

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

October 4, 2013

I. Welcome and Announcements

- *George Johnson, BOARS chair*

Committee Overview: Chair Johnson welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the committee's [charge](#), which is to advise the UC President and Senate agencies on matters relating to the admission of undergraduates, including the criteria for undergraduate status and policies and practices regarding admissions requirements. BOARS will occasionally work with the University Committee on Preparatory Education, the University Committee on Educational Policy, and other systemwide committees on issues of common interest.

BOARS representatives have a role as intermediaries between their local campuses and BOARS. Members are encouraged to communicate with their campus admissions committees about discussions in BOARS, and, in turn, to share local concerns and discussions with the systemwide committee. BOARS members should consider agendas and committee documents confidential and for internal use only, unless otherwise noted. In general, confidential materials may be shared with campus committees, but not distributed more broadly.

Each BOARS member will serve on one of two subcommittees – Articulation and Evaluation or Enrollment Issues – which will work during and outside of regular committee meetings to develop recommendations on specific issues for the full committee's consideration.

Academic Council: The Academic Council held its first meeting of the year on September 25, following a joint half-day meeting with the UC Provost and other senior leaders. The systemwide Senate office has prepared a briefing booklet for President Napolitano, who took office on September 30. It includes a primer on UC shared governance and a summary of the Senate's views on topics such as admissions, the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP), total remuneration, graduate education, research, and budget rebenchmarking.

ICAS: The BOARS chair is a member of the [Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates](#) (ICAS), a forum for California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC faculty leaders to discuss topics of shared interest to the higher education segments. ICAS has lately been discussing transfer issues, including the implementation of CA Senate Bill 1440, which requires CSU and CCC to establish Associates Degrees for Transfer guaranteeing junior status at a CSU. The efforts at CSU and CCC have not satisfied some policymakers, who also want UC to do more. The Assembly Committee on Higher Education is holding a hearing on transfer on November 12.

Enrollment Issues Work Group: An ad hoc work group composed of Senate members and UCOP and campus administrators has been meeting to discuss enrollment issues in the context of the current systemwide enrollment planning process, and competing demands related to academic, financial, access, diversity, space, political, and other pressures.

II. Consultation with UCOP

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Steve Handel, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Adam Parker, Coordinator, Admissions Policy*

Office of Admissions Overview (Judy Sakaki): The Office of Student Affairs oversees a variety of programs and initiatives in the areas of undergraduate admissions, student financial aid, and student services that are designed to ensure access to an affordable UC education to a broad range of Californians. Undergraduate admissions is one of the University's most visible, politically charged, and challenging topics, as the demand for a UC education increases, state funding decreases, and UC campuses enroll more nonresidents to compensate for the lost revenue. UC also seeks to improve and enhance the transfer path and to enroll a student body that reflects the diversity of California.

President Napolitano has committed to visiting each UC campus over the next six weeks. She has already met with the Governor, other state leaders, and UC students groups, including undocumented students. Vice President Sakaki introduced Stephen Handel, who is UC's new Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions. He comes to UCOP from the College Board and brings a deep understanding of access, transfer, and community college issues.

Transfer Issues (Stephen Handel): Associate Vice President Handel met with policymakers in Sacramento recently to discuss transfer admission issues. He emphasized UC's unique role in California higher education, and its increasing commitment to California Community College transfers. This commitment is reflected in the 40% growth in transfer enrollments over the last decade, which continued despite significant budget cuts, and in the increasing proportion of transfers from underrepresented minority groups. The transfer students UC admits tend to perform as well as four-year students after they arrive at UC.

Nevertheless, some policymakers are concerned that the transfer path to UC is still too difficult and complicated. They note that SB 1440 has galvanized CCC and CSU to develop degrees that guarantee transfer admission to CSU, and question why UC has not implemented a similar guarantee. UC also wants to make improvements and to understand better why transfer applications and enrollments to UC have declined slightly the past two years, following increases the previous five years, and while transfer applications to CSU increased. There is some speculation that the decline is the result of cutbacks at the CCCs that have impacted access to transfer prerequisite courses, and UC is studying the issue closely.

