

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting
May 2, 2014

I. Consent Calendar

1. BOARS Minutes of April 4, 2014

Action: BOARS approved the April meeting Minutes.

I. Announcements

- o *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*

ICAS Meeting: The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) held its annual Legislative Day meeting in Sacramento on April 29. The meeting featured a series of visits with legislators, legislative aides, and staff members from the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's Office. ICAS discussed the Governor's proposal for a \$50 million competitive grants program to encourage innovations at the higher education segments that increase four-year degree completion and transfer rates; a bill that would allow community colleges to offer four-year degrees in certain technical fields; and prospects for increased higher education funding in the Governor's upcoming May Budget Revision. Chair Johnson raised concerns with guests about a decision to defund the California Learning Resources Network (CLRN), and the chair of the Assembly Higher Education Committee encouraged the segments to focus on access and affordability and to be aggressive about seeking additional enrollment growth funding.

Academic Council Meeting: At the April 30 Council meeting, Vice President for Budget Patrick Lenz discussed UC's efforts to convince state policymakers to return the University to a sustainable level of state funding. Budget officials are optimistic that the Governor's May Budget Revision will direct some of an expected general fund surplus to the University and provide additional funding for enrollment growth.

Transfer Action Team: Chair Johnson and Vice President Sakaki briefed the Provost and the chair and vice chair of the Regents' Committee on Educational Policy on the report and recommendations of the Transfer Action Team (TAT). Chair Johnson and VP Sakaki will also brief the Council of Chancellors on May 7 before making their formal presentation to the Regents on May 14.

CSHE Report: UC Berkeley's Center for Studies in Higher Education recently released a [report](#) on UC freshman admissions authored by Saul Geiser. The report is informative about the history of eligibility and thoughtful about potential policy solutions to current challenges in undergraduate admissions. It contrasts UC's high eligibility rate and its low "participation rate" – the percentage of California high school graduates attending UC.

Area “d” and Next Generation Science Standards: Chair Johnson recently spoke to a group of high school science educators and administrators who are concerned that area “d” is out of alignment with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). They want area “d” to acknowledge the integrated nature of science envisioned in the NGSS and to incorporate its four core disciplines—physical sciences, life sciences, earth and space sciences, and engineering technology. Chair Johnson acknowledged that area “d” will need to be reviewed, though it is not yet clear when such a review should occur given that the details of the new high school science curriculum is not yet known.

II. Consultation with Academic Senate

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*

Composite Benefit Rates: Chair Jacob reported that the Senate is concerned that UCOP’s plan for composite benefit rates (CBR) will charge some fund sources inappropriately for benefits and will negatively impact faculty grants and the resources available to support graduate students. The president has asked a joint Senate-Administration Advisory Group to help guide her decision on CBRs. The Senate members of the Advisory Group received data from UCOP about employee categories, funding sources, and salary/benefits costs, which Chair Jacob used to build an interactive worksheet that allows users to model the degree to which different CBR plans would shift funds between activities supported by one fund source to activities supported by other fund sources in relation to the projected actual costs for each activity on each campus. The models help illuminate a fuller range of possibilities for CBRs and the pros and cons of each. Chair Jacob will send the administration a final report with recommendations by the end of the week.

ICAS Legislative Day Meeting: A staff member from the Department of Finance engaged ICAS in a discussion about the California Acceleration Project’s efforts to redesign remedial English and math curriculum at the community colleges to increase student completion rates. ICAS also discussed several bills intended to encourage students to take more computer science courses in high school and to increase the recognition of those courses in college admission, one of which asks UC to create guidelines for high school computer science courses that can satisfy the area “c” requirement for UC and CSU admission.

Academic Planning Council: The Academic Planning Council has finalized a set of enrollment principles to guide and inform the development of UC’s long-range enrollment plan. The document emphasizes UC’s commitment to the Master Plan and states that the President is responsible for approving and articulating a systemwide enrollment management plan.

III. Consultation with UCOP

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

Preliminary Admissions Outcomes: UCOP has released [admissions data](#) for fall 2014. UC offered admission to 86,865 freshman applicants, a 4.8% increase over last year. The pool of

admitted students includes 1,000 more California residents and a higher number and percentage of students from outside California. One-third of CA resident admits were from underrepresented minority groups, and for the first time, Chicano/Latino surpassed White admits in number. Asian students remain the largest group of admitted students.

The Washington Post published an [op-ed](#) by President Napolitano regarding affirmative action and the use of race/ethnicity in admissions; Vice President Sakaki attended a community meeting in Los Angeles to discuss outreach and support for African-Americans in UC admissions; and UCOP is interested in a new law school diversity pipeline program involving 24 California community colleges and six law schools that is funded by the State Bar.

Revised SAT: The College Board has released detailed specifications about the upcoming revision to the SAT. College Board representatives are expected to attend the June 6 BOARS meeting.

