

**I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS April 2012 minutes.

**Action:** BOARS approved the April minutes.

**II. Announcements**

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair*
- *Robert Anderson, Academic Senate Chair*

A Senate Memorial asking the Regents to take a formal position in support of ballot measures and legislation that increase state revenues and/or prioritize funding for public higher education, has [passed](#) a systemwide vote of Senate faculty by a large margin.

In April, the Academic Assembly elected BOARS Chair Jacob to be 2012-2013 Academic Council vice chair and approved Council's nomination of John Oakley and Sandra Weiss to be the recipients of the 2012 Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Senate Service.

Provost Pitts reported to the Assembly that the State has raised the idea of tying a long-term UC funding agreement to accountability metrics that include increasing the number of transfer students and improving graduation rates for undergraduates and transfers—standards the UC administration did not object to, although Chair Jacob expressed a general concern about entering into any agreement of this type.

Council discussed the [report](#) of the Senate-Administration Taskforce on Faculty Salaries, which recommends a mechanism for distributing a 3% salary increase. Council agreed that a 3% increase for faculty and non-represented staff should be considered as important as other mandatory cost increases. It recommended distributing 2% of the raise through an across-the-board range adjustment to faculty salaries, and the remaining 1% through other mechanisms described in the report.

The Admissions Processing Task Force has been renamed the Systemwide Strategic Admissions Taskforce (SSAT), and discussion at its first meeting focused on domestic non-resident and international admission processing.

ICAS held its annual Legislative Day in Sacramento on April 24. ICAS met with staff and legislators from the LAO and State Assembly to discuss public higher education. Issues raised included state funding and tuition, enrollment, and transfer policy. A LAO staff member expressed concern that UC did not participate in the Early Assessment Program, and Chair Jacob explained that UC required different information for course placement than was provided by the

EAP. A staffer from the Assembly Higher Education committee encouraged the Senate to get more involved in advocacy pointing out that for-profit higher education has a large presence in Sacramento.

Chair Anderson said the Budget Rebenching Task Force draft report has been circulated to the Senate participants on the Task Force, and will soon be released for systemwide review. The report outlines a new mechanism for distributing state funding to campus on a per-student basis, and for enforcing resident enrollment targets, which recognizes the financial incentive campuses have to enroll non-residents and the disproportionate ability of campuses to attract non-residents. BOARS' "compare favorably" standard will provide some limits on the non-resident population, but as number of non-resident applicants grows, UC could lose its capacity to accommodate all eligible residents. To address these incentives and concerns that eligible residents displaced at one UC campus need to be taken by another campus, the report proposes that campuses that give up their resident enrollment target should transfer the per student State funding amount, plus a penalty equivalent to 150% of the State subsidy per student, to another campus.

### **III. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

BOARS reviewed updated systemwide and by-campus data on freshman applicant and admission rates by eligibility status. UC's overall freshman admission rate for fall 2012 was 66%. 74% of index-eligible-only and ELC-eligible-only applicants were admitted to a campus of their choice, and 94% of applicants with both an ELC and index guarantee were admitted to a campus of their choice. The ELC-eligible-only admission rate was higher than the overall rate, except at the most selective campuses. Systemwide, 48% of Entitled to Review (ETR) applicants were admitted to the campus of their choice, but the ETR admission rate was much lower at the most selective campuses.

The admission rate for the ELC 1-4% pool was higher than the ELC 5-9% pool, although the 5-9% pool contributed more admits than the 1-4% pool, systemwide and at some campuses. Many underrepresented minority students admitted were in the ELC-only and ETR pathways. 9% of all African Americans admits and 16% of all Chicano/Latino admits admitted were in the ELC-only-eligibility path. 38% of African-Americans and 33% of Chicano/Latinos were in the ETR pool.

Applicants who took two or more SAT Subject Exams were admitted at a higher overall rate relative to the total, across all disciplines, than those who took none or one Subject Test; however, many applicants who did not take a Subject Test were admitted, and admitted students who took two or more tests also had stronger academic profiles relative to the total. Most of the admitted students who took two or more Subject tests were admitted into majors such as Engineering that highly recommend the tests.

UCOP is also compiling preliminary data on freshman Statements of Intent to Register (SIR), but will not have final SIR data until wait list and referral pool decisions are complete. Most campuses expect to meet or exceed their overall enrollment targets. UCOP will bring data on the “compare favorably” implementation to BOARS in June.

