

PART I: JOINT MEETING WITH CAMPUS ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS**I. Discussion of 2011 Admissions Outcome Data***o Interim Admissions Director Pamela Burnett*

UC has released final data on Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) for fall 2011. Final enrollment data will be available by January. Although 12% of freshman SIRs are non-residents systemwide, up from 8% last year, and non-resident freshman and transfer SIRs combined totaled 14% overall, numerically there are slightly more California resident freshman SIRs compared to last year, and total non-resident enrollment is not expected to reach the 10% cap recommended by the UC Commission on the Future for several years. The new non-resident referral pool yielded 70 additional non-resident SIRs for four campuses and will likely be continued next year.

Diversity indicators in the SIR pool improved at almost all campuses at both the freshman and transfer levels, due in large part to a substantial increase in the number of Chicano/Latino SIRs systemwide. The proportion of Chicano/Latinos in the fall 2011 freshman class is projected to be the largest in UC history. UC is still concerned, however, about the representation of African-American and Native American students in the UC population.

UC Merced changed the way it handled freshman referrals this year. Merced contacted referral students in advance and asked them to indicate if they were interested in attending Merced, and UCM sent formal offers of admission only to those students who indicated interest. Because of this change, the overall admits to UC shrank by 3.9% compared to last year; however, this is deceiving as the admit numbers were up noticeably at all campuses except Merced and Riverside. So despite the financial crisis, access to UC is increasing. These increases were reflected in the SIRs, which are up 6.5% over two years ago, showing that UC continues to be available and attractive.

Discussion: It was noted that non-resident enrollment will always be contentious, and that campuses with very small non-resident populations have always felt their enrollment mix was not as good as it could be for the undergraduate learning experience. Moreover, campuses may have the capacity to enroll more residents, but they do not have the resources to support them without the additional tuition revenue brought by non-residents. Berkeley Admissions Director Robinson noted that UCB's goal over the next two years is to reach a total non-resident enrollment plateau of 20%. Berkeley has always had a global reach, and the message is out that Berkeley is now more accessible to the rest of the country and the world.

One member expressed concern that enrolling more non-residents to address budget cuts could eventually alter the public's perception of UC as a public institution. The argument that non-residents increase diversity is somewhat counterintuitive, as California is already the most diverse place in the world.

Senate Vice Chair Anderson noted that campuses will have the freedom to enroll more students not funded by the State, and this does bring additional resources to the campuses because the tuition and fee revenue does stay at the campus. However, there are also concerns that over-enrollment will harm educational quality and will send a message to the state budget cuts carry no consequences. He said the Regents support increasing non-resident enrollment on

educational grounds, and some think a 10% cap is too low. The campuses that wish to grow will be unable to do so by taking more residents on a declining budget.

II. Preparing for Implementation of 2012 Admissions Reform Policy

o BOARS Chair Bill Jacob

Managing the Referral Pool. Chair Jacob described some of the original motivations behind the new admissions policy. BOARS decided to recommend elimination of the Subject Test requirement after reviewing a CPEC study prepared for the Assembly Education Committee that showed that among 2003 California high school graduates, 20,000 students completed the ‘a-g’ curriculum and took the SAT/ACT, but were ineligible only because they did not take the SAT Subject Tests; approximately 10,000 of those students had ‘a-g’ GPAs of 3.5 and above, and therefore would have been competitive at the more selective campuses. In addition, BOARS thought increasing the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) pool to 9% would help increase access to UC across a broad range of high schools. However, the policy was conceived in an era of fewer financial constraints, and in addition to critical concerns about workload, there is a new concern that too many ELC students will be placed in the referral pool instead of being represented systemwide. It is important to the success of the policy that a large proportion of ELC students receive an offer they are likely to accept, and that no group is disproportionately assigned to the referral pool.

All campuses should consider holding spaces for ELC students. Score sharing will allow campuses to access data on them, and if UC can institute referral pools for transfers and non-residents, it should have one for ELC students. Campuses could manage these referral pools on an ongoing basis rather than at the end of the process, when only one campus considers referrals.

Discussion: Interim Director Burnett expressed concern about the additional labor required to institute an ELC referral system, noting that a student’s status in the 4% ELC pool never guaranteed the student could succeed at UC. In fact, a UCR study showed that ELC status did not correlate well with success. A few students in the 9% ELC pool will have a 3.0 GPA, which is relatively weak to a growing number of selective campuses. Rather than making decisions now about unknown outcomes, it would be better to wait until there is actual data about the 2012 applicant pool.

Chair Jacob noted that the ELC pool will grow in 2012, but the overall guarantee pool will shrink, to about 10%. Most ELC students will also be in the 9% statewide guarantee pool. Institutional Research Coordinator Tongshan Chang estimated that the referral pool will shrink to 10,000 students in 2012 from 12,000 this year and that about 700 students would be denied by the campuses they apply to. The policy is expected to increase applications by 10-15% overall.

One member noted that all campuses should have the opportunity to share in the review and admission of ELC students who did not apply to a specific campus, particularly campuses that are short of targets. Such a sharing mechanism could be extended to non-residents and non-ELC students and would provide additional options for students as well as opportunities for campuses to sell good applicants on their programs.

It was noted that the new policy places a high value on the democratic promise of the ELC guarantee and its message that UC is for all Californians. We cannot fail to honor that guarantee, and need to maximize the ELC promise. We have to convince admissions committees that the ELC pool is not another campus’ problem. It was also noted that Paragraph 4 of the Regents’ January 2011 [resolution on holistic review](#) expresses a commitment to admitting students from the full range of California high schools.

Institutional commitment is a good predictor of retention and success. A member asked if applicants could rank their choices and then campuses include institutional commitment among ELC applicants as an admission factor.

Directors noted that some campuses give extra points to ELC applicants. Some thought ELC could be a factor in tie breaking, but were unsure how else it could be used. Others expressed a willingness to discuss the issue with their admission committees.

It is believed that the previous process for identifying ELC students influenced behavior because students knew their ELC status before they applied. However, the process will change next year. UC will collect transcripts for the top 15% cohort at each school and send them a letter stating that they have been identified as top students and encouraging them to apply, but applicants will not know their ELC status until after they apply. UC will analyze transcripts from 1/3 of high schools each year to update its records about average GPAs.

It was noted that UCR and UCM experimented with an early referral pool this year. They communicated directly to students with a high likelihood of denial at the campuses where they applied, and invited them to apply to UCM and UCR. They found that students who were invited early this way responded better than students offered referrals at the end of the process.

Action: Chair Jacob invited BOARS members and directors to continue the discussion over the summer and in the fall.

III. Admissions Funding Challenges

Issue: Campus EVCs have received the [funding metric](#) BOARS developed to assist campuses in determining the staffing required for the review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts necessary to implement the new admissions policy. Chair Jacob said every campus admissions committee should monitor the situation closely to ensure they have staffing to handle the work.

Discussion: The admissions directors thanked BOARS and campus committees for their support and engagement around the funding and staffing problems facing admissions offices, and for their willingness to entertain creative and flexible approaches to admissions. Although admissions offices have increased efficiency, workload expectations have increased and resources have eroded. The lack of adequate staffing for reads and customer service is creating PR challenges and less informed students. There is an increasing problem of staff turnover, and some campuses are leaving vacant positions unfilled, despite undergraduate admissions being a critical core function.

Recent efforts to increase collaboration across campuses have been positive and should continue. Faculty and admissions directors should work together to identify additional technological enhancements to ApplyUC and other tools to help with workload. On the other hand, technology does improve efficiency, but it also reduces the personal relationship admissions staff strive to establish with students and prospective students. Drastic cuts to systemwide admissions functions at UCOP also hurt the campuses.

The new admissions policy may exacerbate these problems. The new policy will bring more applications as well as an expectation that more students will be admitted; however, space constraints make the latter less likely. There were also concerns expressed about the workload and budgetary implications of BOARS' proposal to guarantee a comprehensive review of qualified transfer applications. As BOARS points out in its metric, transfer applications are more complicated and have to be evaluated by experienced staff.

