

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

December 7, 2012

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the November 2, 2012 BOARS Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the November minutes.

II. Announcements

- *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*

The November Academic Council meeting included a discussion about quality measures identified by the UC administration in the [2013-14 budget](#) as areas for investment, including the student-faculty ratio. Council also discussed a request from UCEP that divisions update local policies for granting course credit to meet new WASC requirements.

State legislative staff have amended the topics BOARS proposed for a joint meeting in February or March in Sacramento with policymakers to include: “UC’s commitment to California students,” “higher education accountability,” and “means of coordination among the segments.”

Campuses have been asked to report to BOARS by January 24 about the extent to which they are meeting BOARS’ “compare favorably” standard with regard to nonresident admission. BOARS members noted the difficulty of applying the compare favorably standard to international applicants for whom there is limited information on the holistic review factors used to evaluate domestic applicants. It was also noted that the yield rate is much smaller for nonresidents relative to the admission rate for California residents.

A portion of the January Regents meeting will focus on online education and may touch on the role of massive open online courses (MOOCs) in higher education. In the future, UC may be asked to grant credit for MOOCs, which will require the Senate to consider how to assess course quality and issues such as academic integrity.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President Student Affairs*
- *Michael Trevino, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

Preliminary 2013 Application Data

The fall 2013 application cycle closed on November 30, and the Apply UC system performed exceptionally well. Interest in UC remains strong. Preliminary application data show that UC received applications from nearly 175,000 individuals, an all-time record. The total number of applications increased by 8.5%, which was driven largely by a 38% increase in international freshman applications. Applications from California resident freshmen also rose by nearly 5%, while the number of California high school graduates is expected to be essentially unchanged.

The University expects campuses to have enough funding and space only to maintain or increase slightly seats for California residents. As such, all campuses are expected to become even more selective. UC already enrolls at least 11,000, and as many as 37,000, unfunded California resident undergraduates. UCOP will provide final and more detailed application information to BOARS in January.

Campus requirements and procedures for assessing non-native English speakers

UCOP surveyed campuses about their requirements and procedures for reviewing and admitting non-native English speakers. All campuses require such applicants to demonstrate English proficiency with a minimum composite score on a standardized test such as the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Some campuses also review the four TOEFL sub-scores, and others are considering how they might use the sub-scores. One campus is considering the use of SAT writing and verbal scores. Campuses also use the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) to place students in UC English courses. A variety of academic and social services are available to students after they enroll, including tutoring, academic advising, residential services, and peer support groups.

Discussion: It was noted that campuses report some international students still struggle at UC due to insufficient English preparation. One campus dismissed 12% of its international freshmen at the end of the 2011-12 academic year. BOARS may want to collect disqualification data from other campuses and consider whether the [TOEFL exam](#) and/or the minimum TOEFL score of 80 currently used by campuses are effectively assessing English language skills. BOARS members stated that UC should do all it can to ensure that the international students it admits can succeed. The consequences of disqualification are huge, and may include deportation. It was noted that some campuses host pre-enrollment summer programs for international students, and that TOEFL sub-scores might help campuses identify applicants who would benefit from additional services. It was noted that the College Board now offers AP courses in English in Chinese high schools to help address the problem. Members questioned whether the academic and social services available to International students area adequate, and also noted that California residents who are English language learners also have needs that require similar resources.

IV. Re-write of Senate Regulation 478 to accommodate IGETC for STEM

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) has approved language for a new IGETC sequence that accommodates STEM majors. ICAS requires the formal approval of the UC and CSU Senates to add the sequence to the [IGETC Standards](#) document. Academic Council has approved the revisions in principle and asked BOARS to propose amendments to [SR 478](#) to reflect the revisions.

