

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

September 16 and 18, 2008

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above dates at the Student Center, Irvine Campus.

Members present: Regents Cole, Island, Johnson, Lozano, Scorza, Varner, and Yudof; Advisory members Stovitz and Powell, Staff Advisor Johansen

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, Pattiz, Schilling, and Shewmake, Regents-designate Bernal and Nunn Gorman, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Interim Provost Grey, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Vice President Sakaki, Chancellors Blumenthal and White, and Recording Secretary Lopes

The meeting convened at 3:40 p.m. with Committee Chair Island presiding.

1. **BRIEFING ON ACADEMIC COUNCIL'S PROPOSED REFORMS TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY**

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Island reminded the Committee that this briefing is in accordance with his commitment to provide an opportunity for Regents to receive additional input regarding the proposed reforms to the freshman eligibility policy. Academic Senate Chair and Faculty Representative Croughan, former Chair of the Academic Senate Michael Brown, and former Chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Mark Rashid were present to answer questions about the Assembly's proposal.

President Yudof began the discussion by summarizing the proposed reform. He explained that the conditions for admission to the University are established at the recommendation of the Academic Assembly, which is the legislative body of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate is guided by the mandate of the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which establishes that the University is to select from the top 12.5 percent of California's high school graduating class. Currently, the University's admissions requirements are capturing over 14 percent. The University does not have the option of inaction; the requirements must be reconfigured to return to 12.5 percent. Under the Assembly's proposal, the standards for applicants captured within the eligibility zone will rise substantially.

President Yudof observed that under the Assembly's proposal, approximately 75 percent to 80 percent of the students who fall within the eligibility zone will have grade point averages (GPA) of approximately 3.3 or higher. The SAT reasoning test scores likely will be higher in

that zone than currently as well. He explained that students who fall within the zone for eligibility will be admitted to a UC campus that can accommodate them, not necessarily the campus of their choice. The critical fact is that only 750 students currently take advantage of the option to attend a campus they did not choose, out of a very large applicant pool. Most students who do not get into their campus of choice will go to the community college system, the California State University system, or another university.

Under the proposal, the remaining approximately 20 percent to 25 percent of students considered for acceptance who met a certain level of academic achievement, including a 2.8 GPA unweighted by honors courses, would be in an “entitled to review” category, meaning that the students’ record would be subject to comprehensive review to consider additional factors, such as if they came from a poor community, were the first in their family to go to college, if a language other than English is spoken in the home, or other factors such as high musical or literary achievement.

President Yudof summarized, then, that there will be a balance of approximately 80 percent of students admitted through a higher eligibility standard and the remaining admitted through comprehensive review that allows for more discretion in considering life circumstances; from his perspective, the balance makes sense. The University is awaiting 2007 data from the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) in order to better understand what the student demographics of the freshman class will look like under the new guidelines. He expressed concern that the proposal should not create too burdensome a process on the campuses, opining that an increase in the volume of applications of 25 percent in one year could be unmanageable. He suggested the option of phasing in the new policy.

President Yudof stressed that the current proposal is closely aligned with what other universities around the country are doing, many of which have a practice of comprehensively reviewing virtually every file. He noted that Proposition 209, prohibiting California public institutions from considering race, gender, or ethnicity, is a requirement that most other state universities do not have to consider.

Regent Lozano requested clarification of the President’s position on the proposal. He responded that he is very close to endorsing the proposal, but he is awaiting the 2007 CPEC study and needs a better understanding of how the proposal will affect diversity and how the proposal will affect the campuses due to the increase in applications.

In response to Regent Varner’s comment regarding timing, President Yudof clarified that the proposal may come before the Regents in November depending on whether the 2007 data can be analyzed within that time.

Regent Stovitz inquired whether the proposal represented a change to the Master Plan. Mr. Brown explained that the 1960 Master Plan directed the University to admit from the top 12.5 percent of graduating California high school seniors, but allowed the University to determine how that top 12.5 percent is established. For the last three decades, the University

has obligated itself to admit all of the top 12.5 percent. The proposal currently before the Committee includes two different ways to determine that 12.5 percent, but does not change the percentage.