Chair Jacob said the point of the funding metric is to ensure that admissions offices receive an appropriate amount from the application fee (\$38) and to empower campuses to

negotiate for those resources with their administration. Leaving a vacated staff position unfilled is incompatible with the funding metric.

IV. White Paper on Score Sharing

Issue: The White Paper is a joint effort between BOARS and the admissions directors that outlines a plan for sharing review scores. Campuses will share scores as they are generated; UCB will also share its augmented review scores. A new addition to the White Paper is a motion BOARS passed in June that all comprehensive review scores and flags for supplemental review cases should be shared openly throughout the system.

Discussion: UCLA Director Tran noted that the UCLA Admissions Committee adopted a resolution that UCLA will share its read scores only with UC campuses that use UCLA scores in their admissions process (UCI, UCSD, UCSC, and UCD). UCLA may share its read scores with other campuses at the end of the process.

Chair Jacob said the UCLA resolution is disappointing. It contradicts BOARS' June resolution that all campuses share scores with all other campuses. UCLA has been a marvelous collaborator, but this stance will hurt some campuses. It was noted that UCSB uses the UCLA scores to help predict admit overlaps in order to set targets. The difference between BOARS and UCLA will be discussed by the chair and the UCLA committee. Given UC's financial difficulties, it is vital for sharing to be voluntary and cooperative.

Interim Director Burnett noted that UCOP staff are developing a mechanism to facilitate score sharing. Campuses discussed the importance of having the percentile data on the read sheet be based on campus specific information. Different campuses use different processes in this regard. Score sharing will take this into account.

V. BOARS Transfer Proposal

The proposal has a political component in that it helps UC respond to the perception that the transfer system is not working and communicates what UC is doing in the realm of transfer preparation. It also addresses a faculty desire that transfers enter UC with specific major preparation. BOARS wants to gather input on the draft proposal from selective campus Senate committees before subjecting the proposal to full Senate review.

Admissions Directors noted that the document should clarify that the policy does not apply to lower division transfers (UCR). It was noted that campuses should not be forced to review students who have little chance of admission. One campus noted that it has reached capacity with Transfer Admission Agreements (TAGs) and will reduce (and may even end) participation in the program; it expressed concern about language regarding TAGs in the proposal. Chair Jacob said he will include language indicating that campuses will have the freedom to extend TAGs but should not be constrained if they are over extended.

PART II: BOARS MEETING

VI. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the June 3, 2011 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the June minutes.

VII. Chair's Announcements.

- Council [endorsed](#) BOARS' proposed revision to Principle 6 of its 2009 Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment. An announcement has been sent to the President and Provost.
- The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) is developing a number of documents related to advocacy, including advice to faculty about effective interactions with legislators. ICAS is also discussing the role of SciGETC in the SB 1440 transfer legislation.
- Chair Simmons forwarded an ICAS [letter](#) addressed to UC and CSU department chairs regarding the documentation required to support course articulation. Some departments have been asking CCCs for course syllabi when the normal process is only to request course outlines.
- Chair Jacob, Chair Simmons, Vice President Sakaki, and Provost Pitts sent a joint letter to the State Board of Education regarding UC's work to incorporate the Common Core Standards.
- The Governor has eliminated funding for the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC), which has implications for BOARS, as CPEC data has helped inform many of BOARS' past actions.

Senate Chair Simmons reported that the Academic Council met in special session on June 30 and passed a [resolution](#) that UC implement additional fee increases for fall 2011 to match the additional \$150 million state cut. He said it is sad that UC and the State can no longer claim to offer *low cost* higher education, but that UC has exhausted its alternatives to address the cuts.

Council approved the [report](#) of Council's Special Committee on a Plan for the University of California (the "Powell Committee") for circulation. Council's Implementation Task Force is focused on options for budget rebenching, and hopes to take a leading role in guiding the President's Rebenching Task Force, which meets again in September. The Task Force is proposing a new methodology for allocating state funds to the campuses, introducing a common state subsidy per student across campuses; it recommends that all funded resident undergraduates be ensured a space based on a target negotiated between the President and chancellors; and that the true number of state-funded students be determined using a blended average cost of instruction that incorporates the cost of educating both undergraduate and PhD students.

Chair Simmons thanked BOARS members for their hard work and contributions to the University on behalf of the Senate.

Charles Akemann is the lone faculty representative on a systemwide financial aid committee that is discussing issues around UC's financial aid programs, including aid for undocumented students.

VIII. Consultation with UCOP

- *Pamela Burnett, Interim Admissions Director*
- *Don Daves-Rougeaux, Associate Admissions Director*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director*

Pamela Burnett: July 15 is Pamela Burnett’s final day as interim director of admissions. The transition plan includes hiring a permanent new director within the next two to three months. The Office of Admissions is preparing its annual report on admissions outcomes for the July Regents meeting. The process has been more difficult than usual due to the unusual complexity of this year’s admissions cycle. She would like BOARS to review the rules for evaluating in- and out-of-state transfer credit from institutions other than the CCCs.

Don Daves-Rougeaux: Associate Director Daves-Rougeaux announced that he will leave the University at the end of July to take a position with the College Board. He recently presented testimony about [SB 611](#), which would add the UC Curriculum Integration Institute into state statute, and [SB 612](#), which reauthorizes the California Subject Matter project. He noted that BOARS’ subcommittee break-out format has been helpful to UCOP. He recommended that the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee and BOARS provide guidance in the near future about online laboratory science courses; if BOARS decides it wants to continue recommending against the possibility of online laboratory courses, UC would also welcome guidance about how schools can satisfy the requirement.

Shawn Brick: UCOP has sent the legislature a report about the University’s implementation of the transfer legislation SB 2302. It will wait for feedback from Sacramento before proceeding with additional meetings of the faculty groups exploring commonalities among lower-division major requirements. Associate Director Brick has a list of policy action items that he will bring to BOARS for consideration in October.

IX. Area ‘b’ (English) Revision

BOARS reviewed a revision to area ‘b’ drafted by a BOARS subcommittee. The new language incorporates Common Core concepts about college readiness, clarifies the specific skills UC is interested in, and makes the requirement less literature-centric.

Action: BOARS agreed to send the draft revision to the intersegmental area ‘b’ task force for review and feedback.

X. Transfer Admissions Proposal

Under the proposal, UC transfer applicants would be entitled to a review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete one of three proposed pathways: an SB 1440 AA Transfer Degree with a minimum GPA to be set by each campus; a UC Transfer Model Curriculum (not yet developed); or the current pathway specified in [SR 476](#). BOARS wants to communicate to community college students that if they choose and prepare for a major, and show a strong potential to complete that major in two years, they have a good chance to compete for admission. Chair Jacob asked BOARS members for their consent to ask the Academic Council to circulate the proposal to Senate divisions for “targeted” review. Ideally, BOARS would like to receive feedback in time for its November meeting.

It was suggested that the document include a set of Frequently Asked Questions. For example, what is broken about the transfer process that the policy seeks to fix? Will UC faculty and departments continue to have the freedom to require specific major preparation or will they be forced to adjust their curriculum to align with a specific common template? Will CSU and CCC be dictating or influencing UC curriculum? Will campuses or departments be forced to participate in the TAG program?

It was noted that the proposal helps fulfill a legislative mandate, clarifies the transfer requirements, and increases preparation. There is a social equity aspect in terms of increasing transfer opportunities, time to degree, and the number of young people with college degrees. Departments would continue to be able to require specific major preparation, and CSU and CCC would in no way be dictating UC curriculum.

Action: BOARS agreed to send the draft transfer admissions proposal to the Academic Council with a request that Council circulate it to Senate divisions for targeted review among relevant faculty committees, who will provide feedback to BOARS.

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