

**I. Consent Calendar**

- Approval of the March 4, 2011 BOARS Minutes

**Action:** BOARS approved the March minutes.

**II. Announcements and Updates**

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

At its March 30 meeting, the Academic Council reviewed a letter from President Yudof to Governor Brown responding to concerns the Governor expressed at a meeting of the Community College Board about UC's work to improve the transfer path. In the letter, the President describes UC's efforts and says he supports implementation of AB 2302 through a possible Associate Degree for Transfer that would guarantee eligibility to UC across several majors.

Council's consultation with senior management included a presentation from Vice President Patrick Lenz on the state budget process and campus and systemwide options for addressing the budget gap. President Yudof lamented the state's diminishing commitment to the Master Plan, and asked the faculty to consider teaching more. He also spoke about the need to maintain competitive faculty salaries and to better inform the legislature and public about UC's research mission. The President is considering a number of scenarios to address the \$500 million cut and any additional cuts going forward. He wants to establish a five-year budget plan for the University, which may have to include annual tuition increases.

Council discussed the [report](#) of the Senate Membership Task Force, which recommends against extending Senate membership to additional faculty titles in the health sciences. Council also voted to circulate for systemwide Senate review proposed guidelines from CCGA for the review of new Self-Supporting Programs. Council deferred discussion of a UCOPE white paper about the need to fund ESL instruction and English Language support services on UC campuses.

Council voted to nominate UC Davis Professor Robert Powell to the Academic Assembly as the next Senate vice chair. The Assembly will act on the nomination at its April 13 meeting.

Chair Jacob attended the March 14 meeting of the Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF), which discussed transfer, shared review, and admissions processing funding. The APTF discussion will help inform BOARS' work in these areas.

**III. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Pamela Burnett, Interim Admissions Director*

Vice President Sakaki reported preliminary fall 2011 admissions outcomes. UC offered a place to 72,432 applicants, a 6% increase from last year. The number of out-of-state and international applicants and admits also increased. 18.1% of total admits are non-residents, compared to 14% last year. The proportion of admits from under-represented racial and ethnic groups grew from

28.3% to 30.8%, mostly due to an increase in Chicano/Latino admits. The proportion of African-American admits dropped slightly systemwide, although there were increases on some individual campuses. Academic indicators rose slightly overall. BOARS will have access to final outcomes as soon as they are available.

UC has implemented a new pilot referral process for domestic and international non-resident applicants who did not receive an offer from any campus to which they applied. There are 1,995 domestic and 44 international applicants in the referral pool, and campuses have agreed to April 15 as a common notification date. The 12,733 students in this year's resident referral pool will receive an offer of admission to UC Merced only. In previous years, only about 2-3% of referrals have accepted the Merced offer.

Many UCOP programs are being cut or considered for cuts, but so far the systemwide admissions related programs and services have been supported. At the same time, Student Affairs continues to seek opportunities for increasing efficiencies that also maintain quality. At the March 17 Regents meeting, Vice President Sakaki presented the annual [Accountability Sub-Report on Admissions and Enrollment](#), which focused on transfer students and the transfer path.

Student Affairs periodically reviews and responds to legislation affecting admissions. Recently, Assembly Bill 649 asked UC to give priority admission to members of the armed forces within five years of leaving active duty. UC responded that it would support the legislation only with amendments, as it does not offer priority admissions to any group.

Interim Director Burnett noted that the role of the Admissions Director on the campuses is evolving to encompass a greater role in recruitment, and yield efforts, including international and domestic nonresident.

#### **IV. Admissions Outcomes at UC San Diego**

Daniel Widener shared fall 2011 admissions outcome simulations from UC San Diego. UCSD experimented with a dual review system this year. One employed current comprehensive review procedures—using an index based on a combination of academic indicators and other life factors—and the other was a single score holistic review based on the UCLA system and using UCLA scores in addition to reviews done at UCSD. UCSD used both processes in its actual admission decisions; students deemed admissible under both were accepted automatically. Professor Widener noted that the holistic review simulation resulted in a smaller proportion of URM and First Generation College admits, and a larger proportion of high-income quartile admits compared to the comprehensive review system.

