

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

Minutes of Meeting

June 6, 2014

I. Consent Calendar

1. BOARS Minutes of May 2, 2014

Action: BOARS approved the May 2, 2014 meeting minutes.

I. Announcements

- o *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*

May 28 Academic Council Meeting: Chair Johnson and Vice President Sakaki presented the [Transfer Action Team](#) (TAT) report and recommendations to the Academic Council on May 28. They noted that the Senate will be asked to help implement Recommendation 3, which calls on UC faculty to streamline and strengthen lower division transfer pathways by aligning major preparation requirements across campuses and with the Associate Degrees for Transfer (AA-T). Council also received an update on about the Governor's May budget revision and alternative UC budgets approved by the State Assembly and Senate that provide more funding for the University than what is proposed by the Governor.

Presentation to Regents of Transfer Action Team Report: During the presentation of the TAT Report at the May Regents meeting, the Governor suggested that UC replace much of its lower division enrollments with community college transfers, and one Regent challenged the faculty to make a serious effort to implement Recommendation 3. UCOP is preparing responses to questions from Regents that arose during the presentation and plans to give individual or small groups of Regents more detailed briefings about the report.

UCSD Tribal Membership and Admissions Proposal: Chair Jacob asked the Office of General Counsel for a legal opinion about a proposal from the UCSD Committee on Admissions that would broaden the understanding of tribal membership in federally-recognized tribes in the context of comprehensive review procedures for admission.

BOARS-UCOPE Statement on the Importance of Writing: A letter from President Napolitano thanks BOARS and UCOPE for their joint [Statement on the Importance of Writing at UC](#).

Senate Bill 1200: The University has issued a "neutral" position on Senate Bill 1200, which calls on UC to develop guidelines for high school computer science courses that satisfy the mathematics (area "c") requirement for UC admission. The letter notes that should the bill pass, UC will act through BOARS to develop guidelines for computer science courses that incorporate sufficiently rigorous math content that prepares students for college-level work.

May Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) Meeting: The May ICAS meeting focused largely on transfer admission issues. ICAS members learned that more than 5,000

California community college (CCC) students earned an Associate Degree for Transfer (AD-T) in 2012-13, compared to 800 in 2011-12; that the CCC is tracking the destinations of students who earned AD-Ts; and that UC will track the progress of transfer students who arrive at UC with a degree.

II. Topics for Joint Meeting with the Admissions Directors

BOARS identified topics for its annual half-day joint meeting with the campus admissions directors scheduled for June 27. Director of Undergraduate Admissions Trevino noted that campus admission directors are interested in discussing the potential move to a 7x7 eligibility construct, the upcoming redesign of the SAT, and the Transfer Action Team report. BOARS members suggested as additional topics, workload pressures associated with the rising number of applications, increasing selectivity, and holistic review; campus enrollment growth plans; and the extent to which campus waitlist systems and the transfer referral pool are working as well as they should.

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*

LGBT Advisory Group: President Napolitano will create a group to advise her on how to create a more welcoming and inclusive environment for LGBT students, faculty and staff. She made the announcement after reviewing the recommendations of an LGBT Climate and Inclusion Task Force. One of their recommendations is to allow students to voluntarily report their sexual orientation and gender identity on the UC application.

Statements of Intent to Register (SIR) Outcomes: The SIR rate for fall 2014 was 45% systemwide, while campus rates varied from 44.5% at UCB to 16.2% at UCM. SIRs from California resident underrepresented minority (URM) students grew as a proportion of the total, with the growth driven primarily by Hispanic/Latino students. SIRs from nonresidents grew from 18.3% to 20.2% of the total, although nonresidents continued to accept admission offers at much lower rates than residents. It is expected that nonresidents will comprise 13% of the total undergraduate class in fall 2014.

Transfer Admission Outcomes: UC admitted 20,472 CCC transfer students for fall 2014 at a systemwide admission rate of 69.6%. URM students grew to comprise 27.9% of the total admitted transfer pool, and international students comprise 12.5% of the admitted transfer pool, up from 11.5%.

A BOARS member noted that the “URM” category includes African-Americans and American Indians as well as Hispanic/Latinos, and that reporting a single outcome for URM students may obscure the lack of progress of some individual racial groups who help comprise the overall category.

IB and AP New and/or Revised Courses and Examinations: UCOP recently met with Chair Johnson to discuss next steps for reviewing several revisions to the IB and AP examinations and

a new AP “Capstone Program” in the context of UC credit. UC faculty content experts will be tasked with reviewing the Capstone Program and the new and revised examinations, and with recommending to BOARS whether credit should be awarded and at what level. In the meantime, all revised AP and IB examinations will be grandfathered in under current credit provisions. 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.