Mr. Brown explained that the proposal eliminates the SAT subject test requirement and establishes that the top 12.5 percent of graduating high school seniors who apply in a timely manner will be determined by, first, a higher standard for the statewide and local eligibility pathways in order to guarantee a referral seat to a UC campus and, second, a comprehensive review of a broader set of students on track for eligibility by the end of their junior year. One of the objectives of the proposal is to raise academic standards for being deemed to be in the top 12.5 percent. Mr. Brown affirmed that the University is intent on eliminating unnecessary barriers to admission. Some students currently ruled ineligible actually have stronger academic qualifications than some students deemed eligible.

Mr. Rashid addressed concerns that academic standards will decline due to the proposed elimination of the SAT subject examination requirement. In fact, under the proposed policy, the standards for grade point average and test scores will have to rise. Without the subject test requirement, a much larger pool of students will be visible to the index, so the index must be set at a higher level. Mr. Rashid also noted that under the proposed policy, there will be an estimated 11 percent to 22 percent increase in application volume. The \$60 per application fee results in a self-supporting process, given that the cost to a campus to process an application is approximately \$38.

Mr. Rashid explained that the anticipated impact on diversity is uncertain; it is not possible to simulate applicant behavior or to predict the outcome of students in the comprehensive review pool. However, the pool of students currently determined to be ineligible but who would be entitled to review under the proposed policy is significantly richer in students from underrepresented minority groups. That pool of students is evenly distributed across the Academic Performance Index.

Mr. Brown explained that one of the reasons that simulation of applicant behavior from the CPEC data is not possible is that the factors used by campuses to select their students are not reflected in the CPEC database. Mr. Rashid concurred that the University is dependent on the data provided by CPEC for information regarding the students who do not apply to UC. He reported that over the decades, there have been changes to admissions policies with no certainty about outcome.

Mr. Rashid advised the Regents that the current proposal has been thoroughly researched and exhaustively vetted. Projected outcomes have been studied with available data and will continue to be studied as more data becomes available. Once the policy is in effect, the outcomes will be studied and monitored. Public articulation, Mr. Rashid underscored, is a critical component of this proposed change to avoid the erroneous perception that a student not in the guaranteed admission eligibility pool will not be admitted, and therefore will not apply.

Mr. Brown indicated concern with the impact on students from the best high schools. There will be a redistribution of students who receive a referral guarantee. Good students from very good schools may find themselves in the “entitled to review” category rather than entitled to the guaranteed referral admission they would have had under the current policy. It will be important to analyze the numbers for the top dozen feeder schools with a UC sending rate of above fifty percent; those schools sent 2,700 freshmen to UC in 2007. He noted, however, that of those 2,700 freshmen, only fourteen accepted a referral offer of admission.

Regent Hopkinson pointed out that the University already has an admission by exception category. In response to Regent Hopkinson’s inquiry regarding honors courses, Mr. Rashid clarified that students in the “entitled to review” category will have to achieve a 2.8 GPA unweighted by honors course bonus points, but that honors courses will still be considered strongly when campuses are reviewing a student’s application. Regent Hopkinson asked if GPA is the strongest predictor of college success. Mr. Rashid stated that, taken individually, GPA and SAT reasoning test scores are comparable in terms of their predictive power; taken together, GPA and test scores are more predictive than either one individually.

Regent Hopkinson requested clarification regarding which office will determine applicants’ eligibility and at what point the campuses will review applications. Mr. Rashid explained that, currently, eligibility in the local context status is determined centrally, but determination of final eligibility is made by the campuses to which students apply. President Yudof emphasized that the standards for eligibility are set centrally.

Regent Hopkinson expressed her concern that moving from 12.5 percent to 9 percent eligibility in the statewide context may have a psychological impact on students and dissuade them from applying to the University.

Regent Lozano opined that adopting comprehensive review as an element in freshman admissions standards was a very important action taken by the University, but she expressed her concern that it is administered differently at each campus and that disparate outcomes have resulted. She asked if there will be an opportunity to assess how comprehensive review is implemented on the campuses in order to ensure that it is evenly administered.

