

**I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS March 2012 minutes.

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

**II. Announcements**

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair*

At the March Academic Council meeting, President Yudof reported on UC's negotiations with the Governor on a multi-year agreement to fund UC that is contingent on voter passage of the Governor's revenue-raising ballot measure. The Regents are holding their May meeting in Sacramento in hopes that the Regents and students can stand together on behalf of UC (although there are no plans to invite students to Sacramento).

The Budget Rebenching Task Force has agreed to several principles and recommendations regarding a new per-student State funding distribution model. The model will be phased in over six years starting in fiscal year 2012-13. Funding for Merced and UCSF will be treated separately to address their special circumstances.

UC Online Education (UCOE) wants to begin marketing its course in mid-June, and is asking the Senate to establish a provisional policy environment that can govern its operation until Senate bylaws are officially amended. The UCEP chair briefed Council about several potential changes to Senate regulations regarding UCOE, including a requirement that UCEP approve UCOE courses as systemwide courses and impose a 50% cap on non-matriculated enrollment in UCOE courses. In addition, Chair Jacob has asked UCOE to apply for online provider Program status to ensure that UCOE meets the same thresholds expected of "a-g" providers. Some Council members are concerned about the notion that UCOE will be a "self-supporting" program and about the impact on graduate students if large numbers of non-matriculated students enroll in UCOE.

Council has endorsed BOARS' [resolution](#) on maintaining the integrity of the ELC program. Divisional responses to BOARS' Transfer admissions policy proposal are due May 16.

UCOP has determined that it will not be feasible for students to voluntarily report their sexual orientation on the SIR form, and is exploring other options for implementing the Senate's [recommendation](#).

Chair Jacob recently sent comments to the Senate about [Assembly Bill 2001](#), which would encourage UC to use the California Standards Test in admissions. Several legislators recently wrote to ICAS urging UC to implement Senate Bill 532—which asks UC and CSU to adopt

consistent guidelines for granting credit for International Baccalaureate Program courses—by awarding honors credit for IB Standard Level exams in addition to IB Higher Level exams. ICAS will discuss the SB 532 issue at its next meeting.

**Discussion:** Interim Admissions Director Jeffrey said campus administrators occasionally question the value of centrally-managed admissions programs like ELC and “a-g,” which campuses support with their Funding Streams assessment, but which may not benefit them directly. BOARS members agreed that UC’s stewardship of “a-g” is a crucially important contribution to education, and one member suggested that BOARS advocate for raising the application fees to support central admissions operations.

### **III. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

BOARS reviewed preliminary freshman admissions data for the fall 2012 class. UC’s overall admission rate was about 63.5%; for California residents, that rate was about 65.8%. UC admitted 2,200 more California resident applicants compared to last year (unduplicated) and more out-of-state and international applicants, but the systemwide admission rate, along with the admission rate for all resident groups, fell due to the much larger applicant pool.

Applicants who met both the ELC and statewide guarantees were admitted to a campus of their choice at a 93% rate, compared to the overall resident admit rate of 65.8%. Specific UC campuses admitted approximately 74% of applicants who had the ELC-eligible-only guarantee and 74% of applicants with the statewide only guarantee. (ELC-eligible-only admits represent about 7% of total California resident admits.) Campuses also admitted 48% of applicants without a guarantee who met the minimum Entitled to Review qualifications. (21% of total resident admits were ETR.) About 2% of total resident admits who did not meet the minimum ETR requirements were admitted (through Admissions by Exception), well below the 6% level authorized by the Regents. The nonresident admission rate fell at many individual campuses compared to last year, and UC is still analyzing the academic profile of the nonresidents who were admitted.

There were only minor shifts in the academic profile of the 2012 admitted pool compared to last year as defined by GPAs, test scores, and “a-g” course completion, and the shift was smaller than the changes reflected in the application pool. Diversity increased overall. Increases in the number of First Generation College students, low income students and students from low API high schools in the overall application pool is also reflected in the admit pool. The percent of underrepresented minority applicants and admits as a proportion of the total applicant and admit pools increased this year compared to last year. The admit rate for URM students fell at a slightly higher rate (-4.1%) compared to the total admitted pool (-3.9%).

Applicants and admits who are ELC-eligible-only or who have ETR status only are more ethnically diverse than the overall applicant or admit pools. Chicano/Latinos, First Generation College students, and students from low API high schools admitted from those pools were admitted at a higher rate than other cohorts. African-Americans in the ELC-eligible-only and

ETR pools were admitted at a slightly lower rate compared to their representation as applicants. 83% of ELC-eligible-only admits and 63% of the ETR admits are First Generation College.

Preliminary analysis shows the expansion of ELC appears to have contributed to diversity with the ELC-eligible-only cohort being more diverse than the full eligible pool.

All of the above preliminary data will be updated at the May meeting.

**Discussion:** Chair Jacob noted that the admissions outcomes are positive. The numbers are impressive considering the budget crisis. UC continues to serve the people of California and is opening its doors to more excellent California students who might have been shut out in the past. The ETR data show that ETR does not mean “entitled to rejection” as some had feared. The ELC-eligible-only cohorts have less access to Honors courses than others, which shows that the policy is addressing lack of opportunity in high schools and that UC is becoming more inclusive.

