

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the October 5, 2012 BOARS Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the minutes.

II. Announcements

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

October Academic Council Meeting

Chair Johnson briefed Council members about BOARS' [Report to the Regents on Comprehensive Review](#), which summarizes initial outcomes from the eligibility policy changes implemented last year and details campuses' progress in their transition to single score holistic review. Council also received a briefing from UCOP about the state budget and the implications of Proposition 30's passage or failure. Chair Johnson asked Regent Bruce Varner, who joined a portion of the meeting to discuss the future of the University, how the Regents view the Master Plan for Higher Education. Regent Varner indicated that the Regents do not consider the Master Plan to be as relevant as a governing document today, due to the state's disinvestment in the University.

Agenda Items for Sacramento meeting:

BOARS discussed potential agenda items for a joint meeting with policymakers in Sacramento tentatively scheduled for February 2013.

1. Transfer admissions: UC's commitment to the transfer path, and how the Community College system's ability to prepare students for timely transfer affects UC.
2. Freshman admissions: the effect of holistic review and the new eligibility criteria on admissions outcomes, and a discussion of nonresident admission.
3. The Master Plan: its continuing relevance of in the context of budget cuts, and UC's shrinking capacity and ability to maintain the guarantee.

Education Financing Model Steering Committee

BOARS is invited to appoint a new representative to the Education Financing Model Steering Committee, which discusses issues related to affordability and financial accessibility. It meets a few times per year, and most meetings are conducted by phone.

Discussion: It was noted that BOARS still views the Master Plan as a principal guide in policy discussions about the importance of maintaining the University's commitment to admitting the top 12.5% of high school graduates, the referral guarantee, and the "compare favorably" rule with regard to nonresident admission. It was suggested that to prepare for the joint meeting in Sacramento, BOARS gather data on the extent to which CSU is meeting its Master Plan obligation to admit the top one-third, and produce an analysis of projected UC admission outcomes based solely on academic index. Some Californians could perceive holistic review as

disadvantaging students in the top academic quartile who are not from a first generation or low income background. UC must be clear that holistic admissions is intended to look beyond traditional academic indicators at the whole student and academic achievement in context.

III. Implementation of the New Transfer Admissions Policy

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

Report: In 2010, new legislation (SB 1440) required the California Community Colleges to develop major-based Associate Degrees for Transfer that guarantee degrees-holders admission to CSU and a bachelor's degree upon completion of 60 upper division units. The legislation encouraged UC to align its transfer requirements with SB 1440. BOARS crafted a [policy](#) and corresponding amendments to Senate Regulation 476 that guarantee CCC transfer applicants a comprehensive review (but not admission) if they complete an "SB 1440" degree or a UC Transfer Curriculum in the relevant major, with a minimum GPA set by each campus, or the current pathway specified in [SR 476 C](#).

Departments and majors should begin working with admissions offices to develop Transfer Curricula that detail the specific lower division criteria a student needs for transfer admission consideration. Each program should be encouraged to review the Transfer Model Curricula (TMCs) developed by CCC faculty and approved by CSU for the AA degrees, available on the [C-ID website](#). SB 1440 requires the TMCs to include IGETC or CSU GE Breadth, and for many UC programs, with the notable exception of STEM disciplines and some economics departments, a Transfer AA with IGETC will be adequate major preparation. Finally, BOARS may want to opine on whether UCOP should continue convening groups of faculty within the same discipline across campuses to look for ways to increase the alignment of transfer criteria for similar majors.

ACTION: After corrections and clarifications are made to the implementation plan document, Chair Johnson will draft a memo to local admissions committees asking them to review and discuss the implementation plan and report to BOARS in May about what they have done or plan to do to implement the policy.

IV. Consultation with UCOP

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

TAGs and Selection Criterion 14

UCSD intends to end its participation in the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program, but its plan to create a local guarantee program with ten community colleges near the campus has been questioned on the basis of a [resolution](#) BOARS passed in 2004, stating that comprehensive review criterion #14, which allows for the high school's geographic location to be considered in the admission decision, should not be interpreted to mean that campuses can advantage students based on their high school's proximity to the campus. The resolution does not mention transfer students, but the comprehensive review criteria apply to both freshmen and transfers.

Discussion: There was little support in BOARS for revisiting the 2004 decision. A member who was on BOARS in 2004 noted that the decision was motivated in part by BOARS' desire to

prevent campuses from granting preference to applicants (children of faculty) who resided in the same county as a UC campus.