Mr. Brown acknowledged there is no uniformity in the comprehensive review methods used by the campuses and concurred that the value of the proposal before the Regents relies heavily on how comprehensive review is done. Comprehensive review is a broad category of varied practices at each of the nine campuses. It is a very nuanced process at some campuses, for example at Berkeley. Mr. Brown pointed out that UCLA recently adopted UC Berkeley’s comprehensive review process. He stated that it is important for campuses to use best practices when administering comprehensive review. Regent Lozano encouraged the University to look into this issue.

In response to Regent Lozano’s question regarding when the index will be reset and if it is expected to rise, Mr. Rashid stated that the analysis will be redone once the 2007 CPEC data

becomes available. Mr. Rashid and Mr. Brown predicted that the index will rise substantially.

Regent Lozano emphasized the importance of a strong and effective public information campaign, noting that some student populations already have a tendency to self-eliminate, and this proposal may exacerbate that tendency.

Regent Schilling asked for an example of a profile of a student who would not be eligible under the current policy but who would be eligible for admission under the proposal. Mr. Rashid described that the category of students who are currently ineligible for admission include a large number of students who have achieved good grades and have taken and achieved high scores on the SAT reasoning test or ACT with writing component, but for whatever reason they have not taken the SAT subject tests. In many cases, these students do not even apply. He stated that the reasons students do not take the SAT subject tests are varied and complex, and that addressing the issue is not as simple as embarking on a vigorous public information campaign. Mr. Rashid explained that robust statistical analyses show that SAT subject tests add negligibly to predicting a student's college success.

Regent Schilling asked what indicators of success are sought under the proposal, and urged that after four or five years the policy be reassessed and measured against those indicators. Mr. Rashid stated that evaluation of the outcomes is built into the proposal. If passed, the policy will require BOARS to undertake yearly evaluations of outcomes and publish a more comprehensive report after five years on the totality of the outcomes of the new guidelines.

Regent Pattiz remarked that it was his impression that one of the objectives behind the proposal is to increase diversity, but noted that no data have been provided showing that this will be the case. Mr. Rashid explained that the pool of students made visible under the revised admissions standards would be more diverse than the visible pool currently. He concurred that because the outcomes will be based on applicant behavior, which is difficult to predict, the impact of the proposal on diversity is largely unknown. Mr. Rashid emphasized that the Academic Assembly believes that, aside from any impact on diversity that the proposal may have, the University's admissions policy should be fairer than it is currently. Regent Pattiz pointed out that some believe that the proposal is an attempt to circumvent Proposition 209, but that based on the information provided in the briefing, it is clear to him that this is not the case.

Regent Johnson asked if the proposal will impact diversity at each of the nine undergraduate campuses, or if there will continue to be a concentration of minority students at the Riverside and Merced campuses. Mr. Rashid stated that it is not possible at this time to predict exactly how the student demographics will be affected at each of the campuses.

Ms. Croughan spoke of her experience when the admissions criteria were reviewed at UCSF when Chancellor Drake was the medical school admissions director. The revised process resulted in no loss in rank for UCSF as one of the top three medical schools in the country, at

the same time that it increased significantly the diversity of the students. As a result of the modified admissions review process, UCSF medical students now reflect a wider range of backgrounds, including, for example humanities majors, a broader range of ages and ethnicities, and rural and inner city students. Mr. Rashid stressed that comprehensive review is the University's only hope of coming closer to representing the population of the State of California.

Regent Hopkinson suggested that if the revised index for statewide eligibility requires that the minimum GPA be raised, for example to 3.3 or 3.5, then the 2.8 unweighted GPA for the "entitled to review" category may be too low.

Committee Chair Island acknowledged and thanked the faculty representatives and their staff for the valuable efforts that have been made on this proposal. Faculty Representative Croughan thanked Vice President Sakaki and her staff in Student Affairs for their analytic work on the proposal. Committee Chair Island invited members of the public to submit questions as well.

The Committee recessed adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

The Committee reconvened for a special meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy at 11:55 a.m. on September 18, 2008, with Committee Chair Island presiding.

Members present: Regents Island, Johnson, and Lansing; Advisory member Powell

In attendance: Regents De La Peña and Kozberg, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Vice President Sakaki, and Recording Secretary Lopes

Due to the lack of a quorum, the meeting was held as a briefing session for the members.

