

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Minutes of Meeting

March 1, 2013

**I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS February 2013 minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the February meeting minutes.

**II. Announcements**

- *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*

**February Academic Council Meeting:** The Academic Council has asked campuses to conduct a “targeted” review of BOARS’ [proposed modifications](#) to Senate regulations to accommodate a new IGETC for STEM Majors option. Council will review responses in April to allow time for the Assembly to consider the changes at the June meeting. Council is also discussing calls from state officials for faculty to increase their teaching workload, and the need to communicate the importance of UC faculty research to the economy and a highly educated and skilled workforce.

**Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium Meeting:** Chair Johnson, Associate Director Monica Lin, and other UC faculty and administrators represented UC at an intersegmental meeting in Sacramento that discussed implementation of the new Smarter Balanced Assessment system. The Smarter Balanced assessments will align with the Common Core to test college readiness in English language arts and math. Smarter Balanced would like the CA higher education segments to exempt entering college students from remediation if they receive the highest score (4) on the summative assessment that will be given at the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade. It was also suggested that UC consider using the assessment as a factor in comprehensive review. Chair Johnson said he believes the assessments have a strong potential to be valid measures of student learning and preparation.

**Online Education Working Meetings:** Chair Johnson will attend one of two working meetings the Provost is hosting in mid-April to discuss UC’s goals for online education and how to use funding set aside in the Governor’s budget for the development of online educational technologies for matriculated undergraduates.

**Media Inquiry about AP credit:** A reporter contacted Chair Johnson regarding Dartmouth’s decision to stop awarding college credit for successful completion of AP courses. Chair Johnson responded that BOARS was not considering any similar policy change at this time.

**Lower Division Units for Transfer:** Campuses will have an additional year to comply with a policy change BOARS adopted in April 2012 capping at 70 the total number of lower division semester units that may be transferred, regardless of whether the units were earned at a community college or a four-year college.

**III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

**BOARS Meeting in Sacramento:** The joint meeting between BOARS and legislative staff in Sacramento last month has generated positive feedback. UCORP and members of CCGA will meet with legislative staff in Sacramento on March 11 to discuss the importance of the University's research mission and graduate education.

**Budget Update:** UC is concerned about the effect the Governor's request to maintain current tuition levels for the next several years will have on UC's ability to maintain quality and to fund return-to-aid for low income students. UC is also concerned about a claim made in the Governor's budget that UC has increased expenses while other State agencies have reduced costs, when the bulk of the UC's increase reflects higher UCRP employer contributions, which the State has not funded to the extent it funds retirement accounts of other agencies.

**March Regents Meeting:** A presentation about faculty workload and academic efficiencies scheduled for the March Regents meeting has been postponed. Some State and UC officials believe that faculty should teach more, perhaps an additional course per year; however, enrollment models project a 7-10% growth in student credit hours over the next three years, without an increase in the total number of faculty. The Senate and the administration will be working on a plan to address the expected workload increase, improve graduation rates, and maintain UC quality.

**Academic Advisory Committee to the Presidential Search:** Academic Council Chair Powell has appointed a Senate [committee](#) to advise the Regents about the selection of a president. The 13-member Academic Advisory Committee includes the Senate chair and vice chair, one member from each division, and one member-at-large.

#### **IV. Consultation with UCOP – Office of Admissions**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director, Office of Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director, Office of Admissions*

**SWANA Campaign:** BOARS discussed a student-led initiative to add a "Southwest Asian and North African" (SWANA) checkbox with 34 ethnic subcategories to the UC application. Students from these backgrounds are currently classified as "Caucasian," and some feel that they lack the opportunity to self-identify. The effort was inspired in part by a successful 2009 student campaign to disaggregate the "Asian" category into 22 subcategories. The President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion has endorsed the collection of SWANA data, which UC will be able to roll up to meet federal Department of Education reporting standards.

**Discussion:** Members noted that including SWANA on the application would allow UC to gather more diversity data and enhance students' right to self-identify and their sense of social belonging. It was noted that UC identifies African-Americans, Chicano/Latinos and Native Americans as "underrepresented minorities" (URMs), and SWANA populations would not be added to this group. The URM designation normally describes populations who have suffered historical discrimination within the United States and/or underrepresentation within federal or state institutions.

## V. Analysis of TOEFL Scores

- *Tongshan Chang, Institutional Research Coordinator*

**Issue:** BOARS is discussing how campuses use scores from the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to assess the English proficiency of non-native English-speaking applicants. BOARS requested data from UCOP about the effect of the TOEFL score and the relative power of the four TOEFL sub-scores in predicting college-level outcomes.

