

I. Announcements

- *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*
- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Vice Chair*

Chair Johnson welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the [charge](#) of the committee. BOARS advises the Academic Senate and UC President on matters relating to the systemwide criteria for undergraduate admission. Admissions is one of the University's most visible and politically charged topics, and it is important for BOARS to carefully monitor current policies, and adjust those that do not meet the University's goals. Faculty representatives are encouraged to communicate with their campus committees about discussions in BOARS, and, in turn, to share local concerns and discussions with BOARS. Members should treat agendas and committee documents as confidential unless otherwise noted. Confidential materials can and should be shared with campus committees, but not distributed more broadly. BOARS will schedule regular executive sessions to give members the opportunity to discuss issues off the record.

Consultants from UCOP's Admissions Office work closely with BOARS to help the committee monitor and analyze systemwide application, admissions, and SIR outcomes. The student voice is also important in helping BOARS arrive at sound policy decisions.

This year, BOARS will continue to monitor and discuss outcomes from two new admissions policies: (1) the freshman eligibility reform policy that took effect for the fall 2012 freshman class, and (2) the transition several campuses made to the single score individualized ("holistic") review system the Regents [recommend](#) as the preferred method of comprehensive review. BOARS will review options for recalibrating the statewide eligibility index to meet the 9% target more closely, and monitor the extent to which campuses are following BOARS' June 2011 [policy](#) requiring nonresident admits to "compare favorably" to resident admits. Finally, BOARS will follow the progress of the UC Online Education Project and discuss next steps for implementing the [transfer admissions policy](#) approved by the Senate in July 2012.

Two BOARS subcommittees—one focused on articulation and evaluation, and the other on data analysis—will work during and outside of regular committee meetings to develop recommendations on specific issues for the full committee's consideration.

Traditionally, BOARS has not been involved in enrollment management discussions, but the Senate chair has asked BOARS and other Senate bodies to help ensure that the adopted enrollment management plan is one that produces equitable outcomes in the context of the [budget rebenching project](#). Chair Johnson will be working with the UCPB and UCEP chairs to discuss the Senate's role in the development of an enrollment management plan.

The BOARS chair attends meetings of the [Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates](#) (ICAS), which discusses issues of shared concern to the UC, CSU, and California Community College faculty. This year, ICAS will discuss transfer articulation and update its Statements of

Competencies in Math and Science to reference the Common Core. The Competencies provide guidance to high schools about what the higher education segments expect of entering students. UC cites them in the [“a-g” Guide](#).

Finally, Chair Johnson noted that BOARS’ [2012 Report on Comprehensive Review](#) has been sent to the Regents. He recommended BOARS members read *The Conditions for Admission* by John Aubrey Douglass for an historical overview of UC admission policies and practices.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Robert Powell, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Vice Chair*
- *Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Director*

REPORT: Chair Powell welcomed BOARS members and thanked them for their service to the Senate and the University. He said budget cuts have reduced UC’s state funding to the 2007-08 level, when UC enrolled 70,000 fewer students. If Proposition 30 fails, UC will face a \$250 million trigger cut and lose the \$125 million tuition buy-out for this year, making it likely that tuition will increase significantly. The University is preparing two separate budgets reflecting both passage and failure of Proposition 30. The Regents voted to support Proposition 30; the President and Academic Senate leadership support it personally; and the Academic Council [supports](#) it. He is asking BOARS and several other systemwide UC committees to each meet once in Sacramento this year to give policymakers and faculty a chance to interact and discuss issues and policies of common interest.

Vice Chair Jacob noted that 14.9% of total California public high school graduates received an offer of admission from UC this year, and more than 12.5% of them were admitted to a UC campus to which they applied, meaning that despite the budget crisis, UC continues to honor its Master Plan obligation to the state. He noted that UC strongly opposes a proposed state Senate Constitutional Amendment to limit the number of nonresidents admitted to UC to 10% overall and 10% at individual campuses. The Regents have adopted the 10% overall cap on undergraduate nonresident enrollment recommended by the [Commission on the Future](#). Enrollment management will be an important topic this year. Campuses have a financial incentive to enroll more nonresidents, making it important for UC to have an enrollment management plan that ensures the enrollment of all funded residents.