**Discussion:** A member noted that although the Subject Tests are no longer required, it should be made clear to applicants whether and in what conditions the tests are considered in decision-making. Director Jeffery noted that the [Admissions website](#) lists the disciplines for which the Subject test is recommended and states that the tests are not mandatory. Taking the test may be a plus in some majors, but it is only one of many factors considered in comprehensive review. It was suggested that BOARS analyze the extent to which the Subject Test alone is or is not playing a role in admissions and whether taking the test is more or less correlated than the SAT, GPA, and other indicators in the value it adds to the admission decision.

A member noted that while ETR does add to overall diversity, it is not widely used at the most selective campuses. BOARS should encourage all campuses to consider ETR students. BOARS should also study yield, retention, and academic outcomes for the ETR cohort.

#### **IV. Clarification of GPA Calculation in SR 424 B (2)**

- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

**Issue:** UCOP believes that an important qualifier in the language of Senate Regulation [424 B \(2\)](#) was changed inadvertently omitted when the Senate Regulations were modified in 2009 to align with the new admissions policy. Prior SR 424 wording capped at two the number of 10<sup>th</sup> grade honors-level courses that can be used to calculate the minimum GPA for freshman admission.

BOARS agreed to maintain the cap and change the wording of the Regulation to reflect current practice. The Academic Assembly will need to approve the change after a review by UCRJ.

**Action:** Vice Chair Johnson will draft a modification for review at a future meeting.

#### **V. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee**

- *George Johnson, BOARS Vice Chair*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Admissions*

**UCOE Application for Program Status:** Chair Jacob had asked the UC Online Education Project (UCOE) to submit an application for Program Status as an online course provider as part of the Senate review of their program. There has been considerable discussion of their work in Senate and he felt this review would provide a useful measure of how thorough their program would be for prospective high school students whom they propose to enroll.

**Discussion:** A&E members were generally positive about the application and suggested areas where UCOE might elaborate or clarify. It was noted a UCOE course taken by a high school

students to fulfill an “a-g” requirement or for UC credit will appear in the application as a college-level course and should be considered the same as any other college-level course.

**Action:** The Subcommittee decided not to formally act on the UCOE application. It will respond directly to UCOE with its decision, noting the application’s strengths and weaknesses.

*Policy for online learning and BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning:* A&E reviewed final drafts of the proposed *Policy for A-G Review of Online Courses* and the *BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning*. The former outlines new processes for certifying that an online course can be offered for “a-g” credit, according to whether the course is offered by a course publisher, a virtual school with its own online curriculum, or a school or district that uses other publishers’ “a-g” approved online curriculum. The *Statement* summarizes BOARS’ concerns about online education and the quality measures BOARS seeks in an online course or program. Schools and districts will also be required to complete a Certification of Compliance indicating that they meet the quality measures articulated in the Statement.

Associate Director Lin said the Office of Admissions recommends keeping the principal certification option next year pending implementation of the full policy for the 2014-15 “a-g” course review cycle. She said BOARS should also consider the status of approved courses and providers under the current policy. Approximately 350 online courses are approved for “a-g”.

**Action:** A&E voted unanimously to approve the online policy and Statement and to request approval by the full BOARS committee.

## **VI. Transfer Subcommittee**

The transfer subcommittee considered and approved revisions to the BOARS transfer admission proposal it believes will alleviate concerns from one division not favorably inclined toward major based review, along with accompanying changes to the Senate Regulations, in preparation for Academic Council and Assembly approval. The wording of the proposed revision to Senate Regulation 476 was also discussed and left unchanged. A BOARS member discussed successful efforts at one campus to engage departments in preparation for major based review based upon a study of pathways transfer students need to complete a degree in a timely fashion.

**Action:** The subcommittee voted unanimously to send forward the Transfer Proposal subject to sufficiently favorable divisional review, and to request similar approval by the full BOARS committee.

## **VII. Report on Holistic Review Implementation for the Comprehensive Review Report**

**Issue:** BOARS will report to the Regents in September about the implementation of holistic review and the new admissions policy. Several BOARS members reported their campus’ progress implementing holistic review.

UCSD moved to a fully holistic system this year after experimenting with a dual process in 2011. UCSD found that the class of students it admitted under holistic review had a similar academic profile to prior classes and included more ELC-eligible admits, but was also less diverse socioeconomically, sparking concerns that holistic review could reverse past diversity gains. UCSD Admissions office personnel will be discussing how to return UCSD to a more balanced pattern of admission within the holistic framework.

