

PART 1: JOINT MEETING WITH CSU ADMISSION ADVISORY COUNCIL

I. Recent Admissions Cycle Outcomes

BOARS and the AAC reviewed recent application and admission outcomes for UC and CSU. One point of interest was why UC transfer applications and enrollments fell or remained flat over the past two years after increasing the previous five years, while transfer CSU applications increased.

It was noted that UC recently established a new [transfer admission policy](#) to align UC policy with [SB 1440](#), which guarantees holders of Associate Degrees for Transfer admission to CSU (though not to a specific CSU campus or major) and a bachelor's degree upon completion of 60 upper division units. The UC policy encourages prospective transfers to prepare for a specific major so they are more competitive as applicants and more prepared to graduate in a timely way. It also guarantees a review to transfer applicants who complete an SB 1440 degree with a minimum GPA. It is too early for the policy to have had any impact; but it was noted that most UC campuses are meeting their transfer enrollment targets and UC transfers that are admitted perform as well as students who entered as freshmen. UC does want to study and address perceptions about UC's openness to transfers. The university is planning a series of focus groups for community college students this fall, which it hopes will help inform prospective applicants more fully about the transfer paths.

It was noted that budget cuts forced CSU to close spring and winter term enrollment to most students the past two years, which may have created a spike in the fall term transfer application and enrollment data. It was reported that awareness of the Transfer AA degree pathway is not yet widespread. To date, community colleges have issued only 650 SB 1440 degrees statewide, and 340 of those degree holders have enrolled at a CSU. In addition to the SB 1440 degrees, some CSUs have agreements with local community colleges that give transfer students priority admission if they meet certain preparation standards.

It was noted that the public and many faculty are concerned about how efforts to increase international student recruitment will impact California resident access, and that some international students have discovered they can enroll at a CCC and then transfer to a UC or CSU with relative ease. Members also pointed to data showing a declining proportion of male students in California higher education and a converse gender-based trend in most STEM disciplines. It was noted that the cost of attending college in California has changed dramatically, forcing more students to work at least part-time and apply for financial aid. AAC and BOARS members requested overlap data on transfer students who apply to both UC and CSU.

II. Career Technical Education (CTE) and College Preparatory Requirements

BOARS and the AAC discussed ways the segments might collaborate to encourage CTE teachers to integrate appropriate academic content into their courses to meet ‘a-g.’ Although nearly 12,000 CTE or CTE-blended courses have been approved for ‘a-g’ credit, less than 2% of the courses are approved for ‘a-f,’ and a perception remains among some educators that UC is not open to courses with CTE content. There are additional concerns about how UC and CSU standards for CTE courses may differ.

It was noted that the UC Curriculum Integration (UCCI) Institutes have brought together teachers to develop academically rigorous courses integrated with CTE content that can be approved for ‘a-g’, particularly in areas other than area ‘g’. UC is working to inform teachers about the CTE course submission process and encouraging them to submit CTE-integrated courses. In addition, UC and CSU are working on a process by which CSU could identify CTE courses that would not necessarily be UC-approved for ‘a-g’, but would be CSU-approved in disciplines that might not be offered at UC. The CA Commission on Teacher Credentialing is also exploring the development of a joint teaching credential for CTE educators who teach blended courses.

III. Impact of Common Core and Smarter Balanced Assessment

The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) is developing K-12 assessments meant to identify college readiness in English and math in alignment with the [Common Core State Standards](#). Some faculty have raised questions about the preparation of teachers to implement the Common Core curriculum, about the extent to which the SBAC assessments will test college readiness, and about how the segments should interpret and use scores on the 11th grade cumulative assessment.

It was noted that BOARS recently updated the area ‘b’ (English) and area ‘c’ (math) requirements to align with concepts in the Common Core. BOARS also released a letter [expressing support](#) for schools transitioning to the Common Core and reinforcing its support for both the traditional math sequence and an integrated sequence as pathways to fulfill area ‘c’. In addition, UC has convened faculty working groups to review and clarify the evaluation criteria for high school courses that satisfy the ‘a-f’ subject requirements, and to incorporate elements of the Common Core and [Next Generation Science Standards](#) when appropriate.

It was noted that the SBAC assessments are not designed to be admissions tests, nor will higher education be required to use them in placement; however, the segments may find it useful for placement in some cases, perhaps in determining the need for remediation. It was noted that increasing the emphasis on an 11th grade assessment could ultimately harm college preparation by weakening the relevance of the 12th grade and the ‘a-g’ requirements.

It was noted that in 2010, BOARS rejected a proposal to add Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences as a fourth option – along with biology, chemistry, and physics – to the list of courses acceptable to fulfill the ‘d’ requirement. UC still expects students to have at least two years of “hands on” experience in a physical lab.

IV. Associate Degrees for Transfer (SB 1440) Degrees

AAC members discussed some of the challenges related to the implementation of SB 1440. First, CSU is working to increase awareness of the Transfer AA degree pathway. CSU closed mid-year admissions last year to all but SB 1440 transfers, which gave the pathway a public boost, and it continues efforts to improve outreach from specific campuses to their surrounding colleges.

