

UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL
ANNUAL REPORT 2007-2008

To the Faculty Legislature, Santa Barbara Division:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) and its three standing committees held a total of 53 regularly scheduled 90-minute meetings during this academic year. Many of the Council's agenda items were delegated for preliminary review by the appropriate standing committee(s), followed by full Council review and consideration of committee recommendations.

Executive Summary

Purpose: To set standards for and policy on undergraduate education and to provide advice and consent on all matters of policy, planning, programs and practice that impact the quality and diversity of UCSB's undergraduates and their educational experiences at UCSB.

Issues of General Concern

- Ugc heard regular reports and endorsed plans and procedures for Fall 2008 implementation of the Minimum Cumulative Progress (MCP) requirement, which is expected to have an advantageous affect on UCSB's conversion ratio (which is used to determine funding from the state based on student FTE) in the long term.
- Ugc collaborated with the College of Letters and Science (L&S) Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) and Associate Dean Beltz in the College of Engineering (COE) to develop guidelines for submission of course unit revaluation proposals. Increasing course unit values where appropriate, as recommended by the Conversion Ratio Task Force, is aimed at assisting students in maintaining compliance with the MCP requirement.
- Following thorough discussion and careful evaluation of likely impacts, Ugc endorsed the *Proposal to Reform UC Freshman Eligibility Policy*, which was submitted to the Academic Council by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS).

Local Senate Business

Academic Program Reviews

In cooperation with the Program Review Panel (PRP), UGC participated in the academic program reviews of the following departments and programs, some of which were begun during the 2006-07 review cycle:

- Chemical Engineering
- Communication
- Ecology, Evolution and Marine Biology
- English (continued)
- Exercise and Sport Studies (continued)
- History
- Statistics and Applied Probability
- Writing Program (continued)

Since the establishment of the Council in 2002, Ugc has amassed broader historical insight with respect to undergraduate programs, thereby enhancing its ability to observe patterns and compare strengths and weaknesses within and across disciplines. The Council finds this helpful in responding to campus initiatives and program related proposals. Ugc endorsed proposed *Academic Senate Review Guidelines for Council Participation in the Academic Program Review Process*, finding the procedures described to be consistent with existing Ugc procedures. The Council continues to question the equity and effectiveness of the recent practice of delegating academic deans to carry out reviews of select programs within their own divisions.

At the beginning of this fall quarter, chairs of Senate councils that participate in academic program reviews met with the PRP chair, vice chair, and coordinator to discuss matters of concern regarding their respective roles and to facilitate more effective collaboration. This consultation proved beneficial and will henceforth take place annually.

GGSE Proposal to Establish a New Department

UgC reviewed the Girvetz Graduate School of Education's request to establish a Department of Teaching, Curriculum and Professional Development. The 51-page proposal's only reference to undergraduate education was a brief paragraph stating that teaching courses associated with the Minor in Education and Applied Psychology would "constitute a notable portion of the new Department Faculty's teaching load." Since the level of faculty involvement in this minor has been a matter of previous concern, the Council welcomes any additional faculty participation that might result from establishment of the proposed department.

Feminist Studies Proposal

UgC endorsed a proposal requesting departmentalization of the Women's Studies Program, along with an accompanying name change to the Department of Feminist Studies. The Council anticipates receipt of a proposal in Fall 2008 to change the names of the undergraduate programs in Women's Studies to bring them into accord with the name of the Department.

Five-Year Combined Program in Chemistry and Materials

The Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council jointly approved the establishment of a Five-Year Combined Program for a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemistry and a Master of Science degree in Materials, effective Fall 2008.

Minor in Labor Studies

The Council approved the Department of History's proposal to establish a Minor in Labor Studies, effective Winter 2008.

Computer Science Honors Program

UgC approved a proposal from the Department of Computer Science to establish an honors program for Distinction in the Major in Computer Science, effective Fall 2008.

Law and Society Program Proposal

UgC considered the Law and Society Program's *Proposed Plan to Reopen and Regulate the Size of the Law and Society Major*. Although the L&S Executive Committee endorsed this proposal, stating only a few concerns, UgC was quite hesitant to approve the requested 2.9 pre-major GPA requirement and was not convinced that the current number of faculty members was adequate to maintain a viable program. After meeting with the Program's Chair and Divisional Dean to discuss its concerns, the Council voted not to approve the original proposal, but agreed to consider a revised proposal. While UgC was considering a subsequently submitted proposal, the Council learned that a member of Law and Society's faculty had accepted an offer from another institution. Dean Oliver was again consulted, particularly with respect to whether he planned to replace this FTE. However, by this time, other developments had created an even more uncertain situation regarding the future of the Program. UgC therefore voted not to reopen the Law and Society Major.

