

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of the April 5, 2011 BOARS Minutes

Action: BOARS approved the April minutes.

II. Announcements and Updates

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

Chair Jacob summarized BOARS' current activities in a report to the Academic Assembly on April 13. The April 27 Academic Council meeting focused on the UC Online Education Pilot Project. The Senate [endorsed](#) the pilot project in 2010 with the caveat that it be funded externally, but UCOP has not been able to raise the full amount it estimates will be needed, and now plans to borrow up to \$6.9M. Some faculty are concerned about the new financial model and with the project's shifting focus and priorities. Administrators have cited access to transferable lower division courses for community college students as one possible goal. Council is preparing a statement about the project, and Senate Chair Simmons has asked Senate agencies for a quick review of the Project Plan.

Chair Jacob was disappointed about Council's decision not to endorse a UCOPE white paper addressing the need to fund ESL instruction and English Language support services on UC campuses. Council decided that it would be inappropriate to intervene in a campus-based issue and to advocate for a particular program when so many other programs face budgetary pressures.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates held an advocacy day in Sacramento on April 25. Leaders of the three academic senates met with legislators to discuss the importance of building a higher education system that preserves the long-term health of California.

UC hosted its fourth Curriculum Institute last week. It brought together high school teachers to develop academically rigorous math and science courses that are integrated with CTE content and can be approved for 'a-g.' Participants made progress on several new courses. One of the featured speakers was Amir Abo-Shaeer, who spoke about his Santa Barbara engineering academy. The Institute is a tremendous professional development opportunity for teachers.

UCOP admissions staff will update the Regents on the process of implementing holistic review this July. The next full report on Comprehensive Review is due July 2012, and will be placed on a biennial cycle thereafter.

Discussion: The online project has the potential to expand access to UC, but the goals are unclear. Is it to make money or increase access? Could a focus on transfer encroach on the work of community colleges? BOARS can contribute the knowledge it has gained from its review of high school online course providers. It was suggested that a member from BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee join the project's planning committee.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Pamela Burnett, Interim Admissions Director*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director*

Interim Director Burnett said the freshman admission [media release](#) was successful overall, although as expected, the media focused a great deal of attention on non-resident admission numbers. Some California parents of prospective applicants to UC have offered to pay non-resident tuition; Student Affairs drafted a response for President Yudof to indicate that ability to pay is not part of the selection criteria.

Most campuses expect to meet or exceed their overall enrollment targets, and most exceeded their non-resident SIR targets and non-resident SIRs over last year. Several campuses took advantage of the new non-resident referral pool. Campuses have been admitting fewer transfers as they watch freshman SIRs come in, and in the early trajectory of transfer SIRs will in some cases go to their transfer wait lists.

Campus admissions directors reported that the qualifications of admitted non-residents are equivalent to or better than resident admits. At the same time, campuses do not have the same information for non-residents as they do for residents, so it is not always easy to compare; directors use their professional judgments.

UCOP will soon begin a national search to fill the undergraduate admissions executive director position. Before Susan Wilbur's departure, the position was split into two FTEs: an executive director focused on policy and a director responsible for interacting with campuses and the community. The director search should also begin shortly.

BOARS and the campus Admissions Directors will hold a joint meeting the morning of July 8 at the Berkeley Faculty Club.

The annual Ensuring Transfer Success Institute was held last week at two locations in northern and southern California. The event is organized jointly by UC and CCC and includes workshops on transfer evaluation for community college counselors and faculty. This fall, UC plans to repeat the joint counselor conference it held with CSU last year in Fresno. UC is preparing a report to the legislature about how the University will participate in the new transfer legislation, SB 1440 and AB 2302.

Discussion: UC might ask unhappy parents to contact their legislators to say that UC would be able to enroll more residents if the state funded it appropriately. UC also should communicate that it enrolls significantly fewer non-residents than many other comparable public universities.

IV. Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Issue: Ambiguity in one of the [Non-Resident Enrollment Principles](#) authored by BOARS in 2009 (Principle 6, *Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident students by generally being in the "upper half of those ordinarily eligible" as stated in the Master Plan*), prompted Chair Jacob to ask members to discuss a revised Principle #6 with local committees. Campuses summarized discussions.

Reports: UCSB increased its non-resident SIRs 100% this year, from 200 to 400. Overall, UCSB's resident and non-resident admit pools are similar in terms of their unweighted GPA and

test scores, although UCSB did not compare students on the margins. Revenue potential was one of the campus's justifications for increasing offers to non-residents.

To increase non-resident enrollment, UC Davis read non-resident applications in their entirety, allowed non-residents without Subject tests or the visual/performing arts requirement to be considered, and admitted more non-residents into their first choice major. Davis's admit pool included 13.5% non-residents, up from 7.5% in 2009. Preliminary data show that in every category, the characteristics of non-resident admits are, on average, better than those of resident admits, and also better than residents who were denied; however, not all individual non-resident admits have superior characteristics to denied residents in specific categories such as SAT and GPA. Next year, Davis will use a holistic score for both residents and non-residents.

