

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the February 4, 2011 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the February minutes.

II. Announcements and Updates

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

Academic Council devoted much of its February 23 meeting to discussion of UCOP's "Funding Streams" proposal, and has just sent its [final response memo](#) to Provost Pitts. Council endorsed BOARS' concern that the potential loss of central enrollment management could negatively affect the UC system as a whole if individual campuses are allowed to set their own enrollment targets. The president of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) met with Council to discuss changes to the accreditation process WASC is considering as part of its Accreditation Handbook revision. WASC is also considering new levels of accreditation and accountability measures for accreditation. Council also endorsed a UCFW memo criticizing UCOP's "Working Smarter" initiative and the lack of faculty input into the progress report.

Council's consultation with senior UC leadership focused on the budget. The President and Provost noted that UC is asking the state for maximum flexibility in implementing the \$500M cut, which returns UC to its 1998 level of state funding, adjusted for inflation. The President said he expects enrollment to remain flat or decline slightly and does not plan to propose an additional tuition increase on top of the 8% increase taking effect this fall; however, depending on final budget outcomes, UC will have to consider a broad range of contingencies to ensure its survival. The Provost and Council also differ about the Senate's role in the review of new and existing self-supporting programs and supplemental fees.

It may be possible to place the tax extension measure on a June Special Election ballot with a simple majority of the Legislature, rather than a 2/3 majority. The Governor's deadline for approval of the ballot measure is March 10.

The February 10 ICAS meeting included a consultation with Assemblymember Achadjian's (R San Luis Obispo) legislative aide and a report about CSU's Early Start program, which aims to improve college preparation by addressing math and English remediation before students enter CSU as freshmen. CSU and the California Community Colleges are asking UC faculty to get more involved in the [C-ID project](#) and to provide input into three proposed [transfer model curricula](#). Implementation of transfer legislation SB 1440 and AB 2302 continues to be a major priority for CSU and CCC. In addition, the CCC is worried about cuts to funding for remedial education.

The BOARS Articulation and Evaluation subcommittee held a conference call in mid February to discuss online course provider applications and another provider was approved. Chair Jacob wants to convene the previously approved intersegmental task force to form a consensus opinion around a revision to the 'area b' description, but believes BOARS should create the first draft and the task force convened by conference call. Juan Poblete and Daniel Widener volunteered to

draft a revision that can be shared with BOARS and then the task force. Chair Jacob said it is important to address ‘area b’ in the context of the new Common Core Standards adopted by the State Board of Education. BOARS recommended at least one task force member be an expert in second language acquisition. It was noted that when English language learners are placed in a 9th grade course that is not ‘area b’ approved, they are less likely to obtain UC or CSU eligibility because they have to complete four area b courses, and this usually means doubling up their senior year.

The Admissions Processing Task Force will meet March 14. Shared review will be a major topic on the agenda.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Pamela Burnett, Interim Admissions Director*

The Council of Vice Chancellors asked Vice President Sakaki to develop a pilot referral process for domestic and international non-resident applicants to be implemented for fall 2011. Last year, 2,000 domestic non-resident applicants and 29 international applicants did not receive an offer from any campus to which they applied. The non-resident referral pool will consist primarily of applicants who were not accepted at UCB, UCLA, or UCSD. All campuses have agreed to participate. Referral information will be provided to the campuses shortly after the March 23 admissions decision deadline. UCOP will provide holistic scores and academic indicators. Vice President Sakaki is co-convening a non-resident recruitment strategy work group to explore possible systemwide efficiencies.

Vice President Sakaki and Interim Admissions Director Burnett made a presentation on holistic admissions to the President’s Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture, and Inclusion.

Interim Director Burnett noted that BOARS and the admissions directors traditionally hold a joint meeting in July, and that she would begin planning for that meeting soon.

Discussion: BOARS learned about a copy of a memo from Provost Pitts to the Executive Vice Chancellors outlining admissions targets for each campus, in which the Provost notes that admitted non-resident undergraduates must have qualifications that are equal to or greater than resident students who were denied. To some BOARS members, the letter appeared to diverge from the [Master Plan](#) requirement that out-of-state applicants meet higher entrance requirements and “stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible.”

It was noted that the change in policy or practice would presumably make it easier to admit non-residents, who do generally have strong qualifications, but the high non-resident target for some campuses could be a problem if the public perceives individual campuses as turning away qualified residents in favor of non-residents.

Some members thought BOARS should issue a statement affirming the Master Plan and reminding the University community about UC’s historical interpretation of its language about non-resident admission, noting that while increasing non-resident enrollment may be an appropriate response to the current budget situation, there is a danger that it will become the new normal, and it is important to maintain UC’s public character. Other members thought it would be a bad idea to remind the public of a policy that UC is not willing to enforce. It was noted that the policy is not part of Senate Regulations, and that the Master Plan language is actually more

lenient than the University historical interpretation. In addition, campuses are in the process of making admissions decisions and struggling with meeting targets in difficult fiscal circumstances. Campus decisions to admit more non-residents are rational in the current budget climate. The state should not expect UC to accept un-funded students. Any BOARS discussion about a change or clarification should come next year.

