

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

# ACADEMIC SENATE

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

### Minutes of Meeting

February 7, 2014

#### Part I: Joint Meeting with Governmental Guests – UC Center in Sacramento

##### I. Introductions and Opening Comments

A number of staff members from the legislature, the Governor's office and the Department of Finance joined BOARS to discuss current topics in admissions.

BOARS Chair Johnson noted that the UC Regents have delegated to the faculty the authority to set the "conditions for admission." Within the faculty governance structure, BOARS is responsible for advising the Academic Senate and the President about the systemwide criteria for undergraduate admission. BOARS recognizes that its policies affect many Californians and is sensitive to the outcomes and impacts of any decision, particularly on academic quality, access, and diversity. BOARS also recognizes that UC is a highly selective research university and understands UC faculty want undergraduates who can actively engage in the research enterprise.

Vice President for Student Affairs Sakaki noted that her office works closely with BOARS and other constituencies to develop and implement policy. The new UC President, Janet Napolitano, has unveiled a number of initiatives related to undocumented students, community college transfers, sustainability, graduate students, and military veterans. Steven Handel, a national expert on transfer admissions, recently joined the university as the new Associate Vice President of Undergraduate Admissions.

Senate Chair Jacob noted that UC is slowly recovering from the state funding crisis, but demand for a UC education continues to increase, and state funding continues to lag what UC needs to meet its goals for access and quality.

##### II. Current Issues in Freshman Admissions

Chair Johnson discussed outcomes from the new freshman admission policy and touched on other major topics in freshman admissions, noting that BOARS is interested in state officials' views and concerns about admissions policy. Throughout the discussion, BOARS' governmental guests asked committee members questions to clarify policy details and BOARS' goals.

**New Admissions Policy:** In 2012, UC moved to a new [freshman eligibility construct](#), based on a policy BOARS developed and the Regents approved in 2009. Chair Johnson summarized the key aspects of the new policy: it reduces unnecessary admissions hurdles; increases the proportion of students who are Eligible in the Local Context (ELC) from the top 4% to the top 9% in each high school; decreases from 12.5% to 9% the proportion of high school graduates who are identified as Eligible statewide; and introduces a new Entitled to Review (ETR) category of students who are guaranteed a comprehensive review if they meet several minimum markers of college

readiness, but lack the criteria for the ELC or statewide guarantee. The referral system guarantees all eligible applicants a space on at least one UC campus, though not necessarily to a campus that they applied to. ELC is based on high school GPA only, while statewide eligibility is based on an index of high school GPA and test scores. To be eligible for ETR, a student must be on track to complete the full “a-g” pattern with a 3.0 weighted, capped GPA.

**Initial Policy Outcomes:** In November, BOARS issued a [report](#) summarizing outcomes from the first cohort of students admitted under the new policy. The report found that freshmen who began at UC in fall 2012 performed better academically and were also more diverse compared to those who were selected under the old policy and began in 2010 or 2011. The report also notes that all campuses are finding strong applicants in the ETR pool. However, BOARS’s expectation that the policy would identify about 10.5% of high school graduates as eligible through either the local or the statewide route, or both, was not met. In fact, over 12% of public high school graduates and over 13% of all California high school graduates were found to be eligible in the 2013 admission cycle. Chair Johnson noted that there are two causes for this. First, the model used to estimate the statewide guarantee pool captured more than the target 9% of public high school graduates, and second, the model overestimated the overlap between those who were ELC and those who were eligible according to the statewide index. Including students admitted from the ETR pool, 14.9% of total public CA high school graduates were admitted to UC in 2013. In response to the identified failure of the index to identify the correct percentage of high school graduates, BOARS made adjustments to the index that will take effect for students entering UC in 2015.

**The Referral Pool and Capacity Issues:** Chair Johnson noted that there is a larger problem related to the guarantee pool. UC Merced, currently the only campus taking referral students, is becoming more selective and will soon lose the capacity to accept all referrals. Merced also wants to grow graduate enrollment at a higher rate than it has, which will affect its ability to enroll undergraduates. BOARS is reviewing options for modifying the 9-by-9 construct to meet the current fiscal and space environment. The problem may not be enormous in the near term, in that of the 10,000 students in the total potential referral pool last year, only 181 enrolled at Merced.

**Nonresident Admission:** All UC campuses are actively recruiting and enrolling more tuition-paying nonresidents. Campuses argue that the additional tuition revenue allows them to restore programs that were defunded during the state budget cuts, that international and domestic nonresident students contribute to diversity, and that California students benefit from exposure to students who have experienced learning in different ways. BOARS has established [principles](#) for nonresident admission, and asked each campus to report annually on the extent to which the nonresidents they admit “compare favorably” to the residents they admit. It was noted that nonresidents comprise less than 2% of undergraduate enrollments at Merced.

