

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
ANNUAL REPORT 2011-12**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2011-12 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 145](#), to advise the President and Senate agencies on the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. The BOARS chair also charged two subcommittees – Transfer and Articulation and Evaluation – with reporting to the parent committee about specific topics. One hour of each regular committee meeting was set aside for subcommittee break-outs; the subcommittees also met between meetings via teleconference. BOARS also collaborated closely with consultants in the UCOP Office of Admissions, and met jointly with the campus admissions directors in July. The major activities of BOARS and its subcommittees, and the issues they addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

ASSESSING THE NEW FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS POLICY

At the start of the year, BOARS worked with staff from the Office of Admissions and the Office of Institutional Research to develop research questions and propose data analyses that would help BOARS evaluate outcomes from the Freshman Admissions Reform Policy taking effect for the fall 2012 freshman class. Throughout the year, data gradually emerged about student cohorts who applied to UC, were admitted, and who submitted Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs), which attempted to capture changes resulting from the new policy. BOARS reviewed both systemwide and campus-specific data for each of these pools, and compared outcomes to the past for such indicators as GPA and SAT score, residency status, ethnicity, First Generation College status, and the student's high school API ranking. BOARS also considered the characteristics of student cohorts who did and did not take the newly optional SAT Subject Exams and their likelihood of admission; applicants and admitted students from the expanded Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) pool and new Entitled to Review (ETR) pool; the effect of the ELC designation on admissions outcomes for CA resident applicants from public high schools; a logistical regression simulation predicting how the cohort of residents applying to UC in 2011 under the old admissions model might have fared under the 2012 Entitled to Review criteria; and data comparing the credentials of different residency groups based on academic index score, unweighted GPA, and test scores.

UC received 126,455 applications for freshman admission (unduplicated count) for fall 2012, a 19.1% increase over 2011; including 93,379 applications from California residents, a 9.8% increase over 2011. Much of the large overall increase can be attributed to a significant rise in non-resident applications (50% domestic non-resident and 66% international), but given the relatively unchanged high school graduation rate, it is possible that the new ETR category and reduced testing requirement encouraged more CA residents to apply to UC.

80,289 of total applicants and 61,433 of the 93,379 CA resident applicants (66%) were admitted to a campus to which they applied (additional applicants received referral or wait-list offers). 56,231 of the 93,379 CA resident applicants met the criteria for an admission guarantee; 26,869 met the ETR criteria, and 10,204 did not meet either. The number of guaranteed applicants is

larger than was anticipated when the policy was designed due to a higher than expected number of students who met the statewide index but who were not ELC.

81,281 of approximately 399,050 total 2012 California public high school graduates (20%) applied to UC. 59,579 of these applicants (14.9% of total public CA high school graduates) received an offer of admission, which shows that UC is meeting and exceeding its Master Plan obligation to select from the top 12.5% of California high school graduates. BOARS believes UC needs to advertise this fact widely. It is testament to the University's deep and ongoing commitment to California that it can honor the Master Plan and expand access in the current financial environment, and at a time when the other two public higher education segments are contracting access.

Overall, the pools of applicants and admitted students had a similar academic profile, and were slightly more diverse socioeconomically, compared to 2011. 48% of total applicants in the ETR pool were admitted, and a large proportion of the underrepresented students admitted to UC were in the new ETR and ELC-only pools, particularly the new ELC 5-9% group. BOARS cautions that it is difficult to determine the precise reason for these outcomes, as several policies changed simultaneously this year; however, BOARS believes the outcomes provide evidence that the policy is meeting the faculty's original goals of removing unnecessary barriers and broadening access to California students who might have been shut out in the past, while maintaining academic quality.

The outcomes also raised several questions and concerns. When the policy was originally conceived, it was projected that the 9x9 guarantees would provide a guarantee to about 10.5% of the CA public high school graduating class, and that an additional 2% would be admitted under the ETR criteria, to bring UC to the 12.5% figure expected under the Master Plan. However, UC admitted 12.1% of public high school graduates who met the 9x9 guarantees, which grows to 14.9% after adding those admitted through ETR. Of California public high school admits, 4.7% were in the statewide-non ELC pool alone, which means that the number of applicants with the Statewide guarantee but not the ELC guarantee was far greater than projected. BOARS will be reviewing options for recalibrating the statewide index in light of the outcomes, to align UC with Master Plan expectations.