It has also been difficult for some disciplines to comply with the rule that guarantees Transfer AA degree-holders a bachelor's degree upon completion of 60 units at CSU. Some disciplines have created a more general version of their majors to meet the rule. In response, some students who enter CSU with a Transfer AA have decided to switch to a major with less general content. [SB 440](#), a new bill sponsored by Senator Padilla, would require CSU to apply a transfer curriculum developed by a community college for an SB 1440 degree to any and all options within a major. CSU opposes the bill as written.

Finally, community colleges differ in the extent to which they have developed Transfer AA degrees, and it has sometimes been challenging for CSU to identify students who are pursuing the degrees and are eligible for admission under the SB 1440 guidelines. CSU is looking at ways to collect better information about applicants and is also encouraging SB 1440 transfer applicants to apply broadly rather than rely on a referral.

V. Opportunities for Student Career and Major Exploration

CSU is considering strategies for enhancing the advising information it provides to prospective and continuing students that will increase their understanding of academic programs and majors as well as their ability to make connections between those programs and career opportunities. One model is an Arizona State University [database](#) that provides information about admission and degree requirements for various ASU undergraduate majors, along with a list of career possibilities, and US Labor Department statistics about median salary and growth potential.

Some faculty expressed concern about a growing tendency to view universities primarily as vocational institutions that should lead to one ultimate goal— a high paying job—rather than as educational institutions meant to impart a broad liberal arts education and create well-rounded, informed citizens. Faculty can help reframe the debate to make a better case for the larger purpose of college, the need to maintain an environment of exploration at the university, and a view of the university as a public good. It was noted that the financial burden has shifted away from taxpayers onto families, and that people will change professions an average of seven times in their lifetime and need broad skills to adapt to change. It was also noted that students are taking on more debt in a difficult job market and need to think practically about finding a good job, and that a college education is a powerful predictor of upward mobility for ethnic minorities.

PART II: BOARS Meeting

I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS April 2013 minutes

Action: BOARS approved the April meeting minutes.

II. Announcements

- *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*
- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

The Academic Council held its April 24 meeting in Sacramento to allow Chair Powell and other Council members to testify against [State Senate Bill 520](#) (Steinberg) at a Senate Education Committee hearing. UC continues to [oppose](#) SB 520, and has issued a [Support if Amended](#) position on SB 547 (Block), which asks the higher education segments to develop or identify high demand lower division online courses that are transferable across all the segments under IGETC. UC has proposed an amendment to that bill supporting the development of infrastructure that would facilitate a segment's ability to offer online courses across its campuses, rather than across segments, and a phased-in approach to intersegmental articulation after further study.

Council requested a minor change to BOARS' recent [statement](#) supporting both the traditional math sequence and an integrated sequence as pathways to fulfill area 'c', and endorsed a [UCFW letter](#) supporting a UCOP plan to increase the employee and employer UCRP contribution rate to 8% and 14% in July 2014, only if the increase is accompanied by an offsetting across-the-board salary increase.

ICAS met in Sacramento on April 29 for its annual Legislative Day meeting with legislators and legislative staff. Discussion focused on online education and the Governor's proposed long-term funding and performance plan for higher education. The Governor's plan ties four-years of general fund increases for UC and CSU to seven outcomes, including 10% increases in transfer admission, degree production, and four-year completion, and revokes general fund increases if tuition is raised. UC is concerned that the plan ignores UC's completion and time to degree progress over time; that it would create an incentive to admit fewer at-risk students; and that it fails to account for students who explore different degree paths or who take longer to graduate due to an internship, study abroad experience, or part-time work obligations. In May, the Regents will discuss the measures, along with faculty teaching load data showing increasing per-faculty student credit hour loads and bachelor's degree production over time.

The UC Provost hosted two meetings in mid-April to discuss the use of funding the Governor's budget sets aside for the development of online learning technologies at UC. A third meeting on May 4 will discuss next steps, including an RFP that will be issued to faculty in June for the development of online courses for UC matriculated students.

III. Consultation with the Office of Admissions

Admissions Outcomes: BOARS reviewed systemwide and by-campus demographic and academic profile data on the number and proportion of CA freshman applicants and admits by eligibility status for fall 2012 and fall 2013—including those who were ELC-eligible-only,

statewide-index-eligible-only, both index- and ELC-eligible, and Entitled to Review (ETR), as well as applicants and admits who were in the ELC 1-4% pool compared to those who were in the ELC 5-9% pool. The 2013 data show that UC has become even more selective, and the increasing selectivity has impacted ELC students in greater proportion. Admission offers to students in the ELC-only pool fell from 74% in 2012 to 64% in 2013, and 38% of ETR applicants were admitted to the campus of their choice in 2013 compared to 48% in 2012. The average weighted GPA of the total admitted pool was 3.89 systemwide. Applicants and admits from the ELC-eligible-only pool had significantly lower test scores than students in other pools. The groupings of admitted students by ethnicity in each eligibility category for 2013 are similar in proportion to 2012, in general.

