

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of Meeting

December 9, 2011

I. Consent Calendar

Action: BOARS approved the November 4, 2011 Minutes.

II. Chair's Announcements

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

At its November 30 meeting, the Academic Council discussed reports from Senate divisions about the Occupy movement, the recent protests and police actions at Davis and Berkeley, and the investigations into those incidents currently underway. Council also adopted a number of [statements](#) regarding the incidents at a special teleconference meeting earlier in the month.

UCEP and other Senate committees are discussing the UC Online Instruction Pilot Project, which is evaluating the effectiveness of 23 lower-division online courses geared to UC students, and the UC Online Education (UCOE) project, which is intended to offer UC lower-division online courses to a broader audience. Some organizers have indicated that they intend UCOE to be a new path to upper division status. To prepare for the possibility that a significant number of non-UC students will take UCOE courses for transfer admission, the chair of UCEP has asked BOARS to collaborate on Senate and administrative policies and regulations related to UCOE around eligibility, admissions, course approval, and other topics. Chair Jacob said he thought non UC students wishing to enroll in a UCOE course probably can do so through concurrent enrollment at the campus offering the course, similar to what is used by students enrolled in regular UC courses when space is available. Director Jeffery, however, asserted that this is not the current plan.

Director Jeffery said UCOE courses will be regular lower division UC courses that have been approved at a UC campus. The administrative issues around cross-campus instruction and credit transfer for UC and non UC students need to be resolved. The closest model is Summer Session, not Extension. It was suggested that residency regulations be used to manage the problem. BOARS will address this issue at future meetings.

Governor Brown signed into law [SB 532 \(Hernandez\)](#) regarding college credit for International Baccalaureate coursework taken in high school, which is consistent with current UC practice, so it appears no action in relation to SB 532 is necessary. UC indicated that it would end its participation in the Department of Defense's (DOD) Tuition Assistance Program over concerns about a new MOU the DOD is requiring participating institutions to sign, which UC and other institutions believe dilutes academic standards. UC's stance may have an effect; there is a new effort in the United States Senate to postpone and modify the MOU at the request of a number of Universities across the country. Provost Pitts sent a letter to campuses explaining the situation and urging them to take steps to find alternate tuition assistance to former service personnel, as the numbers are very small.

III. Consultation with the Office of Admissions

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*

Issue: BOARS asked the Office of Admissions to provide the Committee with preliminary fall 2012 application data to help inform early discussions about the impact of the new admissions policy on applicant numbers, the ability of campuses to meet the workload demands of the policy, and UC's ability to admit the 9% ELC pool through the existing referral process. Chair Jacob had circulated the data to BOARS members before the meeting, asking them to consult with their Admissions Director about whether they have sufficient resources to implement the required individualized review of all files. The Office of Admissions emphasized that the application data are preliminary and subject to change and verification

Report: Over 160,000 separate applicants submitted more than 538,000 applications to UC, the largest total ever. Total applicant numbers rose 13% over the previous year. Freshman applicants increased by 11.5%, but transfer applicants decreased 6.5%, which may be the effect of cuts at the CCC. Nonresident applicants rose 43%, which is expected to increase the overall quality and selectivity of the nonresident pool but also create more work for campuses, as nonresident applications are more labor intensive to review. (This added workload may be offset slightly by the decrease in transfer applications.) It is notable that freshman applicants grew in the context of a declining California public high school graduate population.

The total ELC applicant pool grew by 132% under the new policy increasing the ELC pool from 4% to 9%. 14,000 applicants are newly eligible in the new ELC 5-9% category. The 4% ELC pool grew by 30%, which may be an effect of the new process of evaluating ELC status. UC is trying to determine which of these students may not truly be in the top 4%, since some of the numbers self-reported on the application may differ from the actual transcript. It was noted that the 4% ELC group is larger than the 5-9% group, because the strongest students in a high school are most likely to apply to UC. The impact of these increases on the referral pool will depend in part on the balance between fall 2012 freshman and transfer targets.

BOARS members reported on their conversations with admissions offices about the preliminary data. The increase in nonresident applications exceeded expectations on many campuses, and some are worried that they will not be able to implement individualized review for the entire pool. Berkeley has already hired additional readers, and while some admissions offices expect to receive additional resources, others are less certain. Some admissions offices have requested budget augmentations but received no response, and others are even being targeted for budget reductions that will force them to cut staff. It was noted that the acceleration of nonresident recruitment last year had a clear effect on the applicant pool. Campuses should now step up and provide admissions offices with sufficient resources to review the new applications.