**Report:** Tongshan Chang presented data on the 1<sup>st</sup>/ 2<sup>nd</sup> year persistence and UC cumulative GPA of international students who entered UC in fall 2010 and fall 2011 and submitted different total TOEFL scores compared to California resident, domestic nonresident and international students who did not submit TOEFL scores. UCOP reported that they were unable to analyze sub-scores, because the Educational Testing Service, which administers TOEFL, had only recently provided the detailed data needed for such analysis. At present, UC receives the total TOEFL score only, as part of the application. UC plans to ask ETS for TOEFL sub-scores beginning this fall.

In general, the analysis found that higher TOEFL scores correlate with higher UC GPAs, and students with TOEFL scores of 85 or above are more likely to earn a cumulative UC GPA of 3.0 or higher after their first or second year than are students who did not need to submit TOEFL scores.

UC's minimum score requirement of 80 took effect in fall 2012. In 2010 and 2011, campuses admitted some students who scored below that minimum, and it was found that those students are more likely to have first year GPAs below 2.00 and less likely to persist beyond the first or second year of college than other freshmen. The majority of UC international applicants have scores well above 80.

**Discussion:** It was noted that the data should be shared with admissions directors and admissions committees. The data could help dispel concerns expressed by some faculty that international students perform poorly at UC. It would also be worthwhile to disaggregate the data to be more country- or region-specific, and to analyze outcomes for specific disciplines.

## VI. Online Education

- *Keith Williams, Interim Director, UCOE*

**Report:** The UC Online Education program has taught or is teaching 18 courses across UC campuses with over 2,000 total enrollments and persistence rates equivalent to regular courses. Revenue from non-matriculated student enrollments has been much lower than expected, however, and UCOP is considering options for revising the business model to generate the income needed to sustain the program. One possibility is to transform UCOE into a service-based organization that would help UC departments put courses online and market them.

UCOE is developing mechanisms to facilitate more seamless cross-campus enrollment into online courses by UC students; to streamline the approval of online courses for major and GE requirements and transfer articulation; and to enable the transfer of registration data and instructional costs across campuses.

The Provost has scheduled two systemwide working meetings in April to discuss the allocation of funding earmarked for online education in the Governor's UC budget. Shortly after, UCOP plans to release an RFP inviting faculty to develop new high-enrollment lower division online gateway courses for undergraduates. Some see massive open online courses (MOOCs) as a potentially less expensive substitute for UC level courses. The April meetings will also consider how UC could use a MOOC platform to offer courses that conform to UC quality standards, in a smaller class format with a higher level of instructor involvement and contact than the typical MOOC. The American Council of Education (ACE) recently found several MOOCs, including two at UC Irvine, worthy of college credit.

UC campuses may be asked to award transfer credit for a MOOC taken at another accredited university (though it may be difficult for UC to know that a course taken at another university was done as a MOOC). The Senate may want to consider what guidance, if any, is needed in the evaluation of credit for MOOCs. In addition, the Senate may want to consider the implications of a larger online education infrastructure on ladder-rank faculty and lecturer workload, teaching credit, promotion, and other areas.

***Discussion:*** There was concern expressed about the quality and integrity of online courses, the level of instructor contact a student enjoys in an online course compared to a traditional course, and the relevance of the online model to disciplines such as the health sciences. It was also noted that the online format could make sense for large enrollment introductory gateway courses and could give more students access to less commonly taught subjects. In addition, there may be a level of rigor being applied to the review of online course quality that is not being applied to traditional courses.

## **VII. Targeted Systemwide Review: Alternative Financial Aid Models**

- *Kate Jeffery, Special Assistant to the Executive Vice President*
- *David Alcocer, Interim Director, Student Financial Support*

**Issue:** UCOP has asked the Senate to opine on three options for modifying UC's student financial aid funding and allocation methodology. BOARS discussed an earlier rendition of the options, their benefits, and trade-offs in November.

**Summary/Report:** The options are intended to maintain UC's financial aid goals and the long-term sustainability of UC's Education Finance Model. Each option extends the Blue and Gold Plan further into the middle class (family income from \$80,000 to \$120,000) with a "Blue and Gold Light." Each incorporates an alternative needs analysis that provides a more accurate view of parental resources than the current federal formula, and each also assumes a new systemwide corporate fundraising effort. Each depends to some extent on annual tuition increases.

