

I. Announcements and Updates

o *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

Pamela Burnett will be acting interim director of admissions until a permanent director is identified. Ms. Burnett was the director of admissions at UC Berkeley between 1999 and 2004 and at UC Davis between 2005 and her retirement in 2009.

California Senate President Pro Tem Darrell Steinberg published an opinion piece in the *Los Angeles Times* citing the importance of the UC Curriculum Integration Institute to job creation and economic recovery. Another Institute is scheduled for May and will focus on the development of math and science curriculum blended with career technical education content.

UC faces very challenging budget times; to help address the \$25B state budget gap, the Governor has released a 2011-12 higher education [budget](#) that calls for a \$500M cut to UC.

BOARS Vice Chair Johnson attended the December Academic Council meeting for Chair Jacob. At the request of BOARS, Council [endorsed](#) President Yudof's proposed resolution regarding "Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions," which the Regents will discuss on January 19. Some Council members were concerned that campuses will be forced to change to a holistic system, but Vice Chair Johnson made clear that BOARS supports the ability of campuses to preserve successful local systems, including UCSB's school context approach, even as holistic review becomes the favored system. He also noted the importance of outreach and yield activities, and the need for campuses to provide sufficient funding to support high quality individualized review processes.

Council also discussed the use of any funds for faculty salary increases that may become available now or when budget conditions improve. The administration prefers a plan that rewards merit. Council wants to enhance the salary scales with across the board increases to help return the salary scales to market reality, but decided to [support](#) a merit-based increment for faculty who have received a favorable merit review sometime in the past five years, including those at the Step V and IX barrier steps, applied to the salary scales but not to the off-scale increment. (It was noted that this plan, while not across the board, would affect 99% of faculty.)

Council discussed a letter signed by 36 UC executives demanding that the Regents implement an IRS rule waiver that allows the University to increase the salary base used to calculate pensions beyond the federal cap of \$245,000.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met in December. CSU and the Community Colleges are both working to address new legislation requiring them to develop AA degrees for Transfer, and are less interested in devoting time and effort into matching the CSU Breadth requirements with IGETC.

Discussion: BOARS should not characterize the 2012 freshman admissions policy as an attempt to increase diversity. The 2012 policy seeks to identify more equitable ways of identifying academic excellence and potential. Diversity may be one outcome, but it is not the defining motivation. It was noted that this is true for the 2012 policy, but in pushing for a holistic review resolution, the administration was motivated by a desire to fix diversity and climate problems.

Chair Jacob asked BOARS to prepare for 2012 by focusing on the future of the referral pool, shared review, funding issues, outreach, and a comprehensive review for transfer policy focused on major preparation. He noted that John Douglass' book *The Conditions for Admission*

details periods in UC's history when BOARS has been active and passive. When the committee is less active, the Senate often has minimal input into decisions.

II. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the December 3, 2010 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the minutes with some small changes; Committee members also requested distribution of draft minutes as soon as possible after meetings.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Susan Wilbur, Admissions Director*

UC releases fall 2011 application information to the media today. UC applications increased for the seventh straight year—6.1% overall, 5.7% at the freshmen level, and 7.3% for transfers—despite flat growth in the California high school graduate population. UC concludes that more students are becoming UC-eligible and applying to the University. This is good news, but also presents challenges.

All campuses experienced application growth, led by UCSD at 11%, which suggests that students are looking beyond UCLA and UCB as those campuses become more selective. Applications from California residents grew at both the freshman and transfer level and increased significantly among domestic and international non-residents seeking to enter as freshman. Most non-resident growth occurred at UCB, UCLA, and UCSD, while all campuses are hungry for non-resident enrollment revenue.

UC implemented a streamlined Transfer Admissions Guarantee this year, and Community College transfer applications rose 9.6%, following a 20% increase last year. UCR saw a 31% increase in transfer applications. The President wants to maintain last year's transfer admission target.

Chicano/Latino applications rose 18% and there was a small numerical increase in African-American applications, along with slight gains in first-generation college and low API applicants. There was a drop in low-income applicants. This is likely due to the new UC application, which encourages more students to report family income, and is not necessarily evidence of a significant change in applicant pool.

Campuses are concerned about application volume and are waiting for UCOP to assign specific enrollment targets. UC still has about 11,000 students enrolled for which the University does not receive funding from the state. Campuses did not achieve last year's freshman enrollment reduction targets, and the President does not want to reduce enrollments beyond last year's goals, although there is an emerging conversation on some campuses that taking more unfunded California residents is better for budgets even if UC does not receive state funding. The combination of enrollment reductions and increased applications may force a status quo, at best, in outcomes at some campuses. The referral pool was 11,000 in 2010 and will probably be even larger this year. UCR over-enrolled last year and will likely cut back this year, which will also increase pressure on the referral pool and Merced, which is already over capacity. Strategies for Merced include increasing offers of spring admissions (especially for referral students) and/or accepting all ELC-designated students and then selecting from the referral pool for specific majors where there is space.

