

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the May 6, 2011 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the May minutes with a few minor changes..

II. Announcements and Updates

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

At its May 25 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed a funding metric developed by BOARS to assist campuses in determining the staffing required for the review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts necessary to implement the new freshman admissions policy. Chair Simmons will send a memo to President Yudof requesting that the President forward BOARS' analysis to the campus executive vice chancellors.

Council met with Regent Bonnie Reiss, who will chair the Regents' Committee on Educational Policy next year. She said transfer admissions will be one of her major interest areas, and that the Regents are studying the possibility of implementing differential fees across campuses. Many Council members spoke against differential fees.

Following Council's discussion of the UC Online Education Pilot Project, Chair Simmons sent a [memo](#) to UC leaders summarizing Council's views about the project's implementation going forward, and its concerns about the project's shifting focus and new financial model.

At its May meeting, the Admissions Processing Task Force (APTF) discussed BOARS' plan for sharing holistic review scores and BOARS' revision to Principle 6 of the [Non-Resident Enrollment Principles](#).

A Council Task Force is working on a new methodology for allocating state funds to the campuses to help eliminate past inequities in the amount of state funding per student distributed to the campuses. It proposes a new way of determining the true number of students the state is funding, as well as a formula for "rebenching" the proportion of state general funds each campus receives, introducing a common state subsidy per student across UC campuses.

III. Joint Meeting with California State University

- *James Postma, Chair of the CSU Academic Senate*
- *Stephen Stepanak, CSU Admission Advisory Council co-chair*
- *Eric Forbes, Assistant Vice Chancellor, CSU*
- *Ken O'Donnell, Associate Dean, CSU Chancellor's Office*

Issue: CSU faculty and administrators joined the meeting by phone to discuss issues associated with fostering and improving the transfer path, including SB 1440 and BOARS' transfer admission proposal, as well as the role of 'a-g,' and Career Technical Education.

Obstacles on the Transfer Path: CSU guests noted several problems related to transfer: Some community college students are unable to find the courses they need at a single location or receive poor advising; and others lose motivation due to a general education curriculum that tracks them into remediation sequences before they can enroll in a more engaging curriculum connected to the real world. In addition, prospective transfers often want access to the most popular campuses, and are frustrated when they are unable to transfer successfully to those specific campuses.

Implementation of SB 1440: SB1440 requires the California Community Colleges to develop Associate Degrees for Transfer that guarantee degree holders admission to CSU with junior status, and in doing so, is supposed to address student confusion about the courses required for transfer and cases of students accumulating too many units that are not applicable for transfer. CSU must establish 60-unit upper division baccalaureate majors for students holding a Transfer AA degree.

CSU recognized that it would be logistically impossible for every CCC district to establish Transfer AA agreements with each of the CSUs, so they brought together CSU and CCC discipline faculty to develop Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) templates that could be approved universally. Ten TMCs have been developed so far, and the top 20 most popular majors should be complete by this fall. CSU is not closing its current transfer pathways. A primary difficulty in complying with SB 1440 has been its rigid adherence to the 60-60 unit requirement. Even a small amount of flexibility would have facilitated superior outcomes.

BOARS Transfer Proposal: BOARS is developing a proposal for major-based transfer admission that parallels the new Freshman Admission Policy taking effect for fall 2012. UC transfer applicants would be entitled to a review (though not guaranteed admission) if they complete any one of three proposed pathway options: completion of an SB 1440 AA Degree for Transfer with a minimum GPA to be set by each campus; completion of a yet to be developed UC TMC; or the current pathway specified in SR 476 with IGETC as an option. BOARS wants to communicate to community college students that if they pick a major, prepare for it, and show a strong case for being able to complete their declared majors in two years, they have a good chance to compete for admission.

Career Technical Education: Legislation requires CSU to develop and implement new career technical education pathways—specifically, to allow completion of a CTE course to fulfill the visual/performing arts or foreign language requirement. CSU depends on UC's guidance to determine which CTE courses fulfill 'a-g,' but they are thinking about developing CTE courses that would not necessarily be UC-approved for a-g, but would be CSU approved for a-g in disciplines that might not be offered at UC.

Discussion: SB 1440's emphasis on major preparation has potential benefit, but the stricter transfer requirements could also establish new barriers. SB 1440 also assumes that community college students will arrive knowing exactly what they want to study. It ignores the tendency for students to change their mind and the need for them to engage in intellectual exploration. Moreover, the bill does not allow students to prepare for multiple majors, a broad major such as Liberal Studies, or take an undeclared path. The goal of maximizing efficient throughput is unrealistic and pedagogically unsound. UC and CSU could join together to argue for more flexibility.