**Discussion:** Members noted that the single score holistic process produced different demographic outcomes from what some had expected; however, some expressed that BOARS should stand behind the basic fairness of the holistic method. There is a distinction between review and selection, and the holistic score is not the only factor that determines which students are finally selected at a campus. Holistic scores depend upon the campus's values embodied in scoring rubrics and the context information in the read sheet. Moreover, the Regents policy includes flexibility with regard to approaches campuses may use to meet their goals. It will be interesting to compare the other experiments in progress at Irvine, Davis, and elsewhere with the UCSD data and BOARS will do this when the data becomes available.

## **V. Proposed BOARS Statement and Metric for Admissions Processing**

**Issue:** BOARS reviewed a draft statement proposing a metric for the funding and staff support necessary to carry out recruitment, selection and yield work for fall 2012 freshman and transfer admissions. The proposal follows a survey of campus admissions directors that revealed general consistency across campuses in the time and personnel required for an individualized review of particular types of applications. Campuses agreed that it costs about twice as much and takes twice as long to review a transfer applicant compared to a freshman. All directors want to be able to hire back experienced retirees to help with workload as needed. The survey also revealed variations in the responsibilities admissions offices have on each campus. Chair Jacob has shared the draft with the Admissions Processing Task Force.

**Discussion:** Vice Chair Anderson recommended that BOARS send the document to Council, which will then send it to the President and Provost with a request that they forward it to the campus executive vice chancellors. He also noted that the Governor had just proposed a prohibition of retiree recall as part of his pension reform proposal. Chair Simmons asked BOARS to facilitate regular reporting and feedback from campuses about workload and staffing needs.

It was noted that the data will also help BOARS and admissions directors determine the extent to which shared review could be valuable and produce new efficiencies. Chair Jacob said he opposes any move to consider application fees as a revenue source equivalent to tuition.

**Action:** BOARS members will bring the document to their admissions committees and directors for further review and comment.

## **VI. Area b and c Descriptions**

Chair Jacob has asked a BOARS subcommittee to draft revisions to the ‘area b’ (English) descriptions to reflect California’s adoption of the Common Core Standards for the language arts. He also proposed changes to “area c” (Mathematics) descriptions that replace citations to the 1998 CA Math Standards with the Common Core Mathematics Standards and asked members to check these proposed changes with their campus committee. He said the ‘area b’ description should also be updated more significantly, and he included a model of what that revision might incorporate—including a list of “capacities” students are expected to gain in high school English taken from the Common Core. The area b draft will eventually be shared with an intersegmental faculty Task Force.

**Discussion:** It is important to change the language to reflect the reality of the Common Core but the area b revision does not address the basic need for students to pay attention to language while reading (reading for meaning). Educators want students to gain skills, not just capacities. Chair Jacob noted that this is discussed in the Common Core and that the committee is free to ignore his model and produce a draft they believe in.

**Action:** Daniel Widener, Tyrone Howard, Juan Poblete, and Susan Amussen will form a subcommittee to discuss the revisions.

## **VII. Shared Review Plan for fall 2012 Admissions**

BOARS reviewed a draft plan for generating holistic read scores for every UC applicant and sharing those scores across campuses. Berkeley and UCLA scores are being shared with San Diego and Irvine and are being used in selection at those campuses. Davis and Santa Cruz are discussing a transition to single-score holistic review and may be interested in scores from other campuses. Santa Barbara, Riverside and Merced may find score sharing useful for projecting enrollment as well comparing outcomes to their own comprehensive review processes.

**Discussion:** Campuses want to clarify the meaning of UCB and UCLA scores, especially lower scores, and their role in admission decisions there. For example, why did Berkeley admit 1000 students with scores of 4 or 5, but deny others with higher scores? It was noted that the shared scores do not reflect augmented reviews that may have led to a better score and an admission offer. In addition, some competitive programs and majors at UCLA and Berkeley establish their own high score targets and cut-offs, which could explain many of the outcomes for high scorers who were denied. It was noted that the scores are less meaningful to campuses if they do not encompass the final augmented review.