UCOP establishes enrollment targets for residents only. Campuses can make local decisions about non-resident enrollment, and there is strong interest in increasing their numbers. At the same time, non-residents have to meet a higher admission standard than residents.

Discussion: Campuses are very concerned about having the necessary resources to properly implement holistic review and the 2012 policy; however, it is not clear that additional resources will be available for admissions functions.

IV. Consultation with UC Counsel

- *Mary MacDonald, Senior UC Counsel*

BOARS' Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee (A&E) wants to revisit BOARS' [2006 Criteria for Approval of Online Providers and Courses](#). BOARS met in Executive Session to discuss UC's legal obligations with regard to on online provider applications submitted under the existing policy.

V. Online Education in California High Schools

In an effort to learn more about the role of online education in high schools, George Johnson, Bill Jacob, and Don Daves-Rougeaux spoke with representatives from the Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Clara, San Francisco, and San Jose school districts. The representatives had been provided in advance with questions from A&E regarding the district's rationale for partnering with online providers, how districts provide and assess online courses, and how they are addressing the possibility of differential access to online courses and technology.

George Johnson: UC's online provider policy involves a two-step process: first, UC approves the applications of online course providers to be providers of courses that satisfy UC's a-g requirements; second, UC approves a provider's specific a-g courses. The current online provider application asks questions about the qualifications of instructors and seeks to determine whether the provider's infrastructure is solid enough to provide instructional support for students at a level comparable to that of a "brick and mortar" institution. Approval of the specific a-g courses can begin once a provider is approved and follows a process analogous to what high schools have to do.

The school districts cited several benefits to online courses. They help many struggling students recover credits so that they have a chance to graduate on time. Schools also use them to supplement the existing curriculum; make 'a-g', AP, and Honors courses more widely available to students; and offer courses they would otherwise be unable to offer at a single school due to lack of demand. They also said it is important that they have multiple providers approved, because not every provider offers every requested course. Moreover, UC approval gives them confidence about the quality of providers and courses.

State law requires districts to provide access to online courses and to assume responsibility for their cost to the student, so students have no additional financial burden in taking the courses. For example, the San Diego school district provides students enrolled in I-High, a virtual academy where all courses are taken online, with computers, printers, and Internet access. Students are expected to appear at a physical site for one-on-one mentoring and assessment from district teachers. The district representatives agreed that online education helps reduce, not accentuate, a "digital divide," because more affluent students already take advantage of a broad array of a-g courses and AP courses at their well-resourced high school or Community College. Online courses help equalize access by giving low-income rural and urban students the opportunity to take to a broader range of a-g and AP courses.

Don Daves-Rougeaux: Under current (temporary) rules, a school principal can certify an individual online course for ‘a-g’ by confirming that it is equivalent to an a-g approved course offered at the school or district; however, some principals are reluctant to sign-off and desire UC approval. A district can also contract with a provider and provide blanket certification for a course offered at multiple high schools (for example when there are not enough students at a single school but where there are enough students across the district.) School districts feel a great urgency to increase access to courses, due to pent-up student demand and dwindling resources. The slow approval process frustrates providers and schools, but providers are happy to supply additional information. Limiting the number of approved providers also limits the ability of districts to find the best quality curriculum at the lowest cost.

Juan Poblete: met with representatives from [UC College Preparation](#), a statewide program hosted at UCSC, which develops free online AP and a-g course content for districts and schools. (BOARS consulted UCCP as it was developing its 2006 policy.) UCCP favors deregulation of online course approval and believes there is no difference between online and traditional courses. Moreover, the trend towards a hybrid format for all courses makes BOARS’ distinction between online and in-person modes less relevant, and the growth of the online learning industry ultimately will make BOARS oversight of online course quality impractical. They suggested that UC convene a summit on online learning in California, and noted that the state Education Code would ideally provide the regulations and guidance to schools that would allow them to increase the range of options for ‘a-g’ completion. This would also remove the burden from UC. They suggested that BOARS consider eliminating its distinction between online and traditional learning or alternatively, review its role with regard to online oversight, and/or produce a modified policy that includes data collection for quality assessment at the end of the approval cycle. UCCP representatives also found the potential distinction between school- or district-provided classes and privately contracted individual classes a relevant one when thinking of BOARS regulatory proposals.

The notion of a summit on online learning may be considered by BOARS, but BOARS will continue its provider approval process.

VI. Reflections from the Outgoing Director of Admissions

○ Susan Wilbur

Director Wilbur said that serving as UC Director of Admissions and having the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of students and families has been a privilege. She continues to believe strongly in access, diversity in all of its forms, and the potential of higher education to promote democratic values and change the trajectory of a family. She also shared observations and suggested priorities for admissions policy in executive session.

Action: BOARS thanked Director Wilbur for her service to the University and gave her a round of applause.

VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee Break-Out

If A&E opts to revise the existing online course provider policy, what aspects need revision? It was suggested that BOARS add to the policy a commitment on the part of approved online course providers to produce data – specifically, the cost per student of approved courses; the racial/ethnic composition of the student body taking the courses; their SES; completion rates;

and grade correlation between online courses and in-person courses, as well as AP exam outcomes.

