

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of Meeting

July 10, 2009

Part I: Joint Meeting with the UC Admissions Directors

Attending:

BOARS: Sylvia Hurtado, chair (UCLA); William Jacob, vice chair (UCSB); Stephen Tucker (UCI); Darnell Hunt (UCLA); Peter Sadler (UCR); Joseph Watson (UCSD); Juan Poblete (UCSC); George Johnson (UCB); Julie Bianchini (UCSB); Cynthia Pineda-Scott (Graduate Student, UCLA); Susan Wilbur (Director of Admissions); Don Daves-Rougeaux (Associate Admissions Director); (Michael LaBriola (Committee Analyst)

Admissions Directors: Mae Brown, UCSD, Frank Wada, UCD, Merlyn Campos, UCR, Michael McCawley, UCSC, Walter Robinson, UCB, Encarnacion Ruiz, UCM, Vu Tran, UCLA, Christine Van Gieson, UCSB, Brent Yunek, UCI; Emily Engelschall (Director of Undergraduate Recruitment, UCR)

I. Welcome and Announcements

Chair Hurtado welcomed the campus Admissions Directors and said BOARS was pleased to have the opportunity to brainstorm with them about issues of common interest and concern. Director Wilbur noted that the directors had met the previous two days to discuss a variety of issues, including the modifications to Senate admissions regulations, non-resident enrollment, the impact of budget cuts and furloughs on enrollment management functions and diversity, and strategies to help campuses meet enrollment targets next year. The directors welcome BOARS' guidance in helping them work through these issues.

II. Modifications to Academic Senate Admissions Regulations

Issue: In June, the Academic Assembly unanimously endorsed BOARS' proposed modifications to the Senate regulations governing undergraduate admissions after two rounds of systemwide Senate review. Chair Hurtado thanked the admissions directors for providing essential input into the modifications, the purpose of which is to improve the clarity and alignment of the regulations with existing policy and practice, including the new policy that takes effect in 2012.

The review raised several issues that may require additional discussion. BOARS added the Admission by Exception (A by E) policy instituted by the Regents in 1990 to the regulations as SR 464; however, one division initially opposed the addition, noting that A by E had never undergone Senate review. But A by E policy has a long history at UC, dating to 1884 when the Regents recognized the Senate's authority to set admissions policy. It is also specifically mentioned in the Master Plan, and Council approved A by E [Implementation Guidelines](#) in 2005 after a systemwide review of guidelines established by BOARS. A by E will remain UC policy after ETR is implemented in 2012. Campuses should continue using it to experiment with new methods and measures of reviewing students. One campus also noted that the definition of a freshman in SR 417 does not address students who take postsecondary courses just before enrolling at UC. The current regulations address only applicants who have taken no postsecondary courses and advanced standing applicants who have completed some college-level work. BOARS agreed to review the issue to determine if a new policy is needed. Finally, it was

noted that the dual (conditional) enrollment policy (SR 476D) is not used in practice, but BOARS decided to leave the policy in place until it can determine if UC would ever accommodate students who seek dual enrollment at a community college.

Discussion: There was concern that SR 417 may discourage prospective freshmen from taking college-level work, but the admissions directors agreed that most campuses would not force students with one or two college courses to apply for advanced standing admission. Students who take college-level coursework in the summer after graduation would be considered individually, and likely as freshmen. Students who take a full term of college coursework, however, would likely be considered for advanced standing. It was noted that campuses should be careful that the admission of freshmen with college courses does not take space away from CCC transfers. Finally, BOARS should add A by E language to the transfer regulations if and when it reviews those regulations, and should engage the admissions directors in a conversation about dual admissions if there is a decision to use it more widely.