The UCLA and Berkeley systems developed in the context of those individual campus cultures. It may not always make sense to import them to another campus, especially if the read sheet data includes comparisons to applicants at Berkeley or UCLA instead of the campus where they are being considered. For a non-UCLA/Berkeley campus, a holistic score may have a different meaning if it was generated at the campus or by UCB/UCLA. It was also suggested that an identical reader training at each location could help make scores more consistent, and that UCOP should facilitate a second tier systemwide read at a single location that is distributed to all campuses.

Some members thought a completely centralized system would make little sense in the context of ongoing decentralization. It was also noted that UC cannot have true “shared review” because every campus wants to maintain a system that reflects its unique values. It might be better to propose a plan for broad “score sharing” without pushing a specific mode of implementation, and for each campus to develop its own individualized review process rather than rely exclusively on the UCLA/UCB scores.

Administrators are touting score sharing as a way to save money. It was noted that several campuses admit the vast majority of students who have very high Berkeley or UCLA scores. Score sharing can allow them to forego a read of those applications and focus on others. It was noted, however, that Merced will be choosing mainly from among the 4 scores, and that the 1-5 system does not provide the granularity in the 4 range Merced needs to make tie-breaking decisions. Whether or not score sharing actually produces new efficiencies or saves money, campuses will want access to the data regardless of how they ultimately decide to use them, because the scores will help promote discussion and understanding as well as be useful in enrollment forecasting.

**Action:** BOARS will review a revised document based on discussion at the May meeting.

## **VIII. Proposal for Comprehensive Review for Transfer Admission**

BOARS discussed Chair Jacob’s proposal for a version of ETR for major-based transfer admissions. The proposal is to guarantee a review to prospective transfers who complete an SB1440 Associate Degrees for Transfer with a 2.4 GPA and show the strongest case for being able to complete their declared majors in two years. It parallels changes to freshman admissions requirements taking effect for fall 2012.

**Discussion:** There were concerns about added workload. A 2.4 GPA requirement is a low threshold, especially for a competitive major at Berkeley, and one member estimated that it could add as many as 1500 applications to the review pool there. Moreover, students have very little chance of being accepted into many majors at Berkeley with a 2.4 GPA, and it is not helpful to send transfers false hopes by inviting them to apply and then telling them they are not prepared at selection time.

Also, when transfers arrive unprepared for a major, they have to enroll in freshman-level classes for remediation, which in some cases is forcing campuses to establish stricter pre-major requirements so the entering transfers do not further impact lower division courses.

On the other hand, many potential transfers will be preparing to transfer into a major at CSU, which guarantees admission with the SB1440 AA degree. The proposal simply gives transfers another option in UC. It is possible that the large number of pre-major requirements in the legislation may actually discourage many prospective transfers from applying. It is important to provide clear messages to transfers about the importance of preparation.

UC is not obligated to accept the transfer model curricula established by CSU and the Community Colleges, which so far number five. (An additional three are out for review, and several more are being prepared.) UC's first priority should be to complete the UC Transfer Model Curricula. The five UC transfer groups who met at the end of 2010 to discuss commonalities in lower division major prep will reconvene by phone this spring to respond to the CSU Transfer Models. Two additional transfer groups will meet this spring and several others will meet in the fall. UC owes the Legislature an interim report by June 30 and a final report by December 31.

It was noted that 80% of UC transfers come from 17 Community Colleges. Most of the other 95 CCCs are not set up to prepare students for transfer to UC, and many of these are in the Central Valley. This situation will only worsen with budget cuts.

## **IX. K-12 Online Education**

- *with Kelly Schwirzke, Santa Clara County Office of Education Online Learning Coordinator*

**Issue:** The Articulation and Evaluation subcommittee invited Online Learning Coordinator Schwirzke to discuss her study of online learning in K-12 school districts. The subcommittee is responsible for approving online providers for a-g courses using BOARS-approved provider criteria, and is examining the role of online education in K-12 as it considers possible revisions to the criteria. They have questions about who is taking online courses and their educational outcomes and preparation.

