

Minutes of Meeting

October 3, 2014

I. Welcome and Announcements

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

Committee Overview: Chair Aldredge welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the [charge](#) of the committee, which is to advise the President and Senate agencies on the conditions for undergraduate admission to UC. BOARS includes 14 members, two non-voting student representatives, and the Senate chair and vice chair as ex-officio, non-voting members. Two BOARS subcommittees—Articulation & Evaluation and Enrollment Issues—will meet to develop recommendations on specific issues for the full committee’s consideration. BOARS representatives serve as intermediaries between their campus admissions committees and BOARS. Members are encouraged to communicate with campus committees about discussions in BOARS, and, in turn, to share local concerns and discussions with the systemwide committee.

Academic Council Meeting: The Academic Council held its first meeting of the academic year on September 24. Council discussed BOARS’ request for a systemwide Senate review of its proposal to adjust the “9-by-9”eligibility policy to “7-by-7.” It asked BOARS to clarify several aspects of the proposal before sending it for systemwide review. President Napolitano indicated at her monthly briefing that she intends to introduce a discussion about nonresident enrollment at the November Regents meeting.

Compare Favorably Reports: Chair Aldredge will be asking each campus to report to BOARS on the extent to which they are meeting the “compare favorably” standard for nonresident admission articulated in BOARS’s June 2011 [policy](#). UCOP will distribute campus-specific data on fall 2014 admits to BOARS members in November. Campuses will be asked to provide BOARS with an analysis of campus outcomes by February.

ICAS Meeting: BOARS Chair Aldredge is a member of the [Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates](#), a forum for California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC faculty leaders to discuss topics of shared interest to the higher education segments. ICAS has been discussing the implementation of Senate Bill 1440, which requires CSU and CCC to develop Associate Degrees for Transfer that guarantee transfer admission to a CSU if they complete a faculty designed Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) for a major. The CCC reported that it awarded more than twice the number of Transfer degrees in 2013-14 as it did in 2012-13. ICAS is also discussing a new pilot program that will allow 15 CCCs to offer bachelor’s degrees in vocational fields such as nursing beginning in 2015.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Vice Chair*
- *Hilary Baxter, Academic Senate Executive Director*

All-Faculty Webchat: President Napolitano is hosting a one-hour “Google Hangout” for faculty on October 14. The live event will be an opportunity for faculty at all UC locations to interact with the President and ask questions. The [video](#) will be archived for those not able to attend.

September Regents meeting: The Regents approved “UC Ventures,” a \$250 million venture-capital fund that will evaluate and finance UC faculty startup proposals that commercialize research, and endorsed the recommendations of its Task Force on Sustainable Investing to develop an investment policy framework that integrates Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) factors into future investment decision-making. The Regents also received an update on the work of the President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence, and expressed concern that UC has not received the state resources it expected after the passage of Proposition 30.

Future Regents Presentations: At the January 2015 Regents meeting, Chair Gilly and Provost Dorr will discuss a set of proposals and best practices for supporting doctoral students generated at an all-UC conference in April, related to non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST), competitiveness in net stipends, professional development, and diversity.

September Council Meeting: Council has requested more information about UC Ventures and the role of the President’s new Innovation Council, a group of business leaders she has empanelled as advisers on entrepreneurship. In addition, Council is considering options for addressing the 10% gap in UC faculty total remuneration outlined in a just-completed [study](#) and a plan of action to recommend to the Regents. The study indicates that the competitive position of UC faculty relative to faculty at the “Comparison 8” group of institutions has declined since 2009, and that UC benefits no longer make up for the gap in cash compensation. Provost Dorr announced that the [Innovative Learning Technology Initiative](#) (ILTI) has released a third RFP to UC faculty for the development of online undergraduate courses, and that award decisions will be made by the end of December.

New Senate Director: Hilary Baxter, formerly of the UCOP Department of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, has been appointed Senate executive director, effective September 1.