A BOARS member suggested that the committee examine which students admitted from the ETR pool would have been admitted under the previous rules. It was also suggested that BOARS review data on the cohort of students who took the SAT Subject test, and data showing the geographical diversity of the admit pool.

One member questioned whether there is really a strong correlation between First Generation College status and poverty or lack of cultural capital. It was noted that the correlation between these factors is very high for Mexican-Americans.

#### **IV. “Excess Units” Cap Policy**

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

Current policy caps the number of units that UC will accept for transfer from a two-year college at 105 quarter/70 semester units. Some campuses have policies barring students with more than 80 semester units of coursework from transfer, when the total number of units includes coursework from a four-year institution. BOARS members agreed in February that it would be more logical to treat lower division units from a four-year institution and a two-year institution identically in the calculation of the cap. The new policy drafted by Associate Director Brick maintains the current 105/70 cap on transferrable lower division units, but makes it explicit that the cap also applies to lower division units earned at a four-year institution. Thus, students who exceed the cap and have earned lower division units at both a four-year institution and a CCC would no longer be barred from admission automatically. In addition, the policy states that students who meet the lower division cap and have up to 15/10 upper division units can still be considered for junior-level transfer admission, reflecting current practice, and encourages campuses to be flexible beyond that. The policy would not change UC’s enrollment preferences for CCC transfers.

**Action:** A motion to approve the policy was made and seconded, and BOARS approved the motion unanimously.

#### **V. ELC Determination Process**

- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*

BOARS reviewed a summary of the process by which UCOP determines the ELC 9%. Interim Director Jeffery noted that UC used to pay an outside vendor to review all transcripts from all high schools each year to determine eligibility for the ELC 4%, but the policy expanding the guarantee to the top 9% made the old process too expensive and burdensome. The new process uses UC applicants' self-reported GPA information as the basis for the initial ELC calculation. UCOP supplements the self-reported information with an evaluation of transcripts submitted by high schools. UC uses the transcript information and information from the CDE about the size of each high school graduating class to calculate a 9% benchmark GPA cutoff for each high school. Students are assessed for ELC status against this benchmark when they apply. UC asks for transcript information on a three year cycle, so the benchmark remains for three years, unless UC notices an anomaly. Anomalies most commonly result from fluctuations in the enrollment of schools, particularly very small schools, which may affect the denominator used to calculate the GPA cutoff. Unlike the past, applicants do not know with certainty that they are in the 9% ELC pool until after they apply, although UC informs the top 15% in the fall that they have been identified as among the school's top students and encourages them to apply.

**Discussion:** Several BOARS members said they were pleased with the summary and explanation of the process, noting that it makes sense to use the information that students are submitting. There was concern that only 63% of high schools participate in the ELC program, and one member asked how many students were represented in the remaining 37% of high schools. A member said UC should do more to communicate to schools the value UC campuses place on ELC; however, there was also concern that ELC status has diminished in value, and that as Merced's ability to accommodate the referral pool decreases, the value of ELC becomes less clear. It was noted that some campuses value ELC in comprehensive review and will continue to use ELC status in tie breaking. One member noted a potential problem related to schools that are broken up into multiple communities or instances where two separate schools are located at the same physical site. Interim Director Jeffery will ask the CDE for information about how these latter circumstances are reported.

## **VI. Proposed Policy for Approval of Virtual Schools, Publishers, and Online courses and Proposed BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning**

- *George Johnson, BOARS Vice Chair*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Admissions*

The new policy would institute a two-step process for certifying that an online course can be offered for "a-g" credit. Online course publishers would start by submitting their courses to the California Learning Resource Network ([CLRN](#)) for review against the California Content Standards or the Common Core State Standards, and a set of [Standards for Quality Online Courses](#) established by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning ([iNACOL](#)). If the course meets an 80% threshold for each, including 15 required "power standards," the publisher can submit it to UC Doorways for final "a-g" review. In addition, virtual schools seeking to offer "a-g" courses would be required to submit a new school survey (application) with evidence of regional accreditation and an operation aligned with iNACOL's [Standards for Quality Online Programs](#).

Vice Chair Johnson also invited feedback on a proposed BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning, which summarizes BOARS' major concerns about online education and the quality measures BOARS is seeking in an online course or program – e.g., access to content experts, instructor support, and proctored exams (it was noted that the latter is not covered in the iNACOL quality standards).

**Discussion:** BOARS members expressed general support for both documents. A BOARS member noted that students enrolled in an online course or program should have access to a qualified local professional, or perhaps a roving paraprofessional, who can provide mentoring and support. BOARS members also expressed concern about academic integrity. A member suggested that BOARS explicitly require face-to-face assessment with identity verification. Another member mentioned that he was aware of research showing that cheating is no more prevalent in online courses than traditional courses. A member said that BOARS' policy should not be so prescriptive that it precludes creative approaches to any of these issues. It was also noted that UCOP cannot monitor how schools and districts use courses once they are approved. The teacher, and to a lesser extent the school using a publisher's course, should be responsible for ensuring that the student enrolled in the course is the one completing the coursework.

