

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

April 4, 2014

I. Consent Calendar

1. BOARS Minutes of March 7, 2014
2. Revised “a-f” guidelines

Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- o *George Johnson, BOARS chair*

Academic Council Meeting: The Council selected a 2014-15 vice chair candidate, whose nomination will be forwarded to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for consideration at its April 16 meeting.

California Open Educational Resources Council: [COERC](#) is a nine-member intersegmental committee formed by ICAS to implement legislation directing the higher education segments to identify or develop open access online textbooks for 50 lower division courses and make them available in a common repository for use across the segments. COERC will be releasing a survey to faculty and students at the three segments to collect data about their experiences and attitudes related to open textbook resources.

Transfer Action Team: Chair Johnson and Vice President Sakaki met with President Napolitano last month to discuss the Transfer Action Team draft report and recommendations. The Action Team will present the report formally to the president in late April and to the Regents in May.

Pressures on “a-g”: The California legislature has proposed several new bills intended to encourage students to take more computer science courses in high school and to increase the recognition of those courses in college admission. One bill asks UC to create guidelines for high school computer science courses that can satisfy the area “c” requirement for UC and CSU admission.

SAT Redesign: Chair Johnson has been contacted by several reporters seeking information about how UC will respond to the SAT redesign taking effect in 2016, which will include a new writing section with a longer, but now optional, essay component.

Entrance Requirements for Majors: Chair Johnson was asked to consider instances when departments or colleges set conditions for admission to a specific major in addition to those required for admission to the general campus, including pilot programs in which one or two criteria may be used to deselect student from admission to a major. Several BOARS members reported that such mechanisms exist for impacted or high demand majors such as engineering.

Students may also enter a UC campus without declaring a major. Chair Johnson noted that in his view, majors may set additional entrance requirements as long as they do not prevent students from being admitted to the University. He asked BOARS members to request information from their admissions directors about campus processes for working with departments to set major-based requirements and meet enrollment targets.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Bill Jacob, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Mary Gilly, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Common Core: Chair Jacob thanked BOARS and Associate Director Lin for working on the revised “a-f” guidelines. Chair Jacob referenced this work and other efforts by UC and BOARS to align admissions policies and guidelines with the Common Core State Standards at a recent meeting in Sacramento about the Common Core.

Computer Science: CA Senate Bill 1200 will be heard in the State Senate Education Committee on April 9. Its authors hope to encourage UC to approve more computer science (CS) courses for the mathematics area “c” requirement rather than the area “g” college-preparatory elective. Chair Jacob noted that a CS course may be approved for “c,” as long as it includes sufficient math content, but computer science should not replace mathematics and UC should consider CS courses for “c” only if they include as a prerequisite three years of area “c” math. A BOARS member remarked that computer programming is a valuable skill and might be considered as valuable as some of the other “a-g” requirements.

SAT Redesign: Vice Chair Gilly noted that senior UC leaders have made comments in the press about the role of writing in the current SAT test and in the upcoming redesign. The comments inspired members of UCOPE and BOARS to draft a statement about the importance of writing at UC. Chair Johnson noted that UCOP produced a 2007 study showing that the writing component of the SAT is strongly predictive of first-year success at UC. BOARS will need to have a better understanding about the redesigned writing section before making any recommendation about its role in UC admission.

IV. Consultation with UCOP – Office of Admissions

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions*

Preliminary Admissions Outcomes: UC campuses admitted a record 86,865 freshmen applicants for fall 2014, including 61,120 California residents who were admitted at an overall rate of 61.2%, both slight increases compared to last year. The number of admissions offers to nonresidents also increased, with the greatest growth coming at UCSC, UCR, UCM, and UCD. About one-third of CA resident admits are from underrepresented minority groups this year. Hispanic/Latino students are a larger percentage of the total, while other ethnic groups were admitted at a similar level compared to last year. The 2014 admitted class was more likely to be low-income or come from first generation families and high schools with low API rankings

compared to last year. Academic indicators for the admitted class are similar to last year, and the referral pool grew by about 700 to 11,000. Full admission data will be released on April 18.

UC Student Association Meeting: Vice President Sakaki and Associate Vice President Handel discussed holistic review, the referral pool, and nonresident admission with UCSA representatives at the March Regents meeting. They noted that the UC campuses not currently using holistic review have met their admissions goals and are the most ethnically diverse in the system, and that UC is finding it more difficult to honor the referral pool but remains committed to finding a space for all eligible students. They also explained that UC is overenrolled by 6,000 residents systemwide compared to its state budget; from this perspective, nonresidents are not displacing residents but are admitted on top of funded residents.

Letter to PSAT-Takers: UC obtained data from the College Board to identify low-income students who performed well on the PSAT. The University recently sent these students a letter under President Napolitano's signature encouraging them to continue their preparation for college and to consider the University of California.