2. **READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING**

For the record, notice was given in compliance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders for a special meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, for this date and time, for the purpose of addressing an item on the Committee's agenda.

3. **BRIEFING ON ACADEMIC COUNCIL'S PROPOSED REFORMS TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY**

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Academic Senate Chair and Faculty Representative Croughan, former Chair of the Academic Senate Michael Brown, and former Chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Mark Rashid were present to answer questions about the Academic Assembly's proposal.

Mr. Rashid outlined the elements that are required currently to be eligible for admission to the University: one, successfully complete fifteen "a-g" courses; two, take the SAT reasoning test or ACT with writing component, plus two SAT subject tests; and three, meet the index calculated using grade point average (GPA) and test scores. He noted that, currently, the index is such a modest standard that it excludes very few students so that, practically, it is the first two elements that really confer eligibility. The current required GPA is 3.0, weighted by honors courses; with that GPA, students only need achieve a 470 average across all SAT tests to satisfy the index. Mr. Rashid described the problem that this proposal is attempting to fix: the eligibility construct as it currently stands unfairly misclassifies many students by declaring some students eligible who have lower indices of academic success than other students who are declared ineligible.

Regent De La Peña inquired about how private school students are treated. Mr. Rashid responded that the 1968 Master Plan required that students from private schools be held to a similar standard. The eligibility index has been applied to all California high schools, whether public, private, or charter.

Regent Kozberg called attention to the system used by the California State University to evaluate the eleventh grade student transcript, which is being heralded as a national model, and suggested that this may be an option for the University.

Ms. Croughan responded to Regent De La Peña's question regarding the over-enrollment of 10,777 students for fall 2008, and confirmed that the University is not compensated for those students. The funding for those students comes out of the campuses' budgets. Mr. Brown explained that in the fall of 2008, there were almost 68,000 UC eligible freshmen applicants; 35,000 students accepted the University's offer of admission. Enrollment funding is negotiated with the State based on the number of students in California high schools' graduating class, the nature of the State's budget, and the educational objectives of the State.

In response to Regent Island's question about the SAT subject tests, Mr. Rashid clarified that the subject test scores are used similarly to the SAT reasoning test scores. In total, there are five scores, each of which falls within a 200-800 point range. The required scores are low, so that virtually everyone who takes all of the tests meets them. Mr. Brown advised that when the University sets eligibility requirements, the University has a responsibility to ensure that the requirements have educational justification, particularly if they are associated with adverse impact. In the case of requiring the SAT subject tests for all applicants, the justification is quite weak and the adverse impact is significant. SAT subject tests are often recommended by particular departments to prove aptitude in a particular area. For example,

engineering departments often recommend the SAT mathematics subject test because it is seen as predictive and leveling.

Mr. Rashid explained that the proposal would eliminate the SAT subject test requirement, but the SAT reasoning test or ACT with writing component would remain a requirement. Regent Lansing pointed out that many schools are dropping the SAT test. Mr. Brown acknowledged that though there are many criticisms of the SAT writing test, it remains one of the better predictors of college performance. Ms. Croughan explained that the grade point average and the core SAT test together predict thirty percent of the likelihood of a student graduating from the University. Other factors are leadership, creativity, and volunteer activism in high school.

Mr. Rashid conveyed that there are practical consequences for every admission requirement the University puts in place. The fact remains that while the SAT and ACT have their challenges, they are widely taken by many students and are part of the college-going culture for students wishing to attend an elite institution. It is also the case that the scores on those tests have some predictive utility. The proposal retains the requirement that has predictive utility while calling for the elimination of the requirement that is both harmful with respect to equity in access and nearly useless with respect to telling who will do well at the University.

Regent Kozberg requested an analysis and report regarding the SAT writing component. Regent Lansing concurred and asked, further, that there be a determination of the predictor status of all of the components of the SAT and ACT examinations.

Regent De La Peña asked if standardized tests were able to balance the grading between a more difficult high school grade and an easier high school grade in the same course. Mr. Rashid responded that the comprehensive review addresses specifically the educational opportunities available to the student.