BOARS reviewed possible new language for SR 478, which states that students intending to enter STEM majors may complete up to three of the IGETC sequence courses post transfer, but only in the areas of Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Science, or Foreign Language. The revision also makes clear that “partial IGETC” allows any transfer to complete up to two of the IGETC courses after transfer with the exception of English Composition, Critical Thinking, or Mathematics/ Quantitative Reasoning. The proposed revision would eliminate the detailed descriptions of each IGETC subject area to streamline the regulation, and align its format with the “a-g” subject descriptions in SR 424. More detailed information on IGETC would be

provided by UCOP in a manner similar to the *A-G Guide*, which provides detail about acceptable “a-g” courses listed in SR 424.

Discussion: Members expressed support for adding the IGETC for STEM provision and for simplifying the regulations. The simplified IGETC subject area descriptions should maintain essential details such as the requirement that one of the required Physical and Biological Sciences courses must be a laboratory course. The regulation also should align exactly with the sequence approved by ICAS. It was 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 as specified in AB 1440.

Action: BOARS will review a new version of the regulation in January.

V. Implementation of New Transfer Admissions Policy

BOARS reviewed an updated plan and timeline for the local implementation of the new transfer admission policy. A memo from BOARS will ask campus admission directors to ask each campus department or program to develop a UC Transfer Curriculum that identifies the appropriate major preparation for that program. The memo will note that UC already has *Transfer Preparation Paths* for the top 20 majors, which summarize the systemwide and campus-specific lower division preparation required (or highly recommended) for each major. It will ask those majors to review their existing transfer requirements in light of the systemwide Transfer Preparation Paths and the relevant Transfer Model Curricula developed jointly by CSU and the CCCs, and will suggest that the Transfer Preparation Paths be renamed as UC Transfer Curricula. Other programs and majors will be invited to define major preparation requirements. Campuses will be asked to report on their progress to BOARS by the end of the 2012-13 academic year. It was noted that the UC Transfer Curricula are not intended to be roadblocks to transfer, but guides to help transfers prepare for success.

Action: The letter will be sent to admissions directors.

VI. Transferable Quantitative Courses

Current UC policy requires transfers to complete a one semester quantitative course that includes Intermediate Algebra as a prerequisite. Some Community College faculty are concerned that too many students cannot pass Intermediate Algebra and therefore fail to transfer, and have proposed alternative math transfer pathways designed for students who do not plan to major in a STEM field. One approach is to prepare students to pass courses that are already approved for UC transfer articulation without taking Intermediate Algebra. Instead, students are provided with the specific prerequisite math content needed to succeed in the transferrable course, but may not be required to learn the broader set of topics covered in Intermediate Algebra. The issue is controversial, with some faculty concerned that the alternative pathways dilute educational standards and that all students should be required to complete Intermediate Algebra, whether or not it is relevant to their major.

BOARS discussed possible options for modifying UC policy to address the barrier that Intermediate Algebra represents for some students who want to transfer into a non-STEM major. One proposal is to add a separate quantitative reasoning path to fulfill this transfer requirement

for non-STEM majors. STEM majors would continue to take the existing pathway requiring the Intermediate Algebra prerequisite.

Discussion: Some BOARS members expressed concern about weakening the math requirement, noting that UC should expect all admitted students to have a broad level of literacy that includes mathematics generally, in addition to a specific standard of quantitative experience that is only obtained through Intermediate Algebra. An example was given that UC requires foreign language proficiency for transfers to Physics, although foreign language does not directly relate to Physics. Other members expressed support for an alternative path, noting that that knowledge of Intermediate Algebra is not critical to all majors, and that SAT math scores do not correlate strongly to college success in the non-STEM fields. It was noted that the proposal would not change the content of courses that have already been approved for transfer articulation, but that may not rely on Intermediate Algebra in a significant way. Instead, the prerequisite for those courses would be tailored with just enough math content to prepare students to pass the course. There was discussion that an integrated two-semester sequence combining Intermediate Algebra and Statistics would be acceptable provided that the math content in the full sequence is not at a level below that of Intermediate Algebra.