Revision of SR 205

Upon recommendation by the Committee on Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy (CUAPP), UgC endorsed and presented for Faculty Legislature approval a request for minor revision of Senate Regulation 205. General Education Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science (Engineering). The proposed change pertained only to the administration of the requirement.

Minimum Cumulative Progress

Throughout the year UgC consulted with former Dean of Undergraduate Studies Al Wyner, Acting Dean Mary Nisbet, and Registrar Ginny Johns regarding implementation of the new Minimum Cumulative Progress Requirement. Various calculation methods were considered prior to the development of a system that tabulates individual MCP progress and makes this information available to students. The Council was also consulted regarding the development of criteria for granting automatic and conditional exceptions.

UgC received a presentation by representatives of Associated Students (AS) regarding response to the MCP requirement. A survey that students were asked to complete when casting their votes in the 2008 AS Spring General Election revealed that many of the 4,907 respondents did not feel confident about their ability to stay in compliance with MCP. However, it was clear from the narrative comments that students were not well informed about the new requirement or their option to petition for exceptions. The AS representatives also argued that the MCP requirement was put in place without providing an avenue for students to be involved in the decision making process. They offered several recommendations to facilitate greater student involvement in Academic Senate matters, some of which UgC found inappropriate. AS officers have been advised to take greater advantage of existing opportunities for student participation on Senate councils and committees as defined in the Senate bylaws.

Workload Policy

In its response to the *Recommended Guidelines for Departmental Instructional Workload Policies*, UgC pointed out several ambiguities and offered suggestions for clarifying how the guidelines should be used, the manner in which information should be compiled and reported, and the delegation of authority with respect to workload policy. Some members of the Council wished to note that, while the workload of lecturers and non-Senate instructors are covered by contract, a document that is directed towards guidelines for Departmental Instructional Workload should include some mention to principles of fairness that apply to all instructors.

Proposed Transfer, Consolidation, Discontinuation and Disestablishment Policy

UgC endorsed, for presentation to the Faculty Legislature, the proposed policies for the transfer, consolidation, discontinuance and disestablishment of academic programs and units. It was suggested that thinking about how these rules could be applied to pending cases may reveal ways in which to make them more effective.

Impacted Majors

In Spring 2007 UgC began a study of departments perceived to be particularly challenged by the demands of serving a very large number of majors with limited or inadequate resources. Upon reviewing comments and numerical data provided by the chairs of ten departments, the Council found that most departments consider allocation of additional faculty FTE and sub-0 funds to be the primary solution to their deficiencies. Some departments have reluctantly taken steps such as imposing pre-major GPA requirements and placing enrollment restrictions on their upper division courses, but with only limited results. Others do not wish to pursue such measures as they wish to keep their offerings open to all students.

The Council considered the degree to which impacted departments might be willing to give up some of their autonomy to work with departments whose resources are less impacted. Such interdisciplinary bridges need to be made more attractive to both students and departments. There is a need for viable programs in less impacted departments that will enable students to pursue desirable careers. It was noted that the disparity in the number of courses various departments require their faculty to teach may be relevant to this issue.

When reviewing data notebooks prepared in conjunction with academic program reviews, the Council repeatedly observes complaints from students about limited availability of required and elective courses, inadequate advising, and minimal access to undergraduate research opportunities. UgC is concerned that unless the campus takes steps to assist with these problems in a global fashion, the quality of undergraduate education will continue to be compromised. Although it's clear that the commonly desired additional funding is unlikely to be forthcoming any time soon, there may be room for creative strategies to better distribute students across departments. However, due to the large number of other issues the Council was asked to address this year, little headway was made in exploring feasible solutions. UgC will revisit this issue in the coming year.

Summer Session Finals

Following up on several recommendations provided by CUAPP, the Council continued its effort toward implementation of a revised Summer Sessions (SS) schedule that will accommodate instructors who wish to give a standard three-hour final within their summer courses. UgC asked Department chairs to report how many of their faculty would be interested in this option and found that there was sufficient interest to warrant moving forward. Following further consultation with the SS Director Loy Lytle and Associate Director Robert Mann, UgC met with Executive Vice Chancellor Lucas to present its recommendations on how this goal could be achieved. The EVC agreed to request that Dean Lytle act on those recommendations by Summer 2009.