A&E agreed to resume consideration of pending applications according to the current policy with the understanding that all providers will be asked to regularly provide data that are not currently being provided. George Johnson will circulate a list of data points to the subcommittee for review and modification. A&E will continue the conversation with school districts to find out what data are available and who has access to them. (It may be too early to access some data.) The subcommittee agreed that the principal certification route to a-g approval should be allowed to sunset for district-provided courses after this review cycle. It agreed to continue discussion about whether BOARS should limit the number of independently provided and purchased online courses a student can submit for ‘a-g’ approval. BOARS should think about how to ensure accountability and whether financial incentives exist for schools to contract with a low-quality provider.

Don Daves-Rougeaux said there are nine approved providers and fourteen new or pending provider applications. Articulation staff screen and review application materials thoroughly, and he will provide information to A&E in February about pending providers along with a brief summary of each application’s pros and cons.

VIII. Transfer Subcommittee Break-Out

Military Transfer Credit: Shawn Brick presented a proposal to allow for transfer credit for Military Service Courses. Many Universities do this (including CSU), and credit would only be available for transferrable courses (for which UC campuses offer an equivalent—exactly as we do for credit transfer from other colleges.) Credit would be awarded based on the American Council of Education (ACE) Standards. UC has not awarded credit since at least 1992, and President Yudof has recommended that we expand opportunities for veterans. In 1971, UC did have a similar policy in place, but it is not known when or how the policy was changed.

The subcommittee leaned towards not imposing a cap on transferrable units. It was noted that the units are awarded for units, not “experience, and ACE gives recommendations about the number of units awarded based on the number of hours in the course. The subcommittee response towards the proposal was favorable and it recommended that Shawn prepare a proposal for BOARS to consider.

AP credit for Computer Science: The Irvine Computer Science Department requested that students receive 12 quarter units for a score of 3 or better on the AP Computer Science BC exam. Currently students are awarded 4 quarter units. Irvine’s reason is that students who receive this score are able to bypass their first two courses, each of which is worth 6 units. The subcommittee decided that they could not see going to 12, since no AP exam is awarded more than 8 quarter units (the level of units awarded is uniform system wide.) The subcommittee also decided that if computer science faculty from multiple campuses were to provide analysis and justification for increasing the units awarded from 4 to 8 it would be given serious consideration, but BOARS does not have the expertise or time to carry out such an analysis. This information will be communicated to Irvine.

IX. Setting Priorities for BOARS

BOARS discussed issues and priorities it wants to address in future meetings.

Funding Challenges: There are numerous challenges facing admissions recruitment, processing, and yield activities related to the new funding realities. These funding challenges also threaten UC's ability to meet its historic Master Plan obligations.

Implementation of Holistic Review: BOARS should facilitate information sharing to help educate committee members about how campuses are implementing holistic review, so the information reaches the Admissions and A&E committees on each campus.

Shared Review: Campuses would like to have access to Berkeley and UCLA read scores as soon as possible so they can make their own admissions offers. In a shared review system based on single scores, there will be pressure on campuses to simply pick from the top. BOARS will ask UCOP to provide data detailing the likelihood of admission to each campus with a variety of Berkeley or UCLA scores. It is important for faculty to raise concerns about the cost of using Berkeley and UCLA scores in budget conversations with their campus administration.

Admissions Reform: Director Wilbur said the President is committed to implementing the 2012 reforms as scheduled, but the policy's success will depend in part on UC admitting at least some students who are Entitled to Review but not guaranteed, and on the smooth operation of the referral pool. Currently, however, Merced is at capacity and no campus plans to admit the full 9% ELC cohort. There is concern that some referral pool students will not be picked up by any campus. This year, there were 4000 students in the referral pool who met the 2012 statewide index (of the roughly 11,000 that met the 2010 statewide index), and there may be many more 9% ELC students who are in this category in the new policy. BOARS agreed that the possibility that UC will turn away guaranteed students is a serious concern. Starting now, UC should signal that it may not be able to honor this guarantee in the context of de-funding, and that UC's problem is financial, not capacity. BOARS also made the case last year that UC not reduce enrollment because it will hurt the success of ETR.

Transfer: Transfers sometimes arrive unprepared for certain majors. BOARS will discuss ways to clarify the major requirements for transfers, so that campuses have more assurance that a prospective transfer is prepared for the major.

Application Fee Revenue: Campuses may begin to look at the application fee as a source of additional revenue, but a higher fee could negatively affect the character of the potential applicant pool. BOARS has also discussed establishing a metric for proper funding of admissions processing functions and advocating that campuses use more of the application fee to directly support admissions. BOARS will survey admissions directors to find out what they believe is adequate both in terms of dollars, and in personnel and person hours. (Note that campuses may have different definitions of what falls under admissions processes.) We need remind the regents about the value of outreach.

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