A second concern for BOARS is that few students were admitted from the ETR and ELC pools at the most selective campuses. The policy's goal of bringing new talent to UC is perhaps most clearly manifested in the expanded ELC pool, and in the pool of students who are entitled to review but not part of the statewide or ELC guarantee. To address this concern, BOARS proposed giving all UC campuses, not only Merced, the opportunity to consider talented applicants with an ELC guarantee in the referral pool. BOARS later modified this plan to include all referral pool students, including ELC referrals. Campuses are being encouraged (but not required) to select students in the referral pool for admission or wait lists.

A third BOARS concern is the continued ability of the campuses to meet the workload demands of the policy. BOARS alerted the President about specific campus concerns when he met with the committee in December, and BOARS will continue to monitor the personnel and funding situation of campuses and advocate for appropriate funding, as necessary. These concerns were reiterated in July by the Admissions Directors, who noted that the large number of international applications has increased the evaluation workload alongside substantial changes in leadership.

NON-RESIDENT ADMISSIONS

In June 2011, BOARS adopted a [clarification](#) to its July 2009 [principles](#) for the admission of non-residents, which states that non-residents admitted to a campus must “compare favorably” to California residents admitted to that campus. The intent was to create more opportunity for campuses to admit non-residents (prior policy expected non-residents be in the upper half of the admit pool) and to reassure Californians that residents are not being turned away to make room for less qualified but higher paying non-residents. The “compare favorably” language reflects the complexity of comparing residents and non-residents, as campuses often do not have the same information for non-resident applicants about local context and achievement as they do for residents. In fall 2011, BOARS studied admission and enrollment outcomes from multiple perspectives to determine the extent to which campuses were implementing the compare favorably rule. Although there have been significant changes, and the non-resident applicant pool is now more closely aligned to the resident pool in many variables, BOARS found no need for alarm. BOARS expects that as the non-resident pool expands, campuses should be able to meet resident targets and remain in full compliance with the BOARS criteria. This appears to be the case for fall 2012 admits, although a final analysis is not available at the time of this report.

Another, more general BOARS concern, independent of the new policies, is that as State funding declines, UC could lose its capacity to meet its historic commitment to residents outlined in the Master Plan. BOARS does not participate in setting enrollment targets, but does hope that campuses will meet resident targets that sum to the University’s Master Plan obligations, and will enroll non-residents on top of those targets according to the availability of space and the compare favorably rule.

TRANSFER ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL

In June, the Academic Assembly [approved](#) two new transfer admission pathways following a systemwide Senate review of [BOARS’ proposal](#) for major-based transfer admissions. The Assembly’s amendments to Senate Regulation 476 mean that UC transfer applicants from California Community Colleges will be entitled to a comprehensive admissions review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete any one of three sets of courses: a yet to be developed UC Transfer Curriculum, in the relevant major, with a minimum GPA set by each campus; an “SB 1440” Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Degree for Transfer from a California Community College in the relevant major, with a minimum GPA to be set by each campus; or the current pathway specified in [Senate Regulation 476 C](#).

The policy is intended to be parallel to the “entitled to review” feature of the new freshman admission policy taking effect for students entering UC this fall. It also responds to State legislation (Assembly Bill 2302) that encourages UC to align its transfer requirements with Senate Bill 1440, which requires the California Community Colleges to develop major-based Associate Degrees for Transfer that guarantee degrees-holders admission to CSU as juniors and a bachelor’s degree upon completion of 60 upper division units at CSU. BOARS opposed offering any similar guarantees—focusing instead on giving holders of Transfer AA/AS degrees a comprehensive review in admissions.

BOARS believes the policy will help clarify the transfer process for California Community students interested in UC, and also improve their preparation for UC-level work. It will communicate a positive message to community college students that if they pick a major, prepare for it, and show a strong case for being able to complete their declared majors in a timely

fashion, they will be fully considered for transfer to UC. BOARS hopes the policy will encourage campuses to consider a transfer applicant's major choice and specific preparation for the major in selection decisions, and will encourage greater alignment in lower division transfer requirements for similar majors across UC campuses. By retaining the current path, BOARS addressed concerns expressed by some departments and divisions that requiring extensive major preparation would disadvantage some applicants, and could hamper their ability to meet admissions targets.