**Other Issues:** BOARS does not usually discuss enrollment management or enrollment targets. UCOP negotiates enrollment targets with the campuses to strike a balance between individual campus aspirations and systemwide goals. Occasionally a campus will have a larger than expected yield, which requires them to make adjustments the following year. Nor has BOARS discussed an early admission option.

### III. Current Issues in Transfer Admissions

**BOARS' Support for the Transfer Path:** UC does a good job of attracting and enrolling community college transfers who, once admitted, tend to perform as well as students who begin at UC as freshmen. However, UC has been asked to do more to acknowledge CA Senate Bill 1440 and Assembly Bill 2302, legislation that instructed CSU and the community colleges to build associates degrees that would guarantee transfer between those systems and asked UC to develop similar transfer pathways. BOARS and the Academic Senate have responded in several ways. In 2012, the Senate established a [new transfer pathways](#) policy, which encourages prospective transfers to prepare for a specific major and guarantees a review to transfer applicants who complete one of the associate degrees for transfer offered by a California community college, with a minimum GPA. BOARS also recently approved a new criterion for the [Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admission](#) recognizing in the review of transfer students those who are on track to complete the Transfer AA/AS degrees.

**Transfer Action Team:** President Napolitano views the transfer process as a critical part of UC's Master Plan commitment and its ability to serve the state and its diverse populations. Last fall, she charged a Transfer Action Team to develop recommendations for making the transfer path less complex and more transparent, and for expanding UC's reach into a broader range of community colleges. The Action Team will be recommending that UC do more to align local transfer admissions processes with the CCC/CSU Transfer Model Curricula, and to increase faculty involvement in the course identification numbering (C-ID) project.

**Local Transfer Agreements:** Many students value the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program, which is now available at six UC campuses and provides clear pathways between the community colleges and UC. Some community college students view their local UC as the only viable transfer option due to work or family obligations that tie them to a community. UC San Diego's Universitylink program recognizes this by giving admission preference to low-income transfer students at nine San Diego area community colleges who fulfill specific academic requirements.

**Transfer Articulation:** UC has been criticized for maintaining individual course articulation agreements between UC campuses and community colleges, rather than working toward common agreements that cross all campuses or disciplines. However, UC faculty want transfers to arrive prepared for UC-level work. Some faculty are concerned that CCC courses are not always equivalent to UC courses and that the content of CCC/CSU Transfer Model Curricula does not always reflect the appropriate major preparation. Moreover, faculty who teach in the same or similar discipline at different UC campuses often have different views about what constitutes the best major preparation, which cannot remain static, but must constantly change and grow to adapt to the latest advances in a field.

It was noted that Admission by Examination, transfer from another four-year institution to UC, and transfer from one UC to another UC, are rare admissions pathways.

#### **IV. The Future of the Referral Pool and the Admissions Guarantee**

Chair Johnson noted that BOARS has been discussing options for adjusting the 9-by-9 to help reduce pressure on the referral pool in a way that would still allow campuses to admit many of the best students through ETR. He also noted that the referral process, with the guarantee of admission to at least one UC campus for all eligible applicants, is still Regents policy, though space constraints at UC campuses make its future less clear. Some have argued that UC should eliminate the guarantee altogether. Others have suggested that the 9-by-9 eligibility construct can be modified in a way to alleviate the problems that the system faces as all campuses become competitive for admission. Chair Johnson asked how a decision to scale back the 9-by-9 might be received in Sacramento.

BOARS members noted that the referral guarantee is not important to most high school students, who are primarily concerned about whether they are admitted to the UC campus of their choice. However, some students do value the guarantee, and BOARS considers the guarantee an important promise to Californians. Several guests noted that UC would need to explain the purpose of any change and who it would affect. Policymakers want UC to reflect the state and would want any change to preserve diversity, especially with regard to the growing Latino population. State leaders are also interested in increasing the completion rate and minimizing the achievement gap, and want to ensure that the students UC admits are able to succeed at the university.

#### **V. UC's Relationship to K-12**

UC faculty believe strongly in UC's public service mission and in extending the promise of a college education to a broad range of communities and groups, including those who have traditionally been underserved by higher education. Faculty are also concerned about poor preparation and disparities within the K-12 system and how those factors affect the UC pipeline. Faculty will be watching to see if and how California's adoption of the Common Core State Standards and the Smarter Balanced Assessment will impact college preparation. Many faculty expect the Common Core to be a difficult adjustment for K-12, but believe it will be a large step forward in the long run. At the same time, faculty are aware that test preparation is only part of college preparation. It does not define what it means to be educated nor should it be the exclusive marker of college preparation.

## Part II: BOARS Meeting

### I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS Minutes of January 10, 2014

**Action:** BOARS approved the January minutes.

### II. Announcements from the Senate Chair

- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair*

At the January Regents meeting, Provost Dorr reported on the progress of UC's online education efforts, including the courses faculty are developing through the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative, and the development of a pilot system to facilitate cross-campus enrollment in online courses. President Napolitano and the heads of the CSU and CCC systems made a joint presentation about the need to strengthen the Master Plan for Higher Education. The Regents also heard a report about the effect of federal budget sequestration on faculty research grants. In his comments to the Regents, Senate Chair Jacob noted that while a four-year graduation rate is a worthy goal, UC must also preserve the opportunities students have to study a broad array of subjects, change majors, and take extra time to realize their academic passion.

