

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

**Minutes of Meeting – February 10-11, 2005**

Approved March 18, 2005

**I. Welcome and Introductions**

BOARS Chair Michael Brown introduced and welcomed the committee's new member Trish Stoddart (UCSC), and new consultant Samuel Agronow, Associate Director of Admissions and Coordinator of Admissions Research and Evaluation.

**II. Consent Calendar – Approval of Minutes**

**ACTION:** The minutes of the December 3, 2004 BOARS meeting were approved with minor revisions.

**III. Chair's Announcements**

- Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Michael Brown reported to the committee on the following topics:

APTF

BOARS member Hans Paar is serving on a subcommittee of the Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) that is developing common definitions for various admissions-related items (e.g., low income). BOARS will eventually be asked to review these definitions.

Academic Council

Professor John Oakley has been nominated to serve as the Vice Chair of the Academic Council for 2005-06, pending approval by the Assembly of the Academic Senate. Prof. Oakley currently serves as the Chair of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and is a law professor at UC Davis with a background in civil rights.

The Academic Council has been inviting members of the Board of Regents to attend one of its meetings for a discussion. This year the following Regents have participated in an Academic Council meeting: Gary Novak, Chair of the Audit Committee, and Richard Blum, Chair of the Finance Committee.

ICAS

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) is concerned with a number of intersegmental issues, including accreditation processes and transfer. ICAS is currently examining transfer issues from the perspective of how the different transfer entities (e.g., ASSIST, CAN, IMPAC) can work together to bring about greater efficiencies and effectiveness in facilitating student transfer.

Admissions Directors Meeting

BOARS Chair Michael Brown was invited to meet with the UC Admissions Directors during their January meeting. The Directors were pleased to learn that BOARS had expressed concerns about resource needs for admissions processing.

#### Comprehensive Review Report

The data for the annual Comprehensive Review report is still being assembled. It is expected that BOARS and the Academic Senate will finalize the report in time for the March or May Regents meeting.

#### SCIGETC

The Academic Council completed its review of the Science Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (SCIGETC) proposal at its January meeting and voted to endorse the proposal, in concept, with the stipulation that UCOP provide campuses with the necessary resources for implementation. The Academic Council leadership will begin drafting a Senate Regulation for the SCIGETC program for the Assembly of the Academic Senate's approval, but has cautioned that this approval might not be forthcoming until the Senate has received assurances that the campuses will receive adequate funds to successfully implement the program.

### **V. Systemwide Senate Academic Senate – Issues Under Review**

#### **A. Proposed Excess Units Fee Policy**

**ISSUE:** UC and CSU have been asked to develop Excess Units Fee policies as part of the Compact Agreement with the Governor.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members expressed a number of concerns with the proposed Excess Units Fee policy:

- The proposed policy assumes that the behavior of earning UC units in excess of those required for graduation occurs for frivolous reasons that a student can easily manage and avoid. However, it is likely that the majority of students that earn excess units do so for legitimate reasons (e.g., changing majors, course availability and scheduling difficulties, transfer unit problems, studying abroad, or seeking dual or interdisciplinary majors).
- This policy doesn't prevent those students who might frivolously acquire excess units from doing so, but rather uses the ability to pay as a rationing device.
- Although the proposed policy does allow for the consideration of exceptions, the existence of such a policy could dissuade students from exploring majors and instead force them to choose their major path very early (and, for many, prematurely).
- Some UC campuses have embraced the philosophy of a liberal arts education and encourage freshman to enter the University without declaring a major. This policy seems inconsistent with these educational goals.
- It seems likely that the administrative and workload costs of adjudicating exception requests, let alone the costs of tracking units and assessing the fee, will be far more significant than the marginal cost of education resulting from students earning excess units.
- If the University's intention for this policy is to ensure that students progress towards graduation in a timely manner, alternative non-punitive approaches should be considered (e.g., calendar time restrictions or degree progress requirements).

