

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Minutes of Meeting

November 1, 2013

**I. Consent Calendar**

- Draft Minutes of October 4, 2013

**Action:** BOARS approved the consent calendar.

**II. Announcements**

- *George Johnson, BOARS chair*

**October Academic Council meeting:** President Napolitano attended her first Academic Council meeting on October 23. She called for a Senate-Administration working group to respond to a report from a panel headed by former California Supreme Court Justice Carlos Moreno that addresses complaints of racial bias and discrimination affecting UCLA faculty. Council also discussed a number of faculty [concerns](#) about changes to the UC employee medical insurance plans and how four new composite benefits rate scenarios will impact fund sources at each campus.

**Advisory Content-Expert Workgroup:** The chairs of BOARS, UCOPE, and UCEP have proposed the formation of standing content expert work groups to support those committees in an advisory capacity on various issues such as the “a-g” criteria. The work groups would be composed of UC faculty from across the system and since they would be advisory to the committees, they would not need to be formally appointed by the Senate.

**Computer Science:** Chair Johnson has been contacted by several individuals representing organizations that want UC to help elevate the status of computer science instruction in high schools by allowing computer science courses to satisfy the math “c” or science “d” requirement for admission. Chair Johnson suggested that BOARS develop a statement on the purposes of “a-g,” which clarifies that the “a-g” criteria are intended to demonstrate a student’s minimum level of preparation for a broad range of work at UC, rather than a “wish list” for the ideal level of preparation related to specific subjects. It should also be noted that computer science courses with sufficient math content could potentially be approved for area “c” already.

**Compare Favorably Reports:** Campuses will be receiving a request from Chair Johnson to submit by January 31 their analyses of 2013 outcomes for the extent to which their nonresidents admits compare favorably to California resident admits. The January date is intended to give campuses a chance to collect data on first quarter/semester UC outcomes, should they wish.

**Transfer Policy:** BOARS Chair Johnson and Senate Chair Jacob met recently with staff from the Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) who are preparing a report on the transfer path in California higher education. LAO staff were particularly interested in UC’s new transfer policy and the status of efforts to develop UC Transfer Curricula. They are concerned about a comparative lack of uniformity in major preparation requirements among UC campuses and the extent of UC’s participation in the Course Identification Numbering ([C-ID](#)) project, which is

attempting to establish uniform course identification numbers for equivalent courses across the higher education segments. UC Senate and administration representatives will be testifying at a November 12 hearing of the CA Assembly Committee on Higher Education on the topic of transfer. It was noted that the Higher Education Committee chair stated on a recent visit to a UC campus that UC should do more to align major transfer requirements across campuses.

It was noted that several years ago, UCOP convened UC work groups of faculty from the most popular majors to review major preparation requirements and discuss the extent to which they could be aligned. Those efforts helped create the UC [Transfer Preparation Paths](#). It was noted that 82% of the more than 2,000 courses with C-ID descriptors are currently approved for UC transferability. Increasing UC faculty involvement in the process of writing descriptors could push that number even higher. UC faculty support these efforts, but they also want to maintain their right to set specific preparation requirements they feel are needed for their major.

**Student Regent Proposal:** The student regent recently suggested that a high school's Title I status be added to the list of 14 Comprehensive Review factors. She also wants to create additional academic preparation and outreach partnerships with Title 1 schools that benefit low-income students. BOARS members noted that the existing Comprehensive Review criteria capture the broad context in which students go to school, and identify low-income status specifically. In addition, the read sheet includes data about a high school's API ranking, which correlates more closely with family income than Title I status, which is shared by a majority of California school districts.

### **III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

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

Chair Jacob and Provost Dorr will co-chair an eight-person Senate-Administration working group the President has asked to respond to the "Moreno Report," discussed earlier by BOARS Chair Johnson. The President views the issues cited in the report as a systemwide problem requiring a systemwide approach. The working group will review processes for bringing, collecting, and investigating complaints, imposing sanctions, and improving the faculty diversity pipeline. She has also asked the chancellors and the systemwide Senate to evaluate anti-discrimination policies, including APM 015 (the Faculty Code of Conduct), and divisional procedures overseen by the Senate committees on Privilege and Tenure.

Starting November 1, the [Open Access policy](#) for faculty publications approved by the Senate in August will be implemented on a pilot basis at three UC campuses. The Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) will be funding UC faculty proposals for online education. The California Open Education Resources Council, an intersegmental faculty group identified in Senate Bill 1052, has secured funding to begin its work to assemble a set of open source textbooks and materials that could be used in 50 large-enrollment lower division courses.

### **IV. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Steve Handel, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Admissions*

- *Adam Parker, Coordinator, Admissions Policy*

Vice President Sakaki is leading the implementation of President Napolitano's recently announced plan to direct \$5 million in non-state funds toward resources that help address the unique challenges affecting undocumented students.