Teaching Assistant (TA) Training

UGC received word from the Office of Instructional Consultation that the TA Ethics Training Modules that were developed at UC Berkeley have been adapted for use within departmental training programs at UCSB. As part of the TA Departmental Training Grant (TAD) program, departments were asked to develop specific plans on how to incorporate some or all of the modules into their training programs. A dozen departments had done so as of the time of this report. UGC supported the TA Training Committee's recommendation that these modules be completed by all TAs on a mandatory basis. Since Instructional Consultation does not want to be responsible for this mandate, it will be incumbent on the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils to pursue this part of the plan if deemed appropriate.

Systemwide Business

University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP)

Following a report on CUAPP's preliminary review of the *Proposal for Modification of Regulations and Guidelines Governing the Participation of Graduate Students in University Instruction*, UGC voted 13-0-2 against endorsing this proposal. Although the Council appreciated the intent of certain aspects of the proposal, members agreed with CUAPP that it was a well-meaning but confused attempt to simplify and unify practices across the UC system, which ultimately failed to institute the level of oversight that it claimed to support.

Upon reviewing a proposed undergraduate mission statement prepared by the Undergraduate Education Task Force, three Council members delegated to respond questioned whether the mission statement could realistically be used for evaluation and accountability and what overall impact, if any, it would have on undergraduate education at UC. Suggestions were offered for improving the passive nature of the language and identifying discernable outcomes.

UGC responded to the 'Dialectic' paper on remote/on-line instruction prepared by UCEP, the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), and the University Committee on Information Technology and Telecommunications Policy (ITTP). While the Council was united in its opinion that whole degree programs should not be made available for on-line completion, there was support from some forms of remote or on-line instruction provided various supporting functions and oversight constraints are in place. UGC favored an administrative structure that involves some centralization, but maintains enough campus autonomy to allow for appropriate experimentation.

In connection with the ongoing effort to implement systemwide Senate Regulation 477, UGC Chair Digeser reviewed and responded to course articulation information as it was incrementally prepared for posting on the UC Statewide Transfer Preparation Paths website.

Board of Admission and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

The Council 'conditionally' supported the original Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy, expressing concerns about additional costs related to processing applications, loss of SAT II test information valued by some departments, and potential need for provision of additional academic support services. However, UGC found the revised proposal to be a well-argued and well-documented improvement over the previous formulation. The Council endorsed both the ends that the reform is attempting to achieve and the means for doing so. (Please see additional comments on this and other BOARS topics within the CAERS report below.)

UGC endorsed the *Proposal to Repeal Academic Senate Regulation 458*, which allows graduates of certain schools and colleges in China and Japan to fulfill various course requirements for UC admission through alternate means.

BOARS Representative William Jacob provided regular updates on BOARS activities to both UGC and its Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS).

University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE)

UgC responded to a UCOPE proposal requesting changes to SR 636 that would improve currently confusing and redundant language, remove the names of specific non-UC exams that may be used to satisfy the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), and impose a cap of 20 on the size of ELWR classes. This proposal has a lengthy history, and was denied by UCEP when it was proposed last year. While UCEP fully agreed with the rationale for the proposal, its members refused to support an unfunded mandate of this kind. UgC is well aware of the financial deficiencies of UCSB's Writing Program, which consistently struggles to meet current student demand for required writing courses at their current size. While fully supporting the intent of UCOPE's proposal, the Council was unwilling to support such a mandate without accompanying implementation funds from a systemwide source.

Other Systemwide Business

UgC reviewed the Report of the UC Joint Ad Hoc Committee on International Education, along with a minority report by Gayle Binion and supplemental comments by University Education Abroad Program Director Michael O'Connell. It was generally agreed that the background information provided was insufficient to allow for effective evaluation of the recommendations contained in the report, particularly those related to budgetary concerns. While some Council members supported the recommendations in principle, others felt inadequately advised to convey even that level of support.

The Council was asked to respond to two of the reports prepared by the Regents' Study Group on University Diversity – *Recommendations and Observations*, prepared by the Undergraduate Work Team of the Study Group, and the *Campus Climate Report*. CAERS was delegated to review these reports and report its recommendations to UgC. In general, CAERS endorsed the aims of the reports and felt that the specific proposals were reasonable, but the committee was concerned that good intentions alone are not enough to inspire significant change. The Council's response detailed several concerns and offered suggestions for the development of action items.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

Committee on Undergraduate Student Affairs (CUSA) – Francis Dunn, Chair

Throughout the year Michael Young, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (ex officio member), and Yonie Harris, Dean of Students (regular consultant), informed and advised the committee on matters pertaining to its charge. CUSA met with Acting Director Lupe Garcia for its annual update on Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS) and with Ian Kaminsky, Director of UCSB's Drug and Alcohol Program, regarding the prevalence of student drug use and drug dealing. The committee met twice with Carol Mosely, Director of the Women's Center's Rape Prevention and Education Program, regarding her work with sexual assault victims and campus-wide efforts to educate students on this issue. CUSA simultaneously consulted with Angie Tozier, Assistant Director of Judicial Affairs, with respect to how the campus responds to claims of sexual assault and whether improvements might be made within the judicial process to attain more satisfactory outcomes. A recommendation was made to the Undergraduate Council, and subsequently to the Senate Chair, that the process be examined more broadly during the upcoming year. The committee also enjoyed a visit from this year's Student Regent and next year's designee.

