I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS draft minutes of October 3, 2014

**Action:** BOARS approved the October meeting minutes.

II. Announcements

- **Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair**

October Academic Council Meeting: The Council chair asked several systemwide committees to discuss options for addressing the 10% gap in UC faculty total remuneration outlined in a just-completed study to help Council reach consensus about a plan of action to recommend to the Regents. Council also discussed the potential reorganization of the UCOP Office of Research and Graduate Studies and the role of a possible new innovation and entrepreneurial function within Academic Affairs.


UCAAD Liaison to BOARS: In 2012-2013, Council, BOARS, and the University Committee on Affirmative Action (UCAAD) agreed to establish a UCAAD liaison to BOARS to facilitate regular consultation between the two committees on admissions issues as they relate to student diversity. Two UCAAD members have stepped forward to share the role this year – Amani Nuru-Jeter (UCB) in the fall and winter, and Colleen Clancy (UCD) in the spring.

Other Meetings: Chair Aldredge met with Stanford Professor Helen Quinn, author of the Framework for K-12 Science Education that served as the basis for the Next Generation Science Standards. She offered to meet with BOARS to discuss the Standards and the possibility of introducing more flexibility into area “d.” Chair Aldredge also met with community college professors Bruce Yoshiwara and Larry Green who are interested in how the new Common Core State Standards may impact UC transfer requirements.

III. UCEP/UCOPE Letter on AP Credit

**Issue:** UCEP and UCOPE are requesting feedback from BOARS about their draft memo of concern regarding the use of the AP English exam by some UC campuses to place students out of lower and upper division UC writing and composition courses. UCEP and UCOPE believe that AP English exam scores should be used only to place students out of the English Language Writing Requirement (ELWR), per the systemwide policy described in [Senate Regulation 636](#) and the [UCOP website](#).
In general, BOARS expressed support for the principles expressed in the UCOPE-UCEP letter and UCOPE-UCEP’s plan to revisit the policy. BOARS also discussed the possibility that a decision to restrict the use of AP English courses could ultimately affect campus policies that allow AP exams to satisfy courses in other subject areas; however, it was noted that the UCOPE-UCEP letter is focused on writing and that no equivalent to the ELWR exists in other subject areas. It was noted that UCOP traditionally looks to BOARS to make a baseline determination about the number of units conferred by AP exam scores. Campuses may then go beyond this baseline determination to grant more credit and decide whether the course can count for major requirements. There was also a question about the boundaries of the systemwide Senate’s authority to establish such a restriction on campuses.

**Action:** BOARS voted to endorse the letter.

**IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**
- *Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

**November Regents meeting:** The Regents will discuss a new long-term stability plan for tuition and financial aid at their November 19-20 meeting. The Senate was briefed on the proposal only two days before its release. The plan calls for tuition increases of up to 5% in each of the next five years, with the exact level contingent on the level of support provided by the state. The president says the plan is moderate and predictable; helps UC meet its mandatory cost increases, and will allow UC to enroll 5,000 more CA residents over the next five years. It will also help sustain the Blue and Gold Opportunity program, which ensures that low income students do not pay any tuition. Chair Gilly noted that tuition increases would be an unfortunate, but necessary measure if the state does not provide funding beyond the Governor’s proposed 4% increase, which will apply to only the state portion of the UC budget, and thus represents only a 1.7% increase to the overall UC budget.

**Intersegmental Coordinating Committee Meeting:** The ICC is a forum that allows faculty, staff, and students from all California education segments to discuss issues of common concern. Its most recent meeting included a discussion of state and federal requirements for sexual harassment prevention compliance training, a looming wave of teacher retirements associated with the adoption of the Common Core, a surge in Community College students seeking Associate Degrees for Transfer, and a new effort to fund initiatives that prepare high school students to transition to postsecondary education and career pathways. The wave of teacher retirements is a particular concern because the pipeline for students in teacher training is not sufficient to prevent a future shortage. In addition, a presentation was made by two people from CSU about the need for a PhD in High School Counseling as a way to promote more professionalism and expertise in student advising about college preparedness.

**UC Path:** UC Path is a new systemwide payroll system that is intended to modernize and replace aging campus systems. It was scheduled to be rolled out gradually to campuses beginning with UCOP in January 2015 and then at other campuses over two years. However, it was just announced that the January 2015 starting date for UCOP has been delayed.