Following the Assembly's approval of the new pathways, BOARS approved a modification to the transfer selection criteria in the [Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions](#) that asks campuses to choose "applicants with a high likelihood of timely graduation," as well as a specific plan and timeline for implementing the new transfer paths. The implementation plan asks each department or program to collaborate with their campus Admissions Office and committees over the next two years. They will develop a UC Transfer Curriculum detailing the specific lower division preparation a student needs to have to be considered for admission into the major as a transfer during the first year, and then develop selection criteria for students applying to their major or program by the end of the second year. Beginning in fall 2014, campuses will evaluate and select transfers for fall 2015 admission according to those criteria, and in fall 2015, the first transfers admitted through the two new paths will arrive at UC.

ONLINE EDUCATION

▪ *New Policy for 'a-g' Review of Online Courses*

In May, BOARS approved a new [policy](#) for the approval of online courses and providers to satisfy the 'a-g' pattern required by high school students for UC eligibility. The policy replaces BOARS' 2006 [policy](#), which had developed a large backlog of applications, and had been criticized as cumbersome and in need of change to adapt to the rapidly evolving world of K-12 online education. Under the new policy, online course publishers will submit their courses to the California Learning Resource Network ([CLRN](#)) for review against the California Content Standards or the Common Core State Standards, and a set of [Standards for Quality Online Courses](#) established by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL). A course meeting an 80% threshold, including 15 required "power standards," can be submitted to UC Doorways for final 'a-g' review. In addition, virtual schools seeking to offer 'a-g' courses will be required to submit a new school survey with evidence of regional accreditation and alignment with iNACOL's [Standards for Quality Online Programs](#). UC intends to implement the policy for the course update cycle beginning February 2013, after resolving a few additional questions and details.

▪ *Statement on K-12 Online Learning*

In May, BOARS also approved a *Statement on K-12 Online Learning*, which summarizes the committee's major concerns about online education and the quality measures BOARS is seeking in an online course or program – including access to content experts, instructor support, and proctored exams. Schools and districts will also be required to complete a Certification of Compliance indicating that they meet the quality measures articulated in the Statement.

▪ *UC Online Education Project*

The BOARS and UCEP chairs collaborated on Senate and administrative policies and regulations for the UC Online Instruction Pilot Project (UCOE) related to eligibility, admissions, course approval, and enrollment. BOARS' general support for the UCOE project was tempered by concerns about access for low-income students and UCOE's plans to enroll large numbers of non-matriculated students into its courses, particularly high school students. BOARS wanted to ensure that students enrolling in UCOE courses have the necessary prerequisites, preparation, local support, and mentoring services necessary to succeed. In May, BOARS sent a memo to the Academic Council expressing concern about a UCOE marketing plan that identified students at affluent public high schools and private high schools as the primary potential target audience for UCOE courses. The memo asked UCOE to adjust the marketing plan to reflect concerns regarding equal access, and to develop a business and marketing model that includes a return-to-aid component.

IMPLEMENTATIONS OF INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC ADMISSIONS

BOARS discussed the transition four campuses were making to the single score individualized ("holistic") review system recommended by the Regents in their January 2011 [*Resolution on Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions*](#) (Regents Policy 2108), and a joint report the BOARS chair and the Office of Admissions will submit to the Regents in September on Comprehensive Review, which will detail the progress of and outcomes from this transition and from the new admissions policy. Six UC campuses now use a single-score holistic review system, although applications receive an individualized read in the selection process at all campuses. BOARS found little change in the diversity of the admit pool after one year—in other words, moving to holistic review is not an instant panacea for diversity as some had hoped. In fact, while socio-economic diversity increased at several campuses using holistic review this year, it declined at others. It is too early to define the overall impact of the change, as campuses are learning to implement the new process, and will make adjustments over the next few years. Campuses appreciate Berkeley's and UCLA's willingness to share scores. Score sharing has been an important factor in the review process at some campuses, helping to define best practices and forecast enrollment. However, each campus sets its own selection criteria, and it is now clear that score sharing will not reduce the cost of review, as each campus needs to fine-tune its evaluation in the band where decisions are made.

Campuses are implementing holistic review because they view it as a fairer system, although some have chosen not to implement a single-score review system because they believe that their current systems are producing solid outcomes using different strategies. All campuses admission policies are consistent with the Comprehensive Review Guidelines and the Regents Policy on Individualized Review. BOARS notes that as with the freshman admissions policy, diversity gains are not necessarily the result of specific policy changes, and should be considered in the context of the state's demographic changes and the larger and more diverse resident and non-resident applicant pools.

