

Part 1: Joint Meeting with the Campus Admissions Directors**I. Admissions Outcomes and the New Admissions Policy**

BOARS and the Admissions Directors discussed issues related to the implementation of the new undergraduate admissions policy. It was noted that an Asian Pacific Islander (API) community organization had asked for an update about API admissions outcomes under the new policy, in follow-up to concerns several groups had expressed about how the new policy would affect API access to UC. It was noted that African-American community groups had expressed similar concerns.

Discussion: BOARS and the Directors noted that it is too early to assess the impact of the new policy, but there have not been major changes in the systemwide distribution of admitted students by ethnicity, and that the convergence of several variables—the simultaneous implementation of the new policy and holistic review, the budget crisis, and increases in workload and selectivity resulting from increased applications and nonresidents admits—make it difficult to establish a precise reason or reasons for any outcome. They agreed that the University should respond to communities that have questions and concerns about policy and to communicate that UC is doing everything possible within the law and fiscal constraints to serve as broad a population as possible; however, it is difficult to design an admissions policy that produces a perfect reflection of the state and remains race neutral. It was agreed that UC campuses should focus on diversity outcomes related to the CA residents and should not use international student diversity to obscure the extent to which a diverse representation of in-state residents is or is not achieved.

It was noted that faculty are also focusing on the retention and success outcomes of students admitted under the new policy, and under holistic review for campuses that have recently transitioned to holistic review, but there are not yet sufficient data to allow them to draw any definitive conclusions.

It was noted that discussions related to the original justification and rationale for the new policy can be found in the [June 2008 Academic Assembly item](#) and in the [July 2008 Regents item](#).

II. The Future of the Referral Guarantee

BOARS and the Admissions Directors discussed future options for meeting the referral guarantee and Regents Policy 2103, which states that “*Freshman applicants deemed Eligible in the Statewide Context or Eligible in the Local Context who are not admitted to any campus where they apply will be offered admission at a UC campus with available space.*”

It was noted that UC Merced currently is the only campus accepting students from the referral pool, but has indicated it will no longer be able to accommodate all referral students as it becomes more selective and loses capacity. As a result, in the near future, without some adjustment to policy or practice, UC may no longer be able to offer a guarantee of referral admission to every student defined as eligible through the “9x9” process meant to identify the top 9% of students statewide and the top 9% of students in each high school. In 2013, there were 10,318 referral pool students who met either the 9% ELC or 9% statewide guarantees, but who were not admitted to a campus to which they applied. Only a small number of those (181, or 1.5%) submitted an SIR in response to Merced’s offer of referral admission.

Discussion: BOARS and the Directors discussed the feasibility of several options that do not involve major policy changes, including encouraging all campuses to select from a portion of the referral pool; offering referral pool students guaranteed transfer admission; reducing the number of students admitted through the ETR pathway; establishing preferences for guaranteed students over ETR students in the admissions process, in tie-breaking decisions, or wait lists; and increasing winter and spring admissions.

It was noted that the guarantee has symbolic importance to many Californians and practical importance to those who enroll at UC through this route. The possibility that UC may no longer be able to honor it is a serious matter. All stakeholders will be challenged to consider the meaning and importance of the guarantee, the effect of its elimination, and possible solutions for preserving it. A short-term fix will not be sufficient to solve the problem.

It was noted that the referral pool has helped several campuses meet their enrollment goals over the years, but other campuses have found it a costly way to produce a relatively small, unpredictable number of students who actually enroll, and are unlikely to use it again without additional resources. Campuses understand that there are many well-qualified students in the referral pool, but some campuses also question whether the students in the pool with the weakest qualifications, who are also the most likely to accept the referral offer, are prepared to succeed at UC. It was noted that a transfer guarantee option could disrupt normal yield patterns and the regular transfer path, if more students than anticipated take advantage of it, and that campuses want to maintain their autonomy over admissions policy and enrollment target-setting, and may oppose any systemwide mandates.

Members suggested other adjustments that could help address the problem, including tightening the requirements for the guarantee and attaching additional major preparation requirements to the referral offer. It was noted that some high schools that currently participate in the ELC program may decide to end their participation if they believe UC is no longer honoring the referral guarantee.

It was noted that while UC policy is clear that the guarantee is valid only to the extent that space is available, it is more difficult for UC to claim that it lacks space as campuses increase nonresident enrollment. However, it is also reasonable for UC to point out that the state is not funding enrollment or capital facilities growth at a level needed to sustain resident access and in proportion to state population growth and demand.

III. Reports on Implementation of the new Transfer Admission Policy

In January, BOARS requested a report from each campus about their progress implementing the new transfer admissions pathways scheduled to take effect in 2015, including what campuses are doing to review existing lower-division transfer requirements and define the UC Transfer Curricula for appropriate majors, and the extent to which majors are setting common preparation requirements or maintaining unique characteristics. The Admissions Directors requested additional time to complete the reports. It was agreed that the reports will now be due by August 16.