**Discussion:** there was concern that endorsing the tuition plan B enables the state to withhold appropriate funding for UC. It was noted that the proposal also opens the door for the state to buy out tuition.
V. Consultation with UCOP
   o Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs
   o Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions
   o Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions
   o Monica Lin, Associate Director Undergraduate Admissions
   o Adam Parker, Admissions Policy Coordinator

Transfer: President Napolitano is on a tour of California Community Colleges to discuss the transfer admission process with College presidents.

Application: UC has already received 4,800 applications for fall 2015 admission since the November 1 application opening. Traditionally, more than 50% of applications are submitted in the final days and hours leading up to the November 30 deadline.

UC Articulation Conferences: In October, over 1,000 high school counselors, teachers, and administrators attended one of four Articulation Conferences hosted by UCOP at UC campuses. The inaugural event included workshops on the mechanics of UC’s redesigned “a-g” course management portal, and the criteria and guidelines underlying the development of different types of “a-g” courses, including recent changes to the “a-g” course criteria and guidelines.

College Board Forum: Associate Vice President Handel co-chaired the 2014 College Board Forum, an annual gathering of K–12 and higher education officials. President Napolitano spoke at the Forum on the fundamental importance of America’s public research universities.

Student of Color Conference: UC Merced is hosting the UC Student Association’s 26th annual Student of Color conference November 7-9. The conference is an educational forum that provides a safe space for students to discuss and organize around common issues and challenges.

Undergraduate Admissions Briefing Papers: The Office of Undergraduate Admissions has prepared two briefing papers. The first summarizes major topics such as the Master Plan and undergraduate admissions policy governance, and reviews major admissions policies and background. The second is an admissions glossary defining key admissions terms, acronyms, and programs.

AP, IB, and Honors Courses: Associate Vice President Handel noted that UCOP is collecting a variety of data related to the use of AP, IB and Honors courses and their efficacy in the undergraduate admissions process including who is taking the courses, how many, and their effect on UC performance, as well as the original purpose of the GPA bump and whether it is serving its purpose. He hopes to present these data at the December BOARS meeting.

VI. Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review

Comprehensive Review in June 2012 and on the impact of the new freshman eligibility policy in November 2013. The report is due January 31, 2015. Chair Aldredge has asked BOARS members to update the description of their campus’s process and experience with comprehensive review in the 2012 report. UCOP will update the tables in the 2012 and 2013 reports.

**Action:** BOARS members will send the updated descriptions within the week.

**VII. BOARS Proposal for Adjusting the Eligibility Construct**

- **Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair**

**Issue:** BOARS members reported on their campus committees’ conversations about a proposal to adjust the “9-by-9” eligibility construct to “7-by-7”. BOARS also reviewed data projecting the net impact of the proposed change on the students in the referral pool who submit Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) and the pool of students who are likely to enroll at UC. One projection indicates that under a 7-by-7 scenario, 86 of 143 eligible students (including nine African-Americans) who did not apply to Merced but who accepted Merced’s offer of referral admission would no longer be in the referral pool, a decline that represents a 0.3% decrease in the total number of SIRs.

**Discussion:** Several BOARS members noted that their committees believe the 9x9 policy is working well, while the 7x7 lacks a clear rationale, carries a high political risk, represents only a partial solution to the problems identified by BOARS, and could impact diversity. It was noted that the projections do not fully account for the potential across-the-board impact on the SIR pool prior to the referral pool stage, nor do they capture the extent to which the change itself could affect the behavior of high school applicants. URM students are more likely to be ELC-eligible only, and changes that appear to tighten admissions requirements could, for example, have a disproportionate impact on underrepresented minority students (URMs).

Other committees noted the paradox of maintaining an admissions guarantee based on a narrow set of criteria (GPA and test scores) alongside holistic review, which requires that no fixed proportion of applicants be admitted based on a narrow set of criteria. It was noted that UC is offering a guarantee to too many students; a 7x7 construct could help campuses control over-enrollment, create more space for holistic review, and give campuses an opportunity to admit more ETR students. Broadening holistic review would increase the fairness of the overall process and could also benefit URMs. Moreover, the effect of moving to 7x7 on lower ranking API schools would be smaller in proportion compared to higher ranking API schools. It was also noted that UC cannot conduct a holistic review on every CA high school graduate and has to determine a portion of eligibility through more narrow criteria.

Some committees noted that a 7x7 construct would not change the way their campus admits students, because they do not look at ELC status specifically. Some also expressed interest in studying additional options for the ELC/statewide percentages or raising the statewide index even more in order to reduce the overlap between the ELC and statewide guarantee.