Discussion: A BOARS member expressed concern that promoting entrepreneurial activities and rewarding them in the academic personnel process could devalue basic research and diminish research performed by social sciences and humanities faculty who are less able to create startups, which could stratify UC faculty by discipline. It was also noted that the compensation gap creates an incentive for all faculty to use outside offers to secure pay raises.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Adam Parker, Admissions Policy Coordinator*

Office of Admissions Overview: The [Office of Student Affairs](#) works with the campuses to implement policies developed by the faculty and approved by the Regents. It oversees a variety

of programs and initiatives related to undergraduate admission, student financial support, and student services that promote access, affordability, and student success. The Office focuses on issues that affect specific student populations and specific issues, such as student well-being, that affect all students. Its High School Articulation unit reviews and approves new or revised high school courses that satisfy the “a-g” requirements, and its transfer articulation staff manage and maintain UC systemwide and campus-specific articulation of California Community College courses that transfer to UC. The Office works with UCOP Institutional Research to analyze admissions data, and with UCOP Communications to create clear public messages about admissions policies and opportunities.

Presidential Initiatives: The Office of Student Affairs staffs several of President Napolitano’s initiatives that enhance support for the diversity of Californians, including her Advisory Councils on Undocumented Students, Veteran Students, and LGBT Students; the implementation committee for the [Transfer Action Team](#) report recommendations; a scholarship program for Oakland high school students; and the [Global Food Initiative](#) student fellowship program.

Fall Counselor Conferences: The annual UC Counselor Conferences are UC’s chance to deliver admissions messages to high school and community college counselors across California, and to address their questions. This year, counselors were particularly interested in nonresident admission, the comprehensive review process, and how UC intends to address the [redesigned SAT](#). UC emphasized that the university continues to find a place in the system for all eligible residents who apply, and that nonresident revenue allows UC to accommodate more residents.

Statway: Over the summer, immediate past BOARS Chair Johnson asked five UC faculty to review a year-long two sequence Statway course, developed by the Carnegie Foundation. Statway is a pre-statistics curriculum offered at the CCC that combines preparatory math with college-level statistics. It is intended for students who may have trouble with a traditional math course and/or who are not intending to enter a quantitative major. CSU has approved Statway for transferability on a pilot basis and is monitoring the academic outcomes of students who took the course. UC faculty have reviewed past versions of Statway and found them to be lacking sufficient rigor in preparatory math to be acceptable as UC-transferrable courses. In a [2013 Statement](#), BOARS reaffirmed that a UC-transferrable math or stats course must have Intermediate Algebra “or equivalent” as a prerequisite, and defined “equivalency” as content that adheres to the college readiness standards of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics. The consensus of the summer 2014 panel was that the Carnegie course contains satisfactory statistics content but does not include mathematics content equivalent to the area “c” content required of freshmen. (UC policy requires transfers and freshmen to enter UC with equivalent preparation in math.) Professor Johnson is preparing an additional request to mathematics faculty for a secondary review of the course’s math content.

Other Comments: Vice President Sakaki encouraged BOARS members to reflect on the impact of several recent policy changes – the expansion of the ELC pool to 9%, the [new statewide admissions index](#) taking effect in 2015, the removal of the cap on school-created honors courses, the upcoming SAT redesign, and the implementation of the Common Core – before proposing additional major policy changes. Associate Vice President Handel added that the transfer issues BOARS discusses are pivotal to California and the nation. No other highly selective research university goes as far as UC in its commitment to community college transfers.

IV. Transfer Action Team Report

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*

Last year, BOARS Chair Johnson co-chaired with Vice President Sakaki a Transfer Action Team charged by the President with recommending ways to strengthen and streamline the transfer path, increase the transfer graduation rate, and expand UC's reach into a broader range of community colleges. It presented its [final recommendations](#) to the Regents in May 2014. Recommendation 3 asks faculty to build on previous efforts to streamline the academic preparation process for community college transfer students by aligning lower division requirements for specific majors across UC campuses to enable potential transfers to prepare for more than one UC simultaneously, and by aligning, when possible, major requirements with the Transfer Model Curricula developed by CCC/CSU for the Associate Degrees for Transfer.