V. Subcommittee Breakout: *Articulation and Evaluation*

Program Status: The subcommittee reviewed proposed revisions to [“program status” policy](#) intended to clarify and streamline the criteria and review procedures for organizations applying for program status. “Program status” refers to established high school academic programs such as Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate that offer standardized curriculum taught in high schools across California that meet the “a-g” subject requirements. Program status entities have their own UC-approved “a-g” course lists, which allow high schools to add the courses to their own course lists without submitting a complete course description to UC for approval. This reduces workload for UC articulation staff and for high schools that want to offer the curriculum, since they do not have to prepare their own “a-g” application to UC for that course. The current policy, approved by BOARS in 2004, requires BOARS to review and approve the application of any organization applying for program status and the specific courses offered by the organization. There are currently eleven organizations with program status.

Discussion: BOARS requested clarification about the rationale for eliminating the 403(b) designation but continuing to cite the 501(c)(3) designation in the revised policy. Members also asked that the document distinguish between the criteria required for an entity to earn program status and the criteria required to maintain program status. Members expressed support for eliminating the requirement that a program must have at least one course approved for “a-g” and offered at a CA high school before UC will consider an application for program status. There was also support for requiring program status applicants to submit a letter of support from the heads of a school or district from at least two California school districts, as well as a professional development plan for the instructors teaching the curriculum and evidence of training. There was concern about eliminating the requirement for onsite mentors and supervisors for online courses, although it was noted that the change is intended to align with BOARS' [policy for “a-g” review of online courses](#) (which BOARS will need to revisit to address the defunding of the CA Learning Resources Network.) There was also concern about the proposal to eliminate the BOARS role in approving program status applications and courses. Subcommittee members

requested an assessment of the policy, the last approved program status application, and a pending application.

Action: The Subcommittee will schedule a conference call before the next BOARS meeting to continue the conversation.

VI. Subcommittee Breakout: *Enrollment Issues*

The subcommittee reviewed several new analyses related to a working proposal to require a minimum SAT score to earn Eligibility in the Local Context. The subcommittee believes the proposal will better identify for an admission guarantee students who are highly likely to succeed at UC. Traditionally, BOARS has sought to ensure that students identified for UC eligibility should have a 70-75 percent probability of earning a “C” or better during their first year. The analyses focused on an SAT score of 1440, and indicated the following:

- Students with SAT scores (or ACT scores converted to equivalent SAT scores) below 1400 have higher probation rates, lower cumulative GPAs, lower retention rates, and lower graduation rates, compared to students with higher SAT scores.
- A 1400 SAT score is the approximate point at which students have less than a 70-75% probability of earning a “C” or better during the first year at UC.
- GPA is a relatively weak predictor of UC success for students with SAT scores below 1400.
- A composite (“Z score”) combining SAT and GPA (similar to the statewide eligibility index) is a better predictor of success than either SAT or GPA alone.
- Applicants with the ELC designation have a better chance of admission compared to ETR students with similar academic indicators.
- A high percentage of UC students who begin poorly and go on probation improve and graduate within six years.
- Last year, there were 14 California high schools with no students that achieved at least a 1400 score on the SAT. These schools include a high proportion of underrepresented minority, low SES, and first generation students.

It was noted that a minimum SAT threshold for ELC eligibility will be controversial because ELC was intended to extend UC’s reach into every CA high school and because the use of the SAT itself is controversial. One possible alternative would be to link ELC eligibility to the “Z score” index. It was also noted that changing the ELC criteria is, by itself, unlikely to solve the problem of the growing referral pool, which may require more significant adjustments to the 9x9 structure.

VII. “Virtual Schools” and ELC

Issue: UCOP recently received a letter from an online (“virtual”) high school provider questioning a UC policy barring virtual schools from participating in the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. UCOP asked BOARS to consider whether virtual schools meet the spirit of the ELC program as originally intended.

Discussion: An essential question permeated the discussion: What does it mean to have a “local context” in the virtual environment, where students from different regions of California, the nation, and even the world may be enrolled in a course, and in which the school offering the course may be based outside of California? It was noted that all California high schools have the opportunity to participate in the ELC program. The virtual schools in question are WASC-accredited and have approved “a-g” course lists. All California students have a right to ELC, and UC should not penalize students for choosing to attend school in a virtual environment. It was also noted, on the other hand, that the ELC program evaluates students in their local context in part to address the inequality among California school districts, of which physical geography is a factor. Virtual schools are, by nature, not “local.” A virtual school may be based outside of California and California students enrolled in a virtual school may interact and compete with students from around the world, making it difficult to assure that a California resident does not receive ELC credit based on a ranking against nonresidents. BOARS members agreed that virtual schools do not fit into the ELC model.

