

## I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the January 14, 2011 BOARS Minutes

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

## II. Announcements and Updates

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

On January 19, the Board of Regents endorsed President Yudof's proposed resolution regarding [Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions](#), which BOARS and the Academic Council both support. Individual Regents did express concern about making expensive policy changes in the middle of a financial crisis, and others asked for clarification about the difference between comprehensive review, individualized review, and single score holistic review. The President also told the Regents that UC could be forced to turn away some UC-eligible students at some point in the future.

At the January 26 Academic Council meeting, Provost Pitts told Council members that the President continues to support salary increases for faculty and non-represented staff, and does not want to implement furloughs or tuition increases. The Budget Office also briefed Council on UCOP's "[Funding Streams](#)" proposal to change the way the campuses, UCOP, and UCOP-funded academic programs are funded, and Council reviewed a list of UCOP-funded academic programs that are being considered as part of a \$40-60 million cut to UCOP's \$305 million budget.

The Governor's budget and its \$500 million cut to UC depend on the passage of a June ballot measure to extend temporary tax increases by five years. Without it, UC's cut may be much larger. Council members discussed emerging campus plans for addressing budget cuts. Campuses are divided between those who want to increase enrollment to generate revenue, and those who want to cut enrollment to state funded levels. One divisional chair said that his EVC told the campus that they can generate \$10 million for every 375 non-resident undergraduates.

A new Council task force constituted by the chairs of three standing committees and four divisions will discuss the fiscal impact of the Special Committee on a Plan for UC's [recommendations](#) and develop implementation plans based on data to be supplied by UCOP. Chair Simmons sent the President a [report](#) on the Senate's efforts to facilitate transition to UC for transfer students. Chair Jacob asked BOARS to review a [New York Times article](#) about rising levels of stress among college freshmen.

**Discussion:** Vice President Sakaki noted that Student Affairs staff have offered to meet with individual Regents to educate them more about specific admissions issues. One Regent plans to visit UCLA to observe its holistic review process.

## III. Consultation with UCOP – "Funding Streams" Proposal

- *Associate Vice President for Budget Debora Obley*

**Issue:** Associate Vice President Obley introduced UCOP's "Funding Streams" proposal as background for discussion of the distribution and use of application fees. BOARS reviewed a committee position memo drafted before the meeting.

**Report:** Under Funding Streams, Campuses will retain all revenue they generate and UCOP will implement a flat tax, calculated on all fund sources, to fund itself and systemwide programs. UCOP will continue to distribute state funds to campuses on the current basis, and will use the current educational finance model to determine expectations for undergraduate financial aid, which will involve some redistribution from the center. In addition, UCOP will distribute application fee revenue to campuses based on the number of applications received, regardless of fee waivers granted to students applying to a particular campus.

The proposal has evolved over 15 months through consultation with administrators, faculty, and students. There is general agreement about specific principles—that all revenue should remain on generating campuses, and that the plan should be "revenue neutral" in its first year, meaning that each campus will receive approximately the same level of funding they would have received under the current model.

UCOP wants to shift more revenue decisions to the campus level. It may encourage campuses to fund specific priorities, but will not dictate how they use revenue. The impact of the flat tax will vary by campus depending on their capacity to generate revenue. It is unlikely that UCOP will mandate enrollment targets this year or for 2011-12 or institute penalties for over-enrollment. Campuses are divided between those who want to increase enrollment to generate revenue, and those who want to cut enrollment to state funded levels.

The \$500 million cut may force the University to raise tuition and application fees, which are among the only revenue streams UC controls. The steady rise in tuition and fees over the past 20 years correlates directly to a decline in state funding.

**Discussion:** The proposal is good insofar as it will increase budget transparency. BOARS is also pleased that application fee revenue will be distributed in a way that does not disadvantage campuses with a large number of applicants with fee waivers.

There was concern about the potential of Funding Streams to weaken the systemwide sense of the university, UC's ability to remain accountable to the general public, and UCOP's ability to advocate on behalf of UC. The future of UC as a system depends on its ability to convince the public and legislature that higher education is worth supporting. It is important for UCOP to manage advocacy, accountability, and transparency centrally, because it is not always in the best interest of individual campuses to think systemically or to disclose budget details.

Funding Streams gives campuses a financial incentive to over-enroll, as each unfunded resident brings with them approximately \$8,000 in fee revenue, net of financial aid. Any increase in the number of enrolled unfunded students will have academic ramifications, however, including a increase in the student-faculty ratio, time to degree, and decline in the overall educational experience, particularly if campuses do not have adequate resources and classes in place to serve the new populations.

Funding Streams could weaken UCOP's ability to influence enrollment targets. Year-to-year enrollment variations will confuse the public, and UC's ability to negotiate budgets with Sacramento will weaken if individual campuses are given complete freedom to set enrollment targets. The onset of the 2012 policy makes it even more important for campuses to have

admissions targets. UCOP should maintain a role in setting, coordinating, managing, and enforcing targets, and in overseeing non-resident enrollment.

It may not be far fetched to imagine Funding Streams bringing about the dissolution of the UC system if the current push among programs for independence spreads to campuses. The Senate's role is to protect quality, and a multi-campus system is necessary to maintain that quality. Nevertheless, in the event that UCOP defers its enrollment management role to the campuses, it is more important than ever that the faculty, including BOARS members, get more involved in local enrollment management decision-making.

The success of the new admissions policy will require sufficient resources to handle the anticipated increase in applications and the required individualized reviews. BOARS has been unable to determine how much campuses spend on admissions processing, recruitment, and yield activities, and how much comes from the application fee. BOARS may develop a template for campuses to report their staffing levels as well as a metric for adequate personnel for admissions processing functions.

**Action:** The committee analyst and chair will revise the letter to include added comments and concerns and circulate for review.

#### **IV. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Pamela Burnett, Interim Admissions Director*
- *Don Daves-Rougeaux, Associate Admissions Director*

Judy Sakaki spoke to the Regents Special Committee on Student Life and Alumni Affairs about undocumented students and financial aid. At the March Regents meeting, Vice President Sakaki will present an oral report on campus climate issues specifically related to LGBT students, and a written Accountability Sub-report about admissions and enrollment focused on transfer students.

Vice President Sakaki said UCOP has not made a final decision about whether it will hold campuses to specific enrollment targets. Many campuses want to increase the recruitment of non-resident and international students, and Vice President Sakaki has been asked to lead a work group to discuss an overall strategy for this effort and the services that will be required to address the needs of the new populations. Campuses are worried about workload as staffing decreases and applications increase.

Interim Director Burnett said campus admissions directors are anxiously waiting for more definitive guidance from UCOP about admissions targets. Don Daves-Rougeaux noted that the [California Subject Matter Project](#) is up for reauthorization in 2012, and Senator Steinberg wants to attach funding for up to ten UC curriculum institutes to the reauthorization bill.

**Discussion:** The undergraduate student representative noted that students strongly support the DREAM act and suggested that BOARS take a position in support.

#### **IV. Transfer Credit for Courses Taken in the Military**

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director*

The BOARS Transfer Subcommittee has endorsed a proposal to remove current restrictions on the acceptance of military coursework for transfer to UC. The change would allow UC to accept American Council on Education (ACE) credit standards to award academic credit for military

education. A sub-regulatory document called the Working Rules currently prohibits credit. UCOP clarified with Senate staff that such a policy change would be within BOARS' purview.

The Subcommittee wants to maintain existing criteria and quality standards for transfer credit, and it wants UC to grant credit only for coursework where there is an equivalent course offered at UC. It does not propose a cap on transferable units, but also does not want the policy to result in a huge number of units for an individual.

Associate Director Brick said 93% of veteran transfers come to UC directly from the Community Colleges, so it is unlikely that students would be granted a significant number of units through this process. ACE units would be subject to the existing transfer credit cap in place for Community College units, and UC senior evaluators believe that the ACE descriptors will allow them to make good decisions about articulating ACE courses, exactly as they do for high school and Community College courses.

As recently as 1971, UC accepted the ACE standards, but Student Affairs could not determine when or why UC reversed the policy. Veterans groups are asking UC to increase recognition of military coursework.

**Action:** BOARS approved the proposal unanimously and the Chair will send a letter affirming this action to ensure it is part of the record.

## **VI. Shared Review**

- *With Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research*

In January, BOARS asked UCOP for data detailing the likelihood of admission to each campus based on variety of UCB or UCLA holistic read scores between 1.00 and 5. UCOP provided data showing the distribution of freshman applicants and admitted students to individual campuses who received a UCB and/or UCLA holistic review read score for fall 2010 admission. About 72% of total UC applicants apply to UCLA and/or UCB and receive a holistic review and score from one of those campuses. UCLA includes score gradations by quarter points within 4.00 and 5, while UCB does not.

As an example of the type of information reviewed, 30,928 of 43,313 UCD applicants also applied to UCB and/or UCLA. 161 of them received a read score of 1.00 from both campuses and 160 were admitted to UCD.

A second analysis listed "Predicted Value" gradations for students within the UCB 4-5 single score range for applicants and admits to each campus, compared to the UCLA score. Berkeley generated the predicted score values using a linear regression predicting a UCB single score based on the academic variables, school context factors, and other quantitative factors from the read sheet and the previous year's results. The analysis shows that two-thirds of students who received a UCB read score of between 4 and 5 have a predicted value of better (numerically lower) than 4. This holistic review considers information that cannot be included in a numerical model such as the essay.

**Discussion:** The data are useful. UCSB, for example, would admit 98% of students with UCB scores of between 1 and 2.5. This knowledge could allow campuses to devote more time to their own individualized review of applicants with lower scores. The predicted values may be able to help campuses distinguish between applicants with a UCB 4 score. The PV scores where the PV

was lower than 4 were only displayed as one piece. To be useful, these should be parsed out and included in the next round of data.