Senate Director Winnacker said the role of the Senate office is to provide administrative, logistical, and analytical support to Senate bodies. The Senate’s dedicated site on SWABIZ allows non-Santa Barbara [travelers](#) to easily book or change airline tickets. BOARS members are encouraged to follow Senate and UC [policy](#) regarding travel reimbursement request deadlines.

DISCUSSION: It was noted that the agenda for the meeting with policymakers in Sacramento should include transfer, diversity, the referral process, and the Master Plan. It will be important for policymakers to hear about UC’s efforts to increase the number of transfers and improve the transfer path. They should also know that transfers admitted to UC are as academically successful as four-year students; that the 6% decline in transfer applications from the CCC was related to reduced enrollments and course availability there; and that UC campuses are building

new campus housing and other facilities specifically for transfer students. It was noted that the Senate might also inform policymakers about the on-the-ground effects of the budget cuts—for example, infrastructure and space problems, overcrowded classrooms, and reduced opportunity for interaction with faculty.

It was noted that UC’s transfer applicant pool is less diverse than the freshman applicant pool, and that a growing number of middle class families and UC-eligible high school graduates are looking to the CCCs as a way to save money. It was noted that international student enrollment is increasing at the Community Colleges, some of whom presumably transfer to CSU or UC.

One member noted that policymakers and citizens should know that while UC is increasing nonresident admits, it is also increasing California resident admits, and that some campuses have increased their minimum GPA requirement for nonresidents. It was also noted that the number of state-supported students at UC has not been well defined; the state and university differ on the number of actual “funded” and “unfunded” students.

III. Consultation with the UCOP

- *Michael Trevino, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

Office of Admissions overview (Michael Trevino)

The UCOP Office of Admissions manages a range of overlapping functions. Staff provide policy guidance to campuses and to BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE as consultants. Recent examples of policy work include revisions to Senate Regulations related to the eligibility of transfers, a new process for approving online “a-g” courses, and data analyses related to outcomes from the new freshman eligibility policy. Admissions staff also review and approve high school courses that fulfill the “a-g” subject area requirements for UC and CSU admission, and CCC courses for transferability. They work with campuses and faculty to craft messages about admissions policies, produce training events for counselors, maintain the UC Application, engage in public education and recruitment, and answer correspondence regarding specific admissions issues. They collaborate with the office of Institutional Research throughout the admissions cycle to produce summary statistics that are released to the public and help inform policy conversations on the campuses and in the Senate.

Director Trevino also noted that Berkeley, San Diego, and UCLA have recently hired new Directors of Admission, and several other campuses continue their searches.

Fall Counselor Conferences (Shawn Brick)

The annual Counselor Conferences are UC’s chance to deliver systemwide and campus admissions messages to high school and community college counselors across California, and to address their questions. This year, UC hosted one joint conference with CSU in addition to four UC-only events that were attended by nearly 4,000 counselors. Conference topics included the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program, the new freshman admissions criteria, ways to satisfy “a-g” requirements, financial aid, the online application, and Comprehensive Review. In general, counselors were positive about UC admissions and encouraged by outcomes from the new policy; however, several expressed concern about the rising cost of a UC education and the

implications for middle class access. BOARS members are invited to attend any future conference.

DISCUSSION: One BOARS member noted that counselors and students from well-resourced, high API schools near campus have expressed concern about declining admissions rates to UC, which some blame on a higher nonresident admission rate. Another noted that 70% of admitted students with a statewide guarantee came from API 9 or 10 public or private schools. BOARS should review more data about the distribution of admits and enrollees by school API.

“A-G” course reviews and new online partnership with CLRN (Monica Lin)

A written report summarized the high school “a-g” course review and approval process managed by UCOP High School Articulation staff. In the last course review cycle, staff reviewed over 9,000 new courses and 13,600 course revisions seeking “a-g” approval. UCOP will be launching a new “a-g” Guide website in the coming year.

