

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

December 6, 2013

I. Consent Calendar

- Draft Minutes of November 1, 2013

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- *George Johnson, BOARS chair*

Academic Council Meeting: The Academic Council discussed President Napolitano's seven [initiatives](#) and the progress a Senate-Administration work group is making to respond to the Moreno Report's recommendations for addressing racial bias and discrimination affecting UC faculty. The Senate office has prepared a list of the Senate committees with charges that relate to each of the President's initiatives. It identifies BOARS as the lead committee for transfer, and a committee of interest for the initiatives related to implementing a more rational and predictable tuition policy, and supporting undocumented students.

Committee on Higher Education Transfer Hearing: Chair Johnson and Associate Vice President Handel testified at a November 12 State Assembly Higher Education Committee hearing on transfer admission. Also testifying were transfer policy advocates and faculty, student, and administrative representatives from the other higher education segments. Some advocates and policymakers argue that it would save the state money to educate more students at community colleges during the lower division years, and believe the segments are not accepting enough transfers, or providing a clear enough path to transfer admission. At the hearing, CCC and CSU discussed their work developing Associate Degrees for Transfer and the impact of related legislation. UC emphasized its desire to improve the transfer path, and noted that some UC majors require more specific or extensive lower division preparation than what may be provided in some Transfer Degrees. The panel also discussed the role of the [ASSIST website](#) in organizing transfer articulation data for students, and a planned upgrade to the website.

C-ID Advisory Committee: Vice Chair Aldredge will represent UC on an intersegmental Course Identification (C-ID) Advisory Committee. The C-ID project is developing a common course "supranumbering" system for equivalent courses across the higher education segments based on faculty developed course descriptors, to help streamline transfer articulation. Campuses asserting that a course satisfies the C-ID "Course Descriptors" for a particular course keep their local course number, but, once approved by a committee of intersegmental faculty, are identified as being consistent with that particular C-ID supranumber.

Upcoming BOARS Meetings: BOARS' January 3 meeting has been rescheduled for January 10, and its February 7 meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held in Sacramento with legislative staff.

III. Consultation with UCOP Admissions Office

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Steve Handel, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

Fall 2014 Application Data: BOARS reviewed preliminary data from UC's fall 2014 undergraduate admission application cycle, which closed November 30. UC has its largest applicant pool ever. There was a 4.8% overall increase in applications compared to the previous year, including a 6% increase in freshman applications and a 1% decrease in transfer applications. The increase in freshman applications was driven largely by international and out-of-state applicants, but California resident applications also increased slightly. Transfer applications from California residents fell 3%.

Transfer Action Team: At President Napolitano's request, Provost Dorr has empanelled a 13-member UC Action Team for Enhancing Community College Transfer. The Action Team is co-chaired by Vice President Sakaki and Chair Johnson, and also includes the chairs of UCEP and UCOPE. The Provost has asked for a preliminary draft report by February 7 and a final report by February 21.

Undocumented Student Initiative: Vice President Sakaki is leading the President's Supporting Undocumented Students initiative, which will provide campuses with \$5 million over three years to improve retention and graduation rates of undocumented students. \$2.75 million of the money will be used for financial aid (loans and work study), and \$2.25 million for expanding student support services. Vice President Sakaki is assembling a student advisory committee that will advise her about on the progress of the initiative. An estimated 2,000 undocumented students are enrolled on UC campuses, and that number is expected to increase.

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Office

- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

Computer Science Petition: Computer science advocates have been petitioning the Senate to change policy to explicitly recognize high school computer science courses in area "c". In fact, the area "c" [guidelines](#) state that a computer science course can potentially be approved for area "c," as long as the course includes sufficient math content. Draft guidelines for area "c," which will be reviewed by BOARS in early 2014, make this possibility more specific.

Quantitative Preparation: Advocates of alternative quantitative transfer course prerequisites such as Path2Stats and alternative transferrable courses like Statway are seeking clarification from BOARS about how their efforts should be viewed in the context of BOARS's July 2013 [Statement on Basic Math](#). The Office of Admissions has asked Chair Johnson to release a memo clarifying that the Statement is not intended to encourage or discourage alternative pathways, but

to ensure that the content of quantitative transferrable courses is linked to college readiness standards of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM). Chair Johnson agreed that he would prepare and release such a statement.

Declining African-American Admissions: A new [report](#) from the Campaign for College Opportunity expresses concern that African-American students are being admitted to UC and CSU at lower rates, are less likely to graduate, and take longer to complete their degrees, compared to students from other ethnic groups.