**ACTION:** Analyst Kimberly Peterson will draft BOARS response to the proposed Excess Units Fee policy.

**VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Academic Services**

- Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

**REPORT:** Director Susan Wilbur reported that the Admissions Directors met recently and discussed their campus enrollment targets. Every campus will be admitting more students this year than last year. Preliminary planning for a referral pool has begun, however, the University won't know if it will need to use a referral pool until mid-March when selection decisions have been made. Director Wilbur also highlighted some of the results of the University's Fall 2005 applicant pool:

- UC experienced an overall increase in applications this year, and it was the first time UC received over 100,000 applications.
- There was a rebounding in the number of African American applicants.
- There were an increased number of application fee waivers, possibly due to the recent application fee increase.
- Some campuses did experience decreases in the number of applications, which may be a phenomenon of increasing campus selectivity.
- As has occurred for the last several years, freshman students applied on average to 3.6 campuses.
- UC is still accepting applications at the transfer level because some capacity for transfer students remains.

**VII. Report from Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

- Michael Brown, Subcommittee Chair
- Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

**REPORT:** The BOARS High School Subcommittee has changed its name to the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee in order to better reflect the nature of its work.

**A. Proposed Revisions to Policy Recommendation: Granting of a-g Course List "Program Status"**

**ISSUE:** Last year BOARS approved a policy recommendation that dictates the criteria a program must meet to be granted a-g course list "program status." During recent five-year reviews of programs that have been granted this status, the BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee had a number of questions about whether or not the course curriculum was taught consistently across schools. Therefore, the subcommittee recommends that one of the criteria for being recognized as a "program" should be modified to require programs to present evidence that course curriculum is taught consistently.

Present wording:

*Provide professional development for instructors to adequately prepare them to teach the standardized curriculum*

Proposed wording:

*Present evidence that course curriculum is taught consistently (such as required professional development for all instructors to adequately prepare them to teach the standardized curriculum)*

**DISCUSSION:** One member questioned whether this proposed revision weakened the original criterion by no longer requiring professional development. It was indicated that the revision actually clarifies the intent of the original requirement for professional development – that the program has mechanisms to ensure that the curriculum is taught consistently. Such mechanisms would not be limited to professional development activities, but might include activities such as regular external evaluations.

**ACTION:** The proposed revision to BOARS Policy Recommendation: Granting of a-g Course List “Program Status” was approved unanimously by the committee.

#### B. AP Program Status Review

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Michael Brown referred committee members to a recent letter regarding the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee’s recent review of continued a-g program status for the Advanced Placement (AP) program. The subcommittee has requested that AP provide additional information pertaining to program evaluation and monitoring, including evidence that the AP curriculum is taught consistently.

#### C. Language Other Than English (LOTE) Policies

**ISSUE:** The BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee was asked by campuses to examine two issues: (1) validation of Language Other Than English (LOTE) coursework at the transfer level, and (2) awarding transfer credit for split language courses. In response to these issues, the subcommittee is presenting two recommendations for endorsement by BOARS.

##### Validation LOTE Coursework

UC’s *Guidelines for the Evaluation of Freshman Applicant Records* specifies that completion of advanced level work in areas of sequential knowledge, in this case Language Other Than English courses, with a grade of ‘C’ or higher validates a subject omission (lack of a lower level course in the same subject area). For example, completion of French 2 with a grade of ‘C’ or higher validates French I. When a student has successfully completed advanced work in an area of sequential knowledge, the student is presumed to have completed the earlier coursework even if this coursework does not appear on the high school transcript. Currently this LOTE validation policy only applies to freshman applicants; at the transfer level, UC does not have a LOTE validation policy.

Recommendation 1: The Language Other Than English validation rule should be extended to apply to transfer students.

##### Credit for Split Language Courses

UC campuses are not currently treating the amount of credit awarded for split language courses in a consistent manner. Some community colleges offer an introductory level foreign language course and the same course split in two terms, sometimes yielding differential units (e.g., 6 units

for completion of French 2A and 2B versus 5 units for completion of a consolidated French 2 course). UC campuses have not been treating these differential units in a consistent manner (e.g., some UC campuses award the full 6 units credit for completion of French 2A and 2B, while other campuses are awarding only 5 units of credit).

Recommendation 2: UC should accept the unit value granted by the sending institution for split language courses.

**DISCUSSION:** Some members indicated that BOARS might need to reevaluate whether these language courses are truly sequential in nature. The transfer level validation policies for mathematics will need to be considered as well.