CUSA deliberated and made recommendations to the Undergraduate Council and/or the Senate Chair regarding the following items of systemwide and local business:

- Proposed UC *Regulations Governing the Conduct of Non-Affiliates*
- A report of the Workgroup on Undergraduate Affordability
- Proposed revision of Section 12.05 of the systemwide *Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline*
- Proposed revision of the *UC Policy and Supplemental Guidelines on the On-Campus Marketing of Credit Cards to Students*
- The Campus Security Task Force's proposal to amend state law (the Welfare and Institutions Code) regarding 5150 (psychiatric) holds

- A proposed new UCSB policy on *Zero Tolerance for Violence*
- Complaints regarding unauthorized changes to the published final exam schedule
- The potential for enhanced and expanded bookstore facilities on campus

CUSA reviewed nomination materials and selected one faculty and three student recipients of the *Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Research* and two recipients of the *Fiona Goodchild Award for Excellence as a Graduate Student Mentor of Undergraduate Research*. Upon completion of this year's selection process, members agreed that CUSA and others should meet to assess the nomination and selection procedures used in administering these awards. Plans for this endeavor will be revisited in Fall 2008.

Over the course of the summer CUSA members and other interested faculty participated in the search for UCSB's new Director of Intercollegiate Athletics. The four candidates interviewed were asked, among other things, about the challenges of balancing academics and athletics, their approach to dealing with the competing pressures on student-athletes from professor and coach, and about improving support for athletics within the student population. The group's assessment of the candidates was reported to the Search Committee Co-Chairs along with praise for having attracted such outstanding applicants.

Committee on Undergraduate Academic Programs and Policy (CUAPP) – Davies King, Chair

Routine Duties

CUAPP responded to the following requests as part of its regular workload:

- 55 General Education proposals
- 179 associate appointment proposals
- 142 requests for establishment of new courses
- 374 requests for modification of existing courses
- 28 requests for discontinuation of existing courses
- 10 final exam time change requests

UCSB Program Proposals

CUAPP conducted preliminary reviews of the following proposals and reported its recommendations to UgC:

- Proposal to establish a Five-Year Combined Program for a Bachelor of Science degree in Chemistry and a Master of Science degree in Materials
- Proposal to establish an honors program for Distinction in the Major in Computer Science
- Proposal to establish a Minor in Labor Studies within the Department of History
- Proposal for departmentalization of the Women's Studies Program with an accompanying name change to the Department of Feminist Studies
- Proposed plan to reopen and regulate the size of the Law and Society Major
- Proposal to moderately revise the curriculum for completion of the Minor in Physics
- Proposed revision of Senate Regulation 205. General Education Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science (Engineering)

Systemwide Proposal

CUAPP reviewed and reported on the *Proposal for Modification of Regulations and Guidelines Governing the Participation of Graduate Students in University Instruction*.

Course Unit Revaluation

In conjunction with the effort to improve UCSB's conversion ratio and to assist students in complying with the new MCP requirement, academic deans began consulting with departments about increasing course unit values where appropriate. CUAPP met separately with Deans Alan Wyner and David Marshall regarding this topic. The committee was asked to develop guidelines for departmental submission of unit revaluation requests. The committee was hesitant to encourage a move that might result in a decrease in the overall number of courses

taken by UCSB undergraduates. Members were concerned about unit inflation, conflicts related to upper-division unit limits within certain majors, and the potential for creating a disproportionate standard between upper and lower division courses with respect to the workload required in exchange for a given number of units. Meanwhile, the Joint UgC-FEC Task Force on Unit Revaluation was formed at the request of the L&S Faculty Executive Committee, and CUAPP began reviewing a small accumulation of pending revaluation requests as a means of determining workload standards for increased units and the type of information needed to demonstrate that those standards have been met. CUAPP proposed a set of guidelines that were eventually approved by the Joint Task Force, UgC, and the L&S FEC. The College of Engineering was also consulted. On May 16, the *Guidelines for Submission of Course Revaluation Requests* were distributed to all department chairs and other administrators along with an explanatory cover memo. CUAPP approved unit increases for several, but not all, of the proposed courses.

