

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of Meeting

June 2, 2017

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of BOARS June 2, 2017 agenda
- Approval of BOARS May 5, 2017 draft minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- *Henry Sanchez, BOARS Chair*

Area D Work Group: The Area D Work Group met on June 1 to discuss potential changes to several specific area “d” course [criteria](#) to ensure they align with the Work Group’s upcoming policy recommendations for area “d”. The proposed changes broaden the criterion requiring courses approved for area “d” to include “hands-on laboratory activities” by linking the criterion to “authentic investigations consistent with the practices of the field” and accommodating virtual labs and simulations. The Work Group also accepted two recommendations from Stanford Professor Helen Quinn, who chairs the CA Science Curriculum Framework and Evaluation Criteria Committee, to add a criterion recommending (but not requiring) one “student driven” scientific project per year, and to change the name of area “d” from “Laboratory Science” to “Science.” The more general title would cover a broader range of NGSS-aligned science fields rather than only traditional laboratory bench science. The Work Group will forward its final recommendations to BOARS for consideration on July 7. If BOARS approves, the proposal will move to the Academic Council and a likely systemwide Senate review in the fall.

III. Topics for July 7 Joint Meeting with the Admissions Directors

BOARS will host its annual half-day joint meeting with the admissions directors on July 7. The directors have requested a discussion of challenges associated with the movement by some elite schools and districts toward non-traditional high school transcripts. BOARS members suggested several additional potential topics:

- Issues and challenges associated with nonresident admission, including the Compare Favorably policy
- Issues and challenges associated with admission to specific majors with different enrollment pressures and levels of impaction
- Strategies for ensuring diversity in the context of increasing selectivity
- Results from and analysis of the new Personal Insight questions on the UC application
- Transfer admissions issues, including the role of the UC Transfer Pathways in comprehensive review, the Associate Degrees for Transfer, and the 2:1 ratio
- The need to collect data about different scenarios in the Augmented Review policy to help BOARS track outcomes

- Question: do campuses seek to enroll the students most likely to be successful at UC or the students who would benefit most from a UC education?

IV. Augmented Review Policy

BOARS approved the UC Augmented Review Undergraduate Admissions Policy over email shortly after its May meeting by a vote of 8 to 4. The Academic Council discussed the policy at its May 24 meeting and voted 16-2 to move it forward to the June 14 meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. BOARS will be monitoring the effects of the policy, and will revisit it if relevant new information arises.

Chair Chalfant noted that BOARS has the authority to recommend the policy to the Assembly. Upon approval, the Assembly will recommend the policy to the Regents, who have final authority. He noted that neither BOARS nor the campuses have the authority to delegate to campuses the authority to set their own policies on letters of recommendation.

V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

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

UCOP Audit: The California State Auditor joined the May Regents meeting to discuss the [audit report](#) on UCOP budget practices and administrative spending. The President has accepted all 33 recommendations in the audit related to budget and accounting, but the political fallout is serious and ongoing. The Governor's May budget revision withheld \$50 million from the UC budget pending UC's implementation of the recommendations, and also to signal the state's dissatisfaction with UC's progress on two initiatives included in the 2015-16 budget framework agreement: 1) expanding transfer enrollments to meet a 2:1 freshman-to-transfer ratio target and 2) expanding the use of "activity-based-costing" to enhance understanding of instructional costs.

2:1 Transfer: UC is meeting the 2:1 ratio target on a systemwide basis and at all campuses except UCR and UCSC. Those campuses are both working hard to meet the goal, but are not attracting enough qualified transfer applicants. UCSC notes that it has already reduced its transfer GPA requirement to the UC policy minimum of 2.4. It is also contacting UC transfer applicants who did not apply to UCSC, and is conducting a critical review of departmental major preparation policies. To meet the 2:1 target, both campuses say they would need to cut freshman admits significantly. And there are other challenges: strong regional competition for transfers, a 4% decline in transfer applicants compared to last year, and CCC data showing that less than 5 percent of total CCC students are prepared to transfer to a four-year institution.

Activity Based Costing: Activity-based-costing (ABC) is a methodology that assigns costs to various activities in an organization. The state believes ABC could help UC campuses understand educational costs and lower them. UC and the state agreed that UCR would conduct a pilot study of ABC in its College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, and that departments at UCM and UCD would conduct scoping studies and additional implementation of ABC based on the UCR pilot outcome. UCR's work is ongoing, but the UCD and UCM campuses found in

their scoping studies that the ABC modeling would not yield viable data to help in decision-making.

