

**Minutes of Meeting – July 14, 2006**

Approved August 28, 2006

**JOINT MEETING WITH ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS****I. Welcome and Announcements**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair
- Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions

**REPORT:** After a brief welcome and a summary report of BOARS' activities over the past two years, BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown and Admissions Director Susan Wilbur made the following announcements:

- The fall 2006 community college transfer admissions data have now been released: <http://www.ucop.edu/news/factsheets/2006/ccctransfer.html>. Next week some UC campuses will open for filing of winter quarter/spring semester applications.
- This week the University issued a press release to inform the public of the new "UC Score" test score conversion for statewide eligibility: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/2006/jul11.html>. An online calculator has been provided to help ease the transition to this new method of calculating statewide eligibility: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/admissions/scholarshipreq>.
- George Blumenthal, former Academic Senate Chair, has been appointed as Acting Chancellor of UC Santa Cruz: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/2006/jul14.html>.
- BOARS' "Inclusiveness Indicators" were presented to the Assembly of the Academic Senate and have now been posted on the committee's website: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/boars.indicators0606.pdf>.

**II. Admissions by Exception**

**DISCUSSION:** Campuses reported on their current use of the Admissions by Exception (AbyE) policy. In response to BOARS issuing the "Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Admission by Exception" in September 2005, several campuses reported having engaged in conversations about their objectives for AbyE admissions and a reevaluation of their methods of employing the AbyE policy. Some campuses are developing experimental programs, in accordance with the AbyE policy, "to test alternative methods of selecting students for admission." These pilot programs include inviting homeschool students to submit portfolios for review and soliciting letters of recommendation from high school principals.

Overall campuses agreed that AbyE is a valuable admissions tool in that it provides the flexibility to admit some students who demonstrate high potential for UC success, but who have not fully met the University's strict numeric eligibility requirements. The "Guidelines for Implementation" have aided campuses in defending the use of the AbyE policy, but the political issue of justifying admitting "ineligible" students remains.

BOARS members stressed that “eligibility” is not a definitive determinate of the ability to succeed at UC. The need for the AbyE policy is driven by the eligibility construct’s simplicity, in that it is limited to identifying students through grades and test scores, and that it fails to recognize the full spectrum of student characteristics associated with UC success.

**ACTION: BOARS will request copies of campus analyses of the performance of students admitted by exception.**

### **III. Freshman Eligibility Construct**

**DISCUSSION:** The role and structure of the University’s freshman eligibility policy were discussed. Some valuable public relations aspects of eligibility are its apparent “transparency” and its function as a social contract with students; however, the eligibility “guarantee” is not fixed, but changes over time as the operational definition of eligibility is adjusted to compensate for the number of students who satisfy the requirements. Another valuable aspect of eligibility is the subject (‘a-g’) requirements, which serve as a guide for what students should do to prepare for college-level study and what high schools should provide in terms of college preparatory coursework. Increasing numbers of California high school students are fulfilling the eligibility requirements, but it seems that some students, especially those in disadvantaged populations, are not receiving the necessary information or resources (e.g., ‘a-g’ courses) to attain UC eligibility.

The perceived versus actual transparency of the eligibility construct was debated. Although an individual student could feasibly determine his or her own eligibility status, such a determination is more complicated than it might seem, especially given that there are multiple pathways to UC eligibility (statewide, ELC and examination-alone) and multiple elements (subject, scholarship and examination requirements) that comprise those eligibility pathways. Even if UC eligibility is determinable, admission to a campus (“selection”) is not. It was noted that applicants generally understand the way *Comprehensive Review* is used by UC – that the campuses look holistically at a student’s achievements – in part because this is the way undergraduate admissions functions at other colleges and universities. A move toward “simplicity,” rather “transparency,” as a goal was advocated.

### **IV. Centralized Coordination**

Due to a lack of time, this item was not discussed.

### **V. Admissions Issues from Campuses**

**REPORT:** Campus Admissions Directors presented various issues and concerns about admissions policy, process and outcomes. These concerns primarily related to campus admissions yield and enrollment issues.

**DISCUSSION:** It was noted that although the University of California is one system, individual campuses are often impacted differentially by changes to eligibility and admissions policy. The admissions actions of individual campuses can also impact the enrollment outcomes of other campuses within the system. It can be difficult for campuses to maintain a systemwide perspective when attempting to manage their own unique campus admissions and enrollment concerns.

Meeting adjourned 1:15 p.m.  
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst

## **BOARS MEETING**

### **VI. Chair's Announcements and Updates**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** Chair Michael T. Brown reported to the committee on the following items:

- BOARS' proposed task force on "Describing a-g Requirements More Specifically" has been placed on the consent calendar for approval at the upcoming July 26<sup>th</sup> Academic Council meeting. A brief discussion about underrepresented minority admissions rates is also slated for the July 26<sup>th</sup> Academic Council meeting.
- The UC Transfer Preparation Pathways project and related state legislation, SB 652 (Scott), continue to move forward.

### **VII. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes**

**ACTION:** The minutes of the May 25-26, 2006 BOARS meeting were approved as written.

### **VIII. Examination of UC Eligibility Construct**

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS further discussed and developed its plans for reexamining the UC eligibility construct. The committee began to articulate those elements of the current eligibility construct that should be preserved and those that may need to be modified. It was noted that eligibility is frequently commended for its "transparency," and in fact, students are generally able to determine whether or not they are eligible for admission to the UC system. The danger of eligibility's perceived transparency, however, is that it may lead some students, especially those at the margins of eligibility, to mistakenly believe they cannot attain UC eligibility and so they do not complete all the necessary requirements (e.g., fail to take the SAT Subject exams).

One limitation of the current eligibility construct is that regardless of achievement, if a student doesn't undertake the correct set of actions (e.g., fails to take the correct test pattern), he or she is deemed ineligible. Obtaining and correctly deciphering information about UC eligibility and college admissions requirements can be difficult, especially for first-generation college students. There are two elements to creating a college-going culture: (1) setting accessible admissions requirements and (2) assisting students in meeting those requirements.

Committee members generally supported the idea of systematically expanding the pool of students reviewed for admission beyond those that meet the strict eligibility criteria of being in the top one-eighth of high school graduates (creating a "qualified for review" category). It was noted that there may be better metrics, beyond grades and test scores, to identify those students at the margins of eligibility that are likely to succeed at UC.

Other topics related to the eligibility construct that were discussed included:

- Using the term top “one-eighth” instead of top 12.5 percent for the Master Plan’s threshold for UC-eligible students.
- The balance between enrollment capacity and admissions/
- Viewing eligibility in terms of “college readiness,” or more specifically, readiness for study in a research university setting.
- The role of the subject (‘a-g’) requirements as an outreach tool for promoting college preparedness.

**IX. Comprehensive Review Report**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** Chair Michael T. Brown updated BOARS on the development of a report on Comprehensive Review, fall 2004 – fall 2006. The committee was informed of admissions database problems that have delayed the production of 2006 data for the report. It is anticipated that this data will be available by the end of August.

**ACTION:** Chair Michael T. Brown will prepare a preliminary draft comprehensive review report for BOARS to finalize this fall.

**X. Testing Subcommittee Report**

- Mark Rashid, Testing Subcommittee Chair

**REPORT:** A letter has been sent to The College Board requesting information to aid BOARS in its assessment of the new *SAT Reasoning Test*. The College Board has informed BOARS that it will attempt to respond to the questions within the next 30 to 45 days.

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

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst