

I. Consent Calendar

- Draft BOARS January meeting minutes

Action: BOARS approved the January minutes with several minor editorial changes.

II. Announcements

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair*

UCAAD supported BOARS' recommendation to give students the option to voluntarily report their LGBT status on the Statement of Intent to Register and other forms used by matriculated students, but not on the UC application; UCAAD also asked the Senate to reconsider the issue in three years.

Council returned UCEP's proposed amendments to SR 610 (residency) to that Committee after faculty reviewers expressed concerns that "residency," for course and degree purposes, should require students to be physically present on a campus. General Counsel Robinson updated Council about an investigation he and Dean Christopher Edley are leading into best policies and practices for policing protests and the oversight of the UC police. Council also discussed the wording of a possible Memorial to the Regents supporting direct public advocacy of measures that will increase state revenues and prioritize funding for public higher education.

UCEP has issued a defense of UC's peer-based program review process in an effort to convince WASC to accept the process in lieu of a rubric-based review proposed by the Lumina Foundation. UCEP drafted a [white paper](#) showing that rubric-based evaluation is less rigorous than a peer review approach, and produced an [alternative proposal](#) that UCEP says satisfies WASC's accreditation standards and ensures educational quality.

The UC Provost asked the chancellors and EVCs to review BOARS' recent resolutions regarding [nonresident enrollment](#) and [programs or policies that guarantee admission to UC](#).

Vice Chair George Johnson reported that the BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee met with Brian Bridges, director of the California Learning Resources Network (CLRN), which has received authorization and funding from the California Department of Education to review online high school courses for alignment with the State Common Core Standards and iNACOL's Quality Standards for Online Courses. The Subcommittee and UCOP articulation staff believe that UC could begin to rely on CLRN ratings to make the initial determination that an online course meets BOARS' standards and qualifies for "a-g" course review. Director Bridges recommended that BOARS focus on individual courses and avoid using the term course "providers," noting that the term does not accurately describe the main players in the online world—the publishers of individual online courses, who provide those courses to districts, and virtual schools.

Discussion: Chair Jacob recommended that BOARS be cautious about adopting the CLRN criteria wholesale. BOARS should continue to consider the effect of online education on “brick and mortar” schools and whether a new provider review process could adequately address issues of equity and access to online courses.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*

BOARS reviewed data prepared by UCOP evaluating the effect of the new freshman admissions policy on the 2012-13 applicant pool. First, almost 30% of total applicants are “entitled to review” but lack an admission guarantee either through the statewide index or ELC. This pool of students includes a higher proportion of underrepresented minorities and First Generation College applicants compared to other applicant pools. Next, about 6% of applicants have an ELC guarantee only. This pool of students is more diverse (81% First Generation College, 64% from low API schools); compared to other applicant pools; they also have similar GPAs, have completed a similar number of “a-g” courses, and have lower SAT scores compared to other pools. The full 2012 guarantee pool (applicants that have an admission guarantee through at least one path) is similar demographically and stronger academically compared to 2011 and 2010. These 56,000 applicants include approximately 12% of California public high school graduates and 14.1% of all California high school graduates (the latter is an underestimate; UC does not yet have final private high school graduate numbers.) These numbers exceed the 10% figure projected for the new policy, and will require a possible recalibration of the statewide index (the ELC GPAs are revised on an ongoing basis). Finally, 57% of applicants took no SAT Subject exams and this pool is more diverse than the pool of applicants who took one or more Subject exams. The “entitled to review” and ELC-only pools are of special interest because they include categories of applicants the new policy was intended to attract.

The Office of Admissions asked BOARS to weigh in on several admissions-related issues raised by the UC Online Education project (UCOE), including the enrollment of non-UC students in UCOE, how UC will recognize a UCOE course or “course of study” taken by a non-UC student in the transfer admissions and articulation process. Director Jeffery said UC recognizes that it is important to clarify that taking a UCOE course will not guarantee transfer admission, but that BOARS should consider whether it might provide a “bump” in the selection process.

Discussion: It was suggested that UC refer to “GLC” (Guarantee in the Local Context) rather than “ELC” to clarify that the policy includes an admission guarantee. It was noted that the expansion of the ELC guarantee under the new policy did not make up for its restriction of the statewide edibility guarantee.

Senate Chair Anderson asked BOARS to look closely at the UCOE marketing materials being provided to non-UC students to make sure that UC is not implying an admissions benefit that does not exist.

IV. UC Online Instruction Pilot Project

- *Daniel Greenstein, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Programs, and Coordination*
- *Keith Williams, UC Davis faculty member and Academic Associate to VP Greenstein*
- *Lisa Baird, Associate Director, Strategic Initiatives, CFO Division*

Vice Provost Greenstein said the Online Instruction Pilot Project (OIPP) is a research project evaluating the effectiveness of online undergraduate courses geared to UC students. It is related to, but distinct from, the UC Online Education project (UCOE), which is intended to reach a broader audience of both UC and non-UC students beginning in Fall 2012. A total of 24 courses are in development from each general campus and broad disciplinary area. The first course is now being offered at Merced and several others will come online this spring and summer. The goals for OIPP and UCOE include enhancing and expanding access to UC course content and curriculum, giving departments a risk free way to experiment with online education, and bringing much needed revenue into departments.

UCOE will offer Senate-approved lower-division online courses to both matriculated and non-matriculated students during regular and summer terms. The program will be similar to a Summer Session that operates across all nine campuses. The UCOE business model involves paying departments a fee to develop each course, a royalty to the course author each time it is offered, and compensation for each non-matriculated student enrolled in the course. non-matriculated students will pay to take the courses, but matriculated students will not. Departments will own UCOE courses, and UCOP will retain no revenues. As with regular courses, campuses will apply varying teaching models employing TAs or GSIs.

A recent [market study](#) determined that there is a market of students with academic backgrounds similar to current UC students willing to pay up to \$1,400 to take a UC online course for transfer credit. Organizers hope to achieve 3,700 non-UC student course enrollments the first year, roughly equivalent to one Summer Session, and to grow enrollments to approximately 8,000 over five years. The business model deliberately overestimates costs and underestimates revenue for conservative modeling purposes. UCOE intends 2012-13 to be the pilot year for its ongoing business phase. UC has enlisted the services of Blackboard Inc. to provide recruitment and other student services, and will work closely with Blackboard to script messages to non-matriculated students.

UCOE is encouraging an instructional model with high level of instructor presence, which contrasts to market trends toward more automation. They believe this will give UC an advantage in the marketplace. A growing number of non-traditional students are returning to higher education for many reasons – returning military, training, etc. – who need quality on-ramps that are not based at the CCC or in high schools.

Keith Williams is advising UCOP about all academic aspects of the project. He prepared a document for BOARS outlining administrative and Senate policies and procedures needed to test the next phase of the project. Before UC can offer any online course beyond its campus of origin, UC needs to define a policy structure and process to facilitate registration and enrollment, some of which require Senate approval. Issues include prerequisites for non-matriculated students who enroll into UCOE courses, how UC will recognize transfer credit, the extent to which UCOE courses will become a part of approved transfer paths, and how matriculated and non-matriculated students will be mixed in the courses. UCOE is suggesting a Summer Session model for at least the first year and they hope the Senate will approve the most critical policies by May to allow UC time to market the courses and enroll non-matriculated students in fall 2012. UCOE has also requested that the Senate approve the policies provisionally, to allow UCOE to reexamine them after a year's experience. BOARS and other relevant committees should bring their recommendations to Council.

The UC Educational Evaluation Center based at UC Santa Barbara is evaluating the educational effectiveness of the project.

Discussion: Some members expressed support for the project, noting that UCOE could benefit matriculated students by helping improve retention and progress to degree, particularly for disadvantaged students and perhaps help academically disqualified students regain status through successful completion of UCOE courses. It also could help UC accommodate more students, and relieve wait lists and overburdened faculty. The new revenue could help departments hire more faculty and TAs, and support graduate students. In addition, taking a UCOE could help CCC students get a better feel for the pace and quality of UC courses before transferring.

Members also expressed a number of concerns. First, a concern about money driving decisions and the likelihood that UCOE would mainly benefit students who are able to afford the courses. There was a concern that because UC students will not pay extra to take a UCOE course, departments will have an incentive to enroll only non-matriculated students, or perhaps to accept students without appropriate prerequisites. In addition, large numbers of non-matriculated students in a course could diminish the quality of the educational experience for matriculated students. UCOE could also usurp the traditional role of faculty to oversee curriculum, and dilute the opportunity students currently have for one on one interaction with UC faculty and students, and the other social aspects of being at a major research university, which are hard to replicate online. There were also concerns about academic integrity.

Vice Provost Greenstein noted that making UCOE courses affordable and accessible to low income students would be challenging in the short run. Most UCOE courses will be lower division, and in reality, one-on-one student-instructor interaction is becoming less common at the lower division level. UCOE will provide opportunities to leverage the social nature of the Web and new technologies to actually increase interactions above what happens in a large lecture class. The university is the ideal place to experiment with these new modes of instruction. Professor Williams added that it is difficult to define “UC quality” metrics even for on-the-ground courses, and that the UCOE self-assessment model is more rigorous than anything currently being done for those. UCOE will expect the same from matriculated and non-matriculated students enrolled in UCOE. UCOE is exploring proctoring services that have proven to be successful in ensuring security and academic integrity.

Members noted that BOARS should consider the prerequisites required of non-matriculated students, whether the looser enrollment requirements of Summer Session and Extension are an appropriate model for UCOE, and whether there should be a cap on the number of courses students take. It will be important to monitor and assess outcomes, including comparing the preparation, performance, and grade distribution of matriculated and non-matriculated students who take UCOE courses. It is also important for UCOE to clarify that non-matriculated students will gain only a transferable credit that is negotiated at the department level.

Action: Professor Williams will give BOARS a two-page summary of the policy document summarizing pros and cons. Members will consult with their committees and return to BOARS in March with views.

V. BOARS Transfer Subcommittee

- *With Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director*

Subcommittee members reported on discussions they have been having with local committees about the revised transfer admission proposal and ways to improve and clarify the proposal.

One member said the technical details of the proposal might confuse and overwhelm some readers and suggested editing the document with an eye to making it transparent and understandable to a lay audience—perhaps a parent. Members also suggested improving the executive summary and updating the FAQ section. The document should emphasize the positive impact the policy will have on campuses, departments, and students. The policy will empower informed decision-making, help prepare students for a major and increase the likelihood that they can complete the major, and increase the department’s confidence that an applicant is prepared to be successful. It is an ethical policy change that will increase access and benefit the State by creating better leaders. The document should note that the policy is intended to clarify existing policy more than change policy, and will impact few if any Senate policies. For example, comprehensive review for transfers already exists as policy. The document also should clarify that missing a “minor” requirement may refer to missing a course that is not offered at the CCC, but that this will be defined at the department level in a two-year process, not by BOARS. The proposal should clarify that the SB 1440 Transfer AA degree differs from a traditional AA degree and also requires significant major preparation. Finally, the policy is not attempting to appease state government.

Chair Jacob said he continues to be concerned about unintended consequences—it is possible the policy could make it more difficult for campuses to meet admissions targets and for students, particularly underrepresented students, to transfer to UC, at least in the short term, although the students who do get in will be more likely to succeed.

Action: Shawn Brick will work on a revised FAQ and the proposal will be updated following these suggestions.

VI. BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

- *With Monica Lin, Associate Admissions Director*

The Subcommittee is developing a straw proposal for approving online high school courses for “a-g” with the help of CLRN. The subcommittee believes it makes sense for BOARS to address virtual high schools separately from online course publishers. It also sees a benefit to giving CLRN a supplementary role in the current “a-g” review process, whereby UC would use CLRN’s initial rating of an online course to determine whether the course qualifies for a UC review for “a-g.”

The subcommittee also approved a program status application for a traditional provider that operates charter schools across the United States.

VII. Proposal for Campus Articulation with AA Degrees

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director*

Associate Director Brick said an SB 1440 Transfer AA/AS degree guarantees admission to CSU, and also supersedes other articulation agreements between a CCC and a CSU by guaranteeing that a student will need no more than 60 units to complete a bachelor’s degree. UC has resisted any guarantees and focused instead on giving holders of Transfer AA/AS degrees a

comprehensive review in admissions. However, students coming to UC with those degrees will also want to know how UC will treat them in terms of major articulation. His proposal is for campuses to build on existing statewide Transfer Model Curricula by reviewing individual AA degrees to determine whether or not they satisfy transfer requirements in that major, and to include this information on their articulation agreements in ASSIST. This would involve a lot of work for UC initially, but would help the CCCs and CCC transfers by providing them in advance with more information about what courses they will be required to take at UC, and would also demonstrate UC's willingness to support the state's goals.

VIII. Transfer Admissions Proposal

Chair Jacob reviewed clarifications for the document recommended by the Transfer Subcommittee, and other BOARS members reported on discussions they have had on their campus about the proposal.

It was suggested that BOARS cite evidence, including a 2009 [report on the transfer process](#) authored by the Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy to support its assertion about the "ambiguities facing potential transfers." The proposal asks all departments to engage with admissions staff over two years to determine transfer criteria and expectations and to put that information on ASSIST; however members noted that some admissions staff think it may be difficult to convince departments to do this. There is also confusion about the role of GPA—the policy establishes a minimum GPA range, but then says the GPA should not serve as a bright dividing line between admission and non admission. The document should clarify that this can be a bright line that determines who is reviewed, but not who is admitted.

Action: A motion was made, seconded and approved unanimously that BOARS move forward with the proposal after the BOARS chair and staff complete the refinements discussed at the meeting.

IX. New Business

BOARS briefly discussed issues related to the admission of international freshmen or transfers, including new recruitment and outreach efforts, and efforts to verify the quality of the home country institution. Director Jeffery noted that UC campuses are interested in sharing information about foreign schools, and that BOARS' recent resolution on transfer guarantees applies to "1-3" programs (one year in the home country, three in the US as a transfer). It was noted that international marketing and recruitment efforts have paid off; most UC campuses are now attracting as many international applicants as Berkeley was only two years ago. It was also noted that nothing prohibits campuses from admitting lower division transfers.

BOARS will discuss the new [federal guidelines](#) for the voluntary use of race to achieve diversity in colleges and universities and the extent to which the BOARS inclusiveness indicators align with the new guidelines at the next meeting.

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