Discussion: BOARS members expressed concern about the intrusion of the Legislature into the faculty's prerogative to set admission standards. They noted that applying the 2:1 ratio on a strict individual campus basis will force campuses to reduce the enrollment of freshman, including many first-generation and disadvantaged students. It will also redirect many transfers to a second or third choice UC campus.

VI. Consultation with UCOP

- *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*

Admissions Update: June 1 was the deadline for admitted transfer students to submit Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs). Campuses are analyzing the SIR data now, particularly in the context of the 2:1 ratio target. However, a new complication has arisen: more admitted freshmen than expected submitted SIRs, which will require an even higher number of transfers to submit SIRs for some campuses to meet the 2:1 ratio. The Governor supports the 2:1 ratio in part because the transfer path is a less expensive option for the state and students. UC wants to be responsive to the state, but it is also asking how many freshmen the state really wants the University to turn away in order to meet the ratio. UC is emphasizing that increasing the transfer applicant pool will take time and that a different enrollment ratio will affect campuses in other ways academic calibration of the campus, upper and lower division mix.

Letter on Transfer Pathways: BOARS Chair Sanchez has sent a letter to campus admissions directors, associate vice chancellors for enrollment management, campus Senate division chairs, and Senate executive directors providing guidance to the campuses about the use of the Transfer Pathway course expectations in campus selection processes.

ASSIST Launch: The public launch of the redesigned ASSIST website has been rescheduled to June 1, 2018. ASSIST is the official online repository of transfer articulation course agreements for California public higher education that provides information to CCC students about how the courses they take will be treated by different UC and CSU campuses. The ASSIST platform needs an upgrade, and the launch of the new website has been delayed due to performance issues with the current vendor and the need for the higher education segments to issue an RFP for a new vendor.

VII. Campus Reports/Issues

The UCD admissions committee is designing a study of academic outcomes at UC Davis – UC GPA, time-to-degree, and other measures – to assess the effectiveness of UCD's comprehensive review procedures. The UCM committee is reviewing marketing materials the campus is producing for specific majors to ensure they are accurate. The UCI committee is discussing factors that may have contributed to the campus receiving the second highest number of applications in the UC system. The committee is also concerned that UCI may not meet the 2:1 transfer enrollment ratio after a higher than expected yield of freshman admits.

The UCR committee approved a proposal to deliver all sections of UCR's non-credit preparatory remedial math course on-line. The change responds to the prioritization of room assignments for regular unit-bearing courses, and is another impact of the recent rapid increase in undergraduate enrollment. The UCR committee is also working to increase its participation in administrative discussions about how to meet the 2:1 ratio target; the committee found that the key to enrolling more transfers at UCR is not to change admissions criteria, but to advertise the value-added of a UC education.

UCSB bases transfer admission solely on GPA, but some UCSB science majors require specific preparation for upper-division coursework, which can delay graduation for students admitted to majors without that preparation. The UCSB committee is reviewing individual department proposals for major-based transfer admission. The committee considered a new campus-wide transfer admission policy requiring transfers to have major-specific preparation aligned with the UC Transfer Pathways, but pressure to reach the 2:1 ratio stopped it from doing so.

The UCSD committee will be piloting a supplemental portfolio review for transfer applicants to the Division of Arts and Humanities. The UCLA committee is discussing an upcoming study of student success factors in admissions that will address questions about how admission decisions align with the goals of excellence, access, and diversity, and how comprehensive review factors correlate with time to degree and UC GPA at graduation. The UCSC committee is discussing strategies for meeting the 2:1 ratio. UCSF is undertaking an effort to train faculty, staff, students, and alumni to be advocates on behalf of the University.