**ACTION: BOARS members unanimously approved the two recommendations: (1) the Language Other Than English (LOTE) validation rule should apply to transfer students and (2) UC should accept the unit value granted by the sending institution for split language courses.**

#### **VIII. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) Study**

- Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Student Academic Affairs

**REPORT:** Assistant Director Roger Studley reported preliminary results of additional analysis of the impact of increasing the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) percentage. This study was conducted to better understand differences between the results of two previous studies (see BOARS December 3, 2004 minutes) by using the 2004 cohort transcript data collected by the ELC program for the top 10% of students from each California high school. These analyses included scenarios for increasing ELC both with and without taking into account the recent increase in UC's required minimum GPA; however, these analyses were unable to model the rules changes requiring ELC students to complete UC's course and testing requirements for eligibility.

**DISCUSSION:** Members questioned why in some scenarios increasing the ELC percentage did not correspond to an increased proportion of eligible students in lower Academic Performance Index (API) deciles and various racial/ethnic groups. It was noted that this lack of increase might be due to the fact that these students did not have the minimum GPA or course completion required for ELC identification. It was also noted that any increase in numbers of low API or underrepresented students resulting from increasing the ELC percentage might not actually achieve a net gain of UC eligibility for these student groups since these analyses were unable to model the effects of the ELC increase on the Eligibility in the Statewide Context pool.

The committee discussed the policy objectives of the ELC program and the kinds of information BOARS needs for its examination of the ELC percentage. Members concluded that the behavioral impact of ELC – its influence on application rates and college preparation – is one of the primary objectives of the program. Other members indicated a desire to review outcome data of those students have been admitted through the ELC program and those students who would have been admitted through additional increases in the ELC percentage. It was concluded that BOARS would examine the results of the behavioral study at the next meeting and then decide what next steps should be taken. Possible areas for further ELC-related analysis include:

- Model how increasing the ELC percentage affects the demographics of the statewide eligibility pool.
- Redo the scenarios while taking into account the recent minimum GPA changes to ELC.
- Examine outcome data of ELC student performance at UC (e.g., how ELC admits from low API high schools have performed compared to other students).
- Compare pre-ELC to post-ELC behaviors (e.g., model the probability of various groups of students applying to UC before and after the ELC program was established)

**ACTION: The Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) Behavioral Impact study will be discussed at the March BOARS meeting.**

**ACTION: BOARS Chair Michael Brown and Analyst Kimberly Peterson will develop an operational agenda for the committee's examination of the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program.**

#### **IX. AP/Honors GPA Bump**

- Michael Brown, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** Gayle Binion, former Academic Council Chair, has been leading a senate task force to examine the admissions grade bump that UC grants for Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate (IB), honors and community college courses. It is anticipated that the final report of this task force will soon be issued.

CSHE Research Associate Saul Geiser, Associate Director Sam Agronow and BOARS members presented the results of various studies on the predictive validity of AP/Honors courses on college outcomes.

**DISCUSSION:** This year 94.4% of UC applicants received some kind of grade bump for taking AP/Honors courses; however, the findings from these studies seem to indicate that the extra GPA weight given for AP/Honors courses is not a strong predictor of UC performance. The committee brainstormed additional data analyses and policy considerations that need to be made for the evaluation of AP/Honors grade bump.

#### Data Analyses

Members suggested additional data analyses to determine the predictive validity of a grade bump for AP/Honors courses:

- Disaggregate the data on API and other variables. Perhaps the grade bump is a strong predictor for certain populations. Although the use of a grade bump for eligibility purposes must be applied across-the-board, disaggregating the data may answer some questions about the general findings that the grade bump is not a strong predictor of student outcomes.
- Examine whether the grade received in the AP/Honors course is a predictor of performance.
- Evaluate whether students taking these AP/Honors courses challenge themselves more in college. AP/Honors courses are supposed to be more rigorous than regular high school courses, so do students taking AP/Honors courses in high school continue to challenge themselves by enrolling in higher level courses their first year of college?
- Study whether the grade bump is an enabling or exclusionary factor. Conduct a disparate impact analysis of reducing or eliminating the grade bump. Determine whether there are

students receiving the grade bump that would not be UC eligible without it and whether there are students that are ineligible because they do not receive the grade bump.