The work began a few years ago when UC developed the [Transfer Preparation Paths](#), which highlight pre-major commonalities across UC campuses for the 20 most popular UC majors. The new effort asks campuses to use the common courses to select students for admission, so that a CCC student may take a single course and be competitively prepared for transfer to a similar major at several UC campuses simultaneously. UCOP will be convening department chairs from five majors – anthropology, biology, mathematics, economics, and chemistry – to review the course maps and to discuss implementation and a communication plan. UCOP will not force individual departments to adhere their major requirements to a systemwide standard, and understands that the TMCs are a good starting point for some majors, but that UC campuses will continue to require additional courses in others.

V. Nonresident Enrollment and the Budget

- *Debora Obley, Associate Vice President, Budget and Capital Resources*

UCOP is developing a 2015-16 budget for UC and a “sustainability plan” mandated by the state, which asks UC to assume 4% state funding increases and no tuition increases over the next three years. UC's plan will outline the university's mandatory cost drivers, high priority funding needs, and enrollment growth assumptions under different budget parameters. UCOP is also developing a long-range enrollment plan that takes into account projections for CA high school graduates and UC's Master Plan commitment to CA residents. UCOP estimates that UC will need to increase resident undergraduate enrollment by about 1-1.5% annually to capture the 9x9 guarantee. It assumes that a 4% increase will be insufficient to meet these needs and will have to be augmented with revenue from other sources such as tuition and nonresident enrollment, although a campus-based or systemwide cap on nonresident enrollment is also being contemplated. UC is doing everything possible to avoid tuition increases and to maintain its commitment to the Master Plan, but without sufficient state funding, UC will be unable to grow resident enrollment and is more likely to increase nonresident enrollment and tuition.

Discussion: It was noted that some faculty are concerned about teaching challenges and interdisciplinary cost shifts associated with the growing number of non-native English-speaking international students, their lower retention rates, and the extent to which UC campuses differ in their ability to generate nonresident revenue. A member noted that a tuition increase could work against UC's nonresident enrollment goals, as nonresident demand is not unlimited. It was also noted that UC's graduate student population is too low; that the growth of nonresidents argues

for maintaining the referral guarantee; and that California's Chicano/Latino population is expected to grow at a higher rate than the general population. Members also expressed concern about the "privatization" of the university and the increasing debt burden of UC graduates.

VI. BOARS Proposal for Adjusting the Eligibility Construct

o *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

Issue: BOARS has requested a systemwide Senate review of its proposal to adjust the "9-by-9" eligibility construct to "7-by-7." The proposal is motivated by the need for UC to accommodate all students eligible for a guarantee of referral admission and addresses a miscalculation made in the 2009 eligibility reform policy by more accurately bringing the total number of guaranteed students to the policy target of 10% of public high school graduates. The proposal also recommends a new methodology for calculating the statewide index as a base for the target, which assumes that 82% of the "top" high school graduates apply to UC. The Academic Council has asked BOARS to clarify aspects of the proposal before sending it for systemwide review.

Chair Aldredge noted that "Eligibility" refers to UC's historic guarantee of admission to at least one campus that UC extends to qualified students. Eligible students who are not admitted to a UC campus to which they applied are offered referral admission to another campus. Today, Merced is the only "referral campus." The 2009 policy was first implemented for students entering UC in 2012. It implements the guarantee through the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program to the top 9% of students in each CA high school based on their GPA in "a-g" courses, and to the top 9% students statewide based on an index of both high school GPA and SAT/ACT scores. The pathways are intended to combine to meet a 10% overall target. Another category of students, Entitled to Review, do not meet the admission guarantee criteria, but are guaranteed a comprehensive review.

UCOP performed regression analyses simulating the effect of the change to 7x7 on the pool of "guaranteed" students, the actual pool of admitted students, and the referral pool. The simulations project that moving to 7x7 with the 82% methodology would have reduced the 2014 referral pool from about 9,055 to about 3,900 students. Chair Aldredge noted that moving to 7x7 is projected to decrease the number of students eligible for the referral guarantee across a variety of demographic groups; while this is a concern, there is likely to be far less of a reduction in the actual admission numbers for any group and a much less pronounced effect on the diversity of the pools of referral and admitted students. Most applicants will still be admitted to the campus of their choice, as 9x9 eligibility is not the determining admission factor. These projections are the more relevant ones to include in the proposal. It was noted that UCOP's projections do not incorporate [BOARS' 2015 change to the statewide index](#), which was estimated to reduce the referral pool by about 2,100. The 7x7 proposal would replace the 2015 index with a new one that accounts for the students who do not apply but would be eligible.