Admission to UCR is still based on a fixed-weight calculation, rather than a single score holistic review; however, UCR obtained holistic scores from UCI this year to study the level of overlap between admissions decisions based on its current system, and a holistic system. UCR found near perfect overlap for students with the highest HR scores and the highest fixed-weight scores, but also found a large subset of students with very high fixed weight scores but very low HR scores. These students would be among the top applicants and would almost certainly be admitted to UCR based on their fixed-weight scores. This outcome may argue against score sharing.

Davis implemented a single score holistic review process this year. More than 50% of UCD applications received UCLA scores. UCD devised a system to translate UCLA's 1-5 scoring scale to a UCD 1-7 scale, and it made all admission and tie-breaking decisions on that recalibrated scale. UCD also re-reads applicants with UCLA scores of between 4 and 4.25, because those applications had a large scoring spread for UCD readers.

Irvine has completed its second year of single score holistic review. In general, UCI found that the process increases inclusiveness, flexibility, and efficiency, although there is some concern about disadvantaging applicants because they attended a high API school, are not economically disadvantaged, or are not the first in their family to attend college.

At Berkeley, the cost of administering holistic review is growing as a result of an increasing domestic and international non-resident applicant pool and the need to establish meaningful school context information for those applicants. In addition, Berkeley is asking that starting next year, UC campuses that wish to use Berkeley read scores in the admissions process give Berkeley \$10 for each to help cover the cost of the sharing process.

**Discussion:** Members agreed that it is important for readers to be trained to identify comprehensive review factors and academic potential in a way that acknowledges the unique talents and experiences of each applicant. It is also important for each campus to have a clear public statement about their admissions values.

It was noted that some campuses have found score sharing to be useful, but that the differences in culture, selectivity, and scoring methodologies on each campus argues against score sharing and a single systemwide score. Readers at some selective campuses may not spend as much time scoring an application that they expect to be a clear reject, even though another campus may find that student admissible. Funding for campus reviews will have to be sustained because the efficiencies from score sharing some at UCOP had hoped for will not be realized.

There was no time for all campuses to present reports. Discussion will continue in June.

### **VIII. Subcommittees Report-Back**

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair*
- *George Johnson, BOARS Vice Chair*

**Transfer:** Chair Jacob reported that the Subcommittee approved a document proposing changes to the Senate Regulations that formally add the pathways articulated in the BOARS Transfer Proposal. Council will review the systemwide responses to the proposal on May 23, and the Academic Assembly meets June 6, so it is unclear that the policy can be approved this year. UCSB also has proposed a revision to the policy to address its concerns, which the Subcommittee has accepted.

**Action:** BOARS gave Chair Jacob its consent to incorporate UCSB’s revisions into the proposal and to ask the Council and Assembly to adopt it as Senate policy if the systemwide review is sufficiently positive.

**Articulation and Evaluation:** Vice Chair Johnson reported that the Subcommittee approved the new policy for “a-g” review of online courses and the BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning. The Subcommittee also decided that UCOE does not need Program Status approval. A motion was made and seconded that BOARS adopt the policy recommendation for approval of online publishers, virtual schools, and courses, as well as the BOARS Statement on K-12 Online Learning.

**Action:** BOARS approved the motion by unanimous vote.

Chair Jacob noted that the UCOE application ultimately provided the Senate with detailed information about the effectiveness of their programmatic plans that is useful for future reference. He will report the positive review back to the Senate leadership, and thanked the subcommittee for its review of the application.

### **IX. Proposed Disclaimer for Programs Offering Courses to Non-Matriculated Students**

**Issue:** A BOARS subcommittee has proposed required disclaimer language for inclusion on websites and in other marketing materials of University Extension and other programs offering courses to non-matriculated Students. A motion was made and seconded that BOARS adopt the disclaimer and ask the Council chair to ask the Provost to disseminate it to the campuses and UCOE.

**Action:** BOARS approved the motion by unanimous vote.

### **X. UC Online Education Project**

Chair Anderson has asked BOARS to advise Council about admissions-related concerns Council has expressed about UCOE. He also recommended that BOARS advise UCEP about its views on non-admissions issues.. He noted that BOARS has an interest in UCOE’s plan to market its courses to high school students who have not yet graduated, and its plan to enroll non-matriculated students alongside UC students.

**Discussion:** It was noted that UCOE should pay close attention to the academic preparation of the students it admits as well as the extent to which UCOE instructors are prepared to teach in the online format and are able to offer direct support (“office hours”) to students. A high failure rates will reflect badly on the University.

**Action:** BOARS decided to support UCOE’s plan to enroll high school students under the same conditions as any other non-matriculated students.

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.  
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Bill Jacob