VII. Enrollment Planning and Management

Issue: UCOP is updating UC's long-range enrollment plan for the first time since 2008, to use with rebenching and to reflect new funding circumstances and campus academic goals. Chair Johnson asked BOARS members to consider principles to guide the effort. Senate Chair Powell noted that UCOP would be sending each campus a template to initiate an iterative discussion about campus and systemwide goals, Master Plan expectations, and other considerations. The final UC enrollment plan will require campuses and the system to reach agreement on a number of issues. He encouraged BOARS members to help engage local committees and senates in the process.

Discussion: One member suggested the principle that UC should reserve all state-funded seats for California residents; however, it was also noted that reaching agreement on what a "state funded" student is and how many exist will be difficult. UC believes it enrolls at least 11,000, and perhaps as many as 37,000, unfunded students compared to a pre-cuts baseline, while the state contends there are no unfunded students, only underfunded students. It was noted that the faculty have limited power in conversations about enrollment management; chancellors set an overall target number and deans negotiate numbers for their programs. It was noted that some nonresident students have reported that they are being labeled by California resident students as "money bags" who are brought in only because they can pay the nonresident tuition, ignoring their academic abilities.

VIII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

- *Nina Costales, High School Articulation Coordinator*

UCOP High School Articulation staff reviewed courses submitted by high schools for "a-g" certification to ensure that the courses meet the criteria established by UC faculty. The lists of approved courses are posted on the [UC Doorways](#) website. Staff received over 22,000

submissions during the 2012-13 review cycle, which closed September 16. The submissions include nearly 5,000 new courses, in addition to existing course revisions and re-submissions.

The evaluation guidelines require each course submission to include a course description, purpose, and outline, a list of materials and key assignments, and descriptions of instructional methods and assessment methods and tools. The rubrics provide more detailed guidance about the knowledge and skills students are expected develop through the course. Schools have the opportunity to resubmit courses to address missing criteria.

The subcommittee reviewed the general “a-g” course evaluation guidelines and subject-specific evaluation rubrics used by UC articulation analysts. The subcommittee also reviewed an example of a course submission that was rejected and approved upon re-submission.

Articulation staff want to add more specificity to each [subject area](#) description in the “a-g” Guide, and are seeking guidance from faculty about the academic criteria they value in a course. The additional specificity also will help high schools design better courses. In addition, UCOP analysts seek faculty expertise in the review of courses in specific areas such as computer science, robotics, web design, and game design.

Action: Articulation staff will bring individual subject area rubrics to a future subcommittee meeting.

IX. Data Analysis Subcommittee

- *Michael Trevino, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research*

The subcommittee reviewed options for adjusting the statewide index to align the overall guarantee pool with the 10.5% target, and admissions outcomes with Master Plan expectations, along with related projected outcomes and effects on different student populations and high schools. One option that seemed promising to the subcommittee is to meet the 10.5% target by adjusting the statewide index to produce a 7.5% statewide guarantee. UCOP agreed to provide new simulations of the effect of this adjustment on 2013 applications. It was noted that the Regents may need to approve such a change to the index, because the “9x9” construct appears in [Regental policy](#).

X. Other Topics

Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs)

Chair Powell asked BOARS to opine on whether it should be possible for a student to take a MOOC developed by a UC faculty member for UC credit or for a student to test out of such a course for UC credit. He noted that a number of academic and logistical issues and questions would have to be addressed. Would the course have to include in-person discussion sections or other elements to make it acceptable as a UC quality course? Would the UC instructor have to require a special or additional assessment for UC students taking the course? Could a student at one UC campus take a MOOC offered by a faculty member at another UC campus, and how would that faculty member get credit for the course taken by a student on another UC campus?

It was noted that there is a policy mechanism to allow a course to be offered as a systemwide course, but no financial model that would allow the transfer of funding across campuses. It was

noted that there will likely be strong opposition to the MOOC model from some faculty, particularly in arts and humanities disciplines. An important distinction is that a MOOC does not replicate the undergraduate experience, and an exam would not be sufficient to assess student learning in the course.

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