Extended Learning Services

As of Fall 2007 UGC took on approval authority for UCSB Extension courses (X1-199) that may be petitioned for credit toward UCSB degrees, and over the instructors of these courses. This responsibility was subsequently delegated to CUAPP. The overall change resulted in the need to update the existing *Policy and Procedures for Senate Approval of UCSB Extension Courses and Instructors*. CUAPP recommended the necessary revisions to the Senate Chair along with suggestions for further grammatical and clarifying edits. The policy states that all Extension courses requiring Senate oversight are generally approved for up to five years. In consultation with the Department of Economics, CUAPP agreed that ECON and BUSAD X1-199 courses should be approved for a period of no more than three years at a time. The Committee approved two such courses and their instructors.

Formalization of Upper-Division Course Prerequisite Requirement

Throughout its existence, CUAPP has upheld the longstanding requirement that some form of prerequisite be designated for all upper-division courses. In response to a request from the Office of the Registrar that this requirement be officially publicized, CUAPP asked UgC to request that the Committee on Rules, Jurisdiction and Elections (RJ&E) add the following text to the Appendices of the Senate Manual under Appendix III: Policy Rulings by the Undergraduate Council and the Former Committee on Undergraduate Courses.

All undergraduate upper-division courses must have one or more prerequisites. Prerequisites may include preparatory courses (with or without grade limitations), consent of instructor or department, class level restrictions, major limitations, or test scores, all of which can be enforced by the UCSB registration system (i.e., GOLD).

UgC submitted the request to RJ&E. That committee responded with several questions about general standards for upper-division courses to which UgC will respond in Fall 2008.

Course Management System

Steve Miley, Manager of Academic Systems for Instructional Computing, updated CUAPP regarding ongoing efforts to implement a course management system for campus-wide use. He presented a comparison of the two systems currently being piloted and explained the obstacles to faster progress as well as concerns emerging as a result of recurring delays. Members offered a few suggestions for responding to the obstacles and expressed enthusiastic support for moving forward as expeditiously as possible.

Revision of General Education Area Definitions

CUAPP considered revisions to the GE area definitions that were proposed by the former GE Work Group, but never vetted by the L&S Executive Committee in response to a request from the Undergraduate Council. CUAPP members agree that the currently used definitions are overly broad and ambiguous, which has in some cases resulted in disagreement among CUAPP members, or between the proposing department and the committee, with regard to the best area fit for a proposed course. CUAPP agreed on minor revisions to the definitions proposed by the GE Work Group, and will present them for UgC review in Fall 2008 with a request that they be forwarded for approval by the L&S and COE FECs. Since the current area definitions are published in the Academic Senate Manual, any proposed revision will also be subject to approval by the Faculty Legislature.

Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Relations with Schools (CAERS) – William Jacob, Chair

Summary

One of CAERS primary duties is to review data relating to undergraduate applications, admission, and yield. In this regard, 2007-2008 was an exciting year for UCSB. As discussed below we had a substantial increase in diversity in the UCSB applicant pool, in admissions, and in yield. A second major CAERS activity during 2007-2008 was discussion of the BOARS proposal to restructure eligibility. This proposal is now under consideration by the Regents. Another of the yearly duties of CAERS is to review, and revise as necessary, the UCSB admissions model. CAERS decided that the admissions model from 2007-2008 would be left intact for 2008-2009¹, although CAERS expects special challenges in the upcoming year due to financial constraints within the UC Office of the President (UCOP) and the uncertain impact of the Admissions Processing Task Force, which as of summer 2008 has not yet concluded its work. Depending upon these uncertainties, it may become necessary for CAERS to jump into high gear in the fall and make adjustments, although for stability sake the committee hopes that any major change will not occur prior to 2009-2010. CAERS members Jacob and Bianchini joined Admissions staff in a visit to UCLA on August 7 to learn about their comprehensive review as part of a pilot effort to determine the feasibility of shared review. Most likely this will only result in a pilot during 08-09, which CAERS will have to evaluate prior to participating in a system-wide shared review. CAERS also heard reports from UCSB admissions counselors and outreach staff, approved a proposal from the College of Engineering on an additional holistic read, and reviewed and commented on various BOARS items, including recent articulation changes in a-g. More details about CAERS work are provided in the six categories below.

Applications, Admissions, Yield

The 2007 freshman class was the largest ever at UCSB, and consisted of students with higher GPAs and SAT scores than those of past cohorts. (Of 40,915 applications, 22,205 were admitted, 4,664 submitted statement of intent to register (SIR), and 4,338 enrolled.) With respect to ethnicity, the class was pretty similar to the previous year's, with the exception of a slight drop in the number of African American students. However, the number of transfer students (1273) enrolled was under the number targeted (1450). For the most part this was consistent with trends for most UC campuses.