IV. Consultation with the College Board – the Redesigned SAT

- *Cynthia Schmeiser, Chief of Assessment*
- *Ken Woods, Western Region Higher Education Executive Director*
- *Senior Consultant, Higher Education*

Issue: Representatives from the College Board joined BOARS to discuss topics and questions related to the [redesigned SAT test](#) taking effect for 2016 admissions. A BOARS subcommittee sent the College Board questions in advance of the meeting to help guide the discussion.

Why Redesign the SAT: Ms. Schmeiser noted that only 43% of the 1.7 million students who took the SAT in 2013 are defined as college-ready, based on a 1550 score benchmark. This statistic is troubling because it is low and has remained flat for five years. College readiness is highly correlated with college success. Unprepared students drop-out of college at high rates and present colleges with a large remediation burden.

Context for Assessment: The College Board understands that simply changing the SAT will not solve the college preparation problem. It is committed to a broader theory of action to expand opportunity and to ensure students are prepared to enter and succeed in college. First, its low-income college application fee waiver service and AP Potential All-In campaign help propel disadvantaged students into college opportunity. Second, a new partnership with the web-based Khan Academy to provide free test preparation and a new effort to publicize SAT test specifications will help protect students from the pressures of inequality. Third, the College Board is promoting a closer relationship between instruction and assessment to encourage excellent classroom work and accelerate students who are falling behind.

The Redesigned SAT: The new SAT will have three sections: the Evidence-Based Reading and Writing section and the Math section will comprise the main three-hour test; an optional 50-minute Essay section will be offered as well. It will be administered for the first time in March 2016, and a redesigned PSAT will be first administered in fall 2015. The new test will continue to be an admissions assessment, but will center on a smaller set of elements that the College Board believes matter most for college readiness and success. The test will emphasize students’ command of evidence in both reading and math, their ability to synthesize words, numbers, and graphical displays, and real world applications. It is intended to reflect students’ best work and their ability to distill high school knowledge that is most important for college success.

Test Specifications and Sample Items: The test specifications are a work in progress and will continue to be refined based on ongoing research. The Reading test and Writing and Language test will be passage-based and focus on cross-disciplinary contexts in literature, history/social sciences, and science; the meaning of words in context; command of evidence; expression of ideas; and standard English conventions. The Math test will include separately-timed calculator-

permitted and not-permitted sections, and focus on application, procedural skill and fluency, and conceptual understanding within a broad range of contexts.

Optional Essay Test: Making the Essay section optional does not mean that the College Board no longer values writing. The College Board remains committed to writing, but believes that improvements to writing should be supported by a stronger connection between assessment and classroom instruction. It also determined that the Essay was not being used in admission decisions by enough postsecondary institutions to justify it being mandatory. The redesigned Essay will expand from 35 to 50 minutes and the report will involve three analytic scores. It will ask students to analyze arguments on a topic rather than present their opinion, and will put students in the mode of creating, revising, and editing an essay. The Essay prompt will not change and is publically available.

Test Development Process: The test development process for the redesigned SAT involved evidence-based research, consultations with college instructors and disciplinary researchers, the development and refinement of test specifications and questions, and testing to ensure that questions do not carry a bias toward any group. The College Board is gathering predictive validity evidence about the extent to which the test is aligned with college success, and will conduct a larger predictive study starting with the first entering class who enter college in 2017. The final test will undergo rigorous review and testing to ensure it is fair to all groups and sustains predictive validity. The Board is also developing a longitudinal assessment system based on research about the preparation students need for college success. The system will include instruction modules for grades 6 to 12 that integrate with the redesigned SAT, as well as a revised PSAT, which the College Board hopes will help identify underperforming students for interventions that will keep them on a college track.

BOARS Discussion: A BOARS member applauded the College Board's efforts to increase the SAT's clarity and openness and its connection to high school curriculum, but expressed doubt about how much change the SAT can really engender in classrooms. A member expressed concern that in making the Essay section optional, the College Board is sending a message that writing is not as important as it used to be. The Board should clarify that the redesigned SAT includes writing and only the Essay is optional. It was noted that some institutions that choose not to consider the Essay may do so on the basis of a flawed product and may reconsider their position if the redesigned product is superior. It was noted that a 2008 UCOP study showed that the SAT writing section is one of the best predictors of first-year UC GPA, and that BOARS will need to make a decision about the Essay section before it has access to updated predictive validity evidence. It was noted that the Essay could be a good surrogate for the Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE). BOARS members noted that the rapid rise in high-stakes testing has had no effect on the proportion of college-ready students and that standardized tests tend to measure the schooling experience of students, not what they know. The College Board must ensure that the new test takes into consideration the diverse learning contexts and unique challenges that are particularly associated with English language learners and students of color.