Survey on Campus Admissions and Selection Processes: A campus divisional chair asked Chair Johnson to opine on several pilot programs underway on that campus in which one or two criteria may be used to deselect student from admission to a major, and the extent to which the program conforms to the letter and spirit of comprehensive review policy. Under the pilots, students who are in the inadmissible pool for a specific major are redirected to other majors on the campus. Chair Johnson noted that in his view, majors may set additional entrance requirements as long as they do not prevent students from being admitted to the campus. To get a better sense of what is happening on other campuses, the Office of Admissions surveyed the admissions directors about local practices related to school/department participation in student selection, comprehensive factors used for admission to a particular major, additional cut-off criteria used to deselect students from a specific program, and processes to consider them for an alternate major.

Action: Chair Johnson asked BOARS members to confirm that the survey information received for their campus is correct. He will distribute information about the pilots to BOARS to help inform discussion in June.

Content Expert Workgroups and Honors Courses: UCOP is considering how to handle several recently revised IB and AP examinations in the context of UC credit. It has decided that all revised AP and IB examinations will be grandfathered in under current credit provisions until BOARS has an opportunity to re-review each one. In addition, UC faculty content experts will be tasked with reviewing new and revised AP and IB examinations, including a new AP “Capstone” Program, and recommending to BOARS whether credit should be awarded and at what level. Campuses will continue to have the authority to determine if AP or IB exam credit can be used to meet general education and/or major requirements, and the minimum score required.

AP Capstone Program: Director Trevino will attend a College Board meeting about a new AP “Capstone” program modeled on the IB. AP hopes colleges will decide to grant additional credit for completion of the program beyond that granted for the AP course and exam. BOARS will review the Capstone program curricula, but may also want to consider whether to cap the number

of units students can bring with them to UC, similar to the cap on lower division transfer credit. Currently, UC awards an unlimited number of credits for AP test scores of 3 or higher.

Chair Johnson noted that some faculty are concerned that students bring too many units with them to UC, and that 10th grade high school courses should not be considered “college level.” There is also concern that that honors course “arms race” benefits high-income students with access to a large number of AP courses, over students at less-resourced schools. Several BOARS members spoke in favor of establishing a unit cap, or of eliminating the practice of granting credit altogether. It was also noted that the current practice helps bolster UC’s time-to-degree rate and that the AP curriculum is becoming more prominent in low API schools.

Review of Online Courses Post-CLRN: The California Learning Resources Network (CLRN) is scheduled to lose its source of funding on June 30. BOARS [policy](#) identifies CLRN as the entity that pre-reviews high school online courses proposed for “a-g” against relevant state and national quality standards. Over the past two years, the policy and partnership with CLRN has been effective, resulting in a 300% increase in the number of online entities approved to offer “a-g” courses, and 3,000 online courses added to “a-g” course lists. In the post-CLRN era, UC will ask online providers to conduct a self-assessment of their courses based on [iNACOL’s national quality standards for online courses](#).

IV. UCSD Tribal Membership and Admissions Proposal

In 2008, BOARS released a [position paper](#) affirming that Selection Criterion 13 of the Comprehensive Review Guidelines allows an undergraduate applicant’s membership in a federally-recognized American Indian tribe to be considered as a “plus factor” in the admission review process, due to the classification of tribal membership as a political affiliation that is not covered by Proposition 209 restrictions. The UC San Diego Senate Admissions Committee was recently asked to consider a proposed program that would broaden the understanding of tribal membership in government-recognized tribes in the context of comprehensive review procedures for admission to that campus. The committee decided that the program has systemwide implications and should be reviewed by BOARS.

The proposers of the program argue that UC’s policy requiring Native American students to provide an enrollment number associated with a federally-recognized tribe to receive that status is overly restrictive. They note that there are individuals who are, for all intents and purposes, tribal members and have benefits within the tribe and on the reservation, but who do not have an official enrollment number. The program under consideration would broaden the notion of tribal membership from enrolled member to “community member,” verified through a letter of support provided by a tribal authority.

Action: BOARS agreed to request advice from the Office of General Counsel and discuss the issue again.

V. Program Status Policy

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Vice Chair*

Issue: The BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee met by teleconference last month and approved policy revisions to the review procedures for organizations applying for “program status.” BOARS is now asked to approve the changes.

The policy revisions approved by the subcommittee are intended to streamline the review process. They would eliminate BOARS’ role in the formal approval of program status applications and courses; however, BOARS and the A&E Subcommittee would continue to receive regular summary reports about the status of applications. The subcommittee decided that it lacks the necessary time and expertise for conducting a deep review of program status applications, which is better left to UC articulation staff. The proposed revisions would take effect immediately so that new program status entities may submit courses to UC for “a-g” review before the 2014-15 course submission cycle closes on September 15.

Action: BOARS agreed unanimously to support the proposed policy changes.

VI. Freshman Eligibility and Referral

Issue: BOARS reviewed a “straw man” proposal for adjusting eligibility policy and the guarantee structure. The proposal would reduce Eligibility in the Local Context from the top 9% to the top 7% of students in each participating high school and reduce the number of students identified as eligible in the statewide context from 9% to 7% of high school graduates. In addition, ELC students would be identified on the basis of high school GPA and a minimum standardized test score. If not all of the top 7% of students in a high school by GPA have the minimum test score, additional students from that school would be selected from those who have at least a 3.0 GPA and have achieved the test score. The statewide index would also carry an equivalent minimum required test score.