"A-G" Course Review Process (Michael Treviño): UC maintains a list of 160,000 California high school courses approved to satisfy the "a-g" subject area requirements for UC and CSU admission. UCOP High School Articulation staff review and approve new or revised courses on an annual basis. During the 2013-14 course review cycle, staff reviewed over 20,000 new course submissions or course revisions. UCOP has also just implemented a new "a-g" database that will modernize the review system, saving money and time.

Over the summer, the Office of Admissions convened six faculty workgroups to review and clarify the evaluation criteria for high school courses that satisfy the 'a-f' subject requirements for freshman admission. Preliminary drafts for each subject area have been released for public comment. The A&E Subcommittee and BOARS will have the opportunity to review drafts this fall.

Fall Counselor Conferences: UC's annual counselor conferences were attended by 4,500 high school and CCC counselors at events on five UC campuses. UC and CSU also hosted a joint conference in Visalia. The conferences featured workshops on the freshman admission criteria, financial aid, the "a-g" requirements, the online application, UC's new [Transfer Admissions Planner](#), and other topics. UC officials described the upcoming recalibration of the statewide admissions index and emphasized that UC would continue to honor the referral guarantee in the foreseeable future. They also reported that beginning in 2014, UC applications would be available to students beginning August 1, the same date that the Common Application opens. Counselors responded positively to the earlier UC application opening.

Discussion: A BOARS member noted that more students with college educated parents are choosing to attend a CCC before transferring to UC. Another noted that the proportion of low family income and first generation college student has declined at some campuses and that the academic achievement gap between high and low income students is greater than the gap between underrepresented minority (URM) and white students.

One member expressed concern that while the lowest income students have access to the financial aid system and the highest income students have access to financial resources, middle class families are shouldering an increasing tuition and debt burden and are finding it increasingly difficult to afford college.

III. Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions

To help BOARS prepare a report to the Regents about the new undergraduate admissions policy, UCOP prepared several analyses related to the success of students admitted in 2012 under the policy, compared to students admitted in 2010 and 2011 before the policy took effect. The first study considers first-term UC GPA, persistence, and probation status (GPA < 2.00) by admissions path (Eligible in the Local Context (ELC)-only, statewide-eligible, and Entitled to Review (ETR)). It indicates that students in all demographic groups who entered UC as freshman in 2012 had a higher overall GPA (3.00) after their first term compared to students who entered in 2010 and 2011 (2.90), as well as a lower probation rate and a higher persistence rate compared to both 2010 and 2011. The second study compares the academic performance of students admitted to UC through different eligibility pathways. It indicates that students who entered UC with the ELC-only guarantee have, as a group, a slightly higher probation rate and lower average GPA than students admitted through other paths. A third study breaks down the UC outcomes (GPA, probation, and persistence) of students admitted through the ELC-only pathway by quintiles within high school GPA, SAT/ACT score, and academic index score. In this analysis, test scores appear to be more strongly correlated with success than high school GPA.

Discussion: It was noted that the data suggest that under the new policy, campuses are selecting students who are better prepared to succeed at UC. However, it is also difficult to definitively attribute the improved outcomes directly to the policy change. The improved student outcomes could be an effect of other factors such as an increase in selectivity in 2012 resulting from a larger number of applicants and smaller admit rates.

It was noted that UC bases ELC eligibility on GPA only. UC requires all students to take the SAT, but sets no minimum SAT score for ELC eligibility. Some campuses are concerned that there are students in the ELC-only pool who are not prepared to succeed at the university. One campus has decided to consider SAT scores more carefully during final selection of students who

had applied to certain majors and had received comprehensive review scores that could qualify them for admission. It was reported that applicants with the best comprehensive review scores were admitted regardless of their performance on the SAT. It was noted that the SAT scores for students being considered in this way places them below the 25th percentile of all college-going seniors across the country. It was also noted that this test score consideration occurs at the end of the selection phase, as distinct from the initial admissions review, as the [systemwide comprehensive review guidelines](#) (#11) would appear to prohibit campuses from establishing a floor for SAT scores during the comprehensive review stage.

Members noted that the ELC program is designed, in part, to recognize the inequality among California school districts and the fact that students in poor districts lack opportunity. It is not surprising then, that students from a disadvantaged background who attend poor schools do not automatically achieve at the level of advantaged students. UC would not have instituted the ELC program if its only goal was to achieve the highest possible persistence rate. Moreover, one problem with focusing on persistence is that students from lower SES backgrounds are less likely to persist regardless of how well they are doing academically, due to their economic situation. It was also noted that it is unfair for UC to admit students if there is a reasonable expectation that they will not succeed. Members agreed it would be important to continue monitoring the performance of students admitted under the new policy.

Action: A draft of the report to the Regents will be circulated to BOARS members for review.

IV. Enrollment Planning, Eligibility, and the Future of the Referral

As Merced receives more applications and becomes more selective, the UC system will, at some point, no longer be able to offer a guarantee of referral admission to every student defined as eligible through the “9-by-9” process. UC will cease to have “available space,” per [Regent’s Policy 2103](#), for students who are not admitted to a campus to which they apply. (The guarantee is defined more categorically in [Senate Regulation 465](#).) UC will have to consider options for adjusting eligibility policy or perhaps reconsider the entire referral concept. The scale of the immediate problem is unclear; although there was a large total referral pool of 10,000 students in 2013, only 836 students opted-in to consider an admission offer by UC Merced, and of those, only 188 submitted a Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) to Merced.

Discussion: It was noted that referral students admitted to Merced (and to Riverside until it stopped taking them in 2010) have performed similarly to students who applied to those campuses and were admitted directly.

It was noted that several solutions to the diminishing ability of the university to continue referring eligible students to other campuses have been suggested: asking campuses to admit all applicants with a 9x9 guarantee before turning to the ETR pool; using a spring or transfer deferral as a way to meet the guarantee; reducing ELC to some number lower than 9%; and asking other campuses to admit students from the referral pool. However, none of these options is likely to fully address the problem. ELC-only applicants comprise only 6% of the total applicant pool, and campuses that are admitting a large proportion of ETR students are also admitting most of their guaranteed applicants.

One member suggested unlinking the guarantee from the concept of eligibility or abolishing the guarantee and allowing campuses to define who encompasses the top 12.5% of California high

school graduates in the Master Plan based on holistic score. Other members noted that the eligibility construct provide strong, positive signals regarding the importance of following a rigorous college preparatory curriculum in high school.

It was noted that the issue goes to the heart of UC's mission to promote social mobility and train future leaders from a broad range of society. The understanding of educational opportunity embodied in Master Plan and the referral guarantee are now running up against the state's disinvestment. Quite simply, the university does not have enough funding from the state to support the expansion of enrollments to meet the state's goals. It was noted that BOARS should still make policy recommendations even if it can't implement them, and UC still needs to describe the preparation needed to enter the university.

V. Consultation with the UCOP Senate Office

- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Chair*

Chair Jacob thanked BOARS members for their service to the Academic Senate and the University. The chair has invited President Napolitano to attend a BOARS meeting and is also considering scheduling another joint meeting between BOARS and legislative staff in Sacramento sometime in early 2014. He encouraged faculty to review [changes to the UC medical plans](#) coming to Open Enrollment this fall, which include [UC Care](#), a new "self-funded" PPO medical insurance plan intended to leverage the resources of the UC medical centers. He noted that a second RFP for online course proposals funded through the [Innovative Learning Technology Initiative](#) (ILTI) has been released to UC Senate faculty, and that UCOP has agreed to the Senate's request for an updated study of faculty total remuneration to clarify where UC faculty stand compared with UC competitors.