BOARS decided not to make a statement. Senate Vice Chair Anderson said he and Chair Simmons would report BOARS' conversation to the Provost. Vice Chair Anderson added that the state considers its \$500m cut to be to state support for students, not in the number of state-supported students. If the University maintains its current enrollment profile, it sends a message that UC can do more with less.

IV. Revisions to Senate Regulation 480

- *Evera Spears, Coordinator, Admissions Evaluation*

Issue: Admission Evaluators have requested clarification and revision of [Senate Regulation 480](#), Language Credit for Native Languages other than English. Assistant Director Spears said that campus evaluators differ in their interpretation of the regulation and are looking for faculty guidance about two points. First, it is unclear how to define the clause "at least nine years of education." The regulation uses this as the benchmark definition of "native language" and requires it for upper division language course credit for college-level language courses if the language of instruction was also the student's native language. Second, it is unclear to what extent the regulation allows or prohibits transfer credit for a literature course taught in the native language. She said the confusion has made it more difficult to determine eligibility for some transfer students.

Discussion: One point of the regulation seems to be to prevent students with fluency in a language from taking an entry-level course simply to get an easy A. The policy makes sense, but the language unclear, and UCOP's revision helps improve the clarity to some extent. Members suggested some alternate wordings and thought it would help to add a preamble to the regulation explaining the purpose and context.

Action: The Transfer subcommittee will take up the revision and report back to BOARS.

V. Admissions Funding Survey

Issue: Each campus admissions office completed a survey about its freshman and transfer admissions workload and available staff resources. BOARS wants to use the data to develop a metric defining the resources necessary to support recruitment, selection, and yield activities at each campus. The data will also help BOARS and the admissions directors determine whether shared review would be valuable and the extent to which it could produce new efficiencies. The survey also collected information about campuses transfer admission policies and whether or not major-based criteria were used in the decision.

Discussion: It was suggested that BOARS generate averages from the responses to obtain a systemwide view of needs, although widely different answers to some questions could make simple averaging impractical; for example, the number of staff concentrating on reading and/or supervising the reading of freshman applications between December 1 and completion. Campuses have different goals and situations. For example, UCSB spends more time on transfer admissions, campuses use readers differently, and readers have varying levels of expertise. Some

campuses use holistic review currently and others are implementing it next year. Campuses using the UCLA or UCB scores also spend varying amounts of time analyzing the scores. It was noted that Merced's responses are projections of next year's needs, when the campus expects to become more selective.

It would be useful to know the average cost of reading an application at UCB and UCLA in terms of human hours to help identify the cost of holistic review for campuses implementing it next year. It was noted that under Funding Streams, funding decisions will be campus-based, rather than UCOP-based, and admissions offices will want to support their funding requests with data. When campuses review the systemwide survey responses, they should explain any anomalies in their responses compared to the other campuses.

Action: Chair Jacob and committee analyst will organize the data into a spreadsheet, and Chair Jacob will share and discuss it with the admissions directors at the APTF meeting on March 14.

VI. Shared Review - Freshman Read vs. Admit Analysis

o With Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research

In response to BOARS' request, Content Manager Chang provided updated data detailing the likelihood of admission to each campus based on variety of UCB or UCLA holistic read scores between 1.00 and 5. A second analysis listed "Predicted Value" gradations for students with an original UCB read score of 3.00 or 3.50 and a UCB read score within the 4-5 score range, for applicants and admits to each campus. He also conducted an analysis of 2009 data to test the consistency of the 2010 data. Finally, Vice Chair Johnson generated charts showing the admit rate by campus by UCB and UCLA read score and by UCB Predicted Value, which show a great deal of consistency across campuses in the likelihood of admission based on UCLA or UCB score and Predicted Value. (The Predicted Value is a linear regression analysis based on the academic variables, school context factors, and other quantitative factors from the read sheet and the previous year's results.)

Discussion: Non-UCB and UCLA campuses should have access to the UCB and UCLA read scores and the UCB predicted value score to help in the review of individual files. But it was noted that the purpose of the PV score is to identify files that might need a re-read—it is not used as a tool in selection at Berkeley. Some campuses have already determined that they do not need to spend a lot of time with files that arrive with a high UCB or UCLA score. Instead, they can devote more time to the individualized review of applicants with lower scores and distinguish among applicants with lower UCB scores. It was also noted that even at Berkeley and UCLA, selection involves much more than simply using the single score, for example many cases require augmented review or tie-breaking.

Chair Jacob noted that about 72% of UC applicants apply to UCLA and/or UCB and receive a holistic score from one of those campuses. Adding UCI and UCSD increases the total to over 85%. Campuses might be able to admit as much as 20% or 30% of their applicant pool on the basis of the UCB/UCLA read score alone. It was noted that campuses will still have to develop criteria to review their remaining applicants and that 42% of Davis applicants, for example, will not have a UCLA holistic review score. It would be instructive for Berkeley to review and score a set of applications to the less selective campuses.

