

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Minutes of Meeting – September 30, 2005

Approved November 3, 2005

**I. Welcome and Chair's Announcements***Michael T. Brown, BOARS Chair*

**REPORT:** BOARS Chair Michael T. Brown welcomed the committee and chaired the meeting. After the welcome, members of the committee and other attendees introduced themselves. Chair Brown reported some of the issues and goals for BOARS this year:

- Develop a recommendation regarding Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) expansion
- Develop a recommendation regarding the Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy
- More broadly examine the Earth and Space Science as a 'd' requirement matter
- Complete the two-year Comprehensive Review Report
- Implement a "UC Score" Eligibility Index for fall 2007 admissions
- Create a method to assess the new admissions tests
- Conduct additional analyses and develop recommendations for changes, if needed, to the new minimum GPA (3.0) approved for fall 2007 admissions
- Work with the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) on transfer issues, such as the implementation of SCIGETC and Streamlining Major Articulation programs

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS Members made a number of suggestions for additional items for the committee's focus this year, including:

- Further the work of the Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) to create greater efficiencies in the UC admissions process
- Construct measures of student context
- Continue reexamining the eligibility construct

**ACTION:** BOARS Members interested in serving on a Transfer Subcommittee should contact Chair Michael T. Brown.

**II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office***Cliff Brunk, Chair, Academic Senate**Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

**REPORT:** Executive Director Maria Bertero-Barcelo provided the committee with an overview of the policies, procedures and role of the Systemwide Academic Senate Office:

Role of the Senate Office

Members were informed of the administrative support the Academic Senate Office provides to the committees. The Executive Director is the chief administrative officer of the Senate and is responsible for implementing policies and allocating resources in a manner that best serves the Senate as a whole. It is the role of the Committee Analyst to facilitate the work of the committee, which includes responsibility for drafting the committee's recommendations and reports.

### Travel Policies and Procedures

The Systemwide Academic Senate will reimburse travel expenses for members (or their alternates) serving on Academic Senate committees. Travelers are responsible for their own travel arrangements. Flight reservations should be made through the UCLA Travel Center, which allows the traveler to obtain state fares and allows the Senate Office to make payment for the airline ticket using the direct billing system, thereby relieving the traveler of any financial burden. UCLA Travel Center reservation procedures for Senate travelers and detailed information about Systemwide Senate travel policies and reimbursement procedures are available online at <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/resources/as.travelregs.0506.pdf>

### Senate Source

The Senate Source (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/news/source>) is an online publication for the University of California faculty published by the Systemwide Academic Senate. Issues are published bi-monthly during the academic year and include coverage of current Senate issues and links to related reports.

### Committee Website

Each of the Academic Senate's standing committees has a dedicated page on the Senate's website (<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/>). The page contains the committee's bylaw, roster, meeting dates, resources, and resolutions and recommendations that have been approved or officially received by the Academic Council. Beginning in fall 2004, simplified agendas and approved minutes began to be posted on the public committee webpages. Password protected sites for all standing committees will be introduced in October or November. On these protected committee websites, members will be able to access full agendas and minutes, draft documents, and other materials.

**REPORT:** Senate Chair Clifford Brunk welcomed the committee members and thanked them for their service in the systemwide Academic Senate. He informed the committee of some of the issues before the Systemwide Academic Senate and University this year, such as the development of the Science and Math Initiative (SMI), a push for greater savings achieved via strategic sourcing, and the need to restore the quality of UC's graduate enterprise. Of note, President Robert Dynes has pledged that monies saved by strategic sourcing will be applied to graduate student support.

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

*Susan Wilbur, Director of Admissions*

**REPORT:** Director Susan Wilbur provided the committee with information on persistence, graduation and time-to-degree of freshmen and transfer Admissions by Exception students. BOARS was informed that the online application for freshmen admissions will be available to applicants starting October 1. A new brochure, "Apply Online to UC," was developed this year to encourage and help students to utilize the online application. Last year approximately 98% of UC freshmen applicants applied online.

Director Wilbur reported to BOARS on the following admissions-related topics:

### Admissions Processing Task Force

The Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) has been focusing on developing ways to achieve greater admissions process efficiencies. This year APTF subcommittees will examine models of assessing academic achievement using contextual factors and begin considerations of how the University could best implement shared evaluation of freshmen applications. For the past three years, through a pilot program created by the APTF, UC campuses have successfully shared evaluation of transfer applications.

### Counselor Conferences

BOARS members were provided with some of the information distributed at the UC Counselor Conferences this year. Director Wilbur reported that the format of the conferences was changed this year in order to provide higher quality information to the attendees. At the conferences it was stressed that students should use personal statement portion of the UC application to describe their educational context.

### UC Score

At the UC Counselor Conferences this year, the “UC Score” calculation worksheet for the examination component of the Eligibility Index was presented to focus groups for feedback. Director Wilbur reported that the “UC Score” concept was well received by the focus group participants. The Student Academic Services unit will begin developing a strategic communication campaign for the new “UC Score” admissions examination score conversion scale for fall 2007 admissions.