Fall 2007 applicant and SIR data showed dramatic changes from the previous year. Application numbers grew to 47,069, a significant increase (at a rate greater than most campuses, but not all) that was accompanied by a dramatic increase in diversity: African American applications rose from 1,351 in 2006 to 2,190 and Chicano/Latino applications rose from 7,460 in fall 2006 to 9,493. Admit and SIR numbers reflected these increases: African American admits were 758 (up from 552) and SIRs were 190 (up from 120) and Chicano/Latino admits were 4,490 (up from 3,839) and SIRs were 1,181 (up from 1,026). The SIR gender balance also changed: for 2008, SIRs are 55% female and were 58% female in 2007. The percent of first-generation SIRs grew from 20% in 2007 to 24% this year, and the percent of total underrepresented minority SIRs grew from 25% in 2007 to 30% in 2008. All of this is matched with improved academic indicators, self-reported GPA from SIRs is 3.84 up from 3.81 in 2007, and the average SAT composite scores are 1782 up from 1774 in 2007.

CAERS is extremely pleased with all the indicators for the 2008 freshmen class. Admissions handled a substantial increase in the applicant pool and maintained recruitment efforts for an impressive yield that is stronger academically and more closely represents the diversity of the state than classes of previous years. In this regard UCSB has proved an important point that is relevant to consideration of the BOARS eligibility proposal: If we have an increase in diversity of our applicant pool, when we apply comprehensive review, we have a corresponding increase in diversity of admits and SIRs—all of this while the campus becomes more competitive and academic indicators go up.

The BOARS Eligibility Proposal

During 2006-2007 BOARS devoted considerable discussion to various models to restructure UC eligibility. A proposal was distributed for system wide review during summer 2007, feedback was received by Academic Council, and after considering this input during winter 2008, BOARS sent a revised proposal for a second

¹ A minor adjustment to the academic index was made in fall 2007. CAERS also reviewed the Athletic Admissions guidelines and decided to make no changes.

system-wide review which was subsequently adopted (with minor revisions) by the Academic Assembly in June 2008. The proposal was presented to the Regents in July 2008, and is pending their action subject to BOARS providing more background information and to give Regents more time to learn about the details.

A major concern of BOARS was the significant number of California high school graduates who are ineligible because of minor deficiencies, but who otherwise would be considered stronger applicants by BOARS than many technically eligible admits to UC. It would be beyond the scope of this report to detail these discussions, or the proposal for that matter, so we offer here only the barest outline. (Interested readers are referred to the BOARS documents.) The basic idea of the proposal is to introduce a new category *Entitled to Review* (ETR) whereby students who meet ETR requirements are entitled to have their file comprehensively reviewed by every UC campus to which they apply, and then to have a smaller group of students receive a referral guarantee (so if they are not admitted to a UC campus where they apply, they are guaranteed admission at either Riverside or Merced.) The SAT subject tests would be eliminated as a requirement of admission. ETR status would be conferred upon students who have a 2.8 GPA, unweighted by the honors bump, in at least 11 of the 15 a-g courses by the end of their junior year (they still must complete all 15 as a condition of admission.) The referral guarantee would be made to all students in the top 9% of their high school class or the top 9% state-wide. (BOARS estimates, using 2003 CPEC data, that approximately 10% of CA high school graduates would receive the referral guarantee, leaving about 2.5% to be selected from the remaining ETR files). We note that the 2.8 unweighted GPA corresponds closely to about a 3.0 weighted GPA (weighted means that honors courses receive an extra grade point), currently the minimum for UC eligibility. BOARS felt that using an unweighted GPA was more equitable for ETR since many schools do not have the same number of honors opportunities for students.

One point often lost in the discussion of the proposal is that the current system of campus-based comprehensive review will remain unchanged. Each campus, however, may have to reconsider its approaches as the applicant pool broadens and as discussed below, there is considerable motion at UCOP towards sharing of comprehensive review data among various campuses as developed by the Admissions Processing Task Force.