Regent De La Peña asked how the criteria for comprehensive review will be communicated to student applicants. Mr. Rashid observed that if certainty is desired as to whether a student will get into a particular campus if they have achieved a particular GPA and test scores, this is an unreasonable standard of transparency and is not to be expected. It is not a level of transparency to which any other elite public institution in the country adheres. Every campus, in its comprehensive review process, makes public in fine detail its comprehensive review criteria, including average GPA and test scores of the students who are admitted to that campus. Regent Kozberg related that the Regents have studied comprehensive review, also known as holistic review, a number of times in past years.

In response to Regent De La Peña's question regarding Proposition 209, it was explained that Proposition 209 prohibits the use of certain student identifiers in the selection process. There is nothing in the proposal that makes student identifiers, such as gender or race, relevant in the admissions process. Comprehensive review is a vigorously monitored and

regulated activity with clear protocols, training, and evaluation activities to ensure compliance with Proposition 209.

Mr. Rashid stated that the proposal calls for some students being guaranteed admission to UC, though not necessarily at the campus of their choice, by being in the top nine percent of their high school graduating class by “a-g” GPA, or by meeting a GPA/ test score index that places them in the top nine percent statewide. This “9x9” eligibility threshold yields approximately ten percent of the state’s students. The remaining approximately two-and-a-half percent of eligible students would be determined through comprehensive review. Those students would need to meet minimal criteria of college readiness by achieving a 2.8 GPA unweighted, taking the SAT reasoning or ACT with writing examination, and successfully completing 11 “a-g” courses by the end of the junior year. These students would fall into the category of “entitled to review.”

Regents Island, Kozberg, and Lansing warned that the modification should not appear to the public to be a lowering of standards and questioned the lowering of the GPA and whether it should be weighted or unweighted.

Regent Lansing suggested that the admissions policy be revised to raise the GPA to 3.0 unweighted. Mr. Rashid advised that the Merced campus would be resistant to this modification because they look very closely at students that are at the lower end of the GPA range but have other factors in their profiles that make them attractive students. If the minimum GPA is publicly articulated to be 3.0, that will mean a reduction in applications from a considerable number of students.

Regent De La Peña asked how many more applicants would qualify by removing the requirement of the subject test but leaving the GPA where it currently stands. Mr. Brown stated that approximately 27,000 additional students is the best estimate.

Regent Kozberg asked for an analysis in the event of a University freeze on admissions due to lack of adequate funding from the State.

Mr. Rashid emphasized that it is critical to make a distinction between how the referral guarantee would work under the proposed policy versus how it works now. Currently, the significance of the referral guarantee is almost exclusively that it keeps people out, in that if a student does not get a referral guarantee it means they are ineligible by definition and therefore almost certainly not coming to the University. Under the proposed policy, students who do not fall within the 9x9 eligibility category are not ineligible. Instead, if they are entitled to review, their application will be reviewed at every campus to which they applied and admitted if competitive. In many cases, it is expected that campuses will admit non-guaranteed students ahead of guaranteed students because they are going to be more competitive. It is not the case that the 9x9 threshold will yield the highest ten percent of students and the other two-and-a-half percent will fall below those students in terms of academic qualifications.

In response to questions as to who would not receive a guarantee under the proposed policy that gets one now, Mr. Rashid explained that it is the case that the pool of students receiving the guarantee will have to shrink, and it is also the case that the guaranteed group of students will be redistributed among students in the state for good reasons. The archetypal student who would have received the guarantee under the current policy but would not under the proposed policy are good students from very good, competitive schools with active college-going cultures. They have met the criteria to be entitled to review, but miss the 9 percent statewide eligibility criteria, whereas under the current policy they would have met the 12.5 percent statewide eligibility threshold. If their applications are competitive, those students may still be admitted to the campus to which they applied. If they do not receive an offer from that campus, they would not receive a referral offer from another UC campus. Mr. Rashid pointed out, however, that very few students accept such referral offers currently.

Regent Kozberg expressed concern about sending the message to students at high-achieving schools that the bar has been lowered. Mr. Rashid stressed that the bar will be higher than it ever was before. Admission to all campuses will be more competitive than it is now, and students from high-achieving schools will continue to have enormous advantages educationally and otherwise. Such students will continue to be admitted in large numbers because they will be competitive in comprehensive review.