- Measure student outcomes of taking these courses in ways other than college GPA (e.g., SAT II scores).

### Policy Considerations

At some point while data are important, a more important question is whether the grade bump has some benefit other than predicting performance. Some policy considerations that must be made include:

- How should AP/Honors courses be used by UC in the determination of eligibility versus how they should be used by campuses for selection. It might be more appropriate for the “strength of schedule” to be considered during the selection process.
- Examine the signaling effect of the AP/Honor grade bump. Does this additional GPA weight provide an incentive for high school students to engage in rigorous high school courses?
- The underlying foundation for the grade bump is the assumption that these AP/Honors courses are beneficial to students. Are these courses really a good thing, and if so, on what basis and how should we appropriately account for that?
- Consider the tracking issues and self-selection bias related to which students enroll in AP/Honors courses.
- Separate out the benefits of participation in AP/Honors courses versus achievement in these courses. BOARS previously decided against the rationale of granting credit merely for participation when it provided guidance on admissions consideration of outreach program participation.
- Other groups have a stake in the use of AP/Honors courses and should be engaged in the process of making a final recommendation about the grade bump.

**ACTION: BOARS Chair Michael Brown and Analyst Kimberly Peterson will develop a list, for the committee’s approval, of additional studies for the examination of the AP/Honors GPA bump.**

## **X. Responses to Eligibility and Admissions Study Group Requests**

**ISSUE:** In October 2003, President Robert Dynes established the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group to examine undergraduate eligibility and admissions issues facing the University. In April 2004 the Study Group issued a final report, including a number of findings and recommendations requiring a response from BOARS.

- A. Recommendation 5: The Study Group requests that BOARS examine the policy of admitting to each campus students from the full range of the eligibility pool and report to the President and The Regents on the benefits and consequences of this approach.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee reviewed a draft BOARS response to Study Group Recommendation 5. A number of modifications of the draft were suggested:

- Indicate that BOARS affirms that this practice is fully consistent with the intent of the *Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*, and that the committee continually monitors the outcomes of the comprehensive review process.

- State that all campuses are striving through their comprehensive review processes to admit an excellent and diverse student body from across the full range of the different selection criteria. Clarify that “diverse” is not specific to racial/ethnic diversity but rather refers to the “broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California” (Regents Resolution RE-28, May 2001). This broad diversity includes characteristics such as geographic and socio-economic backgrounds.

**ACTION: BOARS unanimously endorsed in concept the proposed response to Eligibility and Admissions Study Group Recommendation 5: “selecting from the full range of the eligibility pool.” A revised response will be sent electronically to the committee for final approval.**

- B. Recommendation 9: The Study Group recommends that BOARS examine the extent to which campuses consider the quality of writing in the personal statement and consider issuing guidance to the campuses on this question.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee reviewed a draft BOARS response to Study Group Recommendation 9. A number of modifications of the draft were suggested:

- Clarify the purpose of the personal statement required by UC and how it differs from essays that are required by other colleges and universities.
- Refer to the specific language contained in the UC application that informs applicants of how the personal statement will be evaluated.

**ACTION: BOARS unanimously endorsed in concept the proposed response to Eligibility and Admissions Study Group Recommendation 9: “consideration of the quality of writing in the personal statement.” A revised response will be sent electronically to the committee for final approval.**

## **XI. Admissions by Exception**

- A. Review of feedback received from campuses regarding BOARS’ draft Admissions by Exception (AbyE) Guidelines

**DISCUSSION:** The committee discussed the feedback received from campuses regarding BOARS’ draft Admissions by Exception (AbyE) Guidelines and identified key themes and issues raised in these responses:

### Advertising

There seemed to be agreement that the AbyE policy should not be aggressively advertised. UC’s admissions publications and websites should be reviewed to ensure that they accurately portray AbyE as an existing pathway to eligibility.

### Workload Issues

There is a misperception that BOARS is asking campus admissions offices to increase their workload by establishing a separate evaluation process for students outside of comprehensive review. BOARS may need to better explain that the AbyE policy is meant to function as an admissions tool, not a constraint. The final determination of eligibility can be made with



certainty only at the point of enrollment; therefore, the AbyE policy, by allowing admissions of students that have shown great academic promise but did not achieve eligibility, might actually save campus admissions offices from the significant time and effort they expend in trying to project applicants' eligibility during the application review process.