The differences between the UCLA and UCB scores at the lower end raises questions, although UCLA and UCB scores are reasonably consistent in terms of their admit/not admit lines. It was suggested that BOARS analyze the correlation of UCB/UCLA scores to help understand why differences exist. There was also concern that campuses will base decisions solely on the UCLA/UCB score and simply pick from the top in lieu of a full evaluation. Campuses will want to know that they can trust the UCLA/UCB score and determine the point at which they need to conduct their own reviews. There was a request to see data for multiple years to help gauge its consistency. Members also want to see final admission outcomes, as the data do not reflect UCB augmented review scores.

UC should provide both the UCB and UCLA score and the predicted score to campuses. Having the predicted value scores could help non-UCB and UCLA campuses determine how to review a file.

It was also noted that admissions decisions are traditionally made in March, but UCI has already sent offers of admission to approximately 8,000 students, and wants to finalize all decisions by the end of February. (UCI based some decisions on a high UCLA score, and conducted its own holistic review, based on the UCLA method, for others.) Campuses will want access to UCB/UCLA scores as soon as possible, but the race to early decision-making could cause chaos. The Admissions Processing Task Force should consider establishing a timeline policy for score distribution and admissions offers.

**Action:** Members will bring the data to local committees to see how they would use scores.

## **VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

**Issue:** UCOP High School Articulation staff forwarded three applications to the A&E subcommittee for consideration. One is a state-funded program that prepares high school students for both college and careers with career-technical coursework. The other two were private corporations providing on-line courses.

**Action:** The subcommittee approved two providers.

Members want to compare completion and passing rates and grade distributions for online courses compared to traditional courses. It was suggested that A&E develop an instrument for reporting data that can be reviewed regularly. A poor online course pass rate could raise concerns that the courses are not helping students learn. Also noted was concern about the emerging role of private for-profit organizations in the public school system and concern that an understaffed UCOP has an incentive to process applications without a rigorous review.

It was noted that UCOP staff reviewed 30,000 brick and mortar courses last year and review online courses according to the same standards. UCOP would not ask A&E to approve a provider or course that it did feel confident met the established standards in the existing 'a-g' guidelines. A&E should trust UCOP staff and leave the evaluation work to school districts, which will decide how to use the courses. A&E members asked to speak with a UCOP evaluator about the process of reviewing courses and requested access to actual courses.

A&E will schedule a phone meeting later in February to discuss another application and courses.

## VIII. Transfer Subcommittee

The transfer committee considered a proposal to add the Statway statistics sequence to IGETC. Statway is a one year course developed at UT Austin that provides students access to introductory college Statistics integrated with the algebra prerequisite. Many Community College students struggle with intermediate algebra, and this approach will enable many of them to study statistics. The view of the developers is that statistical literacy is far more important for citizens than later symbolic proficiency in intermediate algebra. Four Community Colleges have implemented Statway sequences. Each has a pre-algebra prerequisite and is designed as a substitute for the traditional two-semester developmental math sequence plus a Statistics for Behavioral Sciences Quantitative Reasoning course. The sequence is designed for students majoring in non-STEM disciplines who would normally take a freshman statistics course and typically would not be expected to take a further math course.

The committee liked the overall thrust of the course but decided that it needed more information about UC statistics courses, which contain equivalent material, before recommending transfer credit.

## IX. Comprehensive Review for Transfer

BOARS reviewed Chair Jacob's proposal for major-based transfer admissions. It proposes that the criteria for the review and selection of transfer applicants be based largely on evidence of adequate preparation to successfully complete a major within two years of enrolling at UC. An applicant would also be entitled to review if they complete the new AA transfer degree being developed at the Community Colleges and/or complete the IGETC or CSU Breadth pattern. General education pathways other than IGETC or CSU Breadth would be considered appropriate in some disciplines. The proposal also suggests evaluating transfer applicants at the systemwide level by major, where they would be assigned a read score, and sent to campuses to make a final decision using the read score and other local criteria.

**Discussion:** Associate Director Brick said it is logical for BOARS to consider a transfer admissions policy that removes unnecessary barriers after it helped establish a freshman policy with the same goal. The state is pressuring UC to accept more transfers, but is not as sensitive to preparation issues. Such a policy could also be a burden on some campuses with current staffing shortages.

It was noted that UC could gain efficiencies by collectively reviewing transfers at the systemwide level. Berkeley conducts a comprehensive review of some of their transfer applicants, and BOARS could use that process as a starting basis. Some campuses admit transfers without accepting them into a specific major, which is a stress on departments that find themselves with unprepared students. Although transfer applicants do not necessarily meet the major requirements, once admitted, it is hard to prevent them from registering for courses they are unprepared for. BOARS should consider requiring transfer applicants to declare a major on the application.

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