A-G Working Group Meeting: On April 19, UCOP hosted a kick-off meeting for six working groups of faculty from across UC that will be reviewing the evaluation criteria for high school courses that satisfy the ‘a-f’ subject requirements for freshman admission, and incorporating elements of the Common Core and Next Generation Science Standards when appropriate. UCOP hopes final draft revisions of the criteria can be circulated more broadly for review in the fall.

IV. Request to Update Geometry Validation Options

The revisions to the area ‘c’ (mathematics) [description](#) recommended by the area ‘c’ task force and approved by BOARS in 2009 added a specific condition that high school students must take a year-long Geometry course as part of the three course area ‘c’ pattern required for UC eligibility. BOARS later clarified that a subsequent advanced math course or examination score cannot validate the omission of Geometry, but that a subsequent math course can validate a deficient grade (D/F) in Geometry. UCOP has now asked BOARS to consider whether a standardized examination score might also validate a deficient grade in Geometry.

UCOP provided data about the prevalence of Geometry content in various standardized tests, and noted that the course validation [option](#) exists only for the Math and Language Other Than English area requirements in the ‘a-g’ pattern. BOARS members requested more information about why the area ‘c’ task force had recommended one year of Geometry.

V. Revisions to Senate Regulation 478

BOARS reviewed feedback from the systemwide Senate review of BOARS’ [proposed amendments](#) to SR 478 accommodating IGETC for STEM majors. The Academic Council approved the amendments subject to the incorporation of several edits and clarifications suggested by reviewers.

Action: BOARS will update the revisions based on comments received, and forward the final amendments to the Academic Assembly for consideration on June 11.

VI. UC San Diego Universitylink Proposal

UC San Diego is proposing to update and expand its Universitylink program, which gives admission preference to low-income transfer students at nine San Diego area community colleges who fulfill specific academic eligibility requirements. UCSD wants to re-establish

Universitylink after its recent decision to end participation in the UC Transfer Admission Guarantee program raised community concerns about UCSD's openness to local transfers.

BOARS discussed the proposal in the context of its [2004 decision](#) that campuses should not interpret "selection criterion #14" as allowing a preference for freshmen applicants based on their geographic proximity to a campus. That decision did not specifically address geographical preferences for transfers. BOARS was concerned that geographic preferences could conflict with larger principles of inclusion and diversity by disadvantaging students in other areas of the state.

Some members were concerned that preferring transfers from a small number of community colleges is inconsistent the mission of each UC campus to serve the entire state, and that UCSD could draw the same diversity from transfers in other regions of California. Other members spoke in favor of the proposal, noting that BOARS should support campus efforts to build closer relationships with local communities and acknowledge that disadvantaged students have responsibilities that may tie them to a local community and make it impractical to attend another UC campus. Members agreed that it would be important to limit the number of transfers admitted through the Universitylink path. BOARS will review the proposal again on May 31.

VII. Adjustment to the Statewide Index

In April, Chair Johnson presented a proposal to the Academic Council that had been approved by the BOARS Data Analysis Subcommittee to adjust the statewide admissions index to more closely capture the policy target of 9% of CA public high school graduates. The new index adjusts the minimum UC Score for each weighted GPA range of 3.0 and higher required to earn a statewide guarantee of admission to a UC campus. BOARS should discuss and formally adopt the change in time for the Academic Assembly to approve the index on June 12. It was noted that BOARS will also continue to consider the larger question of the continued viability of the referral guarantee.

VIII. Transferrable Mathematics: Articulation Issues

UC policy requires transfers to complete a one-semester quantitative reasoning (mathematics or statistics) course that has Intermediate Algebra "or its equivalent" as a pre-requisite. Community College faculty are asking UC to take a more explicit stance about alternative pathways to and through transferable math and statistics courses that are designed to help non-STEM majors who have trouble with Intermediate Algebra successfully complete a transferable course that fulfills the quantitative reasoning requirement.

Chair Johnson proposed two options for clarifying the faculty's expectations for the math competency of transfer students. One option is to require transfer applicants to submit scores from a standardized assessment such as the SAT Reasoning Test or the SAT Math Subject Test to demonstrate math competency. Another is to eliminate the phrase "or equivalent" from the transfer guidelines and insert language indicating UC's expectation for math pre-requisites to be aligned with the mathematics found in the Common Core State Standards. BOARS members favored the second option, noting that it would establish specific expectations for course content based on the Common Core. Members expressed a clear desire that transfer students should have the same basic-level math competence as students who are admitted as freshman. It was noted that some of the more advanced topics in Intermediate Algebra are not found in the Common

Core State Standards for Mathematics, so linking the prerequisite expectations to the Common Core may help facilitate the sorts of acceleration that is being explored at the Community Colleges. It was also noted that it may be difficult to identify a specific course such as Intermediate Algebra that can be used as a proxy for student mastery of the mathematics of the Common Core.

Action: BOARS will review a formal proposal for revising the language on May 31.

IX. Executive Sessions

Notes were not taken during this portion of the meeting.

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