**Report:** Coordinator Schwirzke said many California school districts, particularly those with underserved rural and urban high schools, are struggling with budget cuts and are desperate to find ways to offer specific courses—especially a-g, AP, and advanced math courses—to graduate their students and improve their chances for college eligibility and admission. About 13% of districts responded to her survey, which revealed that school districts use online education to address inequity of access as well as to accommodate the needs of specific students. California is one of the only states without an agreed upon definition of “online,” but districts are using a

variety of models, including purely online courses and “blended” courses that put the student in a classroom with a teacher part of the time.

Ms. Schwirzke said studies show that online instruction and in-person instruction are similar in quality and outcomes. The teacher is the most important factor in student success, and districts require a “highly qualified” teacher (one who is certified in that subject area) to teach online courses. Districts follow national standards and best practices for academic integrity that include exam proctoring, mentoring, and quality assurance. Schools are prohibited from charging students for online courses, so online education is not really a way for most schools to save money; however, it does help schools that are losing teachers stay afloat.

Districts plan to offer more online courses in the years ahead. Some states now require high school students to complete an online class to graduate. California districts want clear models they can have confidence in, and some want to develop their own content. They also want to retain the principal certification route, and they need clearer messages from UC about its expectations.

Districts commented that it may be too difficult and time consuming for BOARS to closely monitor all courses and providers effectively, as online education is a quickly evolving, fast moving target. Some districts feel the need to duplicate UC’s review of the providers and courses as part of their own quality assurance. BOARS should consider why it has an online provider policy and its desired goals and outcomes. Schools sometimes have difficulty interpreting the current policies and meeting them in a way that addresses the needs of students. BOARS has an opportunity to leverage its influence to transform education by eliminating barriers and raising the bar.

**Discussion:** Faculty want a policy that works and makes sense but they do not always have enough information about what is going on in the schools. The current policy envisions phasing out principal certification, but it may be better to strengthen that route to approval.

Some members expressed their opinion that it would be less difficult to offer effective online education in math and qualitative disciplines, where the learning is more cumulative, and more difficult in something like history or literature.

## **X. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

Coordinator Schwirzke and the A&E subcommittee continued the discussion. Members were interested in how they could help simplify the process but also maintain quality and even raise the bar. One member suggested a two-tier process. First, UC would maintain its current provider review procedures, but in the course approval process, UC would provide general guidelines and allow districts greater autonomy to approve specific courses to align them with existing curricula.

Coordinator Schwirzke said districts are interested in anything that can help improve the preparation of students. Some stakeholders view UC’s school-provider partnership policy as confusing or too restrictive or both. The perception is that UC is moving too slowly, and the implementation reality is evolving beyond the policy. Some schools and districts feel they cannot take advantage of multiple partners. BOARS should consider the outlines of a useful policy from the perspective of the users. If UC does not manage the message, the providers will. Other difficult topics BOARS might address include how to fulfill the laboratory science requirement

online (often the last hurdle for underserved students), and how to draw the line between online and face-to-face instruction.

Members requested information about the leading states and exemplars of good K-12 online policy. It was also noted that BOARS does not have access to letters of recommendation from school districts. Don Daves-Rougeaux noted that UC is establishing an a-g Advisory Committee subcommittee that will bring together users and providers regularly to discuss online education topic.

## **XII. Transfer Subcommittee**

The transfer committee discussed the transfer proposal in further detail. It was agreed that more information would help in formulating a new policy and that representatives from the Community Colleges should be consulted. The subcommittee agreed to a revision of SR 480, related to transfer credit for students whose pre-collegiate education was largely completed in a single language other than English, and who then enroll in courses in that language. The revision will go out to BOARS for review.

## **XIII. Executive Session**

BOARS met in executive session.

-----  
The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Bill Jacob