

## Minutes of Meeting

May 5, 2017

**I. Consent Calendar**

- Approval of BOARS May 5, 2017 agenda
- Approval of BOARS April 7, 2017 draft minutes

**ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.****II. Announcements**

- *Henry Sanchez, BOARS Chair*

Academic Council Meeting: Council discussed the California State audit of the UC Office of the President's administrative expenditures. The audit criticizes UCOP's accounting practices with regard to funds that support systemwide and Presidential initiatives, its \$38 million budget reserve the Auditor says could support students, and UCOP's staffing and salaries.

IGETC Standards Subcommittee: The IGETC Standards Subcommittee of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates met Tuesday to approve small clarifying changes to the [handbook](#) that governs the implementation of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). IGETC outlines a way for community college students to fulfill lower division transfer requirements at the CSU and UC.

**III. Area D Work Group**

The Area D Work Group met on April 19 to discuss revisions to the area "d" (laboratory science) requirement that align UC's expectations more closely with the expectations for high school science curricula based on California's adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) for K-12.

The work group unanimously supported increasing the minimum area "d" requirement to three years; continuing the requirement that students take two units of coursework that provides "basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics"; and permitting students to fulfill the third-year requirement with a course from another discipline reflected in the NGSS – earth and space science, interdisciplinary sciences, computer science, engineering, applied sciences, or Honors/AP science. The work group also agreed to maintain the requirement that any course approved for area "d" include a laboratory component, and to retain the name "laboratory science" for area "d."

The work group agreed that the work group, a subset of the work group, or another faculty group should review the nine criteria for area "d" courses listed in the [A-G Guide](#) to ensure consistency with the revised policy language, and to clarify the specific disciplines envisioned as options for the third year of science. They also agreed that faculty should review the definition of "laboratory" in the A-G Guide based on the new three-year requirement and their view of what essential "laboratory work" should entail.

Chair Sanchez will be sharing the proposal with stakeholder groups, including CSU Senate leaders and individuals at the California Department of Education and the State Board of Education, for feedback.

Discussion: A BOARS member expressed concern about including computer science as an option for fulfilling the third year of area “d” and about conflating computer science with the traditional natural science disciplines. It was noted that UCOP analysts review high school course submissions against the A-G criteria. They do not judge a course by its title, but by those faculty-approved criteria. In other words, the title of a given course does not guarantee its approval for area “d” or any other subject area.

#### **IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

- *Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Shane White, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

State Audit: On Tuesday, President Napolitano and Board of Regents Chair Lozano testified at a hearing convened by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee to discuss the State audit of UCOP. President Napolitano and Chair Lozano agreed to implement the Auditor’s recommendations, but also addressed several misunderstandings and mischaracterizations of UC’s budgetary practices described in the audit report.

Nonresident Enrollment Policy: The Regents will vote on a final nonresident enrollment policy in May. The previously proposed systemwide cap of 20% has been taken off the table and discussion is focusing on a campus-specific cap that is likely to be around 18% for all campuses except the four campuses currently above that limit. Those campuses will be allowed to remain at their current levels. The debate around the policy has underscored the resource inequalities across UC campuses and the absence of a viable plan to address them.

AB 1674: Assembly Bill 1674 as proposed would require UC as a condition of receiving state funds to ensure that the academic qualifications for admitted nonresident undergraduate students generally exceed the academic qualifications of resident undergraduate students.

Associate Degrees for Transfer: The University has invited UC and California Community College (CCC) faculty from physics and chemistry departments to a meeting at UCOP on May 12 to discuss possible Associate Degrees for Transfer based on the UC Transfer Pathways.

#### **V. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Robin Holmes-Sullivan, Vice President Student Affairs*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges*

Transfer Admissions: Preliminary data on transfer admission indicates that UC admitted about 23,000 California Community College (CCC) students for fall 2017 out of an applicant pool of about 32,000. This represents a 3.6% decrease compared to last year but a 10% increase over two years. The percentage of admitted transfers from URM groups grew from 34.7% to 35.1%.

Regents Item on Transfer: The May Regents meeting will feature a discussion about strategies to increase transfer student enrollment focused on UC’s progress meeting the 2:1 freshman-to-

transfer enrollment ratio target included in the Budget Framework Agreement with the state. UC agreed to meet the target by the end of the 2017-18 year on both a systemwide basis and at all individual campuses except Merced. UC and most individual campuses will achieve the target, but Riverside and Santa Cruz will fall short due to a lack of qualified applicants. The presentation to the Regents will emphasize that UCR and UCSC are both working very hard to meet the goal and that both accommodated a large number of new freshmen during the enrollment push last year. The presentation will also discuss challenges associated with the CCC to UC pipeline. For example, CCC reports that in 2015 less than 5% of CCC students had earned sufficient credits to transfer to *any* four-year institution. In addition, inter-UC campus competition has reduced the transfer yield rate to as low as 20% on less selective campuses. UC intends to work with the CCCs to build capacity in the transfer pipeline, with a special emphasis on preparing more UC-qualified transfer applicants and encouraging more CCC students to transfer to UCR and UCSC.

Personal Insight Questions: The 2017 UC application implemented eight “Personal Insight” questions for freshman and transfers developed by admissions directors in 2015. Applicants are required to answer four of the eight questions. The questions are intended to provide applicants with an additional opportunity to define themselves, give reviewers sharper insight into the applicant’s traits, circumstances, and educational context, and gather information campuses might otherwise collect in an augmented review. Preliminary data indicate that students generally selected questions at the same rate. Admissions directors and application reviewers have reported that the questions provided more insight into applicants and more information that was directly related to the comprehensive review criteria. Some campuses also reported that the questions helped reduce the number of supplemental reviews.

## **VI. Campus Reports/Issues**

Several admissions committees are discussing strategies for boosting enrollment in under-enrolled majors and reducing pressure on impacted majors. UCM is reviewing marketing materials for specific majors to ensure they are described accurately, and UCI is discussing how department websites can more effectively communicate the interesting aspects of certain majors, what students would actually study in them, and career opportunities. In addition, UCSC may begin considering proposed major in admissions, given the six-fold growth in computer science enrollments in six years and impactation in other majors. It was noted that some campuses address impactation by admitting an applicant to the general campus and then applying supplemental review criteria for specific majors.

UCR and UCSC are discussing strategies for meeting the 2:1 freshman-to-transfer enrollment ratio target. UCSC is considering issues associated with the admission of student-athletes to its Division III programs. And the UCSD committee advised against continuing a program that allowed several Humanities majors to invite applicants to submit an optional writing sample, after applications to those majors fell sharply. The UCLA committee is defining the parameters of an upcoming study of student success factors in admissions. UCB is discussing outcomes from the faculty review of the bottom 100 applicants admitted and the top 100 applicants rejected, a process performed for calibration. UCSB found that while domestic nonresident students have lower rates of first year retention they perform better at UCSB than CA residents or international nonresidents, suggesting that they are leaving for non-academic reasons.

The graduate student representative noted that UC Scout, UC’s online A-G program, was recently granted WASC accreditation.

## VII. Compare Favorably Assessment and Policy

BOARS reviewed a draft report to President Napolitano on the Compare Favorably policy for nonresident admission. The report responds to the President's fall 2016 request to the Senate to review the policy, and specifically to clarify its (1) compliance with the California Master Plan for Higher Education and (2) its consistency with the University's overall freshman admission goals, comprehensive review policy, and holistic review processes in place on UC campuses. The President's request responds to concerns expressed in a State audit last year that the policy is inconsistent with University's obligations under the Master Plan, and displaces California residents with less qualified nonresidents.

The report summarizes BOARS' work over the past year to analyze several alternative measures for Compare Favorably and other analyses that speak to how campuses comply with the policy in different contexts. The report conveys the completeness with which BOARS grappled with the issues; it acknowledges the complexity of the policy and the unique characteristics of each campus's admissions processes; and it notes that success at UC is what matters ultimately.

*Discussion:* It was noted that the report should discuss campus-specific data in more detail and acknowledge the inconsistencies across campuses in compare favorably outcomes. The report should state that some campuses are struggling more than others to meet the policy as they establish an international presence and that BOARS will continue working with them to improve outcomes. BOARS members noted that the report should discuss the value of nonresidents to UC above and beyond their revenue potential, in terms of the diversity of perspectives they bring to campuses that enhance the educational experience for all students. It was noted that BOARS should not conclude that nothing was learned from the analysis by admitting unit.

It was noted that the regression analysis provides no clear answer to the difficulty of interpreting HS GPA for international students; however, it is one way to interpret the inconsistency in the interpretation of high school GPA and to visualize the problem of interpreting the inconsistency. In any case, BOARS should not imply in the report that UC has no confidence in high school GPA generally.

**ACTION: BOARS members will send comments on the current draft, and a new draft will be circulated prior to the June meeting.**

## VIII. Smarter Balanced Assessments

- Michael Kirst, President California State Board of Education
- Keric Ashley, Deputy Superintendent of the CA Department of Education
- Tony Alpert, CEO, Smarter Balanced

Guests from the State Board of Education, the CA Department of Education, and Smarter Balanced joined BOARS to discuss a potential role for the Smarter Balanced Assessments in UC admissions. Smarter Balanced is an assessment system aligned with the Common Core State Standards for English language arts and math.

President Kirst noted that the historical policy link between the K-12 and higher education sectors in California has eroded over the past 100 years. The separation has not served students well. California's adoption of the Common Core helps re-establish the link between the

educational systems and sends clearer and more consistent messages to students about what they need to know. Under the Common Core, K-12 curriculum standards link to college readiness expectations in stages, between grade 1 and 11. Smarter Balanced is a state-of-the-art assessment system. It is computer adaptive; uses extended response in which students must defend their answer; and includes a performance exam in lieu of a traditional writing assignment. To measure progress, the state will administer Smarter Balanced summative assessments in grades 3-8 and in the 11<sup>th</sup> grade. The assessments will be used in K-12 accountability; however, college-going students are not always focused on the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment. UC's recognition of the assessment as a factor in comprehensive review would be a step forward.

Deputy Superintendent Ashley noted that 2017 is California's third year of administering the assessments. Higher education faculty were closely involved in the development of the assessments and continue to participate in the ongoing work to further develop the system. The Smarter Balanced assessments are a major advance over the old California Standards Test and California High School Exit Examination. The Common Core and Smarter Balanced raise the bar in terms of academic expectations and their focus on college and career readiness. The Smarter Balanced assessment system connects to instruction and emphasizes improving teaching and learning, not just year-end accountability. And while the 11<sup>th</sup> grade summative assessment provides a common measure, it is only one piece of information about the student. He asked BOARS to consider using the Smarter Balanced assessments as an additional piece of information in comprehensive review, rather than a replacement for other assessments students currently take.

CEO Alpert noted that computer-adaptive testing supports accessibility for all students, a core principle of the Smarter Balanced system. The tests are designed to give students from all backgrounds, including English language learners and students with disabilities, a fair opportunity to demonstrate what they know and can do. Smarter Balanced takes a comprehensive approach to research to determine the tools and resources – calculators, pictorial representations, bilingual dictionaries, and braille support – that will help support students in the context of the measurement construct. Smarter Balanced is collecting data from the first cohort of students who took the tests to analyze the relationship of the tests to college performance. He noted that students have a three-month window in which to take the online test, which is designed to incorporate breaks and interruptions. Private high schools do not currently have access to the exams. Smarter Balanced sends a clear signal to high schools about how well their students are meeting the Common Core standards, and motivates them to bring more students to “college ready” status. The system includes four levels, with level three indicating “college ready.” CSU uses level four to indicate automatic eligibility for placement in college-level courses.

*Discussion:* BOARS members requested data from Smarter Balanced to help them understand the value the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment may add to comprehensive review, and how well the assessment discriminates at the high scoring end, along with validity, process, and outcome data. A member asked whether the tests might identify students as college-ready who had not previously been identified that way.

CEO Alpert noted that Smarter Balanced has data on reliability score precision and alignment, and will be analyzing the assessments' relationship to first-year outcomes at universities in terms of GPA, persistence, and retention. He noted that Smarter Balanced provides individual scale scores within a given level to provide a more discrete assessment of, for example, performance above level four. He noted that a very small percentage of students reach the 11<sup>th</sup> grade assessment ceiling. However, the extended response format changes the definition of “ceiling.”

A performance exam like Smarter Balanced is conceptually different from fixed form tests. He noted that CSU used the assessments to identify students who were not previously identified as eligible for the CSU early admissions program.

## **IX. Proposed Policy on Augmented Review**

BOARS reviewed a proposed systemwide policy on augmented/supplemental review (AR) that outlines guidelines or criteria for AR; and determines the types of additional info that might be solicited, including letters of recommendation (LORs).

BOARS Vice Chair Comeaux noted that the policy outlines three types of supplemental information a campus may request: 1) a questionnaire inviting the candidate to elaborate on special talents, accomplishments, extraordinary circumstances, and their school/home environment; 2) 7<sup>th</sup> semester grades; and 3) up to two letters of recommendation. The subcommittee responded to concerns from campuses that the previously proposed 5% cap was too low by increasing the ceiling to 15%. It added flexibility to the previous recommendation for exactly two standardized letters by adding the phrase “up to two letters” and eliminating the word “standardized.” The policy also states that campuses may request letters of recommendation only for applicants selected for augmented review.

Chair Sanchez noted that the policy is not intended to pit one campus against another, but to ensure access, opportunity, and fairness on a systemwide level. The policy is a starting point that BOARS can revisit and revise if relevant new information comes to light.

*Discussion:* One BOARS member questioned the need for a cap, noting that a ceiling that is too low could bar some worthy students from an augmented review. On the other hand, there was concern that a cap that is too high or no cap could cast doubt on the basic fairness of UC’s admission policies and processes.

A BOARS member expressed concern that the President’s request for a systemwide policy on letters of recommendation was being conflated with the request for a policy on augmented review. It was noted that at the end of 2015-16 academic year, Academic Council voted to oppose the continuation of the UC Berkeley LOR pilot project and the expansion of the pilot project to all applicants. In a January 2017 straw vote, BOARS unanimously opposed a systemwide policy requiring LORs. There remains strong opposition to LORs on the Regents and in the administration. The Augmented Review policy is a compromise that allows LORs on a limited basis.

Berkeley Representative Worrell noted that Berkeley has completed one study on LORs, and is completing a second study that was designed in consultation with BOARS. Berkeley’s original proposal to ask all applicants for LORs was intended to help them distinguish from among the most highly qualified applicants. Berkeley faces a challenge in that for some applicant groups, the highest 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of GPA or SAT score is in the same range as the lowest 25<sup>th</sup> percentile for other groups. LORs will help Berkeley make finer distinctions and also help some underrepresented students make a case for admission. Berkeley is also concerned that the AR policy as written could preclude its use of LORs in athletic admissions.

BOARS members agreed to add language to ensure the policy accommodates athletic admissions, applicants considered for admission by exception (AxE), and other special reviews. A BOARS member proposed the addition of language that would permit campuses to use the

BOARS augmented review policy or develop their own augmented review policy subject to approval by BOARS; however, it was noted that BOARS members could request additions to the list of criteria in the systemwide policy.

**ACTION: Revisions will be made to the draft policy and distributed to BOARS for an email discussion and vote.**

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm  
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst  
Attest: Henry Sanchez