VIII. Compare Favorably Assessment and Policy

BOARS reviewed a final draft of its report to President Napolitano on the Compare Favorably policy for nonresident admission. The report is organized to address two broad topics: whether the Compare Favorably policy is consistent with the Master Plan; and whether UC admissions practices and outcomes are consistent with the Compare Favorably policy. Although the report responds specifically to the President, it is written for a more general audience of readers internal and external to UC.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that the report should emphasize that high school GPA and test scores are only two components of comprehensive review, and although it can be difficult to capture other components numerically, particularly for international applicants, campus admissions professionals are trained to evaluate international applications and knowledgeable about their unique issues. The report should emphasize that students with the same SAT score tend to perform similarly in their first year at UC, while students with the same high school GPA tend to perform better in their first year at UC if they came from another country. The report should include data on UC student performance (UC GPA, persistence rates, and probation rates) by campus and also raw numbers of nonresident admits and enrollees across campuses. It should also note that student choice affects enrollment numbers and UC performance outcomes; the University admits students, but it is their choice to accept an offer and enroll at a campus. The report should also clarify that Compare Favorably was intended to be a comparison of means, not individual students, on a campus, and emphasize that BOARS will continue to monitor campus

compliance with the policy, report outcomes on an annual basis, and as new data warrant, suggest adjustments to the policy.

ACTION: BOARS will review and approve a final draft in July.

IX. PTE Academic Proposal

BOARS reviewed a proposal for recognition by the UC system of the Pearson Test of English (PTE) Academic as an approved English language test for undergraduate international applicants who are non-native English speakers. BOARS reviewed a similar proposal for recognition of PTE Academic in 2015 and declined to recognize the test.

UC requires applicants who completed all of their high school education in a country where English is not the language of instruction to demonstrate English proficiency by taking the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and earning the required score.

When BOARS reviewed the PTE Academic proposal in 2015, it was concerned about the lack of data related to the use of the test in undergraduate admissions. BOARS also noted that the TOEFL and IELTS are widely available to UC applicants.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that some faculty feel that the TOEFL and IELTS do not effectively assess English language skills or predict academic success at UC, so it would be worth investigating the relative merits of PTE Academic. Members also commented positively on Pearson's measures to ensure academic security and authenticate the identity of test takers and the integrity of the testing process. Members noted that to further entertain the proposal, they would like information about which programs at UC and other institutions are using PTE Academic specifically for undergraduate admissions, additional predictive validity information about PTE Academic, and data comparing it with other English language tests.

X. Work Plans for 2017-18

BOARS discussed work plans for the upcoming study of UC eligibility and the validation studies for Smarter Balanced and the new SAT essay.

Eligibility Study: The state is conducting a study of UC eligibility, the first in ten years, and UCOP expects preliminary results in mid-June. The study may indicate that UC is admitting more (or less than) the top 12.5% of California public high school graduates the University is obligated to admit under the Master Plan. The results may require BOARS to modify admissions requirements to reduce the total number of eligible students and entertain different models for a new statewide index that more closely captures the percentage of public high school graduates identified as being in the top 9% of their class.

BOARS members noted that the state's existing higher education infrastructure is not sufficient to meet the long-term demand expected to coincide with a growing state population. The state's goal to make all high school students "college ready," may run up against a lack of capacity in the higher education system.

SAT Essay: In 2014, BOARS voted to continue requiring the Essay section of the redesigned SAT test that was administered for the first time in March 2016. The College Board has committed to providing data about the Essay to help BOARS determine how well it provides useful information about college-readiness.

Smarter Balanced: A letter from California State Board of Education President Michael Kirst to Chair Sanchez proposes two possible studies to support BOARS' deliberations on the appropriateness of including Smarter Balanced as an additional factor in the UC admissions evaluation. One study would enlist a UC Davis professor to analyze how Smarter Balanced scores compare with existing admission criteria for students entering UC Davis, and how well the scores predict student performance in first-year courses there. The second would enlist the UC Office of Institutional Research and Analysis (IRAP) for a similar systemwide evaluation.

BOARS members noted that any analysis should help BOARS compare the predictive validity of the Smarter Balanced, SAT, and ACT tests, examine correlations between Smarter Balanced math scores and performance in math at UC, and also provide data showing how well the Smarter Balanced assessments discriminate at the high scoring end.

BOARS members also identified other critical continuing and new issues for consideration in 2017-18:

- Evaluation of the 2:1 freshman to transfer enrollment ratio.
- Evaluation of the “Power Standards” for quality online courses articulated in BOARS’ [Policy for A-G Review of Online Courses](#).
- A new type of institution that can qualify for “a-g” course lists with the working title “UC Extended Learning Programs” that would include UC campus-based summer programs and programs such as UC Scout.

XI. Executive Session

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst

Attest: Henry Sanchez