Associate Vice President Handel met with leaders from the Campaign for College Opportunity, which sponsored the transfer legislation SB 1440 and SB 440, to discuss the Campaign's goals and UC's efforts to improve the transfer process. He noted in that meeting that UC has increased transfer admissions substantially and wants to do more, but it also wants to ensure that the transfer students who are admitted are prepared to succeed at a highly selective institution like UC. He also told the Campaign that UC is reviewing the variability of transfer requirements across UC campuses and is developing new strategies for increasing the number of underrepresented students coming to UC through transfer.

Associate Director Lin noted that UCOP articulation analysts are seeking additional clarification from BOARS about how its July 2013 [Statement on Basic Math for all Admitted Students](#) should apply to alternative pathways to and through statistics, such as Statway and Path2Stats, intended for non-STEM majors who have difficulty completing a developmental math sequence needed for transfer. Last year, community colleges asked UC to clarify policy language requiring any transferable math or statistics course that counts toward the quantitative reasoning requirement to include intermediate algebra "or equivalent" as a prerequisite. In the Basic Math statement, BOARS defines equivalency as content that adheres to the college readiness standards of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM) or the ICAS "Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students." However, some community colleges groups are interpreting the statement as reinforcing the traditional intermediate algebra prerequisite, while others believe it opens the door to the alternative pathways.

It was noted that BOARS did not intend to disallow alternative pathways; however, the onus should be on the developers of such courses to explain how they are meeting the CCSSM. Associate Director Lin suggested that UC convene a faculty committee to evaluate different versions of the Statway curriculum to see if an exemplary version of the course that includes the appropriate CCSSM content could be found and approved.

## **V. UC San Diego's Universitylink**

BOARS discussed Universitylink, a proposed UC San Diego program that would give admission preference to low-income transfer students at nine San Diego area community colleges who fulfill specific academic requirements. BOARS had previously objected to some elements of the program, 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.

Representative Thorpe noted that UCSD wants to do more for low income transfer students in the San Diego area. The campus ended its participation in the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program and is phasing out an existing version of Universitylink. The new version would provide a pathway to very low-income students (\$40,000 maximum family income) from local community colleges who meet high academic standards (3.5 minimum GPA). The program

privileges a specific group of students in the area and not geographical proximity *per se*. Many low-income transfers are unable to incur the travel and living expenses involved in attending a UC campus far from home. Universitylink has clear expectations and a guarantee provision that will encourage students to prepare for transfer. The program will also help UC San Diego meet its diversity goals.

There are new data that speak to BOARS's prior question about the extent to which low-income students are place-bound. First, the yield rate for low-income transfer students from the region is much higher (67.4%) than the overall yield rate for transfers (35%). Second, only 5.4% of the transfer students admitted to UCB, UCLA, and UCSD accepted UCSD's offer, while 33% of low-income transfer students from the region who were admitted to those three campuses accepted UCSD's offer.

San Diego projects that no more than 400 students will be admitted through Universitylink each year, which is fewer than the number by which UCSD exceeds its Master Plan target of one transfer enrollment for every two freshman enrollments. The admissions committee will monitor the program and make changes if necessary to ensure it does not exceed that limit. The campus will also discuss the possibility of raising the family income threshold to \$80,000 to match the Blue and Gold eligibility standard.

**Discussion:** BOARS members noted that the campus has made an effective argument for the program and it is more than meeting its Master Plan obligation to transfers across the state. The new data assuage prior concerns that Universitylink could grow too large and crowd out transfers from other parts of California.

**Action:** BOARS voted 8-2 to approve Universitylink.

## **VI. Report to the Regents on the Impact of the New Freshman Eligibility Policy**

BOARS members reviewed a near-final draft of a report to the Regents on the impact of the new freshman eligibility policy. The report makes the case that the policy has met the expectations BOARS articulated in 2008, by removing unnecessary admissions barriers such as the SAT Subject test requirement, inviting more students to apply, and allowing campuses to select a group of students who are more diverse and better prepared academically. The report notes that it is difficult to attribute any specific academic or diversity outcome directly to the policy. It also warns that the policy as currently structured will not allow the University to maintain the referral admission system over the long-term and that BOARS will be examining options and making recommendations for change in the coming year.

**Discussion:** Members requested that an executive summary and additional data on the academic outcomes of students admitted under the new policy be added to the report, and noted that the report should emphasize the structural problem in the referral guarantee system more strongly. It was noted that the referral problem would likely be even worse had the policy remained unchanged, and that BOARS will need to look beyond the first-term performance of students to get a fuller sense of the policy's impact.

**Action:** BOARS will review and approve a final draft and a new executive summary of the report over email.

## **VII. BOARS Subcommittees**

**Articulation and Evaluation:** The Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee discussed the effect of BOARS's July 2013 [Statement on Basic Math](#) in the context of alternative transfer course prerequisites such as Path2Stats, or alternative transferrable courses like Statway, both of which are intended for non-STEM majors who require a different kind of quantitative literacy. The Statement is not intended to encourage or discourage such alternative pathways, but to ensure that the content of quantitative transferrable courses is linked to college readiness standards of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM).