UCSD expects a yield of 425 non-residents after receiving over 600 non-resident SIRs. The pool of non-resident admits is split evenly between domestic and international; most non-resident transfer admits are foreign. UCSC made a special effort to increase non-resident enrollment this year; currently, only 3% of UCSC's student body is international non-resident. At UCLA, non-resident and underrepresented minority admits rose this year. At Berkeley, 30% of admits were non-residents, and the number of international non-resident admits increased by 23%. Berkeley has always been popular with non-residents, but increased recruitment efforts made it easy to boost numbers this year.

Discussion: A legitimate claim could be made that non-residents are taking some spaces that previously might have gone to residents, but the large number of unfunded students in the UC system justifies enrolling more non-residents. Campuses are no doubt increasing non-residents for the revenue, but it would be a mistake to assume that they are considering incomes of individual non-resident applicants. Although campuses do not admit solely on academic criteria, ability to pay is not a comprehensive review factor.

In general, members agreed that Principle 6 is too ambiguous and some supported Chair Jacob's revision; others thought BOARS should collect longitudinal data comparing the qualifications of admitted residents and non-residents before determining whether campuses are diverging from the principles.

It might be better to base comparisons of residents and non-residents on single holistic scores rather than specific factors like GPA and test scores. Campuses should rank both residents and non-residents according to holistic review to ensure that non-residents are above any cut-offs established for residents. On the other hand, doing so may not provide a definitive answer to whether campuses are honoring Principle 6.

Members suggested additional concepts and clarifications for the Principle: language referring to a holistic review ranking; language acknowledging that UC is choosing from two different populations but will apply the principles of comprehensive review to both; and language noting that campuses have to use professional judgment. The Principle also should acknowledge, or at least not limit, the needs of particular schools and academic programs.

Action: BOARS will continue discussion over email and in June.

V. Proposed BOARS Funding Metric for Admissions Processing

Issue: BOARS continued its discussion of a statement and proposal regarding appropriate funding to support campus recruitment, review, selection, and yield work for fall 2012 admissions.

Discussion: Interim Director Burnett noted that there is a proposal for a \$10 increase in the UC application fee. The UCOP Budget Office has agreed to wait for the BOARS metric before it consults campuses about their admissions budget and the role of the fee in supporting admissions offices.

Action: BOARS approved the memo and will forward to Council.

VI. Revisions to ‘area c’ and ‘area b’ Descriptions

Issue: BOARS reviewed a revision to the ‘area c’ (mathematics) description that replaces citations to the 1998 California Math Standards with the Common Core Mathematics Standards. A BOARS subcommittee is also discussing a revision to the ‘area b’ (English) description to reflect California’s adoption of the Common Core Standards for the language arts and that incorporates language from the ICAS Academic Literacy statement.

Discussion: The ‘area b’ description should include a statement about ESL in the context of the needs of a growing population who want access to UC. It should also address desired outcomes. Participants of the UC Curriculum Institute noted that there is some confusion about the Common Core’s distinction between Algebra I and II.

Action: BOARS approved the ‘area c’ revision and will discuss ‘area b’ in June.

VII. Plan for Sharing Review Scores for fall 2012 Discussion Draft

Issue: BOARS discussed a revised draft plan for sharing holistic review scores across campuses. Berkeley and UCLA scores are being shared with San Diego and Irvine, who are using them in selection. Davis and Santa Cruz are moving to single-score holistic review and are interested in scores from other campuses. Other campuses may use score sharing to help project enrollment and compare outcomes to their own comprehensive review processes.

Discussion: Chair Jacob said two main impediments to score sharing are the differences in the way read sheets report local context information, and in the way campuses use that information. For example, Irvine uses UCLA context information for applications read either at UCLA or Irvine, but UCSD uses UCSD context information in UCSD reads and UCLA scores for applicants who also applied to UCLA. It may not make sense for campuses to use UCLA/Berkeley scores if the read sheet compares applicants to those campuses instead of the campus where they are being considered, or at the least, the context information a campus uses should be uniform.

It was noted that “efficiency” can mean saving money, but it can also mean doing more with the same amount of money. Sharing scores may produce new efficiencies but no net savings. Some campuses will admit the majority of students with very high Berkeley or UCLA scores, and score sharing can allow them to focus on other mid-range applicants, but the additional cost of single score review may offset any cost efficiency gained from score sharing. Campuses are transitioning to single score review, and will only get the full picture about efficiencies as they come to understand how meaningful it is to share scores over several years.

