

I. Consent Calendar

- Draft Minutes of December 6, 2013

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- *George Johnson, BOARS chair*

Transfer Action Team: The Action Team and its four subcommittees are discussing recommendations for improving the transfer path. Faculty input will be particularly important in the Action Team's discussions about improving the course articulation system, encouraging more UC faculty participation in the Course Identification (C-ID) numbering project, and the extent to which local UC transfer admissions processes can align with the CCC/CSU Transfer Model Curricula and Associate Degrees for Transfer. President Napolitano joined the Action Team at its January 6 meeting, where a panel of successful UC transfer students discussed their experiences and perspectives about barriers to transfer. The UC Chief Information Officer also discussed with the students ways to enhance information technology tools to improve the presentation of transfer information.

The Action Team is discussing the extent to which UC is meeting the Master Plan target ratio of 60:40 upper:lower division enrollments, which requires UC to enroll one transfer student for every two freshmen, and the impact of increasing the proportion of transfer admits from the current 29% level to 33%, to achieve the 2:1 ratio. It has been suggested that both the UC system and individual campuses should meet this proportion, and that UC should continue to define the ratio in terms of California resident freshmen and all CCC transfers regardless of residency. It was noted that a growing number of international students are using the CCC transfer path to enter UC. The university achieves a 2.1 to 1 ratio by including nonresident transfers in the calculation, but UC has a 2.4 to 1 ratio if only resident transfers are counted. The Master Plan does not specifically address transfer residency, but it is clear about the role the state's public colleges and universities have to serve its residents.

Action: BOARS members will bring the question of the ratio calculation to their local committees for more discussion.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

Transfer Action Team: The Transfer Action Team expects to complete a draft report by early February. It has been considering the trend in declining transfer applications to UC; how UC can reach out more effectively to underrepresented students; strategies for simplifying and streamlining transfer processes; and the extent to which UC can draw transfers from a broader set of community colleges across the state. UCOP appreciates BOARS' leadership in supporting the associate degrees for transfer; its continued participation in discussions about articulation and C-ID will also be essential. The President views the Master Plan as an important promise to California students and has spoken about the transfer path as an important part of that promise.

Fall 2014 Application Data: The media release of fall 2014 undergraduate admission application data is scheduled for January 17. Preliminary data indicate that freshman applications rose 6.2% overall. The increase is driven largely by nonresident applications, although applications from California residents also increased 0.6%. Freshmen applied to an average of 3.8 UC campuses each, a small increase over last year. Applications from freshmen identifying as Chicano/Latinos grew slightly as a proportion of the total. Transfer applications fell 0.5% systemwide compared to last year, but as with applicants for freshman admission they applied to more campuses on average.

Computer Science: Associate Director Lin recently met with representatives of organizations that want to expand Computer Science (CS) education and access in high schools and are seeking UC's recognition of such courses as satisfying a subject requirement other than the college-preparatory elective ("g"). She informed these groups about the UC math faculty workgroup's support for approving CS courses for mathematics ("c"), as long as the courses include sufficient math content. She also suggested that they ask the College Board to resubmit Advanced Placement CS courses to UC for area "c," noting that UC's approval of an AP course will greatly facilitate a high school's ability to put the course on their own school's "a-g" course list if they are planning to offer it. The groups also discussed a separate challenge, which is beyond the control of UC, related to high school teacher credentialing of computer science teachers, who are currently required to have either a CTE certification or a math credential, which creates an additional obstacle to more CS course offerings.

IV. Preparation for February BOARS Meeting in Sacramento

- *Steve Juarez, Director, State Governmental Relations*
- *Sandra Fried, Associate Director, Legislative Affairs*

For the second year in a row, BOARS will hold its February meeting in Sacramento. Last year's half-day joint meeting with staff from the legislature and the Governor's office provided a forum for faculty and policymakers to discuss issues and policies of common interest. This year's meeting will focus on freshmen and transfer admission, and will include an update on the status of the Transfer Action Team and a discussion about the future of the referral pool and the admissions guarantee. It was noted that policymakers are also concerned about nonresident enrollment, time to degree, remediation, and the admission and matriculation of African-Americans. It was noted that the State Assembly Higher Education Committee is holding an oversight hearing on transfer on April 1, and the Assembly has formed a Select Committee on Campus Climate.

Discussion: Members noted that it will be important for BOARS to emphasize UC’s improved time to degree outcomes, to convey the faculty’s desire to admit students who can succeed, and to remind staff about the importance of the UC research mission.

V. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair*

Moreno Report: The special Administration-Senate working group tasked by the President to respond to the Moreno Report’s recommendations for addressing complaints of discriminatory behavior involving faculty has completed its report. The chancellors discussed the report on January 8 and the Academic Council will discuss it later this month. The report examines the extent to which Senate privilege and tenure processes are adequate to deal with issues when they arise. It notes that it is usually the administration’s responsibility to bring complaints to P&T and that most complaints are not recorded but addressed and resolved informally, outside of the P&T process. However, it was noted that “informal resolution” can involve serious consequences. The working group endorses some of the specific recommendations in the Moreno Report, including better recordkeeping systems and a central discrimination office on each campus that can serve as a gateway for complaints and that has authority to conduct investigations on a full range of issues affecting students, faculty, and staff. It recommends that campuses maintain a separate Ombuds Office where students, faculty, and staff can discuss issues and complaints confidentially. It also makes several other recommendations for increasing and recognizing diversity and fostering an inclusive campus climate.

Discussion: It was noted that, ideally, the climate on campuses should not be such to require these kinds of offices.

Enrollment Management: The Senate chair and vice chair have secured standing monthly meetings with the president and meet regularly with her chief of staff. A recent meeting focused on enrollment management in the context of the Master Plan, the referral pool, nonresidents, Funding Streams, rebenching, enrollment funding, and the role of UCOP in setting enrollment targets. The chair and vice chair also have communicated the faculty’s concerns about Composite Benefit Rates and UC Care.

VI. Freshman Eligibility and Referral

Referral Guarantee: One way to reduce UC’s total referral pool while maintaining the guarantee would be to establish a test score floor for Eligibility in the Local Context. BOARS has reviewed data showing a correlation between SAT scores and first term UC GPA and probation rates. Those data indicate that students who were ELC-eligible-only and in the lowest SAT quintile were much more likely to be on probation after their first term at UC than other enrollees. In addition, national benchmark data from the College Board indicate that students with SAT scores below 500 are more likely to receive lower grades in specific courses. These outcomes suggest that there may be an SAT score below which a student is unlikely to succeed at UC. A minimum SAT benchmark for ELC eligibility might remove from the referral pool many of the weakest students who are most likely to accept a referral offer. Such a benchmark would not alter the ability of campuses to admit students who do not meet the benchmark through ETR or through Admission by Exception.

Discussion: It was noted that the ELC program helps address the principle that students should not be punished for attending a poor high school. The SAT is only one indicator of potential, and some research suggests that standardized tests can carry a racial or socioeconomic bias. Moreover, some students with low SAT from low API schools scores go on to be successful at UC. UC has a responsibility to respond to a system that is failing students, and UC faculty should also consider the extent to which they can change practices to better support at-risk students. It was also noted, on the other hand, there is such a large variation in the quality of high schools that GPA can become almost meaningless as a single predictor of success. It does not help students to admit them only to fail them later. Students in the bottom quintile have an average SAT score of 450, which places them in the bottom third of all college-bound seniors in the United States. Some members questioned whether an institution as selective as UC was the best place for these students to pursue their bachelor degrees. The outcomes of underprepared students may not reflect bias but an educational trend or reality that UC cannot fix.

It was noted that UCR is conducting an internal regression analysis on the effect a minimum SAT benchmark of 500 would have on the large pool of incoming students who are placed in remedial English classes at that campus, as well as the effect a minimum benchmark would have on the demographics of the last three freshmen classes.

It was suggested that a new SAT floor could be applied to the ELC pool after a certain threshold, such as 5-9%. It was also noted that the [Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admission](#) discuss three alternatives for meeting the referral guarantee: fall admission to a different major, deferred admission to another term, or enrollment at a community college with later transfer admission. Making greater use of the latter transfer option, could help both to increase the number of transfer students and to meet the guarantee obligation.

Senate Regulation 465: [Regents' Policy 2103 C](#) defines the criteria for “9-by-9” eligibility through the Statewide index and ELC. Section C (4) of that policy is clear that the guarantee of referral admission to eligible students is valid only to the extent that space is available at a UC campus. The corresponding [Senate Regulation 465](#), however, is less clear on this point. BOARS reviewed a revision to SR 465 that aligns the Senate policy language with the Regents’ policy and clarifies that the statewide guarantee is limited to California public high school graduates. The change would align the two policies while BOARS discusses more substantive options for redefining UC eligibility.

Discussion: BOARS members supported the revision in concept. It was noted, however, that the Regents’ language is also ambiguous to the extent that it lacks a conditional “if” in stating that applicants “... will be offered admission at a UC campus with available space.” The language could be interpreted to presuppose that there will always be a campus with space available for eligible referral students. Members agreed that SR 465 should include the “if” to signal that it interprets the Regents’ language more conditionally and to acknowledge the reality that there may not be space. It was noted that the guarantee used to be less conditional on space, but UC is now struggling with limited resources and a growing demand, and is forced to think about the guarantee differently. UC does not have room for all of the well qualified students that apply, nor does it have enough state funding to support the expansion of enrollments. At the same time, it is important for the university to signal to students what it expects them to do in order to qualify for admission, and it needs clear and consistent policies for doing so.

Action: BOARS voted unanimously to support the revisions to Senate Regulation 465. A final draft and justifying language will be circulated for BOARS' review and approval prior to transmission to the Academic Council.

Compare Favorably: BOARS reviewed two new UCOP analyses considering differences in first term performance of matriculated students from different residency groups on each campus. Chair Johnson has requested campus compare favorably reports by January 31.

VII. Transfer Admission Issues

Course Articulation and C-ID: Transfer articulation is a two-step process that occurs first at the systemwide level, where UCOP articulation analysts determine whether a community college course meets basic UC transferability, and then at the campus level (facilitated by campus articulation officers), where faculty decide whether the course fulfills a GE, breadth, or major requirement at the campus. In addition, some are urging more UC participation in the C-ID project, which is developing a course "supra-numbering" system for equivalent courses across the higher education segments based on faculty-developed course descriptors. The C-ID process brings together groups of CSU and CCC faculty who agree about minimum course topics that are reflected in the descriptors. Courses judged equivalent are given a C-ID number, which appears in course catalogs alongside the local course number. It was noted that broader use of the C-ID numbers could help potential transfer applicants navigate the transfer path to UC. UC faculty have been hesitant to participate in the C-ID project. Some faculty find that the course descriptors lack sufficient information to allow them to make a judgment about whether the content of a CCC course is equivalent to a UC course. Others are concerned about giving up control and unsure how or why the C-ID process is relevant to them.

BOARS members had been asked to check on the extent to which admissions officers for specific majors take into account the CSU/CCC Transfer Model Curricula, and/or the UC Transfer Model Curricula, in reviewing major preparation requirements for transfer. It was noted that some campuses are taking into account the TMCs; however,

Chair Johnson asked that all campuses continue to examine the utility of using the TMCs. It was also suggested that the proposed UC faculty content expert groups could play a role in reviewing C-ID descriptors.

Transfer Outreach: Several campuses reported on their outreach activities to potential community college transfers both in their campus region and across the state. These activities include visits to CCCs that have a strong relationship with the UC campus as well as to those without a strong presence at the campus; increasing online transfer information; utilizing existing TAG agreements; participation at college fairs; in-person counseling about specific major requirements; and other direct communication with students who have indicated an interest in the campus. It was noted that there may be good reasons for the low transfer rates from some community colleges to UC; namely, some colleges are believed to be more transfer directed, while others are more CTE focused.

VIII. Articulation and Evaluation Issues

Statement on Basic Math: In December, Chair Johnson released a cover letter for BOARS’ July 2013 [Statement on Basic Math](#) to help clarify the position taken in the statement in relation to alternative quantitative transfer course prerequisites such as Path2Stats and alternative courses like Statway. The cover letter notes that the statement is not intended to encourage or discourage alternative pathways, but to ensure that the content of quantitative UC-transferrable courses is linked to college readiness standards of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM). The additional guidance has apparently been well received.

In addition, the BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE chairs have proposed forming standing UC faculty content expert work groups to support Senate committees in an advisory capacity on various issues. Associate Director Lin noted that after the groups are established, a math/stats group could evaluate a new version of Statway with CCSSM content to see if it is appropriate to approve as a UC-transferrable course. Associate Director Lin also plans to bring the revised high school course evaluation criteria generated by the “a-g” faculty work groups to BOARS in March.

Program Status: “Program status” refers to established high school academic programs such as Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate that offer standardized curriculum taught in high schools across California. UC has approved “a-g” course lists with these programs such that high schools can add to their own “a-g” course lists any “a-g” program courses without having to submit to UCOP a complete course content description for approval. BOARS reviews the application of any organization applying for program status and the specific courses offered by the organization. Associate Director Lin is drafting a clearer, more streamlined policy for this process that she will bring to the A&E subcommittee for vetting before March.

IX. New Business

In December, BOARS approved a new criterion for the [Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admission](#) recognizing students who are on track to complete an associate of arts or science transfer degree offered by a California community college. The language has been modified slightly to reflect the official title: “associate of arts or science degree for transfer.” In addition, all of the criteria applicable to the evaluation of transfer applicants are listed. In the earlier version, readers are asked to refer to items 11-14 in the freshmen selection section.

Action: BOARS approved the modifications.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: George Johnson