During the early discussions of the eligibility proposal, CAERS considered the following issues: the impact of the loss of subject tests as predictors of student success in technical fields, the increased cost of reviewing more applications, the public relations impact of making comprehensive review more prominent in the public eye, the impact of a perceived loss of a guarantee as part of a "social contract", and the impact on diversity including the expected increase in URM applicants versus unanticipated consequences which may reduce them. It was also suggested that the success of ELC and A by E students be monitored more carefully to assess the impact of ETR and to see if it could result in more expenses regarding student academic services. It is noted that all of these topics were discussed extensively in BOARS as well as other senate bodies across the system. CAERS also discussed academic performance data prepared by Steven Velasco, Director of Institutional Research, indicating academic probation and retention rates for UCSB's Fall 2000, 2004, and 2005 freshman cohorts, broken down by high school GPA, SAT scores, parent education, family income, diversity, gender, and disciplinary area. CAERS considered how various demographic characteristics might be related to academic performance. The committee's analysis revealed that low-income students and members of certain ethnic groups do have increased difficulty adjusting to the University, but it is difficult to sort this out in relationship to the admissions process and ELC in particular.

Regarding financial concerns (expressed by many campuses) BOARS did learn that \$40 of each \$60 collected as an application fee does go directly to the campus general funds where the student applied, and about \$15 goes directly to the campus Admissions office. At Berkeley, which has one of the most labor-intensive comprehensive reviews, one study showed that their marginal cost of reviewing an application (they review all) is about \$38. So, it appears funding exists to cover an increased applicant pool should it result from implementing ETR. This point however, is a source of tension between campus administrations and admissions offices (including UCSB, where admissions reportedly has a substantial deficit) because typically only a portion of the \$40 actually finds its way to Admissions. While these financial affairs are beyond the purview of CAERS, the committee does hope that UCSB Admissions continues to receive sufficient support to cover expenses of comprehensive review, outreach and yield activities, especially in view of the stellar results in 2008. Overall, it seems that financial concerns related to the ETR proposal are mitigated by this tracking of funds.

In the spring, both CAERS and the Undergraduate Council strongly endorsed BOARS eligibility proposal. If approved by the Regents it will become CAERS job to reexamine UCSB's selection in light of the new ETR category. Given this year's success, CAERS has reason to be optimistic that such a change will enable a continued growth in diversity at UCSB.

The System-wide Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF)

Over the past year, a task force led by UCSB Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Michael Young and consisting of system admissions directors and UCOP admissions staff has been considering models for sharing review data of applicant files. The average UC applicant applies to 3.6 campuses and each campus conducts independent reviews of eligibility and comprehensive review for selection. The task force's job is the obvious one, find ways to stream line the process and help campuses share data in order to reduce expense and increase accuracy of the reviews.

In spring 2008 BOARS Chair Rashid asked that BOARS members be added to the task force, and UCSB representative Jacob agreed to serve. The task force is developing two proposals. The first involves a machine-based UC Comprehensive score and relevant subscores, and the second involves generation of a holistic UC common read score. BOARS and CAERS members have expressed concern regarding potential loss of campus autonomy over the long term, and BOARS has made it clear that, if these proposals affect campuses comprehensive review processes, implementation won't occur until the Senate has had more opportunity to participate in the decision making process.

There will likely be some pilot efforts in 2008-09 between UCLA and UCSB where the UCLA comprehensive review score will be shared. CAERS members Jacob and Bianchini went to UCLA on August 7 to learn more about the process. It will be CAERS responsibility in the fall to work with admissions on this pilot effort as well as consider the plans developed by APTF.

The Work of Admissions Counselors and Outreach

During the past two years CAERS has consulted with leaders from UCSB's outreach and admissions staff in order to be informed about their work and diversity issues. During 2006-07 CAERS consulted with Tom Ostwald (recently retired Director of UCSB's School-University Partnership Program) and from Joe Castro (former Director, Academic Preparation and Equal Opportunity, UCSB) to get their perspectives on academic preparation, admissions policy and diversity. During 2007-08 CAERS met with Britt Ortiz (Director, Early Academic Outreach) and Katya Armistead (UCSB Admissions Counselor) as well as other admissions counselors. Britt presented an overview of the many outreach activities coordinated by Academic Preparation including work with partnership schools and the algebra academies sponsored by UC system-wide. Katya Armistead presented a report, *Perspectives From the Field*, summarizing work of the Office of Admissions in recruitment and yield activities. Of particular interest to CAERS was the increased diversity of the applicant pool during 2007, where it came from, how to sustain this growth, and how to ensure that increases are maintained in the yield. CAERS was also interested in these discussions because they inform the committee as it reviews the UCSB comprehensive review model, in particular the read score.

CAERS learned about reasons many strong students are not UC eligible (often missing an a-g course or SAT II test) and learned about ongoing efforts to educate students at the earliest possible age to these requirements, especially in our partnership schools. CAERS also learned about new initiatives in the Office of Admissions that seem to account for a good portion of the increased applications from URM's this year, among them the distribution of the bLACK bOOK, a handbook prepared by the African diasporic Cultural Resource Center (AdCRC), and a new on-line system that links prospective applicants to an Admissions counselor. CAERS is extremely impressed with the work and personal sacrifices of the Admissions counselors in their outreach to communities with high URM populations.