College Board: Ms. Schmeiser noted that the College Board believes that focusing on stronger instructional models in high schools and providing more support to teachers through the grade 6-12 course frameworks will help young people prepare for college-ready writing. She noted that the College Board addresses bias in multiple ways. Sensitivity and fairness reviewers evaluate each question on the basis of its potential to carry a racial or religious bias and also consider the

performance of different groups on each question. The Math development team includes ELL specialists to ensure that the questions do not include words students might misunderstand.

V. BOARS Discussion of the Redesigned SAT

- *BOARS Members*

Discussion: A BOARS member noted that UC can demonstrate leadership and send a strong message about the value of writing by continuing to require the SAT Essay. It was suggested that BOARS study the predictive validity of the Essay sub-score, although it was also noted that the new Essay will differ significantly from the old, making a direct comparison more difficult. A member expressed concern about the College Board's new effort to insert itself in K-12 education, noting that high stakes assessments already play too great a role in the lives of children and their education and that changing high school curriculum to prepare students for a single exam is wrong. Another member noted that an assessment test like the SAT will always exist, and commended the College Board for designing a better test that is more worth teaching to than the current test.

Action: UCOP will gather data on the correlations between the SAT essay scores and UC first year GPA for the June 27 meeting.

VI. Consultation with Academic Senate

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gilly, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Jacob: The May Regents meeting coincided with a UC Lobby Day in Sacramento, which featured meetings between state officials and UC faculty, students, Regents, and administrators who pressed legislators for a budget plan that commits more funds to higher education. Regent Kieffer asked for a report detailing how the Senate establishes the "meaning of a UC undergraduate degree," and under pressure from student activists, the Regents agreed to form a task force to study the possibility of divesting from fossil fuel companies. The President expressed concern about "excess units," and has asked a task force to examine the effectiveness of UC's conflict of interest/commitment policies. UC recently settled with the UAW to avert a strike by graduate student Teaching Assistants, and the Senate is satisfied with a compromise agreement for Composite Benefit Rates approved at the May 7 Council of Chancellors meeting. UCOP is drafting an enrollment management plan while the university waits to see if the state will provide additional funding for enrollment.

Vice Chair Gilly: An all-UC Doctoral Student Support Conference held at UC Irvine on April 15 and co-sponsored by the Senate has generated a number of substantive best practices and recommendations for supporting doctoral students. One proposal garnering strong support is to eliminate nonresident supplemental tuition (NRST) charged to students in academic doctoral and MFA programs after the first year.

VII. Next Steps for Transfer Action Team Report Implementation

Issue: Recommendation 3 of the Transfer Action Team (TAT) report focuses on ways in which the Academic Senate may wish to streamline the academic preparation process for community college transfer students.

Chair Johnson noted that the TAT has recommended that UC majors align their lower division preparation requirements across multiple (or ideally all) UC campuses, and, where appropriate, with the Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) developed by the CCC/CSU for the Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T). Greater alignment will help clarify for potential transfers which lower division courses they need in order to be considered for entrance to a UC major, and help them prepare simultaneously for multiple UC campuses and for both UC and CSU. There are already UC majors with a high level of commonality in lower-division requirements across campuses. The next step is for campuses to agree that a TMC satisfies the lower-division requirement for a particular major. In many cases, UC departments can align their major pathways with a TMC without changing existing requirements. Campuses already admit transfers who need additional lower division units; similarly, they could consider students with an AD-T who have completed a sufficient amount of lower division work in the view of the nine campuses, recognizing that they may need to take additional lower division units at UC.

The TAT suggests two options: the first is to assemble systemwide groups of faculty for various majors to talk through differences and attempt to reach agreements that a TMC provides adequate, if not complete, lower division preparation; the second is to empanel a BOARS subcommittee or a separate faculty committee to develop alignment proposals for campus/departmental review. UCOP is currently reviewing the AD-Ts for which there is a corresponding UC major and the extent to which they are aligned at each campus.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that UC faculty want transfer students to arrive prepared for UC-level work, but not all CCC courses are equivalent to UC courses, and the composition and focus of a major may differ greatly from campus to campus. The [UC Transfer Preparation Paths website](#) and the [ASSIST website](#) list the lower division courses campuses have defined as required, optional, or recommended for transfer admission; however, those distinctions do not always help students. It was noted that some departments may resist alignment efforts, but the potential for faculty buy-in may be greater with Option 1, although Option 2 is more manageable and would allow for a broader view. It was noted that campuses have provided UCOP with enough major preparation information to show where commonalities exist.