#### Intent of Guidelines

There is a misperception that the AbyE Guidelines are being drafted in order to push every campus to use the AbyE policy to its full extent (6% of the admitted class). BOARS intent, however, is to ensure that campuses aren't eliminating excellent students from consideration during their application review processes because these students are deemed ineligible due to minor technical reasons.

#### Value of AbyE Policy

There seems to be a notion that the AbyE policy forces campuses to admit students that are sub par in place of eligible students; however, the AbyE policy is meant to provide campuses with the ability to admit excellent students that did not fulfill the eligibility criteria for real and legitimate reasons. There is a mistaken belief that only students deemed eligible are qualified to attend the University. One member suggested assembling example profiles of ineligible students that clearly should be considered for admission. It was also noted that only by achieving eligibility is a student guaranteed admission into the UC system.

**ACTION: The campus feedback on the draft Admissions by Exception (AbyE) Guidelines will be discussed further at the March BOARS meeting. UCOP's Student Academic Services office will provide a summary matrix of the campus responses for the meeting.**

#### **B. Admission of Teacher-Identified Students Proposal**

**ISSUE:** Academic Council Vice Chair Cliff Brunk has requested BOARS feedback on a conceptual proposal for a program that makes use of the Admissions by Exception (AbyE) policy. This program would enlist the aid of teachers in particular high schools to identify students who are not eligible for admission to UC, yet are considered to have a high potential to be successful undergraduates. The primary intention of this proposed program is to develop a college-going culture in schools where such a culture does not currently exist.

**DISCUSSION:** Members agreed that there was potential in campuses developing experimental admissions programs such as this that utilize K-12 schools as partners in promoting a college-going culture. It was noted that there are precedents for such a program: in the early 1900's the University admitted students who had not met subject requirements on the basis of their high school principal's recommendation, various campuses have also experimented with AbyE programs (e.g., UCLA's High Potential Program).

Members made recommendations for improving this proposal and noted a variety of concerns:

- This proposal seems to move beyond the idea of using the AbyE policy to admit students that are ready to succeed in the University in spite of ineligibility due to minor technical errors (e.g., missing one of the 'a-g' required units). Students admitted through this program would likely need a significant amount of support to successfully transition into the

University's academic culture. Using this program to bring students into a bridge or dual admission program, rather than admitting them directly to UC, might be more appropriate.

- The biggest difficulty is trying to find an equitable and effective way to identify the types of students UC would want to admit through this program. Tracking issues and the fact that many teachers and the public don't have a clear understanding of the University's definition of college potential are problems that would have to be overcome through substantial education efforts. Allowing only certain teachers to make these recommendations is a form of networking and a completely undemocratic process. To help relieve this potential imbalance, perhaps the recommendations should be filtered at the high school level by coming forward from the principal and not individual teachers.
- The idea of promoting a college-going culture is similar to the purposes of the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. Perhaps UC could develop a program that combines both the ELC and AbyE policies ("ELC by E").
- This program might be more effective if teacher recommendations are used to identify students earlier on in their high school career (e.g., at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade year). This would allow UC and the schools to actively work with these students so that they are prepared for college and achieve UC eligibility prior to graduation.
- The expectation that students admitted under this program maintain contact with their high school places an additional burden on these students. Perhaps the program could encourage but not require students to maintain this contact.
- Recommendation letters are rarely useful because they don't contain substantive additional information about the student. Is there any research about the predictive validity of teachers' impressions of student success? Would asking teachers to rank students or indicate whether or not they believed they would succeed at UC have greater predictive validity than a standard letter of recommendation?

Associate Director Sam Agronow indicated that the Berkeley campus had studied the correlations between recommendation ratings received through augmented review letters and UC Freshman GPA. The study used a sample of 388 students admitted in Fall 2003 and found no strong correlations between various recommendation ratings and Freshman GPA.

**ACTION: Associate Director Sam Agronow volunteered the Student Academic Services Research unit to investigate whether any additional research has been conducted on correlations between recommendation letters and student outcomes.**

## **XII. Realignment of Academic Affairs Division**

- Susan Wilbur, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

**REPORT:** Director Susan Wilbur reported to the committee on the realignment of the Academic Affairs division of the Office of the President, details of which were announced today.