**ACTION: Vice Chair Mark Rashid will draft an explanation of BOARS’ rationale for developing a “UC Score” for the examination component of the Eligibility Index.**

### High School Exit Exam

Beginning with the Class of 2006, all California public school students will be required to pass an exit exam to earn a high school diploma. One potential issue for admissions is that graduation from high school is a requirement for UC eligibility, but whether or not a student has passed the exit exam is not reflected on the admissions application and will not be known until at the time of the student’s enrollment decision. The California Department of Education also has yet to formalize a policy for accommodating disabled students who take the exit exam, so some students that fail the exam may fall into this category. Campuses have discussed this issue and generally agree that UC admitted students that have not passed the high school exit exam will be considered for Admissions by Exception. Another admissions-related concern is whether or not failure to pass the high school exit exam impacts a student’s ability to obtain a Calgrant. The UC administration is currently looking into this issue.

### VPA Requirement Issues

The fall 2006 freshmen admissions cycle will be the first year of full implementation of the Visual and Performing Arts (VPA) subject requirement. When the VPA requirement was implemented, it included a phase-in process:

- Students entering UC in the fall of 2005 could present any two semesters of acceptable VPA courses provided that both courses were from a single VPA area (dance,

drama/theater, music, or visual arts). For example, a semester each of photography and drawing would be acceptable because they are both visual arts.

- Students entering in the fall of 2006 or later must satisfy the VPA requirement by completing an appropriate single course in a year-long sequence (i.e., the second semester must be the continuation of the first semester).

Approximately 300 high schools, however, have not yet grouped their VPA courses in year-long sequences. Director Wilbur will be sending a letter to these schools to ask that they organize their VPA courses in the manner required to fulfill both UC's and CSU's eligibility requirement.

**ACTION: Director Susan Wilbur will provide BOARS with a list of schools (by type) that do not have approved year-long course sequences that fulfill the VPA requirement.**

#### Accreditation Issues

Compton Community College and Crenshaw High School both recently lost their WASC accreditation. In response, UC has agreed that it will not disadvantage students from these schools that are applying for fall 2006 admissions; however these schools will need to resolve their accreditation issues in time for fall 2007 admissions.

#### Hurricane Katrina Response

In response to college and university students displaced from Hurricane Katrina, UC offered enrollment to 40 students and visitor status to 440 students. Of these undergraduate, graduate and professional students, 211 chose to accept UC's offer of enrollment or visitor status.

Students admitted to UC at the undergraduate level comprised two categories:

- UC admits that originally didn't choose to enroll at UC. These students were allowed to enroll permanently as "late SIRS" at a UC campus.
- Students that had not applied to UC. These students were granted "visitor status" and allowed to enroll temporarily at a UC campus.

**DISCUSSION:** Each BOARS member was asked to indicate whether their divisional senate admissions committee had been consulted about these Hurricane Katrina-related admissions decisions. Every member, except those from the Davis campus, reported that their divisional admissions committees had not been consulted about these admissions decisions.

#### **IV. Consultation with Office of the President – Academic Affairs**

*M.R.C. Greenwood, Provost and Senior Vice President, Academic Affairs*

**REPORT:** Provost M.R.C. Greenwood complimented BOARS on its work this past year, in particular the concerns raised about the National Merit Scholarship Program, the responses to the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group, and the development of implementation guidelines for the University's Admissions by Exception policy. The Provost expressed interest in learning more about the committee's plans for assessing the new admissions tests and the Honors Level grade point policy. Provost Greenwood noted a need for BOARS and the University to focus more intensely in the coming years on transfer and articulation issues.

Provost Greenwood reported that the University is a national leader in providing postsecondary access to many underserved communities. More than half of UC's entering freshmen come from

immigrant families, and among research universities, UC leads the nation in enrolling low income students. Despite the state of California having one of the lowest bachelor's degree attainment rates in the nation, UC maintains one of the nation's higher graduation rates for a public university, with 78 percent of UC freshmen graduating within six years.

After years of demographic pressures that have driven UC's enrollment growth at the undergraduate level, current population projections show that around the year 2010 the number of California high school graduates will stabilize. This will present an opportunity for UC to place a greater focus on growth at the graduate and professional levels to restore the balance between graduate and undergraduate enrollments at UC. Over the past 20 years, the proportion of graduate and professional students at UC has dropped from 30 to 17 percent of the total student population. A UC Task Force on Planning for Professional and Doctoral Education (PDPE) has recently been formed to develop recommendations for the University's graduate and professional student rebalancing efforts. Provost Greenwood encouraged BOARS to broadly consider the overall health of the University when the committee evaluates and develops recommendations regarding undergraduate admissions and enrollment issues.

**DISCUSSION:** The committee and Provost Greenwood discussed the need for the University to make a stronger case for graduate and professional education. The state and public may not realize the impact that UC's graduate and professional programs have on the quality of the undergraduate educational experience and the state and national economies.