BOARS members expressed uncertainty about how campuses are using the application fee revenue. A quick calculation reveals that some campuses are providing their admissions offices with \$10 or less per application when UC is charging \$70 per application and net receipts taking into account fee waivers is probably at least \$45 per application. Chair Jacob noted that BOARS based its funding metric on the personnel required to do the job right, recommending one permanent FTE and three seasonal readers for every 2000 applications. BOARS cannot

micromanage the budget process; only recommend that qualified personnel be available. One member noted that it is important to consider the effect of the application fee on the number and kind of people who apply. Members agreed that it would be useful to see data on application fee revenue and the number of fee waivers.

IV. Executive Session – International Transfer Admission

Action: BOARS unanimously approved a resolution regarding guarantee programs for international transfer admission to UC.

V. Executive Session – Consultation with President Yudof

BOARS met with the President in executive session.

VI. Resolution on the Evaluation of Residents and Nonresidents

BOARS discussed a resolution related to the evaluation of residents and nonresidents. The Committee recognizes that there is growing pressure on campuses to admit more nonresidents, and sees the resolution as a way to ensure that campuses continue to meet BOARS’ “[compare favorably](#)” rule and also to compel a measure of accountability by asking campuses to report annually to BOARS on their implementation of the rule. It was noted that BOARS established the “compare favorably” rule to ensure that residents denied admission to UC cannot claim that they were displaced by a nonresident with credentials that did not compare but who was willing to pay higher tuition. It was also noted that the recent increase in nonresident applications may help ensure that the compare favorably rule is sustained.

It was noted that the Regents are expecting a report from BOARS in July on comprehensive review and the implementation of holistic review. Regent Island had also asked BOARS to establish metrics to measure the success of the new admissions policy.

Action: BOARS will continue work on the resolution over email.

VII. Consultation with UCOP - Russ Rumberger

- *Russell Rumberger, Vice Provost for Education Partnerships*

Vice Provost Rumberger joined BOARS to share his perspectives about online education in high schools. He serves on a [Technical Working Group](#) convened by the U.S. Department of Education that is developing an evidence-based framework that can help inform technology developers, policy makers, educators, students, parents, and others about the effectiveness of online learning and new and emerging learning technologies as they relate to educational outcomes.

Online learning and learning technologies are rapidly expanding and developing. The sheer volume and variety of technologies available and the absence of research about their effectiveness has made it difficult for consumers to judge their value. The involvement of the private sector in the industry has also raised questions and concerns.

The working group is not evaluating specific technologies; they are gathering and documenting Use Cases on learning technologies around the country and inviting the public to submit ideas through the website. They believe it may be possible to gather data about the effectiveness of online education in real time, as technologies are developed and implemented, to inform the framework.

He said he hopes BOARS will review its policy for online 'a-g' with the goal of improving access and competitive eligibility to underrepresented students at less resourced schools without access to the complete a-g curriculum.

Discussion: One member noted that the BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee is grappling with the possibility that online technologies could widen achievement gaps—that is, students with better access to technology, or money to pay for courses, will have an advantage over poorer students. Faculty are limited in their ability to assess the quality of the programs and skeptical that profit driven online vendors have an incentive to care about quality or that outreach to underserved communities will be one of their central missions or priorities. The subcommittee has also been unable to find solid data about basic questions such as who is taking online courses and learning outcomes for students who took online courses in high school.

Vice Provost Rumberger noted that many low-income households lack access to the technology that would allow them to participate in online education. UC should be cautious about moving forward and should make certain that the online vendors they approve are sensitive to these issues by asking them how they ensure equitable access to technology. He noted that some courses have very high rates of attrition, and that one of the primary reasons high schools use online education is for credit recovery.

VIII. ELC Referral Pool

Issue: Members reported on discussions with committees and admissions directors about the willingness of campuses to take a portion of ELC students in the referral pool as well as the logistics of establishing a systemwide ELC referral pool that all campuses can access. The proposal is to allow all campuses the opportunity to consider the referral pool, with the hope that ELC students might receive a referral offer from campuses other than Merced. There is no requirement that campuses consider the pool, and these referral offers would most likely be made along side wait-list offers.

Discussion: Members reported some resistance to a new ELC referral pool. Some campuses are concerned that they will be asked or forced to take less qualified applicants, and others are concerned about adding workload to already overburdened admissions offices. There is concern about favoring ELC referrals who had not applied to the campus over wait listed students who had applied. Campuses also recognize that there will be very good students in the ELC referral pool, including students a campus would have admitted had they applied. Campuses seeking geographic diversity would also benefit from the ELC referral pool. This is an opportunity for campuses, not a requirement. Any campus can opt-out. It was noted that UC established the nonresident referral pool without consulting BOARS and it was felt that residents deserve similar consideration.