In May, UCLA released a report on Holistic Review in Freshman Admissions authored by UCLA Professor Robert Mare, which examines fall 2007 and 2008 holistic outcomes at that campus, where holistic review was first implemented in 2006. The report finds that holistic scoring at UCLA is proceeding according to the criteria set by the UCLA Admissions Committee. In the Executive Summary Mare writes, "Academic achievement and other personal qualities that contribute to a stimulating, diverse campus environment govern holistic ranking. In Regular Review, which is carried out by qualified members of the education community in the southern

California region in conjunction with UARS staff, the importance of academic merit is paramount and I find no important differences along lines that depart from the prescribed ranking criteria.” BOARS believes this solid, independent review of the UCLA holistic review practices demonstrates that UC’s implementation of single score review is headed in the right direction.

USES OF READ SHEET AND SCORE SHARING

All campuses now have access to the same local context (school-based) data in “read sheet” form that UCLA and UCB receive, as well as holistic review scores from UCLA/UCB. Several campuses are incorporating these data into their review processes, and others are considering how they might use them in the future. Score sharing is helping campuses improve review processes, project enrollment, compare comprehensive review outcomes, and in some cases, devote more time to the individualized review of applicants with lower scores, although final admissions decisions continue to be made locally. Eventually, each campus will develop its own individualized review process, and BOARS believes it is better not to push for a specific mode of implementation, but to allow campuses to maintain systems that reflect their unique values. Prior to the Regents’ January 2011 *Resolution on Individualized Review*, UCOP expressed hope that score sharing might increase the efficiency of admission processing and would make it possible to implement a single systemwide UC score. BOARS found little evidence that score sharing will save money. Although score sharing has helped improve the quality and timeliness of some admissions decisions on some campuses, it also involves additional work. BOARS found that a single systemwide score is unworkable due to the differences in culture, selectivity, and scoring methodologies on each campus.

RESOLUTION ON THE EVALUATION OF RESIDENTS AND NON-RESIDENTS

In December, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) outlining procedures for campuses to follow to ensure that non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus. Chair Anderson sent the resolution to President Yudof with a request that he transmit it to the campus chancellors.

RESOLUTION ON PROGRAMS OR POLICIES THAT GUARANTEE ADMISSION TO UC

In December, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) regarding programs or policies that guarantee admission to the University of California or a UC campus, stating that guarantees intended for freshman admission must be limited to California residents, and guarantees intended for transfer admission must be limited to students completing work at a California Community College. The Academic Council endorsed the resolution, and Chair Anderson transmitted it to the UC Provost.

RESOLUTION ON MAINTAINING THE INTEGRITY OF THE ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT PROGRAM

In March, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) urging UC to continue its management of the process by which high school students are determined to be Eligible in the Local Context (ELC), rather than rely on data supplied by high schools, and to delay any changes to the implementation of ELC at least until BOARS has had a chance to fully evaluate outcomes from the first year of the new freshman admissions policy. Council Chair Anderson transmitted the resolution to the UC Provost.

REQUIRED DISCLAIMER LANGUAGE FOR PROGRAMS OFFERING COURSES TO NON-MATRICULATED STUDENTS

In May, BOARS adopted [disclaimer](#) language for use in the marketing materials of campus-affiliated programs offering courses to non-matriculated student, including, but not limited to, University Extension, online academic programs, academic preparation programs, and English language courses. The Academic Council endorsed the language and asked the UC Provost to transmit it to the chief academic officers on each campus, including University Extension, and to the UC Online Education Project.

RESOLUTION ON MAINTAINING THE PRE-ADMISSION VERIFICATION PROGRAM

In June, BOARS passed a [resolution](#) calling on the University to continue the process by which it verifies data reported in the undergraduate application, and to extend that process to all applicants, including freshmen, transfers, U.S. citizens, U.S. permanent residents, and non-U.S. citizens.

ALLOWING LGBT APPLICANTS TO SELF-IDENTIFY ON THE UC APPLICATION

BOARS recommended that UC provide the opportunity for students to report their sexual orientation and gender identity on the Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) form and other forms required of admitted and enrolled students. In response to state legislation, BOARS had been asked to consider soliciting this information on the application form, but the majority of the committee did not think the application for admission would be an appropriate venue for collecting this information. UCAAD agreed with BOARS, and also recommended that the question of whether to collect the data on the application forms be revisited in a few years. The Academic Council [endorsed](#) the joint recommendation and asked the UC Provost and the Vice President for Student Affairs to take steps to implement it.