Mr. Brown stressed that to be accepted into the campus of choice, students will have to make full use of the opportunities available to them; they must work hard, successfully take all the college preparatory courses that are available to them, and take the SAT test the University requires and perform well on it. This will not change. He further explained that currently, in order to be accepted into any campus, students must go through comprehensive review. Eligibility never guaranteed access to the campus of choice; it only guaranteed that students would receive an offer at a UC campus that could accommodate them.

In response to Regent De La Peña's question regarding the fiscal impact of the proposal on the University's budget, Mr. Rashid emphasized that it is the number of enrolled students that affects the budget, not the number of those eligible, and that enrollment can be precisely controlled by the Office of the President when it sets campus enrollment targets. If in a given year, the State or University deems it necessary to limit enrollment due to budget issues, campuses will receive tighter enrollment targets.

In response to a question from Regent Kozberg, Mr. Brown stated that the University does not know whether the proposal will increase diversity. The University can predict the demographic profile of the pool of guaranteed students using CPEC data, but it cannot predict the profile of the "entitled to review" pool because the data does not contain the factors campuses use to select students, such as leadership and creativity. He stressed that comprehensive review is the best mechanism for admitting students based on a broad range of achievement characteristics. Ms. Croughan added that the diversity of freshman accepted under the new policy likely will be broader in terms of age, rural students, and students from schools that do not offer adequate numbers of "a-g" courses.

Regent Island requested more discussion on the reasoning behind the recommendation for a minimum GPA of 2.8. Mr. Rashid explained that a 2.8 GPA unweighed by honors course bonus points is equivalent to a weighted 3.0 GPA. He emphasized that the 2.8 GPA will only guarantee that a student's record will be reviewed; it does not guarantee admission as the 3.0 GPA requirement does currently. The reason an unweighted GPA is recommended is due to the fact that the opportunity to take honors courses is highly varied across the state. It was determined that the comprehensive review process is the best point at which to review course taking patterns, for example whether students took advantage of the courses available to them. Mr. Brown recalled that the value of honors course bonus points was studied in 2003 and 2004, and it was found that awarding bonus points for honors courses was not justified when measured against the predictive utility of those courses. For all these reasons, the faculty felt that honors courses should not be a factor in the decision of whether or not to review a student's record.

Regent Kozberg reiterated her concern that the proposal may send the message to high schools that it is not important to offer honors courses if they are not considered in admission to UC. Mr. Rashid strongly emphasized that it will continue to be important for students to take honors courses if they hope to be competitive in the admissions process. Mr. Brown pointed out that honors course bonus points will continue to be used in calculating GPA in the eligibility index.

In response to Regent Kozberg's question on the reasoning behind the 9x9 eligibility threshold, Mr. Brown pointed out that BOARS' original proposal to the Assembly was that eligibility in the local context be set at 12.5 percent and in the statewide context be set at 5 percent – a "12.5x5" threshold. The Academic Council decided to endorse the 9x9 construct because moving from 4 percent to 12.5 percent eligibility in the local context was viewed as too large a step change. Mr. Rashid explained that BOARS was comfortable with the modification from 12.5x5 to 9x9 because both constructs yield approximately 10 percent of the state's high school graduating seniors. He also emphasized that the admissions guarantee is not that important to students once the "entitled to review" category is added and due to the fact that, again, very few students accept a referral offer. It was felt that some guarantee had to be retained in the University's admissions policies, however, due to the philosophical importance of the guarantee in the history of California higher education, a guarantee that is unique among state universities.

Regent Island stated that he was impressed with the analytic work and thought that had gone into the proposal. He expressed concern about making modifications to one element of the proposal, for example by raising the minimum GPA for review to 3.0, without knowing how that would impact the pool of students that are made visible in the admissions process. Mr. Rashid assured Regent Island that any change to the proposal will be thoroughly analyzed.

Regent Kozberg requested more modeling analysis on the cost to the University. She questioned what elements are factored into the estimated cost of \$38 to process an

application, such as FTE and office space. Mr. Rashid stated that costs were thoroughly examined in the original proposal by BOARS. Regent Kozberg asked that more information be provided to Regents on this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff