

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

**Minutes of Meeting  
November 3, 2017****I. Consent Calendar**

1. Approval of BOARS November 3, 2017 Agenda
2. Approval of BOARS October 6, 2017 Minutes of Meeting

**Action:** The consent calendar was approved as noticed.

**II. Announcements**

*Henry Sanchez, BOARS Chair*

1. Academic Council Meeting of October 25, 2017

Chair Sanchez reported Chairman of the Board of Regents, George Kieffer, joined the Council for discussion on several topics. Chairman Kieffer invited Chair Sanchez to a future Regents meeting to discuss the admissions requirements and why they were chosen. Chairman Kieffer has long been interested in the meaning of UC degree – to applicants, to potential employers, and to the general public – and defining selectivity and academic achievement could help in that effort. More Regents will be invited to future Council meetings.

2. Update on Academic Verification Task Force

Chair Sanchez reported that meetings of the task force are on-going. The Task Force was formed after the recent Irvine incident, and recommendations are being vetted among task force members for presentation to the Regents at this month's meeting.

**Discussion:** Members wondered how many high schools or campuses utilize UC's Transcript Evaluation Service. Chair Sanchez noted that many high schools have limited staff during the summers, and he added that not many high schools or UC campuses are equipped for electronic transcript services. E-transcripts at the present time would be an unfunded mandate to both high schools and UC campuses.

**III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

*Shane White, Academic Council Chair*

1. State Budget and AB 97

AB 97 requires UC to find from UCOP's operating budget \$15M to support an additional 1500 California resident undergraduates. The Academic Council shared principles with the administration to help guide their evaluation of UCOP expenditures. There are several stakeholder groups with frequently conflicting priorities. The UCOP response to the legislature is due November 29 – which is also unfortunately the date of the next Academic Council meeting.

2. UCOP Audit Impacts

In addition to Item 1 above, the impacts of the recent state audit of UCOP operations continue to manifest themselves. Several personnel changes at UCOP have been linked to the audit, and an external evaluation of UCOP in light of the audit's findings will be presented to the Regents in closed session later this month. One possible outcome is that the governor may have an excuse not to continue the annual 4% base budget augmentation agreed to in the past. As a result, tuition increases must be considered, but doing so will only further challenge UC's external relations and public perception. Another audit, assessing settlements of sexual violence/sexual harassment, is still in the scoping phase.

3. Retiree Health

President Napolitano has agreed to form a task force in early 2018 to assess the retiree health landscape and present recommendations for cost management going forward. The Senate has been guaranteed seats at the table, but the other participants are not yet known. The Senate will also be vigilant in assuring that the group's charge is to preserve quality benefits for retirees and emeriti. For 2018, no significant changes to retiree health coverage will be presented.

4. Transfer Pathways

Following successful articulation of transfer pathways for 20+ majors, only a few outliers remain to be agreed upon. Certain STEM fields, such as chemistry and physics, have asserted that the unit cap on the transfer pathways precludes students from adequate preparation for these fields with cumulative math, biology, or other prerequisites. Three new subgroups are being formed.

5. DACA

UC continues to monitor closely changes from the federal government. Moreover, non-DACA undocumented students and other vulnerable populations need enhanced support services. One challenge is to facilitate degree completion from abroad, if necessary.

6. Online Education

Many barriers remain to be surmounted: registrar policies and technologies need update; Senate regulations will need conforming emendation; local campus and departmental conventions and cultures may need to be changed. Some still assert online education will be a cost savings mechanism, but the evidence of this claim is slim.

7. Self-Supporting Program Proposal Reviews

Last year, the Senate was able to demonstrate that its review process did not delay or extend the review period for these proposals. Nonetheless, the trope that the Senate is slowing lives on; similar concerns about Senate slowness are being voiced in opposition to Senate participation in multi-campus research unit (MRU) reviews, despite the Compendium's requirements.

8. SB 201 – Graduate Student Researcher Unionization

Governor Brown signed this bill in October over UC's objections; previous iterations of the bill were vetoed. UC's objections center on the argument that unions treat employees as interchangeable, which is not true for GSRs. The conflation of teaching assistants with GSRs may have complicated the issue, as may have negative student opinions on mentoring relationships.

**IV. Review Items**

1. Statement on Practice on Changes to Major Prerequisites and Advanced Notification to California Community Colleges

Santa Cruz and Berkeley both raised concerns that the proposed changes could inadvertently harm applicants from under-resourced schools, who are predominantly under-represented minorities (URMs). As a result, Student Affairs will revise the proposal to simplify the verbiage while underscoring the goals of the changes: 1) to avoid last-minute changes to requirements, and 2) to offer guidance on how to evaluate preparation when a required course is not offered or if adequate lab/studio space is not available to support some courses. Parallel preparation of native freshman and transfer students is sought.

**Action:** Student Affairs will revise the proposal and resubmit it in December.

2. Proposed Revisions to SR 424 (area 'd')

Chair Sanchez noted that he had received initial positive feedback from CSU despite short review, as well as the California State Science Teachers Association. The data generated by Student Affairs show that URMs and under-resourced schools will not be negatively impacted by changing the requirement from 2 + 1 optional to 3 required preparatory courses. He reminded members that the goal of the proposal is to align UC admissions with federally mandated Common Core curricula and the Next Generation Science Standards. BOARS 16-17 spent considerable time during the spring conducting due diligence and drafting the proposal.

**Discussion:** New members were not persuaded that a third science course would be more valuable to applicants than another studio art course or other résumé building elective; nor were they certain about removing "laboratory" from the requirement. Chair Sanchez observed that the revised requirement still has a minimum threshold of 20% lab or field work. Others noted that access to advanced science courses may increase with new online and computing resources, but school resources could skew those advances.

3. UC/CSU Extended Learning Programs and 'a-g' course lists

*Frank Worrell, Berkeley Representative*

Some undergraduate applicants take extension learning courses in hopes of gaining 'a-g' credit for UC admissions. Since such courses are offered by 4-year institutions, they have not been "articulated" for admissions evaluations. The proposal would allow qualifying courses at qualifying institutions to "articulate" and thus be counted toward meeting UC and CSU admission requirements. Further, qualifying courses would be

added to the centralized 'a-g' course list. UCOP will follow standard and prescribed procedures for articulation and continuation.

**Action:** The proposal was passed unanimously.

**V. Consultation with Campus Admission Directors** (via Zoom videoconference)

1. Augmented Review Implementation

To date, four campuses utilize augmented review: Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Members are asked to identify which (additional) data should be tracked and how they should be evaluated. One of the most critical decisions is when to request augmented review: Should there be a decision-tree or procedurally designated protocol? Of those who have previously undergone augmented review: 1) how many responded, 2) what additional materials were requested, and 3) how many decisions were influenced, and in which direction?

**Discussion:** The directors noted that applicants are not required to respond to solicitations for additional information, so response rates may not be fully indicative of augmented review efficacy. Indeed, applicants can still be admitted even if they do not respond. At present, though, there is insufficient data to determine whether a request for additional information influences the ultimate admission decision. The directors further observed that not all contacted applicants will still be interested in pursuing UC admission, and thus response rates should not be seen as reflecting the utility of the process.

The goal of augmented review is to disentangle compound disadvantages and to evaluate properly extraordinary achievements and personal challenges. Some members noted, though, that most responses are self-reported. The impact of school resources, family income, personal connections, et cetera, will become clearer only as time passes. Tracking the final enrollment of this subpopulation could also be instructive.

2. Compare Favorably and AB 1674

The state legislature intended to tie UC's budget to its native freshmen enrollment data, but Constitutional autonomy protects UC to a limited degree. UC must still track and report non-resident freshman statistics, but some might view the report as a political document rather than as a recitation of facts. Some language in the bill could also be interpreted variously, so careful liaising with the office of State Governmental Relations is needed.

Nonetheless, last year's BOARS' report on the Compare Favorably policy should hold UC in good stead: By all proffered metrics, UC continues to exceed mandates. A formal response from the state to BOARS' report is still pending. One potential area of disagreement is whether/how to apply the standard: on a systemwide or a campus-by-campus basis. This issue continues to be one of high political stakes, so UC must move carefully.

3. Meeting the 2:1 Transfer Ratio

Many campuses indicated the need for greater resources for outreach and admission support staff. Many UC campuses are not proximately located to a California

Community College (CCC) “feeder school”, which complicates both CCC applicants and UC communications. Several campuses noted that their greatest recruitment competitors were other UC campuses. All agreed that the CCCs need greater support for counseling staff, and that many CCCs would benefit from a greater understanding of the different roles a research university (UC) plays versus that of a teaching university (CSU). The divergent competencies of CCC major preparation efforts further complicate achieving the transfer ratio by campus. Occasional UC departmental admissions add still another layer of complexity to be understood by the CCCs; overcoming the discrepancies by campus is yet another layer to be peeled by CCC stakeholders.