REVISION TO SENATE REGULATION 424 B (2)

BOARS determined that an important qualifier in the language of Senate Regulation [424 B \(2\)](#) was inadvertently omitted when the Regulations were modified in 2009 to align with the new admissions policy. Prior SR 424 wording capped at two the number of 10th grade honors-level courses that can be used to calculate the minimum GPA for freshman admission. BOARS submitted a proposed modification of SR 424 B reinstating the cap for the review and endorsement of the Academic Council and Assembly.

“EXCESS UNITS” CAP POLICY

In April, BOARS approved a modification to the Working Rules clarifying that the current 105 quarter/70 semester cap on the number of units UC will accept for transfer from a two-year college also applies to lower division units earned at a four-year institution, and that students who exceed the cap and have earned lower division units at both a four-year institution and a California Community College will no longer be barred from admission automatically because of “excess units”. In addition, the policy encourages campuses to be flexible beyond current practice that allows students who meet the lower division cap and have up to 15/10 upper division units to be considered for junior-level transfer admission.

BOARS ARTICULATION AND EVALUATION (A&E) SUBCOMMITTEE

The A&E Subcommittee (George Johnson, Monica Lin, Steven Clark, Lynn Huntsinger, Bonnie Halpern-Felsher, Abel Valenzuela, and Angela Arunarsirakul) was charged with reviewing issues around high school preparation, the “a-g” requirements, and selected courses submitted for “a-g” approval where faculty input is required. It met monthly during regular BOARS meetings

and also held additional conference calls to conduct business. The Subcommittee approved several new online providers and rejected others, and led the effort to develop and refine the new *Policy for A-G Review of Online Courses* and the *BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning*. BOARS approved in May.

BOARS TRANSFER SUBCOMMITTEE

The Transfer Subcommittee (Bill Jacob, Shawn Brick, June Gordon, John Whiteley, Charles Akemann, Ralph Aldredge, Daniel Widener, and Adam Jackson-Boothby) met monthly. The Subcommittee led the effort to develop and refine the transfer admissions policy based on feedback from the systemwide Senate reviews and discussions with local committees. It also discussed policy provisions for denying “Mixed record” transfers (those with both CCC units and units from other four-year universities) with a large number of units, articulation issues, and Senate Regulations around lower division transfer admission that may be outdated.

RESPONDING TO LEGISLATION

On behalf of BOARS, Chair Jacob sent views to the Academic Senate’s legislative analyst regarding several bills, including a proposed state constitutional amendment (SCA 22) that would limit non-resident enrollment to 10% at each UC campus; AB 2001, proposing a new K-12 student assessment system; SB 185, requesting UC to consider race, gender, and ethnicity as relevant factors in their admission policies; and SB 1458, proposing to restructure the current Academic Performance Index. BOARS monitored other relevant bills, including AB 130 (the Dream Act); SB 611 (funding for the UC Curriculum Institutes); SB 612 (subject matter projects); SB 532 regarding college credit for International Baccalaureate coursework taken in high school; and SB 721, which would give the Legislative Analyst’s Office authority to define accountability metrics and goals for higher education in California.

JOINT MEETING WITH THE UC ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS

BOARS and the UC admissions directors held their annual joint meeting in July. BOARS and the directors discussed the transition to the 2012 admissions policy, views and concerns about the implementation plan for the new transfer admissions policy, non-resident enrollment, score sharing, financial challenges, and recruitment and outreach efforts of residents and non-residents.

OTHER BUSINESS AND BRIEFINGS

- In December, BOARS met with President Yudof to discuss the implementation of the new freshman admissions policy and holistic review, non-resident admissions, and BOARS’ proposed transfer admissions policy.
- Vice Provost for Educational Partnerships Russell Rumberger joined two meetings to discuss the work of a U.S. Department of Education [Technical Working Group](#) to develop an evidence-based framework about the effectiveness of online learning and other educational technologies. He also reported on meetings with school superintendents and their concerns about a-g policy.
- BOARS discussed concerns about a high school that was advising students to skip Geometry as part of the “path to calculus,” which prompted a letter to California high schools and the Superintendent of Schools noting that students who fail to take Geometry will not meet UC’s area ‘c’ requirement or be eligible for UC/CSU beginning in Fall 2015. The letter indicates that high school students who have just completed 9th grade will need to complete the

Geometry requirement. BOARS added the Geometry requirement to area 'c' in 2009, so schools have had ample time to bring their programs into compliance.