#### **V. Honors Level Bonus Grade Point Policy**

*Jeannie Oakes, Professor of Education, UCLA and Director, UC All Campus Consortium On Research for Diversity (UCACCORD)*

Jeannie Oakes is a Presidential Professor in Educational Equity at UCLA and Director of the Institute for Democracy, Education & Access (IDEA) and UC's All Campus Consortium on Research for Diversity (ACCORD). Professor Oakes' work addresses curriculum tracking and ability grouping, as well as inequalities in the availability and distribution of educational resources and opportunities. More information about Prof. Oakes' work and background is available at <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/pages/oakes>. Professor Oakes was invited to share her expertise with BOARS as part of their evaluation of UC's honors level bonus grade point policy.

**REPORT:** Professor Oakes informed the committee of a number of findings that have been consistently identified in her own and others' work regarding honors level courses:

##### Inequalities in Access

There is consistent evidence of inequalities by race/ethnicity and social class of access to the honors level courses (i.e., AP, IB, honors courses). This inequality in access is both a function of which school a student attends and a function of tracking practices and/or unequal knowledge within that school. The inequality of access to honors level courses at both these levels – between and within schools – comes about partly due to differences in parental knowledge (e.g., what courses make students more competitive for college) and skills (e.g., the political savvy to negotiate course-taking advantages for their children).

### Inequalities in Opportunities and Resources

Once students are placed in differentiated levels of classes – honors level versus regular level classes – it has been shown that considerable inequalities exist in terms of what students are given an opportunity to learn and the educational resources that are made available to them. When these course differentiations exist within a school, less is expected and offered to students not in the honors level classes even if the course is a college preparatory that fulfills an ‘a-g’ requirement. As a result of these inequalities, students taking the honors level courses have greater access to postsecondary opportunities than students who do not. These inequalities in college access have been found to exist by race/ethnicity and social class, even when student achievement levels are taken into account.

### Achievement Levels and Outcomes

Students learn more when they are engaged in more rigorous and challenging courses. Research indicates that achievement outcomes are enhanced when students participate in rigorous courses regardless of the initial level at which the student starts in terms of achievement scores and academic preparation. Studies have also shown a large variation in the initial achievement scores of students enrolled in honors level and regular courses. These studies reveal racial/ethnic patterns in the variations of achievement levels in these different courses – low scoring students in the honors level classes tend to be white and high scoring students in the regular classes tend to be underrepresented minorities.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members questioned Prof. Oakes about the signaling effect of UC’s honors level bonus grade point policy. Professor Oakes indicated that the existence of the current honors grade bump policy provides an extra motivation for schools to differentiate the quality of their curricular offerings. Establishing different curricular tracks sends signals to the teachers that the students enrolled in the honors level courses are more capable of high academic achievement and deserve higher grades. Students in the non-honors courses in turn receive the signal that “UC is not for them.” Eliminating the honors bonus point might have the same signaling effect on students from disadvantaged communities as the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program – that UC wants and will admit capable students from all communities, not just those that are advantaged.

**ACTION:** The Analytic Subcommittee will develop a proposal for further data analysis of student access to honors level courses.

**ACTION:** Analyst Kimberly Peterson will provide BOARS members with a number of previously distributed reports and resources related to the committee’s evaluation of the honors level bonus grade point policy.

## **VI. Analytic Subcommittee Report**

*David Stern, Analytic Subcommittee Chair*

*Sam Agronow, Associate Director, Student Academic Services*

*Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Student Academic Services*

*Tongshan Chang, Principal Analyst, Student Academic Services*

**REPORT:** Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern and UCOP consultants presented draft samples of school-based and household-based indicators that could be produced and used to examine and track data on inclusiveness.

**DISCUSSION:** BOARS members provided feedback on the draft indicator sets and made suggestions for improvement of the presentation of the inclusiveness measures:

School-Based Indicators: Ratio Tables

- The second row of the school-based indicators ratio tables could be presented in graphic form (e.g., bar charts). Such charts would highlight where leaks in the educational pipeline occur for different groups of students, from 10th grade to UC enrollment.
- The column indicating the number of ‘a-g’ graduates should precede the column indicating the number of SAT II takers.

School-Based Indicators: Charts and Indices

- Indicate that each decile bin contains a specific set of schools and that each decile bin also contains approximately the same number of students.
- Include a small data table that shows the actual number of admits and schools in each decile bin.
- Add the ratio of UC admits in each decile bin to the overall UC admit pool.

Household-Based Indicators

- Adjust the scale of the household income distribution graphs to differentiate more clearly between the two different distribution lines.
- Produce household income distribution graphs that are disaggregated by ethnicity.
- Add error bars to show the variability in the measures.

**ACTION: BOARS Members are asked to send further feedback and suggestions to Analytic Subcommittee Chair David Stern on how to best proceed with the development of the inclusiveness indicators.**

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

Minutes drafted by  
Kimberly Peterson  
Committee Analyst