VI. Nonresidents and Compare Favorably

In June 2011, BOARS adopted a [policy](#) that non-residents admitted to a campus must compare favorably to the California residents admitted to that campus, and asked each campus to report annually to BOARS on the extent to which they are meeting the standard. Campuses submitted their first reports last year, and will be receiving a request from Chair Johnson for an analysis of 2013 outcomes.

UCOP distributed data to BOARS members comparing the Academic Index score, unweighted GPA and test scores of fall 2013 UC admits on their campus by resident status, to assist members as they prepare this year's reports. Members asked that the chair's request include as much specificity as possible about what the report should include. They noted the difficulty of comparing international nonresidents to CA residents in the absence of data related to holistic review factors used to evaluate domestic applicants. Chair Johnson emphasized that there are no prescribed measures regarding how campuses must perform the assessment. BOARS members should work with their campus committees and admissions offices to write the reports, and to ensure they receive the appropriate vetting and approvals.

Action: Chair Johnson will send each BOARS member a request for the 2013 report.

VII. Implementation of New Transfer Pathways

Several campuses have responded to a BOARS request for reports on their progress implementing the new transfer admissions pathways scheduled to take effect in 2015, including what campuses are doing to review existing lower-division transfer requirements and define the UC Transfer Curricula for appropriate majors, and the extent to which majors are setting common preparation requirements or maintaining unique characteristics. It was noted that counselors and students are not yet making a strong connection between the SB 1440 degree and UC.

Action: Chair Johnson will send a reminder letter to campuses that have not submitted reports.

VIII. Authority for Admissions Policy

One campus admissions committee is discussing the extent of its authority over admissions policy relative to the campus administration and to BOARS, and is proposing to modify its bylaw to clarify its role and authority. It was noted that BOARS' delegated authority to "determine the conditions for admission" derives from [Regents Standing Order 105.2](#). It was also noted that the UC General Counsel opined on the subject in a 1996 memo to former President Atkinson, who was responding to concerns that the Regents had banned affirmative action in admissions above the objections of the faculty. The Counsel indicated that the Senate has authority over the minimum academic qualifications for admission, but that the administration and Regents have ultimate power beyond that.

The Senate Director noted that local committee bylaws must be consistent with systemwide bylaws. A divisional chair or systemwide committee chair may request a formal legislative ruling by the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction on any bylaw issue.

IX. New Business

Universitylink: Last year, BOARS discussed Universitylink, a proposed UCSD program that would give admission preference to low-income transfer students at nine San Diego area community colleges who fulfill specific academic requirements. BOARS objected to some elements of the program, particularly in the context of its [2004 decision](#) that campuses should not interpret "selection criterion #14" as allowing a preference for freshmen applicants based on their geographic proximity to a campus, although that decision did not specifically address such preferences for transfers. BOARS invited UCSD to respond to its concerns with a modified proposal.

UCSD's representative noted that the campus decided to end its participation in TAG over concerns that it was crowding out other transfer paths and benefiting transfers at a small number of community colleges. However, UCSD wants to support low-income students at local CCCs who face significant barriers to transferring to a university outside the area. Universitylink is limited in scope, academically rigorous, and stringent in the extent to which it will document low-income status. UCSD already exceeds its Master Plan target of one transfer enrollment for every two freshman enrollments, and the Universitylink population is projected to be smaller than the amount by which the campus exceeds the target. Finally, UCSD believes that the proposed Universitylink is consistent with the 2004 BOARS statement, as it does not privilege

geographical proximity by itself, but focuses on what geographical proximity means to a specific low income cohort.

Discussion: BOARS members appreciated the comments and one asked whether it would be possible to verify the extent to which low-income students are place-bound.

Meeting adjourned at: 4:00 p.m.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: George Johnson