It was agreed that BOARS should not interfere with the development of transfer course prerequisites at the community colleges, but should ensure that any transferrable quantitative course includes CCSSM-aligned content. It was noted that CSU is experimenting with a Statway pilot; however, UC has twice reviewed and rejected Statway. UCOP has been receiving new requests from faculty who want to resubmit Statway courses for approval, and UC might endeavor to find an acceptable version of Statway that aligns with the CCSSM. It was agreed that UCOP should gather any data that exists on the CSU pilot and convene a group of faculty content experts to review a model Statway course. Statway course developers should be asked to call out in the submission exactly what elements of the course address the CCSSM.

**Enrollment Issues:** The Enrollment Issues Subcommittee discussed the future of the referral guarantee. Members agreed that the guarantee process has provided an important signal to California students about the importance of academic preparation, and has been powerful politically. Members discussed what data would be needed in order to assess the likely impact of any proposed changes to the eligibility policy and what the broad outlines of what changes might be feasible. The subcommittee will review options for a modified guarantee structure and its effect on different groups of students. The subcommittee will also consider the effect of a minimum SAT/ACT score for ELC status.

## **VIII. ELC Treatment of Magnet Programs within High Schools**

The ELC program identifies the top 9% of graduates from each high school for eligibility on the basis of a benchmark GPA for the school. Some schools have separate magnet programs operating within the walls of the school (in contrast to entire schools that are defined as magnets), and UCOP currently calculates separate 9% benchmark GPAs for each individual program.

UCOP has several concerns about the accuracy of magnet program benchmark GPAs. Magnets tend to have small enrollments, so their benchmark GPAs may fluctuate more widely from year to year compared to the general high school. In addition, there is currently no good way of identifying which applicants are enrolled in a magnet program at a school. Participation in a magnet is based on information reported by the student and school, and because many magnet programs have higher benchmark GPAs than the general school, some students may choose not to report their participation. For these reasons, UCOP has proposed eliminating the practice of separate ELC benchmarking for magnet students, and using a common ELC benchmark for all students within a school. The change would be implemented for fall 2015. During the last admission cycle, 48 high schools in the state identified magnet programs, and 586 students in the ELC-eligible pool self-identified as being in such a program.

**Discussion:** BOARS members agreed that it would be fairer to establish a single benchmark ELC for a high school.

## **IX. Associate Degrees for Transfer and the Comprehensive Review Guidelines**

BOARS reviewed a proposal for adding a new criterion to the [\*Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions\*](#), which recognizes in the comprehensive review of transfer applicants students who are on track to complete an Associate's Degree for Transfer.

Associate Vice President Handel noted that the value of an Associate's Degree has been well documented; there is research indicating that community college students who plan for an Associate's Degree have better outcomes in community college and that those who complete an Associate's Degree are more likely to transfer to a four-year institution and complete a bachelor's degree. The criterion would align with the new transfer pathways being developed for UC, and would be another signal that the University values the new Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T) being developed by the California Community Colleges. Beginning in the next application cycle, students will be able to self-report that they are making progress toward an Associate's Degree for Transfer.

**Discussion:** In general, BOARS members were supportive of the proposal. It was noted that completion of an AA Degree is at least as positive an indicator of potential success as some of the other Comprehensive Review criteria. There was also concern about the need for UC to verify that a student is on track to completion of the degree. It was also noted that UC sometimes requires more of transfers than CSU for some majors and that an AD-T degree may be less relevant to some majors. Some members expressed the view that UC should not give an impression that an AD-T degree will always add value in comprehensive review.

It was proposed that rather than adding a separate criterion, wording be added to Criterion 1 regarding "evidence of progress toward an Associate's Degree for Transfer."

**Action:** BOARS voted in favor of adding language to Criterion 1 of the Guidelines, and will review specific language at the next meeting.

## **X. New Business**

**Role of Test Scores in Comprehensive Review:** Some campuses have determined that applicants with standardized test scores below a certain range are considerably less likely to be successful at UC than students whose test scores are higher. These campuses are taking a closer look at test scores at the end of the comprehensive review process, and in some cases, applying a minimum SAT score during later stages of holistic review, particularly in "tie breaking" decisions for students with lower holistic review scores.

Chair Johnson clarified that the [14 comprehensive review criteria](#) are selection criteria. It was noted that the policy does not explicitly prohibit minimum SAT scores, but emphasizes that standardized tests must be considered in the context of other factors, and there should not be strict cut-offs in which multiple factors are being considered, but one is determinative. BOARS members felt that the comprehensive review policy was being satisfied provided that students

who have test scores below the minimum are still admitted if their comprehensive review scores are sufficiently high.

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