### III. Consultation with UCOP – Office of Admissions

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

**Vice President Sakaki:** President Napolitano has been meeting with various student groups, including those representing undocumented students, transfers, and veterans. She plans to attend meetings of the CSU Trustees and the CCC Board of Governors, and will be working with the higher education segment leaders on issues of common interest such as K-12 early outreach and IT procurement. Vice President Sakaki will co-present the Campus Climate Survey results at the March Regents meeting.

**Transfer Action Team Draft Recommendations:** Vice President Sakaki and Chair Johnson co-chair the UC Transfer Action Team, charged by the President with recommending strategies for streamlining the transfer process, increasing the transfer graduation rate, and possibly increasing the number of transfer students. The Action Team has consulted a broad range of internal and external constituencies, is finalizing its report, and expects to present recommendations at the March Regents meeting. There are five main recommendations are under discussion:

1. Upgrade the transfer message with a new universitywide communications and technology strategy.
2. Improve UC's geographic, ethnic, and socio-economic diversity by creating a stronger presence at every CCC.
3. Welcome students to campuses with a Transfer Success Kit.

4. Organize for academic success by streamlining the transfer preparation process through greater involvement in the Course Identification Numbering system (C-ID) and by evaluating the UC Transfer Paths in light of the new Associates Degrees for Transfer.
5. Reaffirm UC's commitment to transfer students on every campus.

**Discussion:** It was noted that the community colleges categorize their students as “transfer directed,” “transfer prepared,” and “transfer ready.” It was noted that UC should understand the extent to which each of these groups includes students UC should target, but UC should not neglect outreach to community colleges students who may not be considering transfer to UC. It was also noted that up to 80% of CCC counselors are part-time and that some community colleges are less transfer focused than vocational training focused.

BOARS members suggested that UC develop transfer podcasts and provide scholarships, financial aid, or other recognition to successful UC transfer students who serve as transfer ambassadors at college fairs and other venues. It was also suggested that a portion of the application fee be directed to fund transfer outreach activities.

#### **IV. Campus Compare Favorably Analyses**

Eight of the nine undergraduate campuses have submitted their compare favorably reports to BOARS. All campuses say they have analyzed the data and are admitting nonresident students who compare favorably to residents. It was suggested that BOARS write a brief report summarizing what the campuses have provided.

**Action:** The committee analyst will draft a report summarizing outcomes reported by the campuses.

#### **V. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 465**

In January, BOARS approved a revision to Senate Regulation 465 intended to align it with [Regents' Policy 2103 C](#) by clearly qualifying the admissions guarantee described in the regulation as valid only if space is available. Following that decision, BOARS discussed additional minor edits to the approved revision over email after a member expressed concerns about its clarity. It has also been noted that BOARS' authority does not extend beyond setting the conditions for admission. Admission depends on resources, but neither BOARS nor the Academic Senate can address resources, nor do they have the capacity to offer or deliver a guarantee. Therefore, it has been suggested that it may have been outside BOARS' authority to interpret Regents policy when it wrote SR 465 in 2009. Prior to 2009, none of the current provisions related to the guarantee, including ELC, were mentioned in the Senate regulations.

**Discussion:** It was suggested that BOARS might completely strike from SR 465 the phrase about the referral (“Such applicants not selected for admission by any campus to which they apply will be referred to a campus with available spaces.”) It was also suggested that BOARS might totally eliminate SR 465. BOARS members agreed that the committee should discuss these additional issues in more depth before moving forward with a proposed revision.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded that BOARS rescind its January 10, 2014 vote to revise Senate Regulation 465. The motion carried by a vote of 10-1. BOARS will continue the discussion in March.

## **VI. Report on First-year Academic Performance of Freshman Entrants in fall 2012**

BOARS received two new UCOP reports analyzing first-year academic performance, probation, and persistence outcomes of freshmen who entered UC in fall 2012, based on their high school GPA and test scores. BOARS will review and discuss the reports in more depth at the March meeting. It was noted that introducing a test score floor for Eligibility in the Local Context will be controversial, but the data suggest that students who enter the University with low test scores were much more likely to be on probation after their first year at UC, and were much less likely to persist into their sophomore year. It was also noted that the College Board has established college readiness benchmark scores of 500 on each of its three Reasoning tests, and that the ACT has also established college readiness benchmarks for their tests. It may be appropriate for a highly selective institution like UC to establish its own benchmarks for eligibility and the associated guarantee. However, BOARS will need to carefully examine the effect that any change would be expected to have on the demographics of the students affected.

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm  
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: George Johnson