IGETC for STEM

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) has approved language for a new IGETC sequence that accommodates STEM majors. ICAS cannot add the sequence to the [IGETC Standards](#) document until the CSU and UC Senates formally approve it. In June, the Academic Council approved the revisions in principle, and asked BOARS and UCEP to propose amendments to [SR 478](#) to reflect the revisions. UCOP is concerned that creating another pattern could confuse students and burden campuses. They recommend treating students who have completed IGETC for STEM identically to students who have “partial IGETC,” which allows transfers to complete up to two of their courses post transfer. Senate Vice Chair Jacob noted that IGETC for STEM is intended to be a variant of IGETC, and only IGETC or CSU Breadth, not partial IGETC, will satisfy the legal requirements of the new Transfer AA/AS degrees.

ACTION: Chair Johnson will discuss the partial IGETC option further with staff, or draft a revision to SR 478 for BOARS’ review in December.

Smarter Balanced Assessment

The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) is a multi-state effort to develop an assessment system for testing college readiness in English language arts and math that is aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Monica Lin is one of California’s higher education leads for SBAC. The summative SBAC assessments will be implemented in 2014-15, given to students in grades 3-8 and at the end of the 11th grade, and used in federal and state accountability reviews of the schools. Although the assessments will not affect UC eligibility or be used for college placement, UC might want to review UC student outcomes in comparison to their SB scores to see if the test could have additional value in placement or admission decisions.

Online “a-g” Course Approval

The new [policy for “a-g” review of online courses](#) approved by BOARS last year involves a partnership with the California Learning Resources Network (CLRN), which has been approved by the California Department of Education to review online courses for content and quality. Under the new policy, CLRN will review courses submitted by an online publisher or school against the California Content Standards or the Common Core State Standards, and a set of national [Standards for Quality Online Courses](#). A CLRN-certified course meeting an 80% threshold, including 15 required “power” quality standards, can be submitted to UC Doorways for final “a-g” review and approval. The policy will take effect for the course update cycle beginning in February 2013 and online courses completed during the 2013-14 academic year.

E-Transcripts

In October, BOARS asked UCOP to explore the feasibility of accepting electronic transcripts from high schools, at the post-SIR stage, to help address instances in which students have missed transcript deadlines. An e-transcript system could also save UC campuses time and money. Director Trevino reported that UC campuses accept electronic transcripts directly from high schools or from approved third party vendors through established secure connections. He said the main challenge to fuller implementation is a lack the resources or technology at high schools to deliver transcripts electronically.

It was noted that the state of Wisconsin has partnered with an outside vendor to implement a statewide e-transcript service, at a modest cost for each high school. UC should identify allies in state government who could help advocate for and fund a similar system.

V. Alternative Financial Aid Models

- *Kate Jeffery, Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President*

Issue: BOARS reviewed alternatives for modifying the University's financial aid funding strategy to increase its sustainability but also allow UC to continue meeting its undergraduate financial aid goals and commitments.

Report: UC's primary financial aid goal is to ensure that the University is financially accessible to all students regardless of income, and that family income does not affect a student's choice of campus or educational experience. The accessibility of the financial aid system is distinct from its competitiveness and perceived affordability. At UC, financial accessibility is need-based, while admissions decisions are need-blind. UC is committed to accessibility for all admitted undergraduates, including nonresidents, although UC offers financial aid to nonresidents only on the in-state portion of their tuition, not on nonresident supplemental tuition.

By many measures, UC is financially accessible. It enrolls a high percentage of low income students compared to other selective institutions; however, the proportion of middle income students is declining. UC's current financial aid goals are expressed through the Education Financing Model (EFM), which is based on a formula that asks parents to contribute an amount based on their "ability to pay," and expects students to contribute through a manageable level of part-time work and borrowing ("self-help"). UC fills in the remaining need gap with aid from UC Grants, after Pell and Cal Grants have been applied.

UC places 33% of any increase to in-state tuition into a systemwide return-to-aid pool, and awards UC Grants to needy students from that pool. However, projections show that the funding available from return-to-aid for grants will soon be inadequate to meet the EFM's requirements. One option for addressing the problem is for UC to develop an alternative needs analysis formula that provides a more accurate view of parental resources. The federal formula UC currently uses does not take into account all aspects of wealth. Another option is to increase student borrowing and/or part time work expectations, in a way that is still manageable for the student. For example, UC's current self-help methodology is based on an expected loan repayment burden of 7% of post-graduation wages over 10 years; that expectation might be expanded to 15 years or longer. A third option is to raise tuition, which would increase the amount of return-to-aid available for grants for low income students.

Discussion: It was noted that increasing tuition under a high return-to-aid model will shift the burden to high income families and benefit lower income families; however, a high sticker price can also be a disincentive to lower income people, and increasing tuition shifts the burden to middle income families who do not qualify for financial aid. High tuition could also inspire more high quality applicants from all income groups to choose another institution they perceive to be a better value. It was noted that reducing the emphasis on low socioeconomic status in comprehensive review could reduce the financial burden on the University. There was concern about the accuracy of the federal financial means methodology and verification process, and the extent to which people misreport residency status and income. One member cited research

indicating that a student's GPA is not impacted by working up to 20 hours per week; however, it is more difficult than ever to find a part time job on or near many campuses.