Director Jeffery said the admissions directors support expanding the sharing process to the entire referral pool, not just those with ELC status. The directors are also concerned about sending rejected ELC referral students an additional letter that could unrealistically raise expectations.

Action: Circulate the final draft proposal for accommodating the full ELC pool.

IX. Transfer Issues

BOARS Transfer Proposal: BOARS reviewed feedback from Senate divisions and committees to its [Transfer Admissions Proposal](#). Some reviewers expressed general support for the proposal, and others expressed major concerns. One concern was about allowing flexibility with regard to admitting applicants with the strongest likelihood of completing their major in two years. Some reviewers noted the difficulty of applying the proposal to all majors—both due to a lack of access at the CCC to some pre-major courses, and to more stringent pre-major requirements in some UC departments. Others noted that students should have the freedom to explore different intellectual paths and to change majors, and that the two-year requirement could disadvantage First Generation students lacking the social capital to know how to prepare for a major. There were also concerns about the quality of CCC courses, the resources required to implement the policy, and the idea that politics are driving educational policy. Some reviewers were also opposed to a systemwide policy trampling department autonomy.

Chair Jacob noted that the proposal does allow flexibility and should be clearer on that point. Faculty have similar concerns about the quality of high school courses, but we have to educate the students we have. UC is responding to legislation, but that legislation also serves as good advice and provides a useful roadmap for students. It is in UC's best interest to get involved, as the SB1440 AA transfer degrees could establish patterns of course behavior at the CCCs. Campuses are already increasing their emphasis on major preparation, and students are more likely to be caught off guard if the preparation requirements are not clear and transparent.

Shawn Brick noted that UC has so far convened nine transfer articulation groups to discuss commonalities in the lower-division major requirements for their discipline across campuses. UCOP is not asking departments to become more uniform but to identify existing requirements that are uniform to help establish baseline advice for the major.

Discussion: There was concern that increasing major preparation requirements could have the unintended effect of de-motivating Community College students from transferring to a four year institution if they know they will have to spend another year at a CCC fulfilling pre-major requirements. Chair Jacob agreed that this is a serious and central concern.

One member noted the problem of “rogue” departments that do not recognize any CCC transfer work, and another recommended fixing ASSIST. Shawn Brick mentioned that the three segments are entering into a new contract with an outside vendor to improve ASSIST.

UC Santa Cruz's major mapping effort is attempting to clarify the courses associated with any major for both native and transfer students. The campus believes it is important to give students tools that will allow them to self-advise.

The UCSD admissions committee has voted to exit the TAG program.

Action: The Transfer Subcommittee will discuss next steps for the transfer proposal and report back to BOARS.

Excess Unit Cap Policy: Shawn Brick surveyed the campuses about their current policies and practices for barring students with more than 80 units of coursework from transfer, when the total number of units includes coursework from a four-year institution. There is variation across campuses. Several campuses cap at 80/120 semester/quarter units, others at 86 units, and others at 90. The common rationale for the policy is that students should take the majority of their upper division work at that campus. Campus policies do not distinguish between upper and lower division units.

BOARS members noted that it would be more logical to apply the cap only to lower division units, to treat lower division units from a four-year institution and a CCC identically in the calculation of the unit cap total, and/or to not accept upper division units from four-year institutions. It was noted that some students will try a four year institution, decide they are unable to afford it, and return to the CCC. Credits from another university should not automatically preclude a student from transferring to UC. BOARS agreed to a rule change that would ensure that students who attend a 4-year institution for a term immediately out of high school and then transfer to a CCC, or who attend a 4-year institution for a semester overseas as part of an education abroad experience in the middle of their CCC years, cannot be denied admission on the basis of extra units acquired during those times.

Action: Shawn Brick will return to BOARS with a proposed revision of the Working Rules that addresses the desired changes relating to units acquired right after high school or during education abroad.

X. Allowing LGBT applicants to Self-Identify on the Application

BOARS reviewed a draft memo responding to the proposal based on discussions in October and November. It was recommended that the reference to UC Undergraduate Experience Survey be dropped from the memo.

Action: BOARS approved the memo with the suggested amendment.

BOARS will meet on January 6 via teleconference. The entire committee will meet between 10:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m. PST, followed by a session for the subcommittees between 1:30 p.m. and 2:30 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Bill Jacob