Some campuses noted that their transfer pool is so slim that achieving the 2:1 ratio would mean either shrinking the size of the freshman class or lowering the academic admission standards for transfer students. It is unclear how the CCCs have improved academic and counseling services to facilitate greater transfer rates. Time lags between allocation of additional resources by both UC and CCC, on the one hand, and student outcomes, on the other, suggest that this issue will continue to be a bone of contention for the immediate future.

**Action:** BOARS will welcome the admission directors in person at the July 6, 2018 meeting.

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

*Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*

*Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

*Tongshan Chang, Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning*

### 1. Further Discussion

*Note: Item not addressed.*

### 2. Academic Verification Task Force Update

AVP Handel reminded members that a report is due at this month’s Regents meeting. The final draft is being edited for accuracy regarding UC processes and student recourse clarity.

### 3. Admissions Data

Members should review last year’s [Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review](#) and be prepared to discuss formatting, verbiage, or data presentation improvements. A preliminary view of data will be available in January. The December discussion should focus on narrative concerns.

## **VII. Student Success Metrics**

Several campuses are re-assessing student success metrics, and best practices are sought.

**Discussion:** UCLA, for example, has convened a subcommittee to assess 1) interrelations between admissions criteria and holistic review outcomes (e.g., how secondary school resources inform matriculated student performance), and 2)

admissions criteria vis-à-vis four-year outcomes (e.g., GPA, time to degree, withdrawal/incomplete rates); the group is hampered by data being housed in different, non-cooperative departments. Manager Chang noted that his office should be able to secure data from various departments with perhaps more ease than local inquisitors. Other potential metrics could include post-graduate activities, employment data, earnings versus debt ratios – both short term and lifetime, and social mobility indicators. Manager Chang indicated that state Department of Labor data could be mined for some of this information; a short online demonstration will be scheduled for a future meeting. Additional data could be gleaned from UCUES, which includes academic satisfaction indicators, affordability data, and various soft-skills assessments which are grouped into five buckets, such as interpersonal skills, critical thinking, and the like. Some campuses/departments are also now tracking academic probation rates in upper level courses. Preliminary data and anecdotal evidence suggest that many first-generation students seem reluctant to seek academic and/or personal assistance, so mid-term reports are being requested on several campuses to supplement full-term data.

#### **VIII. Campus Reports**

**Berkeley:** The proposed changes to area 'd' were the subject of much discussion.

**Davis:** No update this month.

**Irvine:** 1) The proposed changes to area 'd' were discussed. 2) Admission and enrollment outcomes following the verification debacle over the summer are pending.

**Los Angeles:** 1) The proposed changes to area 'd' were discussed. 2) Some previously graduate only departments now seek to offer undergraduate degrees. Whether such departments have this authority is under discussion.

**Merced:** 1) The campus admission director is in the unenviable position of being the public campus face for undergraduate admissions while simultaneously being denied a seat at the decision-making table. 2) Discussions of how to involve more comprehensively faculty in admissions events continue. Some schools/departments are quite successful.

**Riverside:** 1) Discussions of how to achieve the 2:1 transfer ratio dominates local discussions. Some favor capping freshman enrollment. The advent of holistic review is being viewed as an unfunded mandate, rather than as an opportunity.

**San Diego:** 1) The proposed changes to area 'd' were discussed. 2) Re-enrollment of students who have encountered medical or academic issues seems unduly prohibitive. How to account for improvements and changes remains unclear.

**San Francisco:** No update.

**Santa Barbara:** 1) The proposed changes to area 'd' were discussed. 2) How best to implement the new standards for sexual violence/sexual harassment is still unclear.

**Santa Cruz:** 1) Achieving the transfer ratio remains a campus-wide priority. How to handle transfer applicants who do not qualified for their preferred major is still unclear. 2) In light of these concerns, how best to implement the Compare Favorably policy is under new pressure. 3) Whether to adopt augmented review further complicates (1) and (2) above and introduces further resource and transparency concerns.

**IX. Executive Session**

*Note: Item not addressed.*

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Henry Sanchez, BOARS Chair

Attendance:

Henry Sanchez, Chair

Eddie Comeaux, Vice Chair

Frank Worrell, Berkeley

Patrick Farrell, Davis (via Zoom)

Laura O'Connor, Irvine

Anna Lau, Los Angeles

Chris Viney, Merced (via Zoom)

Peter Sadler, Riverside

Josh Kohn, San Diego

Andrea Hasenstaub, San Francisco

Madeleine Sorapure, Santa Barbara

David Smith, Santa Cruz

Jonathan Li, Undergraduate Student Representative

Kevin Heller, Graduate Student Representative