Discussion: It was suggested that the educational inequities in the primary and secondary California educational system are largely driving the outcomes and are difficult to overcome. It was also noted that the educational achievement gap based on income is much larger than the gap based on ethnicity. It was suggested that BOARS review data correlating SAT scores with the success at UC of students from different ethnic groups.

Regents Meeting: At the November Regents meeting, Chair Jacob and Provost Dorr made a [joint presentation](#) on the state of doctoral education at the university, which the Provost plans to follow up with an all-university conference on graduate education in the spring. Chair Jacob also urged the Regents not to accept the current level of state funding as a “new normal,” for the sake of continued access for underrepresented students.

V. Compare Favorably

BOARS members have been asked to work with their local admissions offices to assess the extent to which their campuses are meeting the nonresident compare favorably rule. To help them prepare the assessment, each campus has received UCOP-generated data on the academic indicators of fall 2013 nonresident admits and California resident admits. In addition, UCOP has produced a new report considering the first-term UC performance of fall 2012 admits by residency status. The latter report shows that the differences in persistence rates and mean GPAs among residency groups vary by campus but are not significant. At the systemwide level, international students have a higher overall UC GPA compared to national students, and both international and national students have a higher UC GPA than California resident students. Most residency groups have very high persistence rates across all campuses.

VI. Comprehensive Review Factors for Transfer Admission

BOARS discussed a proposed modification to the criteria listed in the [Comprehensive Review Guidelines](#) for the selection of Advanced Standing Applicants that recognizes students who are on track to complete an Associate Degree for Transfer (also referred to as an associate of arts or science transfer degree (AA-T/AS-T)) offered by a California Community College. The language will help put into operation the new transfer pathway in Senate Regulation 476 and ensure that admissions staff value the degrees in selection. As approved at the November 1, 2013 meeting, the language is proposed to be appended to existing criteria #1 and #2.

Discussion: Members noted that the language should not unintentionally imply that students will be required to follow the AA-T/AS-T pathway to ensure a serious review, to the exclusion of other transfer patterns or pathways such as IGETC. The majority of BOARS members preferred adding a separate criterion to the Guidelines about the degrees, rather than embedding language in the existing criteria. Members also noted that the criteria as listed on the Office of Admissions website do not in all cases match the Guidelines word-for-word. The information on the UCOP website should be reviewed for consistency with the Guidelines that BOARS approves.

Action: BOARS voted unanimously in favor of adding a fifth criterion to the transfer guidelines: “Completion of an associate of arts or science degree for transfer (AA-T/AS-T) offered by a California community college.”

VII. Transfer Initiative Action Team

The Provost’s charge letter asks the Action Team to appoint four subcommittees—Outreach and Preparation; Admission, Diversity, and Articulation; Student Transitions and Orientation; and Enrollment Growth and Impact—to recommend strategies for increasing the number of transfer students, streamlining the transfer process, and increasing the transfer graduation rate, without reducing access for freshmen. The charge also asks the Action Team to consider the role of transition programs such as Summer Bridge, to discuss strategies for increasing outreach to community colleges with low transfer rates or high percentages of low income students, and to assess the cost of transfer enrollment growth.

Chair Johnson noted that the effort will touch on several areas of interest to BOARS:

1. The extent to which both UC as a whole and individual campuses are meeting the Master Plan target ratio of 60:40 upper/lower division students, which requires UC to enroll one transfer 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. In addition, how can the trend in declining transfer applications to UC be explained, why do some UC campuses have lower transfer application, admission, and enrollment rates than others, and where are transfers who live in communities with UC campuses applying?
2. Strategies for streamlining transfer processes, including the extent to which UC can participate in the C-ID project, align its transfer requirements with the CCC/CSU Transfer Model Curricula and Associate Degrees for Transfer, and improve outreach efforts.
3. Strategies for improving transfer student graduation rates.
4. How to determine which CCC students are on track to earn a Transfer Degree and which CCCs award more or fewer AA-T/AS-Ts.