Academic Affairs will be realigned into four units. Members of the Academic Affairs staff, noted below, will provide interim leadership for these four units. These individuals, working with many others, will begin the task of shaping the development and direction of each unit. Ultimately, competitive searches will be conducted to fill each of the leadership positions on a permanent basis.

- Student Affairs, led by Winston Doby, will focus on enhancing and supporting the academic preparation, access, and success of students from the pre-kindergarten level through graduate school. This unit will encompass academic preparation programs, admissions, enrollment, student academic services, and student financial support.
- Academic Programs, led by Julius Zelmanowitz who also will serve as the Provost's deputy. This unit will have a mission of fostering excellence in the University's instructional, research, and academic service programs. The unit will include the functions of academic personnel, research, graduate education, the Education Abroad Program, the California Digital Library, UC Press, Extended Learning, the Natural Reserve System, Continuing Education of the Bar, and other academic programs.
- Academic Strategic Planning and Analysis, led by Linda Guerra, will promote collaborative thinking and decision making about the actions and initiatives necessary to respond to internal and external academic challenges facing the University. Its core functions will include academic strategy, long-range planning support, academic budget development, institutional competitiveness, and major national and international trend analysis.
- Educational Relations, led by Joyce Justus, will work to position Academic Affairs in the external environment so that it is able to advance the University's strategic academic objectives. Its functions will include campus relations, inter-campus coordination, legislative affairs on academic issues, and intersegmental relations.

This new structure takes effect immediately. Over the next several months, unit-level assessments and implementation plan development will be undertaken to ensure that each unit is optimally organized to meet its strategic mission. Organizational models for the two newest units will be developed by unit heads working with Vice President Larry Hershman, Assistant Vice President Jerry Kissler, and Executive Faculty Associate Lynda Goff for the Academic Strategic Planning and Analysis unit, and with Vice President Winston Doby, Lynda Goff, and Director Todd Greenspan for the Educational Relations unit.

### **XIII. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Affairs**

- Winston Doby, Vice President, Student Affairs

**REPORT:** Vice President Winston Doby reported to the committee on recent meetings with legislative staff in Sacramento to discuss UC's academic preparation programs. Progress was made towards aligning the legislature's and University's views about funding, accountability and the mission for academic preparation programs.

VP Doby also indicated a desire to consult with BOARS and the Academic Senate about plans for the realignment of the Student Affairs unit to help ensure that the support the Senate committees need is provided.

### **XIV. PSAT and the National Merit Scholar Program**

- Michael Brown, BOARS Chair

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Michael Brown provided the committee with a synopsis of the issues surrounding the use of the PSAT and the National Merit Scholars Program (NMSP) along with a chronology of his communications with the College Board and the NMSP. So far no evidence has been provided to show that the PSAT has been validated for identification and selection of

meritorious students. In fact, the NMSP appears to use the PSAT in a manner that violates the guidelines and principles established by the College Board and by leaders of the testing industry for responsible use of standardized tests.

Director Susan Wilbur also provided BOARS with information on the use of the National Merit designation in UC campus admissions and financial aid/scholarship decisions. Most of the UC campuses consider to some degree an applicant's designation as a National Merit Scholar to some degree in admissions decisions, usually as an element of the applicant's honors and academic awards. Six of the eight undergraduate UC campuses also participate in the National Merit scholarship program.

**DISCUSSION:** Members questioned the benefit to UC for participating in the program. It was indicated that campuses use this program mostly as a recruitment tool. Concerns also were expressed that UC funding of National Merit Scholars redirects resources away from need-based financial aid efforts. Two separate motions for action were made:

Motion 1: Inform campus admissions committees of BOARS' findings regarding the PSAT/NMSP and recommend that campuses review their admissions policies and practices using National Merit Scholar status in view of the questions that have been raised regarding the fairness of the programs selection practices.

Motion 2: Alert the Academic Council leadership to BOARS' findings regarding the PSAT/NMSP and the related financial aid concerns, and request that these issues be brought to the attention of the appropriate Senate bodies for evaluation.