Chair Aldredge outlined three possible next steps: 1) Clarify the details and intent of the current proposal without changing policy or implementation; 2) Separate the policy from the implementation – that is, propose maintaining in Regents policy the 10% target but consider the details of the construct (e.g. 7x7) used to achieve the target as implementation that BOARS can adjust as necessary in the future without Regental approval; or 3) Abandon the proposed policy and start over.

Discussion: It was noted that UC’s current funded capacity is roughly equal to the number of 9x9 guaranteed students, and that UC is clearly extending a guarantee to too many students. It was also noted that Merced’s growth has slowed this year and that the campus is looking for more students to meet its enrollment target; thus, one problem the proposal is attempting to solve is not there, at least in the short term. One member expressed support for the chair’s proposal to separate the policy from its implementation to give BOARS the flexibility to adjust the construct as necessary in the future without Regental approval. Several members expressed concern about projections related to the diversity of the guaranteed student pool, although it was noted that the more relevant projection is the effect of 7x7 on the actual pool of admitted students. It was noted that BOARS considered a variety of combinations for the ELC/Statewide Index and arrived at 7x7 because it meets the 10% target and the symmetry is easier for the public to understand.

UCOP consultants noted that there are existing mechanisms that will help to reduce the referral pool. Admissions is a dynamic process; there is an ebb and flow, and we should examine the issues carefully before implementing any big changes.

Action: BOARS members will discuss next steps for the proposal with their campus admissions committees.

VII. Implementation of State Senate Bill 1200

Issue: The Governor has signed Senate Bill 1200, which asks UC to develop guidelines for high school computer science courses that may be approved for “a-g,” specifically the area “c” mathematics requirement.

Associate Director Lin noted that the issue has already been addressed through the recently revised [area “c” course criteria and guidelines](#) that BOARS approved in April 2014. The mathematics faculty who led the review of the area “c” guidelines made sure that the guidelines note specifically that a computer science course may be accepted for area “c” if it includes substantial mathematics content.

VIII. AP, IB, and other Pre-UC Units Awarded to Incoming Freshmen

Issue: Last year, BOARS discussed UC policies covering Honors/AP units and the GPA bonus (“bump”) that provides extra points in the GPA calculation for completion of up to four AP or UC-certified high school honors courses. Some BOARS members spoke in favor of eliminating or reducing the GPA bump, and the committee reviewed data showing a recent increase in the number of units brought to UC by enrolled freshmen and a disproportionately large increase in average units brought by students from high ranking API schools and by white/Asian students compared to students from low API schools and underrepresented minority groups. BOARS also reviewed a North Carolina [study](#) which found that first-year UNC students who took more than five AP courses performed no better at UNC than those who took five, and students who took fewer than five have lower first-year GPA. Some BOARS members were concerned that students are bringing too many high school units to UC and that the honors course “arms race” burdens students and benefits high-income students with access to a large number of AP courses, over students at less-resourced schools. On the other hand, BOARS noted that the AP curriculum is

becoming more prominent in low API schools with large populations of underrepresented students, providing those students with new educational opportunities. A separate concern was that the formula for calculating weighted-capped GPA in some cases inappropriately favors students who take fewer “a-g” courses over students who take more and may also incentivize the avoidance of non-honors “a-g” courses.

Action: UCOP agreed to provide data about the effectiveness of AP, IB, and Honors courses in student learning at a future meeting.

IX. 2014-15 BOARS Issues

BOARS members noted several issues for possible discussion in addition to those identified during the meeting. These included how UC should recognize or award credit for completion of the French Baccalaureate exams; how campuses should approach tie-breaking in admissions decisions for engineering and other highly selective majors; how campuses can increase enrollment capacity in high demand majors; the effectiveness of the holistic admissions policy; and the role of undergraduate mentorship programs in increasing retention.

X. Executive Session

Notes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Ralph Aldredge