All options would reduce net cost for middle-income families through the Blue and Gold Light plan. Option "A" would set return-to-aid at a level necessary to maintain a self-help expectation at the midpoint of the current benchmark for work and loans. It would reduce the net cost for lower- and middle income families, and increase the cost for higher income families. Option "B" would increase the net cost for lower income students by increasing the self-help loan repayment expectation from 10 to 15 years. Option A requires a larger tuition increase than B to be viable. Options A and B are both policy driven options that fund return-to-aid to meet the desired outcomes. Option C is revenue dependent. It would adjust the self-help expectation annually

based on the revenue available under a 33% return to aid of new tuition revenues plus funds raised centrally. No option provides a “free ride” for any students. UC still expects students from families making under \$80,000 to cover approximately \$9,000 of the cost of education through part-time work and borrowing.

UC’s progressive financial aid model attempts to provide access to the largest possible number of students, and there is evidence that UC remains affordable for the majority of families. Very few students drop out for financial reasons once they arrive, and controlling for academic preparation, students from different income groups perform equally well. Compared to UC’s public peers, UC has a high sticker price, but a moderate net cost. The Blue and Gold Plan counters the effect of “sticker shock” with a positive message about affordability, and the “Blue and Gold Light” builds on this framework and enhances UC’s affordability message for middle-income families.

UC has not detected significant changes in yield by family income, but it has seen a trend toward increased borrowing and debt among middle-income students and declining application and enrollment rates for middle-income students, although the latter decline may correlate more closely with broader demographic and economic changes.

**Discussion:** BOARS members expressed support for the adoption of an alternative methodology for obtaining more accurate information on family resources. Members noted instances of students whose families have “gamed” the financial aid system in order to appear needier than they actually are. There was also support for a proposed systemwide fundraising effort that benefits students at all UC campuses, although it was noted that campus development offices may resist such an effort.

However, members expressed concern that the sharp changes in aid that occur at the eligibility cutoffs for Blue and Gold Light Plan eligibility are unfair and may be prone to gaming. A sliding scale for the Blue and Gold Light Plan would be fairer and might encourage applicants to report income more accurately.

The Blue and Gold Light plan did not receive broad support. Some members noted concerns about the cost of a plan that benefits families making well over the median income for California families, and others did not think that UC should increase tuition to enhance affordability for families making as much as \$120,000.

Some BOARS members spoke in favor of Option B, noting that the current work/loan burden for low-income students is relatively modest; that middle and higher income households are already shouldering a heavy burden for the benefit of lower income families; and that there is a risk to the University if middle-income taxpayer perceive themselves as unfairly burdened or priced out. There was some criticism about the underlying premise that student costs will always rise, and that tuition increases as part of this overall increase are inevitable.

It was noted that Options A and B, at least compared to Option C, appear to be more rational financial aid funding strategies, because they base funding on the desired outcome rather than on how much revenue UC happens to have.

BOARS did not vote to prefer any one option, but will weigh in on the pros and cons of each. BOARS made plans to discuss a draft response to Council over email. It was noted that deciding which option is the “best” is to some extent contingent on the success of efforts to convince the state to support the university at a sustainable level. Financial aid should continue to be a major part of UC’s strategy for changing the public’s perception of the university.

**Action:** The committee analyst and chair will draft a memo to Academic Council and circulate to BOARS for review.

### **VIII. Compare Favorably Reports**

Most campuses have submitted their first annual report to BOARS about the extent to which they are meeting BOARS’ “compare favorably” standard with regard to nonresident admission. All campuses indicate that they are meeting the standard. Chair Johnson thanked BOARS members for their work. He noted that the policy has made a difference, and that the act of writing the reports has encouraged campuses to examine their practices and be more cognizant of the policy. It is important for the university to say assuredly that campuses are meeting their obligations to California residents outlined in the Master Plan and that the nonresidents they admit are at least as likely to succeed as California residents.

### **IX. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

Memos to campus department chairs have been distributed electronically under BOARS Chair Johnson’s signature to solicit nominations for six faculty workgroups that will help clarify the evaluation criteria for “a-g” high school courses. The Office of Admissions has already received nominations for work groups in science, English, history, and math, and will now turn to foreign language and arts department chairs for nominees. The memos note that the each workgroup will examine and revise the relevant criteria via email and conference calls between March and November 2013. It was suggested that each work group have an appointed chair and attend an all-day kick off meeting at UCOP.

Next month, UCOP will be asking the Subcommittee to review new curriculum that has been submitted to UC by some previously approved program status entities.

### **X. Data Analysis Subcommittee**

The subcommittee reviewed new models for the statewide index that would capture 9% of CA public high school graduates. The subcommittee reviewed the effect of the new index on students who applied for admission for fall 2012 and fall 2013, and recommended approval of an index that would apply for the next admissions cycle – applications received during fall 2013.

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