Action: Chair Jacob will discuss the data and BOARS' deliberations with the Admissions Processing Task Force on March 14.

VII. Campaign for College Opportunity

- *Michele Siqueiros, Executive Director, and Jessie Ryan, Associate Director, Campaign for College Opportunity*

Representatives from the Campaign for College Opportunity joined BOARS to discuss SB 1440 and AB 2302, transfer legislation authored by the Campaign, an independent non-profit organization that promotes college access and success with a particular policy focus on transfer and community college completion.

SB 1440 requires the California Community Colleges to develop Associate Degrees for Transfer that specify a major and guarantee degree holders admission to CSU with junior status (though not necessarily to a specific campus) if they complete minimum GPA and unit requirements, including the CSU GE or IGETC and a defined set of major preparation courses. AB 2302 asks UC to develop a similar transfer degree pathway. It also requires the CSU and the CCCs to develop a tool to inform students of the new path, and a mechanism to facilitate the accumulation of similar units across CCC campuses. So far, CCC and CSU have completed three transfer model curricula, an additional three are out for review, and are preparing several more.

In writing the legislation, the Campaign for College Opportunity sought to provide community college students with a clearer pathway to a four-year degree, and with the Transfer AA degree, give them a tangible benchmark of their work. In particular, if they don't complete their transfer work for some reason, they will still have an AA degree (many transfers do not have AA degrees and if they leave the four-year school before completing a BA then they have no degree at all.) They hope the Transfer AA will be the pathway of choice for most transfers, and they believe strongly that a common statewide transfer pathway is the most ideal way to serve the California public.

Discussion: Members expressed support for the goals of the legislation, although there was some concern about unintended consequences. It was noted that many transfers come to UC unprepared to enter a major or to complete a major in two years, and that implementing additional major-based transfer criteria could actually cause fewer community college students to become competitively eligible for transfer to due to the larger number of requirements and the tendency of students to change their minds about majors during the first two years.

One member noted that it is unfair to lay particular blame on transfer students. Four-year students experience the same difficulties, and UC should not hold transfers to a higher standard. Campuses can do more to clarify major requirements and the importance of major preparation to potential transfer applicants. Campuses may also want to look at which community college courses are the best predictors of success at UC.

BOARS was disappointed about the lack of data projecting the effect of UC implementation of SB 1440 or AB 2302 on transfer eligibility. It was noted that it would be difficult to mobilize UC faculty in support of the effort and to coordinate 10 campuses with 135 CCCs in a multitude of majors. Members suggested targeting specific UC departments and building regional partnerships to gain support, looking at CCCs that do not feed many students into a UC, and basing future efforts on the Transfer Admissions Guarantee (TAG) program.

VII. Transfer Subcommittee

The subcommittee discussed SB 1440 and the prospect of setting and enforcing major-based criteria for transfer admission. It reviewed background documents noting that current transfer admission policy includes specific eligibility requirements and comprehensive review. Many campuses/departments evaluate applicants on the basis of specific major preparation, but others admit them using general transfer requirements and GPA. One idea is to increase the number of majors where major-based preparation is evaluated as part of transfer selection, possibly using the Transfer Preparation Pathways and UC-specific criteria. UCOP plans to reconvene the five transfer groups to look at straw man associate degrees.

The subcommittee discussed the pros of major-based transfer, which include reduced time-to-degree and early information about major preparation, and the cons, which include discouragement because of the larger number of requirements, and the expense of implementation, although on-line evaluation tools can help facilitate the reviews. The discussion stressed the role of Transfer Admission Guarantees (TAGs) in transfer from specific Community Colleges. It was suggested that BOARS review existing TAGs in an effort to expand them. UC may prefer TAGs to major-based admission requirements, but the TAGs have not led to diversity gains. The subcommittee will review UCOP's proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 480 at the next meeting.

VIII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

Issue: UCOP High School Articulation staff forwarded one online course provider application to the A&E subcommittee for consideration.

Action: The Subcommittee approved the provider application.

To help generate policy positions regulating online education, the subcommittee would like to gather data comparing students who have taken some or all their high school courses online with students who have taken them in person, in order to study their correlation with UC performance, as well as high school graduation rates, standardized test scores, and GPA. The subcommittee would also like to collect demographic information about students who have taken online courses.

It was suggested that BOARS compare outcomes of students who are currently enrolled at UC. It was also suggested that a better approach would be to conduct a longitudinal study of current high school students. Associate Director Daves-Rougeaux confirmed that BOARS could use the application to gather data about which courses were taken online and what provider was used. BOARS could add fields to Apply UC if UCOP receives the information by March 31. There was some concern that students would be reluctant to volunteer the information on the application. BOARS voted to approve the change to the Apply UC, and will ask that students check a box indicating if any course was taken on-line.

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