- BOARS discussed new [federal guidelines](#) on the voluntary use of race to achieve diversity in colleges and universities, which include granting preference in admissions to high achieving graduates of low-performing schools.
- Chair Jacob and Senate leaders briefed BOARS at each meeting about Academic Council business and discussions regarding state budget cuts, the budget rebenching project, faculty salaries, and other topics.
- Chair Jacob regularly briefed BOARS about meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). ICAS members from the California Community Colleges and the California State University have been deeply involved in developing SB 1440 Associate of Arts and Science degrees for transfer. Their discussions at ICAS were important in informing the BOARS' transfer policy adopted by the Academic Assembly in June.
- Chair Jacob attended meetings at the California Department of Education in October and by phone in June regarding the implementation the Common Core State Standards (adopted by the California Department of Education in 2010.) He reported to the CDE that BOARS had updated the area 'b' (English) and 'c' (Mathematics) requirements and application templates to align with the Common Core Standards in 2011.

LOOKING AHEAD TO 2012-13

BOARS will monitor implementation of the freshman admissions policy, the transfer admissions policy, holistic review, score sharing, online a-g submissions, and the funding of admissions functions on the campuses. In addition, BOARS will review options for recalibrating the statewide admissions index and discuss enrollment management.

BOARS REPRESENTATION

BOARS Chair Bill Jacob represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Academic Assembly, and the Admissions Processing Task Force. He also attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) to discuss issues of shared concern to the UC, CSU, and California Community College faculty, including general education requirements, legislation affecting all three segments, and higher education advocacy. He presented a session on the new admissions policy at the annual meeting of the College Board in October and attended a meeting hosted by the CA Department of Education regarding the State's adoption of the Common Core standards and its decision to replace the California Standards Test with the Smarter Balanced test by 2014-15. Vice Chair George Johnson substituted for the chair Jacob at the Academic Council and served on the Admissions Processing Task Force. Charles Akemann represented BOARS on the Education Finance Model Steering Committee.

CONSULTATION WITH UCOP AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BOARS benefited from regular consultation with Interim Director of Admissions Kate Jeffery and Vice President for Student Affairs Judy Sakaki, who updated BOARS regularly about application, admission, SIR, and enrollment data for freshmen and transfers; financial aid policy; enrollment management; UC's participation in the Department of Defense Tuition Assistance Program, UC's messaging regarding SAT Subject Tests and non-resident enrollment, and efforts to fill vacant leadership positions in the Office of Admissions. Associate Admissions Director

Monica Lin attended each meeting to brief BOARS on the high school ‘a-g’ course certification process, the UC Curriculum Integration Institutes, and other topics. She also worked closely with the A&E Subcommittee to review online provider and course applications and develop the new online policy. Associate Director Shawn Brick attended each meeting to discuss transfer policy, initiatives and legislation, feedback from counselor conferences, and efforts to update the ASSIST website. He worked closely with the Transfer Subcommittee. BOARS also appreciates the work of Tongshan Chang and Erika Jackson from the Department of Institutional Research, who provided critical analyses of the new admissions policy; Vice Provost Daniel Greenstein, Professor Keith Williams, and Lisa Baird, who worked with the committee on the UCOE project; Vice Provost Russell Rumberger; High School Articulation Coordinator Nina Costales; and President Yudof, who took time out of his schedule to meet with the committee in December.

Thanks also to the faculty who attended meetings as alternates for regular committee members: Mindy Marks (UCR), Lee Bardwell (UCI), and Richard Rhodes (UCB).

Respectfully submitted,

William Jacob, Chair (SB)	June Gordon (SC)
George Johnson, Vice Chair (B)	John Whitely (I)
Charles Akemann (SB)	Daniel Widener (SD)
Ralph Aldredge (D)	Adam Jackson-Boothby, Graduate (R)
Michael Beman (M)	Angela Arunarsirakul, Undergraduate (LA)
Bonnie Halpern-Felsher (SF)	Robert Anderson, <i>ex officio</i>
Steven Clark (R)	Robert Powell, <i>ex officio</i>
Abel Valenzuela (LA)	Michael LaBriola, Committee Analyst
Lynn Huntsinger (B)	