VIII. Campus Admissions and Selection Practices with School/College/Department Participation

Issue: The UCI Senate division chair asked BOARS to opine on whether several pilot programs underway on that campus are consistent with systemwide comprehensive review policy. Under the pilots, students are admitted to the general campus through holistic review, and then an additional filter is applied to determine admission to the major in which one or two criteria may be used to deselect students. Students who are in the inadmissible pool for a specific major are redirected to other majors on the campus.

Some UCI schools and departments, including Biological Sciences, Engineering, and Physics, are concerned that students who enter the campus with SAT math scores below a certain

threshold are not prepared to succeed in certain majors. The Biological Sciences pilot requires students who intend to enter a Biology major to have a minimum 550 SAT math/24 ACT score or a minimum AP Biology score of 4 or 5. Pilot programs in Physics and Engineering require students with similarly low SAT math scores to undergo a second major-based holistic review.

Discussion: A BOARS member noted that it would be consistent with policy for majors to set additional entrance requirements as long as they do not prevent students from being admitted to the campus. While the School of Biological Sciences pilot uses a single variable to deselect student for admission to a specific major, no student is being denied admission to the campus, and admission to a major is fundamentally different from admission to the campus. Other members expressed the opinion that the practice violates at least the spirit, if not the letter, of the [Comprehensive Review Guideline](#) that states that “no fixed proportion of applicants should be admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.” To ensure that all students are reviewed on the basis of their full range of achievements, the School of Biological Sciences should change their strict cutoff policy and implement a supplemental review of students seeking admission who have lower than desired math SAT scores or a low indicator in another single area.

BOARS members noted that the pilots in Physics and Engineering pilots are consistent with policy because they require a supplemental holistic review. It was also noted that majors at other campuses may have similar policies to the one in use at the UCI School of Biological Sciences.

Action: A motion was made and seconded that would have affirmed that the UCI School of Biological Sciences policy is consistent with the spirit of the holistic review. The motion failed 7 to 2 with one abstention.

Action: Chair Johnson will respond to UCI Division chair.

IX. AP, IB, and other Pre-UC Units Awarded to Incoming Freshmen

Issue: BOARS discussed data provided by UCOP showing a recent increase in the number of units brought to UC by enrolled freshmen, and the variation in average number of units by ethnic background and high school API ranking. Some faculty are concerned that students bring too many high school units to UC, and have suggested that BOARS adjust the Honors/AP units policy or the GPA bonus (“bump”) policy that provides extra points in the GPA calculation for completion of AP and UC-certified Honors courses. The Senate and BOARS have considered the honors grade point bump several times in the past. In 1998, the Senate recommended reducing the bump from a full 1.0 to 0.5, and in 2005, a Senate Task Force [concluded](#) that the bump policy was educationally unsound.

The UCOP data indicate that between 2007 and 2013, the number of units students brought to UC increased across all API school categories, with disproportionately large increases at high ranking API schools. For example, the average units from API 1 schools rose 8%, while the average units from API 10 schools rose 31%. Among ethnic groups, the differential between white/Asian students and students from underrepresented minority groups grew between 2007 and 2013.

Discussion: Several BOARS members spoke in favor of establishing a cap on the number of units students can bring with them to UC, and eliminating or reducing the GPA bump. Some faculty are concerned that the size of the bump is inappropriate and skeptical that high school courses, particularly 10th grade courses, should be considered “college level.” Moreover, completion of Honors/AP courses is already an explicit added-value factor in comprehensive review, making it less clear that a bump is necessary. There is also concern that the honors course “arms race” benefits high-income students with access to a large number of AP courses, over students at less-resourced schools.

It was also noted that without the bump, students might elect to take fewer advanced courses; that the current policies help bolster UC’s time-to-degree rate; and that the AP curriculum is becoming more prominent in low API schools with large populations of underrepresented students.

Action: BOARS will seek to define the problem more precisely and take up the issue again.

X. Freshman Eligibility and Referral

Issue: BOARS reviewed a proposal for calculating the percentage of “top” public high school students who apply to UC, using ELC benchmarking information reported by high schools. The calculation will help in the construction of a new statewide eligibility index that more accurately brings the total number of statewide eligible (guaranteed) students to 10% of public high school graduates. The model assumes that 82% of top students apply to UC, and based on that assumption computes the statewide index for the top 9%, 8%, and 7% of public high school graduates. The simulation of a 7x7 eligibility/guarantee construct that retains GPA-only for ELC estimates a referral pool of about 3,500 in 2013. The model addresses the problem that UC is offering too many students a guarantee.

One member noted that the goal was not to eliminate the referral pool but to minimize the number of students with a guarantee. Another member suggested that a goal might be to tighten the guarantee qualifications sufficiently that more campuses would be interested in selecting students from the referral pool.

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