**ACTION:** The committee unanimously approved the motions to alert Academic Council Chair George Blumenthal and the Divisional Admissions Committee Chairs of BOARS' findings and concerns with the PSAT/NMSP. Analyst Kimberly Peterson will draft letters for the committee's approval.

## **XV. Report from Analytic Subcommittee**

- David Stern, Subcommittee Chair

**REPORT:** Subcommittee Chair David Stern presented a partial draft of a background paper, "Equal Privileges Therein: Measuring Equality of Access to the University of California." The Analytic Subcommittee is currently focusing its efforts on the development of "inclusiveness indicators" and will be meeting with UCOP staff and the UC All Campus Consortium for Research on Diversity (UC ACCORD) to formulate specific recommendations for constructing indicators that would allow BOARS and the University to monitor broad measures of "inclusiveness" by comparing the composition of the UC student body to the state population. Ideally these indicators will eventually move beyond admissions outcomes and will also monitor whether high school student populations are on track to achieving eligibility.

**DISCUSSION:** Committee members were supportive of the subcommittee's efforts to develop inclusiveness indicators. One member suggested that the draft should be more explicit about examining high school sending rates. The committee questioned who would be responsible for performing the analyses required for producing these indicators. It was indicated that the hope is

that this work would become a regular function of the Office of the President and that these indicators would be reported on an annual basis.

Vice President Winston Doby noted that this topic relates to his office's efforts to develop measures of the impact of academic preparation programs. It was suggested that BOARS might be consulted in the construction of these measures.

#### **XVI. Creating a Strategic Vision of Admissions Policy**

- Michael Brown, BOARS Chair

Due to a lack of time this item was postponed.

#### **XVII. Report from Testing Subcommittee**

- Mark Rashid, Subcommittee Chair

**REPORT:** Subcommittee Chair Mark Rashid presented a status report on the Testing Subcommittee's efforts to develop a new Statewide Eligibility construct for Fall 2006. Effective for students entering UC as freshmen in fall 2006, applicants will be facing a new testing environment: each applicant must submit scores on an approved core test of mathematics, language arts and writing. This requirement can be satisfied by taking either the ACT Assessment plus the new ACT Writing Test or the new SAT I (critical reading, mathematics and writing). In addition, all applicants must complete two SAT II Subject Tests in two different subject areas: history/ social science, English literature, mathematics, laboratory science or language other than English. The subcommittee has developed a draft framework for a new eligibility index that would reflect these testing changes and reproduce essentially the same group of students that were eligible under the previous index. The weights and concordance for the old and new testing schemes were diagramed:

##### Old Testing Scheme

SAT I: Verbal, Math	= .25	= ACT: Math, English, Science Reasoning, Reading
SAT II: Writing	= .25	
SAT II: Math	= .25	
SAT II: Option	= .25	

-----

Total Test Score for Eligibility Index

##### New Testing Scheme

At the July 17, 2003 meeting, the Board of Regents adopted Academic Senate's recommendation that, pending future research on the predictive validity of the new exams, the three components of the new SAT I and the two additional SAT II Subject Tests be weighted equally in the eligibility index (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/july03/303.pdf>).

SAT I Math + Critical Reading	= .40	= ACT Math + Science Reasoning + Reading
SAT I Writing	= .20	= ACT Writing/English
SAT II Option	= .20	
SAT II Option	= .20	

-----

Total Test Score for Eligibility Index

### UC Test Scale

The subcommittee is also proposing that UC develop a single normalized scale of 0-200 for scores that equally values similar levels of performance across tests. This would allow for UC to move beyond just linearly mapping ACT scores to SAT scores, but rather taking into account the averages and variances of the different tests. It would also establish a foundation for the utilization of other tests for UC's eligibility determination. UC would provide an online calculator and publish the formula for calculating normalized test score to make it easy for the applicants to determine their "UC Test Score."

**DISCUSSION:** Members concluded that BOARS will need to conduct long-term studies of the predictive validity of each testing complement as data about these tests become available. Members suggested eventually using a percentile conversion or normal curve equivalence for calculating the normalized UC test scores.

**ACTION:** The proposed Statewide Eligibility Index construct for Fall 2006 admissions was unanimously approved in principle.

Meeting adjourned 2:30 p.m.  
Attest: Michael T. Brown

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst