

**University of California Academic Senate
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Minutes of Meeting
July 9, 2010**

I. Preparation for meeting with Regent Eddie Island

The Committee discussed topics expected to arise during the morning session with Regent Eddie Island. Vice Chair Simmons mentioned that he had invited Regent Island to attend a BOARS meeting earlier this year, after a series of racial incidents at UCSD generated concern about diversity and campus climate and Regent Island suggested that UC's low African-American enrollment may be attributable to UC's faculty-governed admissions system, which in his view, relies too heavily on grades and test scores.

II. Meeting with Regent Eddie Island

Chair Hurtado said she is encouraged by the commitment of the Regents and President Yudof to access and diversity. She noted that BOARS' [Comprehensive Review Report](#) examines how well campuses are meeting UC's comprehensive review principles, including the consideration of student achievement in the context of opportunity. The report outlines successes but also highlights areas of concern, particularly the low African-American admission rate. It recommends how campuses can improve processes and move toward greater individualized student review. She added that enrollment constraints due to the budget crisis are a threat to diversity and UC's ability to predict outcomes under the eligibility reform policy.

Regent Island: BOARS' report contains good messages about areas where UC is succeeding—the academic excellence of the student body, high persistence and graduation rates, and broad economic and geographic diversity. But the challenges are large and UC's performance is lacking. The University has failed the people of California because it is not meeting its mandate to educate a broad cross section of the state. UC is doing better than it was, but better is not a standard we ought to embrace. UC does not have a plan to address diversity, particularly the African-American community's wish to be included in UC or the challenge of educating the growing Chicano/Latino population. UC must be more responsive to a rapidly diversifying population to maintain public support. Neither comprehensive review nor the new admissions policy will help UC meet these goals fully, and the latter may take us further away with respect to African-Americans (although the policy is fairer).

Proposition 209 is not the roadblock UC has made it into. K-12 quality in California contributes to the problem, but it is not fair to tell an entire generation of Californians that it can only have access to UC after K-12 is fixed.

The Board of Regents places a high value on diversity and inclusion. UC correctly places in the faculty purview who is taught and what is taught. The Regents want to validate the faculty's judgments. The Board has asked for real change, but the faculty have not delivered. The problems are difficult and complex, but the time for change is now. It is dangerous for political appointees (regents) to make policy, but they may have to intervene if the faculty are incapable of delivering change.

He challenged BOARS to reaffirm its commitment to diversity and inclusion and to think creatively about new solutions. First, the referral system is unfair to students of color. UC should end the referral system or develop a mechanism to distribute referral students more broadly

across the campuses. Second, UC should establish clearer metrics, benchmarks, and timetables to define success for diversity and inclusion. Finally, there is a perception that UC's definition of merit allows some communities to have greater access than others. UC should think about a new definition of merit that weighs traditional academic measures and achievement in context more equally. He said diversity is important not only because it is fair, but also because it enables UC to attract the best and brightest. UC cannot fully achieve quality without diversity.

Discussion: Members noted that Proposition 209, K-12 quality, and the California Master Plan all constrain UC. The Master Plan restricts UC to choose from the top 12.5% of California high school graduates. Eligibility reform is an attempt to broaden the definition of the top 12.5%, but under any definition of merit, the top 12.5% will not mirror California demographics. Moreover, the diversity problem begins well before the stage at which students are applying to UC, and UC has chosen not to resist or challenge Proposition 209.

The eligibility reform policy removes unfair barriers, diminishes the impact of the SAT, and expands Eligibility in the Local Context, which could increase diversity in the applicant pool with directed recruitment and outreach. UC cannot fix preparation at the K-12 level, but it can do more to reach out to students and encourage them to apply. However, enhanced resources and support systems will be vital to the success of the new policy.

Davis, Santa Barbara, and Riverside have individualized systems that have helped them achieve more diversity. UCSB has been successful with targeted recruitment at API 1 and 2 schools. The success of holistic admissions at UCLA was due in part to a focused outreach and recruitment effort, which helped bolster applications and yield, although other campuses may not benefit from a holistic system as much because UCLA and UCB are often the first choice of many African-American students.

Regent Island responded that UC's definition of merit and quality is anchored to standardized test scores and GPA, but there are other measures to help understand what it takes to succeed at UC. He urged BOARS to consider new definitions of merit, metrics, and tools, without fear of Proposition 209. At the same time, he said UC does not want to challenge Proposition 209 explicitly. He asked BOARS to gather data about the pool of admitted students who are placed in the referral pool and who choose not to come to UC. Vice Chair Jacob thanked him for coming and noted that one of the new principles in the CR report is that campus selection criteria should give priority to the 9% ELC students; moreover, the discussion on page 45 of the report asserts that BOARS will monitor ELC admissions to ensure that no group is disproportionately assigned to the referral pool. This aligns with the Regent's request in his opening statement regarding ELC. The vice chair also accepted the Regent's challenge to implement the recommendations of the report and to prod BOARS to think creatively about new metrics to guide campus selection. He asked the Regents to accept a reciprocal challenge to ensure that there are sufficient financial resources for admissions and outreach in place to implement the 2012 policies, and in addition, when the faculty have serious concerns about issues of K-12 preparation that are not being heard by the establishment, to facilitate communication with the CA State Board of Education.

Members noted that GPA and test scores do contribute usefully to UC's ability to judge merit and predict success, although the CR report asks campuses to collect more contextual information that will help identify academic and leadership promise. UC is still operating in an entitlement mode, which is at odds with its basic public mission. UC collects little data about the contributions of UC graduates, which could demonstrate the value of UC and a diverse UC to the state. UCSD has not done well due to an overemphasis on grades and test scores. It loses many admits to UCLA and UCB and needs to focus on recruitment. Finally, the "Asian" demographic is not a monolith, but hugely diverse.

III. Meeting with Campus Admissions Directors

Preparing for new admissions policy in 2012:

The Comprehensive Review report recommends providing more of the application fee to admissions departments to support, in the short term, the increased workload expected in 2012, and in the long term, individualized or holistic review of all applicants as campuses become more selective. BOARS also recommends that campuses invest more resources in recruitment and outreach to ensure a diverse class.

Discussion: 2012 diversity outcomes will depend on a diverse applicant pool. Removing the Subject test requirement eliminates a barrier, but it does not guarantee new applicants. The ELC 9% cohort is an opportunity to enhance diversity. Campuses must find ways to reach out to ELC students at low API schools and encourage them to apply by sending admissions representatives to those schools and contacting students directly. In addition, UC needs a mechanism to ensure that students in the ELC 9% cohort have some predictable probability of being admitted into one of the campuses of their choice. It was suggested that every ELC student in the referral pool have some enhanced opportunity to enroll at their local campus.

Sharing Holistic Review Scores:

In response to President Yudof's request that BOARS consider moving all campuses to a holistic review system, BOARS recommended that beginning in 2011, all campuses receive the UCB and UCLA holistic review scores and devise a plan to generate a holistic score for the remaining 28% of applicants who do not apply to either UCB or UCLA to use at their discretion. In addition, campuses should explore the use of a common rating system based on a shared read of all files. Ideally, all campuses would have trained readers to help foster institutional knowledge and a common understanding about what goes into a score.

Discussion: Shared scores will provide more useful information to campuses, increase efficiency, and ensure similar processes and procedures. UCSD has been using UCLA's scores for several years and plans to conduct its own holistic read on the 30% of UCSD applicants who do not have a UCB or UCLA score. UCI has been using UCLA's scores for some decisions at the border of admission and denial and is discussing moving to a single score holistic system. It will be important to test drive a shared review process in 2011 to ensure that a strong process is in place by 2012. UCLA and UCB could divide up the applications.

Campuses will need training to understand how to use a Berkeley or UCLA score, and some may need a finer gradation of the Berkeley and UCLA 1-5 scores. UCB has technology to share scores electronically in real time and to host training webinars, although small group, in-person training over multiple sessions is more effective for new readers. In addition, the UCLA and UCB scores are imbued with the values of those campuses, but the scores will mean different things on each campus because each has its own selection philosophy that weighs the 14 CR factors differently. It is important for campuses to involve faculty in reader training. Faculty also should help establish principles to guide the use of the UCLA or UCB scores.

There was concern that for shared review to really work, comprehensive review guidelines and the details of reader norming would have to be more similar across campuses, which could be difficult from a practical point of view. There was also concern that a systemwide "UC holistic score" would limit the ability of campuses to evaluate and admit students based on local values. It was noted that using the UCLA or UCB scores in 2011 is the first step in moving a

campus to its own holistic process and a scoring system imbued with local values. A distinction was made between the rating of students and actual selection, in which campuses can use their own values (which may include an additional read).

It was noted that holistic review is not a silver bullet for diversity, and it is important to allow campuses to maintain uniqueness and autonomy. A reconceptualization of UC's educational mission will be controversial among faculty who seek a specific type of preparation and who gear their teaching to that preparation. It was noted that even under affirmative action, UC never achieved its diversity goals, but Proposition 209 is a barrier and the political environment is very challenging. Change will require some kind of public policy push at the highest levels of the California educational establishment, including the Regents.

Best practices for faculty involvement in the admissions process:

Faculty involvement varies across the system. At Berkeley, faculty collaborate closely with admissions staff and are passionately involved and fully engaged in policy and implementation. Members serve a minimum three-year term. The committee meets every other week and reviews all policy documents each year. Faculty are involved in reader training and norming, some aspects of quality control (reading of lowest 100 admits for confirmation), and outcome analyses (retention, augmented review students, etc.).

IV. Consent Calendar

1. Approval of the July 4, 2010 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the June minutes.

V. Announcements

On July 7, Chair Hurtado met with the Asian Pacific American Legal Center in Los Angeles to discuss the effect of eligibility reform on diversity. She will present the Comprehensive Review report at the July 14 meeting of the Board of Regents.

Director Wilbur noted that beginning next year UCOP will return all application fee revenue generated by a campus to that campus, with a tag to identify it as fee revenue. As a result of concerns BOARS members expressed in June about the potential for an inequitable allocation of revenue, UC leaders have agreed that fee revenue will be distributed to campuses based on number of applications received, regardless of whether the student has paid a fee or received a fee waiver.

Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux distributed copies of the program from the May 16-19 UC Curriculum Integration Institute, and Chair Hurtado distributed a higher education advocacy brochure put together by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

VI. Systemwide Review of Proposal to Expand Area 'd' to include EESS

In June, Council voted unanimously to decline a proposal to expand UC's Laboratory Science (area 'd') admissions requirement language to include Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences (EESS) as a choice to fulfill the requirement, along with the fundamental sciences of biology, chemistry, and physics. However, Council also passed a motion asking BOARS to consider an

expansion of area 'd' language in Senate Regulations to include a description of alternatives to meeting the laboratory science requirement, particularly integrative science courses.

Chair Hurtado and Vice Chair Jacob drafted a response memo stating that Senate Regulations should not be changed, as they are intended to be narrow, concise statements about the minimum admissions requirements. Detail about specific types of courses is best suited for the online [A-G Guide](#), which is read by schools, counselors, teachers, and students. UC invests expense and faculty time to review the A-G Guide language periodically, employing expertise from UC, CSU, community colleges and high school teachers. An intersegmental task force recently completed this work for areas 'c' and 'd'. The area 'd' language was carefully crafted by the task force and already mentions integrative courses.

It was suggested that language about interdisciplinary science courses be added to the 'd' language on the [Paths to Admission website](#). There was also a suggestion that UC host a curriculum institute specifically to promote the development of integrative EESS courses that could meet the 'd' requirement.

Motion: Given the clear result of the systemwide review of the proposal to expand Area 'd' to include EESS courses, BOARS voted unanimously to oppose changing Senate Regulations. BOARS will continue to examine ways of clarifying the eligibility of interdisciplinary science courses as an admission pathway for 'area d'. In addition, BOARS will explore the development of curriculum workshops for high school teachers to improve EESS courses to become acceptable as college-ready courses for UC.

Action: The motion passed unanimously. BOARS will submit the memo to Academic Council.

Action: Members gave Chair Hurtado a round of applause in recognition and thanks of her service as BOARS chair.

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