III. Comprehensive Review and Shared Review

Issue: The new admissions policy will increase the applicant pool, meaning all campuses will need to expand their use of Comprehensive Review and become more selective. Chair Hurtado asked BOARS and the admissions directors to consider strategies for implementing and strengthening CR policies and procedures. BOARS believes there is too much variability in existing campus CR policies and guidelines. Some have elaborate policies and procedures in place, while others need more development. Campuses should assess their policies, determine what needs improvement, and, if necessary, develop new or revised guidelines to ensure that CR processes take into account the 13 criteria, including those for assessing achievement in the context of opportunity and selecting students with top academic or personal accomplishments who are broadly representative of the state. Campuses lacking a guiding statement of philosophy for CR and admission should consider developing one.

BOARS was recently reminded of a standing request from the Regents for an annual report on the effectiveness of CR, which BOARS has not produced since [September 2003](#). BOARS is now being asked to submit a comprehensive retrospective on CR by December 2009. Chair Hurtado drafted a preliminary outline for the report, which she said should show how UC campuses are moving toward more uniform CR systems and evaluating students in the context of their environment.

Director Wilbur noted that UC now prefers the term “Shared Scores” over “Shared Review” in reference to a developing plan to enable campuses to share application data and CR scores. UC is assembling a preliminary version of a systemwide shared score read sheet, which will be available on the “Apply UC” platform beginning for fall 2011 admissions. In addition, UCB will allow campuses to access its read sheet data and scores in the upcoming application cycle, and a UC Davis system for evaluating transfer applicants who apply to more than one campus is being implemented systemwide.

Discussion: The admissions directors described several collaborative efforts, including a UCSD plan to use the UCLA read sheet and scores as a pilot project in 2010, and a UCI plan to expand a similar program with UCLA this year. UCI is also sending a team of evaluators to UCLA to

observe its holistic read norming process, and UCB is developing a webinar to help train campuses to use its read sheet and scores. It was noted that the coordination and centralization of IT services across campuses aid systemwide collaboration in admissions review, but campus-specific IT tools can also make such efforts difficult. While uniformity in data collection is useful, there should be no “one size fits all” model in selection. Campuses should continue to have autonomy and individuality in decision-making.

The CR report is an opportunity to describe campus processes and identify areas for improvement and greater alignment. The report should summarize past and current practice; outline how CR will change in 2012; and imagine the future direction of the policy. It should describe the ways campuses ensure the quality, integrity, and consistency of the review process and cite evidence that campus processes are consistent with policy and unrelated issues are not creeping into reviews. Campuses want to preserve flexibility, but other constituencies are more concerned about maintaining fair and consistent application of policy and practice. These competing concerns must be resolved. Finally, the report should describe how CR adds value to the review process over the sole consideration of quantitative factors, which, given the budget crisis, may appeal to some as a less expensive means of review. It was noted that the current guidelines are flexible enough to apply both to the current system and the 2012 reform model.

Several campuses shared best practices. At one campus, each file is read and scored twice, and discrepancies trigger a third read. Others discussed methods of certifying the integrity of the read process – e.g., analyzing random sample cases to compare reader outcomes, and tracking specific indicators over time to help ensure consistency and maintain quality. It was noted that in the past it was more common for local admissions committees and BOARS to review a selection of files to verify outcomes. Returning to this practice would benefit the faculty and the process.

CR faces challenges due to the budget crisis. Financial and expert staffing support for the read process will likely decrease as applications and selectivity increase. Admissions staff will have to find a way to increase efficiency without sacrificing quality. Moreover, if reviewers are forced to spend less time with files and campuses come under increasing pressure to choose students with the highest traditional indicators diversity will be impacted. There is hope that score sharing will help counterbalance these negative effects. It was suggested that BOARS include a statement in the CR report articulating the importance of diversity to the institution as a core value, and connecting diversity to excellence.

Action: BOARS will appoint a subcommittee to draft the Comprehensive Review report and work with the admissions directors to help frame it.