Davis plans to admit applicants with very high UCLA and Berkeley scores, but wants to clarify the meaning of the scores and score rubrics to ensure that students who are read only at Davis are scored comparably with students who have a UCLA or Berkeley score. Davis plans to re-read 1000 applications from across the UCLA score ranges in an effort to calibrate UCLA and Davis scores. Davis will also re-read all UCLA 4 and 4.25 scores for tie-breaking.

Professor Widener distributed data showing a high correlation between the UCLA holistic score and the UCSD score used in the dual admission review system this year based on 100 randomly selected UCSD applications.

It was suggested that the score sharing plan mention the need to maintain and increase the fairness of the entire procedure and encourage campuses to make the results of their holistic review process useful to other campuses. It was also suggested that campuses might collaborate on reviewing applicants with midrange scores from more selective campuses. The Plan will be viewed as a living white paper that moves between BOARS and the admissions directors and is not going out for Senate review.

VIII. Introduction of Reading Materials on Stress in Pre-Collegiate Years

o Bonnie Halpern-Felsher

Professor Halpern-Felsher introduced BOARS to research on the stress felt by ultra-competitive high school students whose daily lives are scheduled beyond a reasonable limit with the goal of getting into a top college. Such students may take every AP and honors class possible, attend summer school, and schedule numerous extracurricular activities. More of these students are being diagnosed with developmental disorders and depression, and in sacrificing depth for breadth, they may not be learning more or in a meaningful way.

Discussion: The holistic review process may contribute to the problem because it brings many additional metrics into the process. Sustained, passionate involvement in one activity is more important than minimal involvement in many activities. This is an opportunity for BOARS to rethink how UC considers admissions, take a leadership role, and influence the educational landscape. BOARS could help change the culture by taking specific actions – for example, limit the number of activities it is possible to list on the UC application or reconsider the role of AP courses in admission. We still lack metrics that can adequately define quality, equity, preparedness, and desire to learn.

This is a limited, class-based experience in some ways. It is less of an issue for lower income students who do not come from a college going culture, and who, moreover, have been living with various economic and cultural stressors for many years. In fact, the stress low income students often suffer is comparably severe, although for different reasons. BOARS should focus on fair admission policies and equity of access for all and be more concerned about students whose economic status limits their access to college than with overachievers who suffer from stress. Possibly, policies that limit the number of items reviewed and seek to measure depth of accomplishment within those items can benefit both groups.

IX. Proposal for Comprehensive Review for Transfer Admission

BOARS continued its discussion of a draft proposal for major-based transfer admission. Chair Jacob also shared the proposal with UCEP, which provided a few informal comments to BOARS. He said he hopes BOARS can produce a final document by July that can be released for Senate review in fall 2011.

Discussion: BOARS should clarify that the proposal is not “comprehensive review” for transfer, but a review of major preparation for transfer. It signals that UC is paying particular attention to preparation for upper division courses in specific majors. UC is not doing students a favor by admitting them without the proper upper division preparation.

It was noted that departments want to maintain control over major-based requirements and some will resist more centralized processes. Also, UCSD voted to raise its Transfer Admission Agreement minimum GPA requirement from a 3.0 to a 3.5, and is discussing leaving the TAG program altogether.

X. Transfer Subcommittee

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

Statway: Several Community Colleges are using the Statway pilot program, which is intended to allow potential non-STEM majors to acquire skills equivalent to a lower division statistics course in one year without taking an intermediate algebra prerequisite. Statway advocates are asking UC to add the Statway sequence to IGETC and award college credit equivalent to one college semester. There is some concern that Statway leaves out material that would normally be a prerequisite for some courses, and the Subcommittee would like to review the content of sample courses before agreeing to this request.

Associate Degree for Transfer: CSU and CCC faculty are moving quickly to implement the SB 1440 legislation by establishing major-based transfer model curricula. CCC districts will use the models to develop their own Associate Degrees, and the CCC Chancellor’s office will give fast track approval to conforming models. UC is too late to influence the development of the models, but still plans to send CCC faculty a letter providing feedback on the math model curriculum. In some cases, the Associates Degrees will align with UC’s expectations, but there may be less coordination in other majors. UC is convening four additional UC faculty groups this spring and fall to discuss the extent to which commonalities can be found in lower-division major preparation at different campuses and may invite CCC faculty to those meetings. Some of the CCC counselors who participated in UC’s Ensuring Transfer Success Conference expressed confusion about SB 1440, but also understand that UC degrees are different and it is reasonable to have additional requirements beyond the transfer model curricula.

Transfer proposal: Transfer students who complete any one of the three proposed pathway options would be entitled to a review, but not guaranteed admission. The goals of the proposal are to help CCC students get clear information about transfer requirements, educate them about what they need to be successful in their major, encourage them to pick a major early and prepare for transfer, and to respond to the legislation.

XI. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee reviewed two applications to be online a-g providers. One provider was approved and one was not.

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