IV. Compare Favorably Reports

In June 2011, BOARS adopted a policy that nonresidents admitted to a campus must “compare favorably” to CA residents admitted to that campus. BOARS later issued [evaluation procedures](#) to ensure that campuses meet the compare favorably standard and also resolved that campuses should report annually to BOARS on the extent to which they are meeting the standard. Campuses submitted their first reports to BOARS this year, for the 2012 admissions cycle.

BOARS Chair Johnson noted that campuses had used a variety of approaches in their assessments, and that BOARS will not prescribe measures for how campuses must perform the assessment. BOARS has suggested that it may be useful for campuses to consider traditional academic indicators, or to describe how they use comprehensive review to meet the standard, or to look for evidence of success after admission to UC. However, BOARS recognizes that “compare favorably” reflects the complexity of comparing residents and nonresidents, as campuses do not have the same local context and achievement information for nonresident applicants as they do for residents.

Agenda Part II: BOARS meeting

I. Consent Calendar

- Draft BOARS Minutes of May 28, 2013

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

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

Chair Powell thanked BOARS members for their service to the Senate and University, noting that BOARS' work demonstrates what can be achieved when dedicated faculty and administrators work together.

Following a recent tour of Chinese schools specializing in programs that prepare students for international study in English-speaking countries, a BOARS member noted several ways that UC may be disadvantaged in its recruitment of international students. First, UC's offer of "conditional admission" to international students may be less appealing compared to offers of "early admission" from other U.S. colleges, even though the plans are essentially the same. Some Chinese schools and students may also be discouraged by UC's request for a four-year transcript, as Chinese high schools typically are only for the final three years of study, and so use a three-year transcript. Finally, UC campuses do not usually provide boarding opportunities during breaks, which can pose a logistical and financial burden for some international students. It was noted that some UC campuses have been adjusting their break and summer housing arrangements to accommodate international students.

III. The Future of the Referral Guarantee

BOARS continued its discussion about options for maintaining the referral guarantee. Members expressed several concerns about a proposal that campuses admit all applicants with a 9x9 guarantee before turning to the ETR pool to meet an enrollment target. It was noted that campuses that admit large numbers of ETR students have comprehensive review procedures designed to capture students with the best chance of academic success, which often result in higher scores for ETR applicants compared to some applicants with a guarantee. Such a policy would also violate campus autonomy and the policy guaranteeing ETR students a comprehensive review.

Members expressed some support for asking campuses to review the referral pool prior to admitting from the campus's wait list, but it was also noted that asking other campuses to take referral pool students would not solve the essential problem. It was also noted that the scale of the problem is still unclear. Of the 10,318 total referral pool students this year, approximately 800 opted in to consider an admission offer by UC Merced's, and of those only 181 submitted an SIR to Merced.

IV. UC San Diego's Proposed Universitylink

BOARS continued its discussion of Universitylink, the proposed UCSD program that would give admission preference to low-income transfer students at nine San Diego area community colleges who fulfill specific academic eligibility requirements. It was noted that UCSD decided to end its participation in UC's systemwide Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program over concerns that it was crowding out other transfer paths and high performing students. UCSD remains concerned that as the third most selective campus, participation in a statewide transfer guarantee program would overwhelm its applicant pool, but wants to respond to local colleges and groups asking UCSD to institute a community-based guarantee. Universitylink would allow UCSD to establish a closer relationship with local community college counselors and students to better prepare more students for transfer. The clear pathway provided by the guarantee provision also helps instill confidence in potential transfers who might be more difficult to recruit without it.

Some BOARS members reiterated their concern about an admissions preference based on geography. Others noted that Universitylink could help engage students and prepare them for transfer even without the guarantee component, and it was suggested that Universitylink be implemented on a pilot basis and made available to a certain percentage of transfers. It was also suggested that UCSD review UCLA's Transfer Alliance Program as a possible model. It was agreed that UCLA and UCSD faculty and admissions directors would discuss this further.

V. Transferrable Math and Statement on Basic Math for All Prospective UC Students

BOARS reviewed several options for revising the language of the Transferrable Course Agreement (TCA) Guidelines to clarify the faculty's expectations for the math competency of UC transfer students and the content of courses that fulfill the quantitative requirement for transfer admission.

BOARS members discussed the pros and cons of several options, including replacing the reference to an intermediate algebra pre-requisite with a requirement for a pre-requisite tied to the Common Core State Standards for Math; maintaining the requirement for an intermediate algebra "or equivalent" pre-requisite and defining "equivalent" in terms of the Common Core; and removing the reference to "equivalent" courses, leaving a strict requirement for an intermediate algebra pre-requisite. No member favored maintaining the current language or totally eliminating the reference to a pre-requisite.

Action: BOARS voted unanimously in favor of maintaining the requirement for an intermediate algebra "or equivalent" pre-requisite, but defining "equivalent" in terms of the Common Core. Chair Johnson will prepare and circulate a statement describing the rationale for the change. It was noted that the University Committee on Preparatory Education had asked to review and weigh in on BOARS' position. The BOARS statement will be circulated to that committee's leadership.

It was noted that there is an effort to end some individual state's participation in the Common Core, but that California appears to be committed to its implementation as adopted in 2010.

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