VI. Rebenching and Enrollment Management

Issue: [Rebenching](#) is the second phase, following Funding Streams, of the University's internal budgetary reform. Rebenching seeks to re-balance the historical general fund allocation formulas that determine the proportion of state funds UCOP distributes to each campus, by equalizing over six years the per-student ratio of state funds across campuses. UCOP began implementing rebenching this year, although some details have not been resolved.

The Academic Council recently made a [statement](#) about the need for an enrollment management plan under rebenching that will set appropriate and enforceable CA-resident enrollment targets and ensure campuses have a financial incentive not to under-enroll their target number of residents. The rebenching plan proposes that for each student below the target, a campus will lose its per-student funding times a multiplier. Council has suggested a 150% penalty.

Discussion: In general, BOARS members expressed support for the goals of rebenching. They agreed that UC is one system of universities, and that all UC students should be funded equally regardless of the campus they attend.

There was some concern that the highest funded campuses on a per-student basis will be cut disproportionately under rebenching. Chair Powell noted that rebenching will not reduce state funding to any campus; rather, it will use a portion of any new state money to increase the per student funding of the lowest funded campuses to the level of the highest funded. 20% of any new state money will be allocated to campuses that are currently funded below the mean of the campuses.

BOARS members agree that Funding Streams creates an incentive to campuses to enroll additional fee-bearing nonresidents and, potentially, to under-enroll residents. It was noted that some campuses are actively considering plans for increasing nonresidents and decreasing resident enrollment. BOARS agreed that UCOP should set enforceable California resident enrollment targets for each campus that are large enough to accommodate all state-funded students. Members did not have enough information to opine on whether Council's proposed penalty of 150% would be of sufficient magnitude to ensure that campuses enroll residents up to the target, but they did support making it costly enough that campuses will be dissuaded from under-enrolling California residents. The magnitude of the penalty needs careful evaluation to determine whether it is large enough to serve that purpose.

There was a concern that enforcing resident enrollment targets with a penalty could hurt some campuses unfairly, due to the difficulty of predicting enrollment yield. A buffer should be built into the rebenching plan that is sufficiently large to account for yield uncertainty. The proposed buffer of 1% mentioned in the review document may not be large enough.

BOARS members agreed that the Senate should play a role in the critical issue of enrollment management, but not all agreed that BOARS should be closely involved in the details. BOARS will continue to focus on eligibility standards that allow UC to meet its Master Plan commitment. Regardless of the ultimate balance of nonresident and residents, BOARS will continue to

monitor and insist that campuses are meeting the BOARS “compare favorably” standard with regard to nonresident enrollment.

ACTION: Committee analyst and Chair Johnson will draft a memo to Academic Council with comments about rebenching. Chair Johnson will also send local committee representatives a summary of nonresident admissions outcomes and ask them to provide BOARS with an assessment of the extent to which the “compare favorably” rule is being met.

VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

- *Ralph Aldredge (chair), Monica Lin, Robert Gurval, Henry Sanchez, John Park, June Gordon, Daniel Widener, and Angela Arunarsirakul*

UC Program Status

When UC grants an entity such as the College Board “Program Status” after their initial submission of Advanced Placement curricula, it expedites the subsequent review of AP courses that have received Program Status when high schools submit those courses for “a-g” approval. The College Board recently revamped some of its AP curriculum, which needs to be reviewed by UC articulation staff. The subcommittee agreed to help UCOP review the revised curricula.

Criteria for “a-g” course reviews

UCOP wants to increase the standardization of the “a-g” course review process and add more specific guidelines to each [subject area](#); however, staff need faculty expertise to help them address certain disciplines, areas where gaps in criteria exist (e.g., high school robotics, web design courses), and in the re-review of English and mathematics courses in the context of the Common Core. The subcommittee agreed to provide guidance in needed areas and/or find faculty with the appropriate expertise to help.

ACTION: At the next meeting, the subcommittee will review specific cases of course outlines that have been approved or not approved to help identify the main questions and issues.

VIII. Data Analysis Subcommittee

- *George Johnson (chair) Lynn Huntsinger, Patrick Farrell, Michael Beman, Mindy Marks, Lee Bardwell, Lilia Meltzer, Tongshan Chang, and Michael Trevino*

Admissions Index Adjustment

The subcommittee reviewed options for adjusting the statewide index to align UC admissions outcomes and the guarantee pool with Master Plan expectations along with related projected outcomes and effects on different populations of students. The model presented for discussion was a new statewide index that would reduce the statewide eligible pool to 8.3% by raising both high school GPA and UC score requirements.

IX. Executive Session

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