IV. Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Issue: BOARS and the admissions directors discussed BOARS’ proposed guidelines for the admission of domestic and international non-resident undergraduates. Chair Hurtado said the systemwide Senate review of the guidelines produced thoughtful feedback and also some misunderstandings. First, there is no written policy on non-resident enrollment, although the Master Plan mentions that non-residents should come from the top half of the eligibility pool, and campuses have traditionally limited their enrollment to about 6% and use a 3.4 minimum GPA cutoff for non-resident applicants. Second, it was not BOARS’ intention to limit non-resident enrollment. Several campuses expressed support for a specific cap of between 10% and

15%, but BOARS does not support writing such limits into policy at this time. In fact, BOARS assumes non-resident enrollment will inevitably increase, and its intention is to ensure that campuses move cautiously and have sound guidelines in place for their selection.

Discussion: Admissions directors noted that non-residents bring new perspectives and geographic diversity to campuses, and there is an opportunity to use non-resident tuition for educational services, including financial aid, benefiting resident students. On the other hand, non-residents generally do not come from economically diverse or historically underrepresented backgrounds, and UC draws most international enrollees from only a handful of nations. UC should balance non-resident enrollment against resident expectations for access. It is true that the State is not funding UC appropriately, but UC must still ensure that it is serving California and accommodating California children.

It was noted that some Senate reviewers argue that other state-funded institutions—e.g., Michigan—enroll a much higher percentage of non-residents. However, those states are not as diverse or as populous as California, which is already a fully global state, and they do not have the demand and expectation for access that exists in California for UC. Moreover, increasing non-resident tuition revenue does not guarantee that the State will not cut UC further.

There were suggestions for new principles:

- UC should remain committed to always enrolling 100% of state-funded California residents.
- A part of revenues generated by increases to non-resident enrollment at UC should be tied to funding outreach to underrepresented minority residents.

Part II: BOARS Meeting

I. Consent Calendar

1. June 5, 2009 meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the June minutes.

II. Announcements

- *BOARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado and Vice Chair Bill Jacob*

Report: Chair Hurtado summarized recent Senate news and business of interest to BOARS.

The Academic Assembly met on June 17 to discuss the budget crisis, and the Council held a conference call on July 7 to discuss President Yudof's three proposed options for furloughs and salary reductions. The President assured the Senate that he will take its comments into account. BOARS members are invited to participate in UC's Counselor Conferences in September.

Vice Chair Jacob participated in a phone call with Achieve, Inc. on June 18. He noted that Achieve is developing two sets of national standards—one on college readiness and the second related to achievement by grade level. Achieve's plan, which has the support of the U.S. Department of Education and the National Governor's Conference, is to develop tests in line with the standards by the end of 2009. Federal money will be available to states that adopt the tests as part of their standards, although there will be no single national test.

III. Continued Discussion of Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Issue: BOARS reviewed divisional Senate and systemwide committee responses to its Principles document. Seven reviewing agencies expressed general support, three were opposed, and four supported a cap on non-resident enrollment. There were a number of other reservations and concerns expressed, particularly about limiting income and campus flexibility, and some misunderstandings about BOARS' intentions. There was less support for the budget-related principles.

Discussion: The Senate determines who UC admits and teaches. The recent mandates for campuses to establish specific targets for non-resident undergraduate enrollment could force campuses to increase dramatically the non-resident admissions rate to achieve specific yield targets, and in doing so, adopt differential selection processes for residents and non-residents. BOARS agreed that enrolling more non-residents could help enhance financial resources in the absence of sufficient state funding, but enrolling international and out of state students is not a practical or legitimate way to *solve* the fiscal crisis.

Action: Analyst LaBriola and Chair Hurtado will incorporate suggestions into a revised draft and cover letter.

