comply with Senate Bill 1543, which asks UC to offer more clarity and guidance to high schools about how they should design Career and Technical Education (CTE) courses that have sufficient rigor to fulfill the [“g” elective requirement](#) for UC admission. UC will be convening a panel of subject matter experts and high school representatives to review CTE courses for excellence and relevance.

As of May 1, 39,200 students submitted Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) as freshmen in fall 2008, the largest number in UC history. The University wants to send a positive message about accommodating more students this year, but also wants to be clear that UC is not being funded for the increase, and without sufficient funding, it will be a challenge to accommodate all students in the future. She said all campuses met their enrollment targets and the yield rate for URM students was high (50%), with significant increases in African-American SIRs. UC also admitted a larger number of international students this year, most of whom applied to either UCB or UCLA. UCR and UCM also saw higher referral pool yields.

She said there was a presentation at the May Regents meeting about transfer students from the California Community Colleges (CCC). UC admitted a record number of CCC transfers this year, although UCB, UCI, and UCLA scaled back transfer admissions, and all campuses showed significant declines in African-American transfer admits and some declines in Chicano/Latino admits. She urged against making transfer students an afterthought in admissions, noting that the transfer persistence rate is nearly identical to the freshman rate, and the transfer graduation rate exceeds that of freshmen. She noted that implementation of Senate Resolution [477](#) (Streamlining the Major Preparation Course Articulation Process), [California Senate Bill 652](#), and *UC Transfer Preparation Paths*, continues. The goal of these projects is to provide better information to CCC students about systemwide and campus-specific transfer requirements for various majors. She circulated a sample *Transfer Path* document for the philosophy major, and noted that Office of Admissions staff have completed an initial goal of adding Paths for the 20 highest demand transfer majors to <http://www.uctransfer.org/>.

Finally, she encouraged BOARS members to attend one of several scheduled UC admissions Counselor Conferences.

V. Non Resident Tuition (NRT) and Enrollment – Nina Robinson

Issue/Report: In January, BOARS requested more information about what seemed at that time to be a new policy directing campuses to set separate admission targets for state supported resident undergraduates and fee bearing non-resident undergraduates. Memos from Provost Hume and EVP Lapp clarified that the “new” policy is partly the result of changes to the state’s enrollment targets, and partly the result of new transparency in UCOP budget processes.

Director Robinson noted that over time UC has developed a shortfall in budgeted non-resident tuition revenues. In the past, UCOP collected NRT revenues and redistributed them to campuses, passing shortfalls on as undesignated cuts. The new system allows campuses to control NRT revenues, ensuring that campuses know exactly how many state-supported students they must enroll to meet targets and how much NRT they must generate. She said the state does not fund over-enrollment of state-funded students, so most campuses are not replacing in-state slots with out of state students. Rather, they first meet their in-state targets and then admit fee bearing non-residents. She encouraged BOARS members to take an interest in enrollment planning.

She said only revenues from non-resident tuition can be used to recruit out of state students, and there are informal expectations that non-resident students should be more qualified than native

students, and together with international students should comprise no more than 5% of the undergraduate population.

Discussion: BOARS expressed concerns about the possibility of fiscal considerations being injected into admissions decisions and a system in which campuses are forced to generate additional non-resident tuition revenue to fund budgets. Some members felt that informal agreements about limiting non-resident enrollment might not carry much weight if there are fiscal incentives to enroll more of them. Chair Rashid encouraged BOARS members to bring the issue before their local committees and to remain engaged in enrollment issues. One member suggested that BOARS develop a set of guidelines and principles around admission and enrollment of non-residents for broader Senate review.

Action: Chair Rashid will start work on drafting a set of principles for admission and enrollment of non-residents at the undergraduate level.

VI. Shared Admissions Review

Issue: Chair Rashid reported that two Workgroups comprised of BOARS faculty and administrators continue to discuss the details of a system that would allow campuses to share reviews of freshman applications. The Workgroups are developing two protocols for processing, extracting, and distributing application information centrally. The first protocol would generate a score or set of scores from a holistic, human read of the application. The second would generate a set of “machine” scores based on an automated algorithmic assessment of various Comprehensive Review factors.

He said one point of disagreement on the Holistic Workgroup is whether it would be better to have a single holistic ranking, modeled on those used at UCB and UCLA, or some less aggregated form of information that would provide separate (dimensional) holistic sub-scores around common characteristics, such as leadership. He asked BOARS members to give their views on this issue among others.

Discussion: Holistic Workgroup member Daniel Weiss noted that UCB and UCLA are concerned about changing established functions and finding new resources to implement a shared review system. Part of the resistance to the holistic read system is a concern about placing an additional burden on UCB and UCLA readers to review thousands of additional applications. He suggested an initial small scale pilot study involving 50-100 applications could help identify precisely how much time and resources would be required.

There is concern that a single holistic score will leave out important information, although there may be other ways of approaching that problem short of multiple scoring, such as a triggering mechanism in which human readers would flag dimensional factors for a closer campus-based read. The machine score would also be designed to flag indicators for potential further investigation by human readers. Sylvia Hurtado noted that while UCLA wants to acquaint other campuses with the usefulness of a single holistic score, they are also open to revising the scores at the lower end of the scale.

There was a comment that the Workgroups should work closely with campuses not only to solicit feedback – for example, what information would be sufficient for them to choose *not* to read an application – but also to reassure them about the goals of the project.