A new [Policy for “a-g” Review of Online Courses](#), developed by the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee and approved by BOARS last year, will take effect for online courses completed during the 2013-14 academic year. UC will partner with the California Learning Resource Network (CLRN) to review courses submitted by an online publisher or school for “a-g.”

IV. Executive Session

V. 2012 Admissions Outcomes

- *With Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research*

ISSUE: BOARS reviewed fall 2012 systemwide and campus-specific freshman and transfer intent to register (SIR) [outcomes](#), with the data organized by residency status and by demographic characteristics. BOARS also reviewed data requested by last year’s committee comparing the academic credentials (academic index score, GPA, and test scores) of different resident groups; the characteristics of student cohorts who did and did not take the newly-optional SAT Subject Exams and their likelihood of admission; applicants and admitted students from the expanded ELC pool and the new Entitled to Review (ETR) pool; the effect of the ELC designation on admissions outcomes for CA-resident applicants from public high schools; and a logistical regression simulation predicting how the cohort of CA-residents applying to UC in 2011 under the old admissions model might have fared under the 2012 criteria.

Consistent with previous studies, the data show that no single factor determines admission for residents or nonresidents, but that on average, nonresident admits score higher than CA-resident admits on the academic index, and that international admits have lower average GPAs than CA-resident admits. Chair Johnson asked BOARS members to share the data with their local committees, and discuss whether their nonresident admits “compare favorably” to residents and thus meet the BOARS [policy](#).

In addition, UC Merced’s SIR rate is increasing, and about 200 students took advantage of the referral offer to Merced last year. About 90% of UC’s transfer students come from California Community Colleges, although an increasing number are international.

DISCUSSION: It was noted that some countries base academic ranking on high-stakes test scores alone—transcripts are not used, and GPA is not considered important. In addition, it is difficult to norm international students with domestic students, because they arrive with a different set of credentials and without data on some of the 14 factors used in the comprehensive review of domestic students.

Tongshan Chang noted that a recent study determined that the test scores of international students are a much higher predictor of college success than their GPAs.

It was noted that the more selective UC campuses are more likely to admit nonresidents, and that nonresidents have higher admission rates relative to their scores, independent of campus selectivity. It was also noted that campuses admitted more CA-residents than ever last year. Moreover, the population of nonresidents who actually enroll is much smaller than the admitted population. Campuses know that a relatively high rate of “melt” will occur in this population between the time SIRs are submitted and when students enroll, and thus may over-admit nonresidents to guarantee appropriate yield.

Members agreed that the nonresident admission issue affects UC as a whole, and BOARS has a responsibility to speak to any disparity and play a role in finding solutions.

VI. Adjusting the Statewide Index

- *With Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research*

ISSUE: The number of guaranteed applicants for 2012 was larger than anticipated when the new admissions policy was designed, due to a larger than expected number of students who met the statewide index. The model UCOP devised in 2009 for a statewide GPA/SAT admissions index that was intended to capture the top 9% of high school graduates was based on a flawed CPEC study, but it provided BOARS’ best estimate at the time about who would apply under the new criteria. In reality, the top 13.6% of CA public high school graduates who applied to UC for fall 2012 earned a guarantee of admission either through ELC or the statewide index under the new policy. The overlap between the ELC pool and those who met the statewide index was also smaller than anticipated. The percentage of California high school graduates who were admitted to the University rises to 14.9% after adding ETR admits.

UCOP was asked to model options for adjusting the statewide index to capture the top 9%, so that along with ELC and ETR, UC can provide a guarantee to 10.5% of CA high school graduates to align with Regents policy, and can admit the top 12.5%, to align with the [access provisions](#) of the Master Plan. UCOP generated two models to predict the pool of students who would be ineligible next year but who were eligible this year, based on different adjustments to the index. Both predict that a new index that limits the guarantee pool to 9% of high school graduates would decrease and disproportionately affect students from low API schools, who are first generation college-goers, who are low income, and who are underrepresented minorities.