Action: BOARS voted unanimously against allowing virtual schools to participate in ELC.

VIII. BOARS-UCOPE Statement on the Importance of Writing

Issue: BOARS reviewed a “Statement on the Importance of Writing at the University of California” drafted by the chairs and vice chairs of BOARS and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). The statement references the upcoming redesign of the SAT and changes associated with the writing portion of the exam. It notes that the committees will be assessing what role the new Essay section should have in the evaluation of students applying for admission to UC and in preparatory education, particularly the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). BOARS discussed and approved minor edits to the document.

Action: BOARS approved the joint statement and agreed it should be posted on the Senate website and forwarded to the President.

IX. Senate Regulation 465

Issue: The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCR&J) has responded to BOARS’ request for advice about the language of Senate Regulation 465. UCR&J says it is within BOARS’ jurisdiction to recommend changes to SR 465 and appropriate for Senate regulations to include language defining how eligible students will be treated in admission. Earlier in the year, BOARS had considered revising SR 465 to align it with the language in [Regents’ Policy 2103 C](#) by clearly qualifying the admissions guarantee described in the regulation as valid only if space is available.

Discussion: A BOARS member noted that aligning SR 465 with Regents Policy 2103 would not clarify ambiguities in the Regents policy, though it would clarify the Senate’s expectation that the guarantee is only valid to the extent that space is available on at least one campus. It was noted that the public assumes that space will always be available, and that Regents policy refers to the “guarantee structure.” A member noted that Merced would prefer to not be the sole referral

pool destination, even if the pool is made significantly smaller. It was noted that reducing the size of referral pool with more selective criteria could make the referral pool more attractive to Merced and other campuses.

X. Compare Favorably Report

BOARS reviewed a short report summarizing systemwide admission and academic progress outcomes for California residents and nonresidents in the context of the “compare favorably” standard.

Action: BOARS approved the report pending a few minor edits. The final report will be circulated to the committee and posted on the BOARS website.

XI. Honors Course Policy

Issue: At the March meeting, BOARS requested additional information about four proposals related to high school honors policy and the approval of “a-g” courses that students may take to earn a GPA “bump.” A high school student may earn a one-point bump for completion of up to four AP, IB, or UC-approved high school-created honors level courses. Current policy allows schools that offer no AP/IB courses in a given “a-g” subject area to offer a maximum of two school-created courses in that area that are eligible for the bump. UCOP is recommending the removal of all limits on the number of school-created honors courses that may be approved for the bump.

Discussion: Associate Director Lin noted that UCOP believes the policy was intended to prevent the proliferation at better-resourced schools of school-created honors courses that carry the bump. However, the policy also has the effect of limiting the overall number of honors course offerings at less-resourced schools. Removing the cap will increase flexibility and provide students at low API schools with additional opportunities to access honors courses and to earn the bump. She noted that all school-created honors courses are reviewed by UCOP for the bump based on faculty-defined criteria.

A BOARS member noted that campuses may prefer the AP/IB curriculum in comprehensive review over school-created honors courses. Another member noted that UC should encourage schools to create innovative school-based curriculum outside of the AP/IB structure. One member proposed making the number of school-created courses eligible for the bump in each area equal to two or the total possible number of AP courses that could be offered in that area, but it was agreed that this policy would be difficult to administer.

Action: BOARS voted to approve the proposal to lift the current cap on honors courses. The committee will return to the other proposals at a future meeting.

XII. Freshman Eligibility and Referral

Minimum SAT Recommendation: Chair Johnson summarized the Enrollment Issues Subcommittee discussion reported above. A BOARS member noted that a fairer and more holistic approach to the referral pool problem would be to adjust the 9-by-9 structure rather than to focus only on ELC and the SAT. Doing so would have a more significant impact on the problem and eliminate many students with low SAT scores from the guarantee pool in the process. Another member noted that UC is offering an admission guarantee on the basis of a single academic indicator, GPA, which is not well-correlated with success and which would seem to contradict the principle that students should be assessed on multiple measures of achievement. The few ELC students affected by a minimum SAT score could still be considered in comprehensive review and admitted through ETR. The ELC program is positive for the university, but pressures on the referral pool are pushing the University to act. It was also noted that while the SAT and GPA are both single indicators, the SAT is a three-hour exam, while the GPA is an amalgam of several years of work and achievement.

A straw poll indicated strong, but not unanimous, support in the committee for a proposal to incorporate a minimum SAT into the ELC eligibility.

Action: Chair Johnson will draft a document outlining the options and pros and cons associated with each. He asked BOARS to provide additional feedback and to share any campus-level analyses that may be helpful in reaching a decision in May.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: George Johnson