IV. Report to the Regents on the New SAT

Report: Testing Subcommittee Chair Peter Sadler briefed BOARS on the latest version of a draft report to The Regents on the use of standardized admissions tests that incorporates comments

from the June meeting. The report now includes an analysis of the ACT and a more comprehensive definition of fairness. It recommends that the BOARS principles prefer tests that are curriculum-based and scored by achievement standards. It does not make an explicit recommendation for changing current testing policy, but presents possible pathways to change that UC should continue to consider; for example, placing less emphasis on the tests or joining the growing number of four-year colleges that have made tests optional.

Discussion:

- Members suggested new recommendations: First, UC should explore ways to elevate the profile of the ACT with Writing to increase the number of students who take it. Second, individual campuses should not overweight test scores. Third, future University reviews and analyses of admissions tests should give appropriate attention to the ACT along with SAT.
- It is important for the report to address social-economic status in its analyses of the impact of the tests.
- The ethnic group differences in the power of each test to predict freshman GPA do not necessarily mean a test is unfair; more likely they may indicate that the test is not measuring all of the characteristics that are critical for college success.
- It is true that if UC abandons the testing requirement it risks losing the confidence of the public in admissions decisions, but this cannot be the only rationale. Without the SAT or ACT, UC would lose its modeling capability and high schools would begin to engage in more grade inflation.

Action: Peter Sadler will solicit changes and revisions to incorporate into a new draft for the next meeting. BOARS will vote on a final version in the fall if they are not able to address it over email by August 31.

V. Discussion with the Academic Senate Chair

- *Mary Croughan*

Report: UCOP has just released President Yudof's final employee furlough proposal, which the Regents will review on July 15. The Senate conducted its review of the three proposed options rapidly and exceptionally well, and the final proposal addressed many suggestions and concerns. Several major themes emerged from the review, including the need for UC to calculate retirement benefits on the basis of pre-furlough salaries; provide flexibility as to when furlough days are taken; and include more progressively graduated income bands that give higher paid employees larger cuts. The plan will reduce employees' work time by a specified number of furlough days according to their salary level, with an equivalent pay reduction each month. Individual campuses may institute required campus-wide furlough days, but otherwise employees have flexibility. It exempts student employees and those whose salary funding comes entirely from non-state funded sources. The President has asked campuses to implement the plan in a way that does not impact instruction. The plan will be implemented September 1 and assessed after the first year, with consideration to the effects on retention, recruitment, and morale. In the meantime, the Senate will participate in a Regents commission looking at the "future of UC." Chair Croughan said she expects BOARS to be involved in some of the working groups of this commission. Finally, she thanked Chair Hurtado, Vice Chair Jacob and BOARS for their hard work, leadership, and support during the year.

VI. Consultation with UCOP

○ *Interim Provost Lawrence Pitts*

Report: Interim Provost Pitts said UC will be examining many University operations to see where it may be possible to do things more efficiently with minimal harm to quality. One option is for UC to maintain its current quality by becoming much smaller, but this would have serious repercussions for diversity and access. He invited BOARS and Student Affairs to consider where UC might be able to increase efficiencies in admissions related functions—for example, by eliminating or improving some expensive or repetitive elements of the a-g certification process to make them more routine or lighten the review load; finding new ways to streamline articulation agreement process; and sharing scores to simplify the application review process.

Discussion: Associate Admissions Director Don Daves-Rougeaux said there may be cost saving opportunities that the Office of Admissions can address in the near term. One involves working with charter school management organizations instead of individual charter schools to approve courses collectively for multiple charter schools. Another involves looking at the amount of variance and standardization in introductory level courses.

One member said at the same time UC is brainstorming about how to get through the bad times, it should be developing a better political advocacy and communication strategy that highlights the need for public reinvestment in education and other public services.

A-g is special and unique to UC. UC should think about new initiatives that can strengthen a-g that can also yield cost benefits. UC should engage secondary teachers in the conversation. Can UC train secondary teachers to do some course approvals themselves?

Chair Hurtado thanked BOARS members for their hard work during the year, and members gave Chair Hurtado a round of applause in appreciation for her service as chair.

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