Associate Director Lin noted that since 2006, schools have used the principal certification option to approve an unknown number of online courses, including courses offered through providers who have not received program status approval from UC.

**Action:** The A&E subcommittee will discuss a final draft and send it to BOARS for approval in May.

## **VII. Proposed Disclaimer for Marketing Materials re Guarantees**

A BOARS subcommittee has proposed required disclaimer language for use in the marketing materials of Extension and other campus-affiliated programs to address recent instances in which guarantees of campus admission may have been explicitly or implicitly implied to non-matriculated students. The subcommittee also proposed a resolution to address a separate but related concern about communications promising “conditional” admission to the campus for non-matriculated students enrolled in a year-long academic preparation program offered by University Extension.

BOARS members supported the general intent of the disclaimer and favored a resolution stating that application to Extension or other UC-affiliated programs does not constitute an application to UC, and that notification to students of their admission to Extension or other UC programs should not originate from or be implied to come from the campus admissions office, and should not communicate or imply any guarantee of admission or conditional admission to the campus.

**Action:** The subcommittee will put final touches on the resolution, which will be circulated to BOARS for approval.

## **VIII. Planning for Comprehensive Review Report**

Chair Jacob reminded BOARS members to submit a report on their campus' implementation of holistic review in time for the May meeting. It was noted that on some campuses, administrators

and faculty may have differing perspectives about the implementation and successes of the holistic review process, which will limit their ability to speak in a unified voice. Chair Jacob said it is not necessary for campuses to reach a consensus view; the report can acknowledge differing opinions.

## **IX. UC Online Education Project**

- *Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs, & Coordination*
- *Keith Williams, UC Davis faculty and Academic Associate to VP Greenstein*

Chair Jacob reported that UCEP and BOARS are considering new Senate Regulations to govern UCOE course enrollments and have asked UCRJ to comment on a number of issues, including how UCOE courses enrolling primarily non-matriculated students should be classified; whether UCOE courses offered during the regular term can be considered “self supporting”; the extent of BOARS’ purview over admission into UCOE courses; and the authority for determining prerequisites for UCOE courses. In addition, since it is unlikely that the Senate can approve changes to the Regulations in time to meet UCOE’s anticipated timeline, the committees have asked UCRJ whether the Academic Assembly can enact provisional, temporary regulations with a “sunset” date.

Chair Jacob noted that BOARS is particularly concerned about students without a high school diploma enrolling in UCOE courses. He suggested that UCOE apply for Program Status as an online provider to ensure that UCOE fulfills the expectations BOARS has established for other providers offering online courses to high school students. He noted that UCOE would not be expected to submit individual courses for “a-g” approval since they are UC courses. As UC courses, UCOE courses will not be on the “a-g” list, but they will count for “a-g” if a high school student takes one and applies to UC. Therefore BOARS wants to make sure such students receive guidance and support at the level expected of approved online providers. Vice Chair Johnson noted that BOARS is in the process of revamping the online provider application process and is developing a list of key online course elements that are intended to ensure quality.

Vice Provost Greenstein said that UCOE wants to offer 4-5 college-level courses in fall 2012 with up to 3,700 total course enrollments the first year. The primary target audience will be students who want to demonstrate a capacity to succeed in high-level courses—mostly UC students, but also a few adults, including military veterans interested in improving their chances of being accepted into a four year university. The most likely high school target audience, at least at first, will be students taking a single course in summer. The evaluation effort will help UCOE understand which students want to take UCOE courses and why, and to measure how their presence impacts UC students. It is in nobody’s interest to enroll students who will not succeed.

Professor Williams said UCOE wants to have the flexibility and freedom to experiment this year, and then use the evaluation of outcomes to make informed changes, as necessary. The Senate can help UCOE by approving regulations on a provisional basis. UCOE leaders are meeting with groups on the campuses and want to continue to engage regularly with BOARS and other Senate constituencies.

**Discussion:** A BOARS member noted that high school students do not have a high success rate in online courses or programs. UCOE needs to communicate clear guidelines and expectations

about the necessary prerequisites and preparation to ensure high school students are prepared for the content and disciplined enough to do the work. UCOE should also ensure that students have access to local support and mentoring services.

**Action:** Vice Provost Greenstein and Professor Williams agreed to complete the Program Status application and to review the draft BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning.

**X. Policy on Transition to Common Core in Areas ‘b’ and ‘c’**

Last year, BOARS revised the areas ‘b’ and ‘c’ requirements to align with the Common Core State Standards adopted by the State Board of Education in 2010. As a result, high schools will be expected to revise their Math and English Language Arts courses to align with the new Standards, and resubmit the revised courses for ‘a-g’ approval after completing these revisions. Chair Jacob remarked that UC needs to communicate to high schools this expectation. Due to the number of courses that will be revised, this process will take some time to complete and BOARS will work with the Office of Admissions to find a mechanism for managing the review work. Associate Director Lin noted that UC could address some of the workload concerns by asking districts to submit course revisions for all the district’s schools at the same time.

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Bill Jacob