Chair Johnson noted that UC’s capacity to sustain the referral guarantee is shrinking. UC is now offering a guarantee to a percentage of students that is far in excess of the 10.5% target BOARS established in 2009. The proposal would return the percentage of students who receive a guarantee through eligibility to 10.5%, and reduce the referral pool to a more manageable level. In addition, UC is offering a guarantee to a large number of ELC-only students who are being admitted on the basis of a single factor, GPA, which is not highly correlated with success at the University for these students. Many of these students end up on probation after the first year. The SAT minimum would establish a clearer baseline for eligibility that is more aligned with success. It would not apply to applicants who are Entitled to Review, only to those who receive the guarantee.

One member noted that the proposal would not eliminate the referral pool, as several thousand students are still projected to be in the pool under a 7x7 construct. It was suggested that BOARS should instead encourage campuses to admit more of their 9x9 guarantee applicants. It was noted that expanding the referral pool to other campuses could increase its popularity and worsen the problem. Moreover, campuses want to maintain the opportunity to admit ETR applicants over ELC applicants. It was suggested that BOARS also explore a possible adjustment to the 10.5% target. It was noted that the Senate rejected BOARS’ original 2007 proposal to eliminate the statewide guarantee, which led BOARS to develop the 9x9.

It was suggested that BOARS decouple or stagger the proposals for moving to 7x7 and for the SAT minimum. It was noted that UCOP is considering administrative solutions to help address part of the problem—for example, UC might ask on the application whether the applicant would be willing to consider the referral pool. BOARS members agreed that the proposed SAT minimum could doom the overall proposal in the systemwide review. Members agreed to remove that part of the proposal and to focus on options for the guarantee structure that will meet the 10.5% target.

A member noted a possible error in UCOP's model projecting the 2012 referral pool under a 7x7 construct. Content Manager Chang will check the model for accuracy, project simulated referral pool outcomes under 7x7 for the 2013 and 2014 cohorts, and provide data on the characteristics of students who are likely to opt-in to the referral pool under a 7x7 policy. It was agreed that BOARS should re-examine prior estimates of which top public high school graduates are actually applying to UC, using ELC benchmarking information.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to move to a 7x7 construct that retains GPA-only for ELC as the main focus of ongoing analysis. The motion carried by a vote of 9 to 1.

VII. SAT Revisions

The College Board has released test specifications for the SAT revisions taking effect in 2016. Chair Johnson noted that a 2009 BOARS [report](#) discussed outcomes from the SAT Reasoning Test introduced in 2005, and the extent to which it aligned with BOARS' January 2002 [Testing Principles](#). He asked a BOARS subcommittee to review the specifications for the 2016 test against these past statements and principles. He added that the Academic Council has endorsed and forwarded to the President a joint [BOARS-UCOPE Statement on the Importance of Writing](#) that references the SAT redesign.

It was noted that the College Board suggests that the revised SAT will be a fairer test that is more closely aligned with college-level expectations. The revised test will incorporate items that contribute to seven sub-scores that should help provide deeper context about student achievement and preparation. Associate Vice President Handel noted that GPA reflects student behavior and achievement over many years and courses. Tests like the SAT are snapshots of students' learning, but generally do a good job of measuring, from a psychometric perspective, what students have learned in three years of high school.

A member noted that the new test may be even more closely aligned with BOARS' Testing Principles, and that the SAT, like the larger educational world, appears to be moving toward a greater emphasis on assessment of core competencies. It was noted that the essay portion of the Reading and Writing section will be optional, but that UC requires students who use the ACT to fulfill UC's testing requirement to take the ACT with Writing.

Action: Professors Cooper, Farrell, Huntsinger, and Sanchez volunteered to participate on a subcommittee to review the SAT specifications.

VIII. Honors Policy

In April, BOARS approved one of four UCOP policy revisions related to the high school honors policy guidelines and the approval of “a-g” courses that students may take to earn a GPA “bump.” The committee now turned to the three remaining proposals.

1. Under current policy, only AP or IB courses may be approved for the GPA bump in the college-preparatory elective (“g”) area. The change would allow any qualified school-created honors courses to be eligible for the bump in “g.”

A BOARS member noted that the policy will help encourage schools to create innovative school-based curriculum outside of the AP/IB structure.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to approve the change. The item carried unanimously.

2. Current guidelines stipulate that for a school-created honors course to be approved for the bump, a non-honors version of the course must be offered simultaneously in the same subject area and at the same grade level. The change would require schools to offer a non-honors equivalent only at the same frequency, rather than *simultaneously* with any school-created honors course.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to approve the change. The item carried unanimously.

3. Under current policy, school-created honors courses are only eligible for the bump at the 11th and 12th grade-levels, while AP courses may be approved for the GPA bump at the 10th grade level. The change would extend eligibility to qualified school-created honors courses offered in 10th grade.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to approve the change. The item carried unanimously.

It was noted that BOARS and other Senate bodies have, in the past, considered eliminating or reducing the weight of the Honors Level GPA bump.

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