On the other hand, students on any UC or CSU campus are expected to declare a major and finish lower division requirements by junior year. This is how four-year colleges have always worked, which the legislation attempts to replicate at the community college level.

Shawn Brick noted that UC has convened seven discipline groups to explore commonalities among lower-division major requirements at different UC campuses with the aim of facilitating a successful transition to UC for transfers. In cases where a CSU TMC exists for those groups, the UC group reviews it.

CSU representatives expressed support for the BOARS transfer proposal. There would be an additional benefit if UC could align its TMCs with CSU's TMCs. It was noted that a transfer AA degree might not be good preparation for some majors, particularly in the STEM disciplines, and that ICAS is reviewing SCIGETC.

UC and CSU should work together to develop a common message for transfer students. The September counselor conferences are one opportunity to disseminate such a message.

III. Consultation with UCOP

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

Vice President Judy Sakaki: UCOP wants to increase the \$60 UC application fee, but opinions differ as to how much. Many see a \$10 increase as reasonable, but some administrators think the fee should be as high as \$100 per application to help generate much-needed revenue. BOARS may want to opine.

Vice President Sakaki co-chairs a Non-Resident Recruitment Strategy Work Group, which is looking at ways to better coordinate domestic and international non-resident recruitment marketing and messaging.

She and other UC leaders recently met with 100 Black Men of America, Inc. to discuss concerns about African-American admissions and how that organization can work with UCOP to achieve common goals.

Interim Director Burnett's appointment ends July 15; UCOP has employed an executive search firm to recruit a permanent Executive Director.

UCOP is surveying campus administrators to assess campus' readiness for the next phase of *ApplyUC* implementation.

Interim Director Pamela Burnett: The Admissions Processing Task Force is concerned that many additional students could end up in the referral pool under the new freshman admissions policy, and about the pending changes to ELC outreach; starting next year, applicants will not know that they are in the 9% ELC pool until after they apply, whereas previously students were informed about the ELC guarantee before the application filing deadline. The admissions directors support BOARS' focus on major preparation in its transfer admissions proposal, and BOARS' plan for sharing holistic review scores. They suggested that BOARS develop a policy and procedure for requesting an exemption from holistic review. All campuses are now willing to share scores, except UCLA, which does not want to share its scores with Berkeley

Campuses are reviewing preliminary data on freshman Statements of Intent to Register (SIR). Wait lists and the new non-resident referral pool are making enrollment management more challenging and complicated, so UC will not be able finalize SIR data as quickly as in the past. Most campuses will reach their resident and non-resident enrollment goals. Data show that the freshman SIR rate for California residents is up overall compared to last year. There are increases in traditional academic indicators and in the number of first generation college students and students from low API schools. The racial and ethnic mix is similar to last year.

Don Daves-Rougeaux: UC is planning another Curriculum Institute for November 2011 with a focus on developing social science and laboratory science courses that are integrated with CTE content from related industry sectors.

Shawn Brick: UCOP is drafting a report to the legislature about UC's implementation of last year's transfer legislation. The transfer subcommittee will have an opportunity to review the draft.

Discussion: A \$10 increase in the application fee seems reasonable, but as the BOARS funding metric memo states, the University should not consider the application fee as a broad revenue source; it should only be used to support recruitment, review, selection, and yield work. BOARS members opined that the increase to \$100 seemed inappropriate because it appears to be motivated by a desire to raise general revenue rather than being grounded in meeting the needs for support of recruitment, review, selection, and yield work.

Vice Chair Anderson encouraged BOARS to discuss a methodology for evaluating different admissions processes, but he thought it would be a mistake to develop a holistic review exemption policy, as the President reserves the authority to mandate the holistic approach.

It was noted that UC is in a transitional period with holistic review. BOARS will support campus decisions, but should wait for empirical evidence about the implementation of the new policy. Holistic review scores or any single evaluation method does not determine admissions; it is one piece of information.

Action: A motion was made and seconded that BOARS communicate to all directors of admissions the expectation that all comprehensive review scores and flags for supplemental review cases should be shared openly throughout the system. The motion carried unanimously.

V. Planning for July 8 Joint BOARS-Admissions Directors Meeting

Members discussed topics for the July meeting agenda, which will include a morning session with the campus Admissions Directors.

- The referral pool is expected to be stronger than usual and include members of the 9% ELC pool. It is important to the success of the new admissions policy that a large proportion of ELC students not receive only a referral offer and that no group is disproportionately assigned to the referral pool. Can we ask all campuses to hold spaces for ELC students? Could ELC students in the referral pool have an enhanced opportunity to enroll at their local campus? Will there be a referral pool at all next year?
- UC needs to develop clear and consistent messaging that explains the new admissions policy. We also need a plan to evaluate outcomes from the new policy. How will we know if we have succeeded in increasing access and fairness?

- The budget crisis is pressuring campuses to enroll more non-residents. How are campuses addressing the perception that these enrollment changes do not benefit Californians, and how are recruitment plans and strategies may be changing from past years?
- Assessing the wait list policy.

VI. Plan for Sharing Holistic Review Scores for fall 2012

BOARS discussed a document outlining a plan for sharing review scores, and its goals and expectations for the process. The Plan is a statement of understanding between BOARS and the admissions directors and a living document that can be modified periodically. The Provost and other administrators will be interested in the document. Interim Director Burnett thanked BOARS on behalf of the admissions directors.

VII. Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Issue: The APTF reviewed BOARS' draft revision of Principle #6 of the [Non-Resident Enrollment Principles](#) and recommended a new formulation:

6. Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should be comparable to admitted California residents at that campus.

Discussion: Members felt that "comparable" was too vague and eliminated something vital from the original language that BOARS wanted to clarify but not eliminate.

Action: BOARS approved the following wording for Principle 6 and will send a memo to Council asking for its endorsement:

6. Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to admitted California residents at that campus.

VIII. Area 'b' (English) Revision

BOARS reviewed a draft revision to area 'b' being developed by a BOARS subcommittee. Before the meeting, Chair Jacob shared the draft with two UC faculty experts in linguistics and English language acquisition, and distributed their input to the committee. He said he hopes a final revision can be posted to UC Doorways by the fall.

Discussion: The revisions attempt to clarify the objectives of the English requirement; that there are multiple forms of literacy and information students must be able to access and evaluate; and that the ability to speak and write in languages other than English should be considered assets, not deficits to be eliminated.

The linguists gave advice about new language defining the kind of courses that should receive credit, and about the consistent use of ESL terms in the document. They also suggested expanding the kind of courses that can be considered for 'b' (e.g., composition, creative writing) that are not currently approved. It was noted that BOARS should do anything it can to ratchet up writing skills and expectations. There was some support for allowing schools to develop non-traditional ways of satisfying the 'b' standards, although some felt creative writing and journalism, for example, may not accomplish the goals sufficiently. Don Daves-Rougeaux noted that UC has received one journalism course that is being reviewed for 'b.'

Action: Juan Poblete will incorporate the comments into a new draft. Chair Jacob will collect additional feedback from the UC experts and eventually send a draft to the faculty members proposed for the intersegmental area 'b' task force.

IX. Proposed EESS Course

A group of high school teachers and UC Faculty have submitted an Honors Earth Systems Science course for consideration by the BOARS articulation and evaluation committee to meet the area 'd' (laboratory science) requirement. The course is similar to an Honors Geology course that already meets area 'd,' and has been further enhanced to include biology, chemistry and algebra as prerequisites.

Chair Jacob remarked that some Earth, Environmental, and Space Sciences faculty have felt that area 'd' discriminates against EESS by not including an EESS option alongside biology, chemistry, and physics. On several occasions in the past, BOARS has rejected requests to add EESS to the area 'd' language, noting that an EESS course can fulfill area 'g,' as well as area 'd' if it includes enough content in one or more of the three fundamental sciences.

BOARS agreed that the course in question is strong and should be a model area 'd' course. BOARS should support and encourage the development of such courses.

X. Transfer Issues

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

Associate Director Brick is drafting a report to the legislature about UC's implementation of AB 2302, which asks UC to consider a transfer eligibility guarantee similar to what is being mandated to CSU under SB 1440. UC does not want the term "eligibility" misinterpreted; in other contexts, UC uses it to denote the referral guarantee, but UC will not guarantee admission to any transfers. In addition, the terms used in the report should be consistent with the BOARS transfer proposal, which guarantees applicants a comprehensive review for consideration of transfer admission if they meet certain minimum requirements.

He noted that the BOARS transfer proposal states that students will be guaranteed a review if they complete the UC Transfer Model Curricula for their chosen major along with 60 (90 quarter) transferrable units and attain a minimum overall GPA established by the campus. This goes a little further than what the transfer groups were asked to consider and currently agreed to. They are not discussing TMCs. It is more accurate to say students can qualify if they meet existing campus and department requirements.

XI. Articulation and Evaluation

An on-line provider was approved.

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