What CAERS learned is that there are substantial numbers of potential URM UCSB applicants who are competitive, and that what we need to do is bring in their applications and continue to work with them throughout the admissions cycle. CAERS feels that this year is proof that the new efforts in Admissions are making a difference. In early spring CAERS consulted with Admissions and formally proposed to EVC Lucas that additional funds be made available to Admissions for yield activities to ensure the opportunity of increase URM

admissions is not lost. CAERS was pleased with EVC Lucas' response to provide additional support to ensure that yield activities were sustained in financially difficult times. It will remain a top priority of CAERS to ensure that the work of Admissions Counselors, and Admissions staff more generally, continue to receive adequate funding.

College of Engineering Holistic Pre-Read

In the fall Associate Dean Glenn Beltz presented the COE's *Proposal for an Engineering Faculty Pre-Read of High-Risk Applicants*, which had been endorsed by the COE Faculty Executive Committee. The rationale for this proposal was supported by a study, carried out by the Office of Institutional Research, using a metric referred to as the Engineering Eligibility Score (EES). This score, which is based on high school GPA and SAT math test scores, is sufficiently correlated with retention and graduation rates of engineering students to make it a useful predictor in assessing potential for success in the various engineering majors.

The study showed that students with an EES below 600 completed engineering degrees at lower rates than those with an EES above 600. COE proposed that high risk applicants be defined as those receiving an EES of less than 600, and that the applications of those students receive an in-house holistic read by an engineering faculty member. It is emphasized that the read would be conducted within the spirit of UCSB's existing comprehensive review strategy as opposed to automatically disqualifying at-risk applicants from consideration for a major in engineering. More specifically, applications approved by one of its faculty readers continue through the normal read process toward a final admission decision, as would applications rejected by COE. However, applicants rejected by COE faculty would not be further considered for any of the engineering majors. Engineering applicants admitted to L&S would be advised they could apply to Engineering after completing prerequisite course work with strong grades. CAERS unanimously supported the proposal, which was piloted this year. It is noted that spring 2008 SIR's indicate that COE had an exceptionally large yield during the pilot year so there is no reason for concern that this program will hurt COE enrollment. (This enrollment surge will have to be closely monitored, however, as some people in Admissions are speculating it may be due to CSU limiting enrollment at many campuses because of this year's fiscal crisis.)

Review of BOARS Articulation Committee Work

There were several changes to a-g requirements made or proposed by BOARS this year that CAERS reviewed. First was the revision of the area g (electives) description to accommodate more Career Technical Education courses (CTE). A UC review of the area g language was mandated by Senate Bill 1543. CAERS was comfortable with the revision as it requires such courses to meet high academic standards. CAERS also reviewed the area c (math) and d (science) requirements that have been proposed by an Academic Senate Task Force. There was considerable discussion of the math proposal requiring that three years of area c be taken in high school (leaving 8th grade algebra in limbo). BOARS has not acted on this and this aspect proposal is now questionable given recent actions by the State Board of Education mandating Algebra 1 in grade 8. This will be decided by BOARS in the fall. CAERS also heard from Professor Bruce Luyendyk (Earth Science) about his concern that area d does not include earth, environmental, and space science in spite of the California Science Standards having Earth Science as one of four categories at the high school level. The Task Force had considered this issue in depth and decided against making the change Professor Luyendyk advocated, explicitly noting that such courses are allowed as area g courses, along with all science courses typically directed towards 9th grade students (for example, Conceptual Physics or Integrated Science 1, which along with Earth Science are routinely accepted as meeting g). Professor Lyuendyk was invited to continue to develop his case, and Chair Jacob explicitly advised him to look closely at the CA standards and explain why the area g recognition for such courses is not adequate for meeting most students' needs. BOARS will act on the area c and d proposal in the fall.

Undergraduate Council Members:

Gerardo Aldana
Steve Allaback
Julie Bianchini
Paula Bruice
Francis Dunn
Thomas Even
Kevin Falvey

Roger Freedman
William Jacob
W. Davies King
Leroy Laverman
James Lee
Upamanyu Madhow
Louise Moser
John Park
Mark Rodwell (Fall and Winter)
Paul Spickard
Rolf Christoffersen, Vice Chair
Paige Digeser, Chair

Unit 18 Representative: Douglas Bradley
Associated Students Representative: Stephanie Brower (Winter and Spring)
Graduate Student Association Representative: Amber Gonzalez
Staff Advisor: Debra Blake