Discussion: It was noted that UC has increased transfer admissions dramatically over the past 15 years. UC should meet its Master Plan obligation to transfer students, but increasing their proportion much further could also impact UC’s capacity to meet freshman enrollment targets. It was noted that the majority of students enrolled at a community college are not on a transfer or four-year degree track, and that some transfers choose CSU over UC for particular academic interest or focus, or geographic considerations. It was noted that UC should not consider itself in competition with all CSUs for all community college students. It was noted that in the past, UC

faculty have resisted calls to align UC major preparation with the CSU TMCs; however, many of the TMCs appear to some BOARS members to provide strong preparation for an upper division education at UC. It was noted that C-ID could be a very useful project to the extent that it can help students prepare for transfer, and that that articulation information on the ASSIST website can be confusing to students. Hopefully the ASSIST “Next Generation” website upgrade will create a more user-friendly experience and allow students to track their progress toward transfer requirements. It was noted that the California Community College System maintains data on transfer-intended, transfer-focused and transfer-ready CCC students, and that UC hopes it can use that database to reach out to students. It was noted that there are data indicating that students who participate in outreach programs are more likely to be admitted to and enroll at UC. Finally, it was noted that UC should enhance the transfer referral pool by encouraging good students who apply to a competitive or impacted program on one UC campus to apply to other UC campuses, and/or by creating a mechanism that allows campuses with similar programs to share transfer applicant information. It would also be helpful to assess whether the outcomes gained from a transfer referral pool would be worth the effort and would not have an unintended impact on direct transfer applicants.

Action: BOARS members were asked to return to their campuses to check on the extent to which admissions officers for specific majors are taking into account the Transfer Model Curricula developed jointly by the CSU and the CCC, and/or the UC Transfer Model Curricula (formerly UC Transfer Preparation Paths) in reviewing major preparation requirements for transfer.

Action: BOARS members were asked to gather information about their campus’s outreach efforts and processes related to community college transfers, to help the Transfer Action Team fulfill its charge. This may include information about any local efforts to increase outreach to community colleges with low transfer rates or high percentages of low income students.

VIII. Other Presidential Initiatives

It was suggested that BOARS provide input into the President’s initiatives related to implementing a more rational and predictable tuition policy and supporting undocumented students. The President has indicated that she supports a tuition freeze next year, but is interested in a more rational and predictable tuition policy over the long-term and perhaps cohort-based tuition pricing.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that tuition increases have the most impact on middle-income students who are not covered by the Blue and Gold Plan, but they do help support the return-to-aid system that reduces costs for low-income students. It was suggested that the university could model the effect of tuition increases on the application or yield outcomes of middle-income students, although such an analysis would have to account for tuition pricing in the larger marketplace, and would be beyond the scope of BOARS. Members also noted that the undocumented student support funding is one-time and temporary, and expressed concern about the effect of defunding after the three-year funding period ends.

IX. The Future of the Referral Guarantee

BOARS reviewed models projecting the effect of potential changes to the statewide and ELC eligibility structure on different cohorts of students and on the size of the 2012 referral pool. Models were provided for different ELC and Statewide Index combinations between 6x6 and 9x9. In addition, benchmark data about the success of students with specific ACT or SAT scores was provided to help BOARS determine a basis as to whether to establish a potential minimum SAT/ACT score for ELC eligibility.

Discussion: One member noted that no policy change is likely to reduce the referral pool to zero; it may therefore be better to eliminate the guarantee altogether. It was also noted that the referral pool is not homogenous. It includes both highly competitive students who may have applied only to one of the most selective UC campuses, as well as less competitive students who may have applied to all campuses without receiving any offer of admission. Establishing 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, and encourage campuses that are currently choosing ETR students over ELC students to accept more ELC students.

It was noted that the guarantee is irrelevant to the vast majority of students, as only 181 enrolled at UC Merced following a referral offer. BOARS should strive to disassociate the concept of “eligibility” from the guarantee and redefine it as a set of criteria that entitles students who meet certain criteria to a prioritized review. It was noted that eliminating the statewide guarantee but maintaining the ELC program with a new test score floor would reduce the referral pool but also ensure representation from high schools across the state, although it would be important to model the effect of such a change on diversity and other outcomes. It was also noted that the statewide guarantee has an important function in recognizing good students from schools with a large proportion of high achieving students. It was also noted that the original BOARS eligibility reform proposal to eliminate the statewide guarantee altogether was not supported by the greater Senate.

It was noted that [Regents Policy 2103 C\(4\)](#) is clear that the guarantee is valid only to the extent that space is available in stating that “Freshman applicants deemed Eligible in the Statewide Context or Eligible in the Local Context who are not admitted to any campus where they apply will be offered admission at a UC campus with available space.” [Senate Regulation 465](#) is somewhat less clear on this point, first noting that students who are identified as eligible “... shall be admitted to at least one campus of the University.” and then stating that “Such applicants not selected for admission by any campus to which they apply will be referred to a campus with available spaces.” BOARS may wish to pursue changing the regulation to conform to the Regents policy language while it discusses substantive options for redefining UC eligibility.

Action: BOARS members were encouraged to discuss options for redefining UC eligibility and the future of the referral guarantee with their local admission committees.

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