DISCUSSION: Members agreed that the overall goal should be to admit the top 12.5%, and to provide a guarantee to approximately 10.5% to align with policy. Any adjustments to the statewide index should minimize effects on diversity.

VII. The Future of the Referral Guarantee

ISSUE: UC Merced uses the referral pool to meet enrollment targets, but the campus is also receiving a larger number of applications and seeing higher yield from the referral pool. As Merced approaches capacity, UC may not be able to guarantee a referral offer to every eligible student in the near future.

Chair Powell has asked the Academic Council to develop set of funding priorities regardless of the election outcome. Should the Senate continue to consider UC's historical Master Plan commitment to guaranteed access for the top 12.5% as one of its top priorities?

DISCUSSION: It was noted that the practical implementation of the Master Plan policy [evolved](#) over time to include the referral guarantee provision. The guarantee remains important to some high school students and is broadly recognized as an important part of the University's commitment to the Master Plan. It was noted that demand for UC is increasing, and the California high school graduation rate is projected to increase again in the near future (Tidal Wave 3). It was also noted the Master Plan was established at a time when the state was funding all UC students.

Members commented that UC's commitment to the Master Plan is important, but not practical or feasible without appropriate resources. UC should remain committed to its public mission and the Master Plan to the greatest extent possible, but the state must increase funding for UC and all segments of California higher education. One member remarked that the guarantee is unnecessary as long as UC offers admission to the top 12.5% of high school graduates. Perhaps the best approach in the current context is to commit to admitting the top 12.5% of graduates, and then guarantee admission a smaller subset of that group.

It was noted that UC has been able to meet its obligations to California residents only by enrolling more nonresidents. Another said that the UC campuses enrolling high numbers of nonresidents are not serving the state to the same extent as the smaller campuses; the University should ensure that all campuses meet their commitment to Californians.

VIII. Member Reports

REPORTS: Members discussed issues and topics being discussed by their campus committees and suggested topics and priorities for BOARS.

UCSD is reviewing options for addressing the drop in Chicano/Latino admits that followed the campus's move to single score holistic review system, and discussing its future participation in the Transfer Admission Guarantee program, including the possibility of instituting a local campus guarantee program.

UCR will be reviewing outcomes, in terms of academic performance at the University, of freshman who were admitted under the new policy, with particular attention paid to the ELC population to help the campus decide how much weight to place on ELC status in the future. They also want to create an Admission by Exception policy that can be applied to international admits, and would like UCOP to add additional data fields to the read sheet, such as GPA by subject.

UCD is evaluating outcomes from its recent move to single score holistic review, and the complex system the committee devised to translate UCLA scores into a UCD context.

UCB is discussing outcomes from the new admissions policy, the differing capacities of the campuses to generate nonresident tuition, workload issues related to international admissions, and the impact of the funding streams and budget rebenching reforms on the campus.

UCM is discussing the future of the guarantee, outcomes from the admitted ELC population, and the UC Online Education project.

UCSF is discussing ways to optimize the e-curriculum and other educational technologies in undergraduate and graduate education.

UCI is evaluating outcomes from the new admissions policy and its new holistic review process to ensure that the campus is admitting students who are prepared for the rigors of a UC education. They are discussing the appropriate predictors of academic success and how to address those in holistic review.

The undergraduate student representative noted that diversity, affordability, and access to UC for California residents must continue to be highly valued priorities.

UCSC is reviewing outcomes from the new policy and discussing the appropriate weight that each of the 14 comprehensive review criteria should have in their holistic review process. They are also discussing criteria for the review of international students and next steps for the local implementation of the new transfer admissions policy.

UCSB is discussing strategies for increasing retention and academic success after the admissions decision, extra services needed to support the large increase in international students on campus, and class-based concerns – the UCSB student population seems to be becoming socioeconomically bimodal: either underprivileged or wealthy. Finally, the campus is looking for a new admissions director.

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