It was noted that the statewide index and ELC program help address both meritocratic and egalitarian principles in admissions policy. It was noted that some campuses remain concerned about the performance of ELC students at UC, and that last year, BOARS considered (but ultimately rejected) a proposal to adopt an SAT minimum for ELC status, after reviewing data correlating an SAT score below 1400 with high rates of probation. At that time, it was also noted
that many of the students in this category are the first in their family to attend college and come from low API schools; they take longer to graduate but still do so at a high rate. It was noted that UC bases ELC on performance in high quality “a-g” courses and that the “a-g” pattern is a basic graduation requirement at a growing number of high schools, which is expanding opportunity but also increasing pressure on the eligibility system.

Senate Vice Chair Hare noted that any change to undergraduate admissions policy has significant political implications. Before moving forward, there should be a clear understanding of the problem, the proposed solution, and the mechanics underlying the solution. It would help if BOARS were unanimous in support for a solution.

**Action:** BOARS members will continue to discuss next steps for the proposal with admissions committees.

### VIII. Campus Reports

The Berkeley Senate has approved a new student-athlete admissions policy developed by the Committee on Admissions, Enrollment, and Preparatory Education. The goal is to decrease the number of special talent exemptions given to athletes, so that within three years 80% meet minimum eligibility requirements, including a 3.0 GPA, and complete a successful holistic read. 77% of current football program recruits already meet the new eligibility threshold.

At Merced, the Provost has initiated a review of campus academic programs to determine which should grow fastest, given the campus’s interdisciplinary capacities and strategic needs in relation to its 2020 Project for growing campus facilities.

The Riverside admissions committee is developing a plan to address holistic review in anticipation of reaching a less than 50% acceptance rate and becoming officially “selective.” A statistical analysis concluded that UCR would have accepted the same pool of students under a holistic system compared with its current comprehensive review system, raising concerns that the cost of moving to holistic review would not be justified, particularly given the campus’s already high level of diversity. However, some are also concerned that the current system may be missing high quality students. A subcommittee is discussing the extent to which additional holistic review factors can be incorporated into UCR’s existing weighting system.

The Irvine admissions committee is discussing a decision by BOARS last year that a pilot program for freshman admission to the UCI School of Biological Sciences is not consistent with systemwide policies governing comprehensive review. The committee believes it may be better to have a single holistic review policy for the campus rather than department-by-department policies.

The Davis committee is reviewing the extent to which holistic review adds value to the admissions process and whether elements of the holistic process can be simplified to be less costly and time-consuming. The committee is also discussing admissions and enrollment issues associated with the increasing number of international students on campus.

Santa Cruz will introduce a new quantifier in the upcoming admissions cycle based on a formula combining GPA and SAT score. The quantifier will be used as a floor for admission and a mechanism to check the holistic review score. If its value is significantly different from the holistic score, the application will merit a second read.
The Los Angeles committee is discussing strategies to reduce the burden associated with the holistic review of a growing and increasingly diverse pool of international student applications, which lack much of the contextual information found in domestic applications. One proposal is to use a formula for international applications that will trigger a second read only if the initial holistic read fails to affirm a minimum outcome from the formula.

San Diego is reviewing a proposed administrative plan for admission by major and capacity-based enrollment plan, under which departments would specify their capacity and an enrollment target, and an applicant’s choice of major would be a tie-breaker in the admissions process. The proposal is intended to address the lengthy process of declaring impaction in popular majors, and to help shore up enrollment in undersubscribed majors.

BOARS’ student representative noted that the UCSA and other auxiliary student organizations are concerned about low African-American admission and enrollment, and want to engage the university in creative thinking about new ways to promote affirmative action and diversity.

Discussion: It was noted that the Regents provide clear policy guidance about affirmative action and diversity. They forbid UC from using racial preferences or any admissions procedure that violates Proposition 209, but they also direct UC to enroll a student body that reflects the broad diversity of California. It was noted that diversity was not the primary motivator of BOARS’ recommendation to move to holistic review; rather, BOARS wanted to find a fairer, more equitable way of identifying academic excellence and potential. Although some campuses believed that holistic review would also increase diversity, some were concerned that it could impair their diversity goals. It was noted that the Office of General Counsel is developing a guide related to diversity strategies allowable under Proposition 209. It was noted that university admissions cannot solve all of the larger societal issues or those that originate earlier in the educational cycle, and that the issue cannot be separated from the mass incarceration of African-Americans and the converse trends in state spending on higher education and corrections. It was noted that UC enrolls a much higher proportion of low income/first generation students than other public universities, although UC campuses are struggling to enroll the African-Americans they do admit.

IX. 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