Director Robinson noted that the Admissions Processing Task Force conceived shared review as a way to eliminate unnecessary reads at the top end – that is, to build on the fact that most students admitted to UCB and UCLA are likely to be admitted at other campuses – and to give other qualified students an opportunity to be read.

VII. BOARS' Revised Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility

Issue/Report: In May, Academic Council voted to approve a modified version of BOARS' proposal to reform UC freshman eligibility. Council settled on a compromise that would institute BOARS' recommendations to implement the ETR admissions pathway and eliminate the SAT Subject test requirement, but would establish a 9% within-school and 9% statewide referral guarantee structure in place of the 12.5/5 index proposed by BOARS. If the Academic Assembly votes in favor of the proposal at its June 11 meeting, it will move to the Board of Regents for final review and approval. The policy would take effect for fall 2012 admissions and would also institute a regular cycle of evaluation in which BOARS would analyze its impact and could recommend a revised guarantee structure for future Senate consideration.

Chair Rashid said while there was strong support in Council for ETR and elimination of the SAT II requirement, several reviewers felt the proposed 12.5% / 5% referral guarantee index represented too drastic a departure from current practice. Chair Rashid told Council that BOARS believes the 12.5/5 index is optimal, but the other elements of the proposal are in fact more critical to the overall soundness of freshman admissions than the referral guarantee. To that end, he supported the 9x9 compromise, which is projected to yield a 9.7% overall guarantee rate.

Chair Rashid asked BOARS representatives to turn their attention to the task of educating and informing their campus Assembly representatives about the proposal, anticipating concerns and developing well reasoned rebuttals. He also encouraged members to participate in the June 11 Assembly meeting conference call, during which any Senate member can speak for two minutes. He mentioned that President-Designate Yudof is expected to join that meeting.

Discussion: One member noted that there should be a renewed focus on the expanded ELC, which emphasizes how critical it is to UC's mission to reach into all California high schools. ELC helps motivate and encourage students, particularly those at disadvantaged schools throughout the state, to apply. It also encourages schools to better prepare their students for UC. Some faculty are concerned that good students from top "feeder" high schools will be left without a referral guarantee; however, these students will still be Entitled to Review, and few use or benefit from the referral. Campuses, not the guarantee, admit the overwhelming majority (99%) of students, and ETR would not change that. Students from top schools will still apply and be admitted to individual campuses on the basis of their records. The referral guarantee is more important in lower API schools. It sends a message that it matters just as much to do well in comparison to your high school peers as to do well in comparison to students in more advantaged schools. In short, some members felt the referral guarantee, while important, was the least of the three proposal elements because it is used by a very small percentage of students, while others thought the proposal was akin to a three-legged stool.

The proposal is an attempt to broaden the applicant pool and loosen some strict eligibility requirements that have little educational value. The pool of ineligible students with GPAs of 3.5 and above who applied and were denied is evidence that the system is broken. One member said the proposal's "winners" will be high school students and UC faculty.

Some faculty have suggested that it would be viable to remove the SAT II requirement without implementing ETR. The SAT II is a barrier to diversity that differentially impacts URM students, but if it were removed without ETR, the eligibility index would have to be ratcheted up to meet the 12.5% target, which would cause more harm to diversity.

A few members felt that Senate Chair Michael Brown should be encouraged to speak as an advocate for the proposal at the Assembly meeting rather than as a neutral chair/moderator.

Action: The committee adopted the following resolution and asked Chair Rashid to convey it to the Assembly: "BOARS unanimously supports 9x9 as a compromise in the interest of gaining faculty support for advancing the principles embodied in BOARS' eligibility reform proposal."

Action: The Office of Admissions will gather data on students from the top high schools in the state who accepted a referral offer and enrolled.

Action: BOARS members thanked Chair Rashid for his efforts on the eligibility reform effort and gave him a round of applause.

VIII. Report from the ('c') and ('d') Task Force

Issue/Report: A task force is drafting new language intended to provide clearer, more specific guidance to high schools about how to structure courses to meet the mathematics ('c') and laboratory science ('d') coursework required for UC eligibility. The task force is examining the guidance in the context of various state-specified curricular standards as well as UC's own educational goals. The new language will appear in the [guide](#) the Office of Admissions publishes for high schools. The Task Force met for the fourth time in May and its work is nearly done.

Activists have continued to lobby BOARS to add Earth and Space Sciences (ESS) as a fourth core laboratory science option in UC's 'd' and 'g' requirements, which helped delay the effort. BOARS has declined the request on several occasions and has advised ESS proponents to submit a proposal to Council for systemwide review.

William Jacob reported that the group revising the mathematics ('c') language wants to recommend that high schools draw content from the [California Academic Content Standards for Mathematics](#) and follow pedagogical approaches outlined in ICAS' [Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students](#). They are also revising the language to make the geometry requirement more explicit and to highlight and the viability of certain integrative math curricula. They also believe that an Algebra I course taken in 8th grade should not count toward the requirement for completion of three math courses in high school, which would be a policy change.

Mark Rashid reported that the laboratory science ('d') language outlines the course requirements for students, the educational goals of the requirement, and what courses must include to be approved. It also references the California Content Standards, noting that the Standards are a useful, but not comprehensive guide to the topical breadth suitable courses must cover.

Action: BOARS will consider the topic again in July.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45pm

Minutes prepared by: Michael LaBriola; Attest: Mark Rashid

Distributions

1. Disparate Impact Fact Sheet and Report
2. Disparate Impact PowerPoint
3. Undergraduate Diversity Work Team PowerPoint
4. Memo re: CTE
5. SIR Data
6. Transfer Student PowerPoint