BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)

Minutes of Videoconference

January 4, 2019

I.   Consent Calendar
1. Approval of BOARS January 4, 2019 agenda
    Action: The agenda was approved as noticed.

II.   Chair's Announcements
Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair
1. Academic Council meeting of December 12, 2018
    - Chair Comeaux presented the transfer guarantee to the Council, who had questions about the academic preparation of the TAGs. The MOU called for TAGs to be reviewed for academic rigor, and BOARS supports this step. Council will soon circulate the proposal for formal systemwide review.
    - The Standardized Testing Task Force members have been invited. BOARS will be represented by Chair Comeaux and UCSF Representative Hasenstaub. The Task Force will focus exclusively on undergraduate admissions.   The group will likely continue its work through the summer.

III.   Transfer Guarantee Next Steps
1. Policy Language
    The new guarantee proposal, should it pass, will need clear policy language to facilitate easy implementation.   Further, public messaging must be created that accurately and succinctly conveys the guarantee and what transfer applicants need to do and by when. To help achieve these goals, several joint administration-Senate task forces have been established. The Transfer Advising Innovations and Communications (TAIC) working group will provide recommendations on efforts related to CCC student/counselor outreach and student communications; they support the plan to convene focus groups with CCC students and counselors to examine the baseline understanding of UC's existing transfer programs (i.e., TAGs and the Transfer Pathways that the new guarantee will be based on going forward). The Transfer Pathways and Articulation (TPA) working group will guide efforts to close CCC-UC articulation gaps for Pathway courses, and may make recommendations for Pathway requirements to be reviewed by UC faculty as needed. The Transfer Task Force will review their efforts.
2. Review Packet Contents
    Members are encouraged to notify Chair Comeaux and Analyst Feer of any additional materials that might usefully be included in the review packet accompanying the transfer proposal.
3. Reviewing TAGs
    Each campus has autonomy to set their local standards, and each campus has autonomy to determine in which majors to offer TAGs. Academic preparation is one lever to pull, and there is significant data available to help underscore the link between better preparation at the CCCs and academic success at UC. Discussion points to inform local TAG reviews might include: 1) Are current TAG requirements adequate for enrollment management should TAG applications double or treble? 2) Are TAG students on track to graduate in two years? 3) Explain the rationale for any

gaps in TAG requirements and Pathway recommendations. 4) Are potential GPA minimums supported by data? 5) What local idiosyncrasies should also be considered in this discussion? 6) Would an increase in TAG admits adversely impact local achievement of the 2:1 ratio?

IV.   Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Student Affairs
Robin Holmes-Sullivan, Vice President, Student Affairs
Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director, Undergraduate Admissions
Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools and Colleges
Tonghsan Chang, Manager, IRAP

1. <u>Area d next steps</u>
    Given the inclusion of computer science, engineering and applied science courses under area d, UC must indicate which courses are approved to meet the requirement/recommendation. Many courses were previously approved under area g (electives), so migrating the relevant courses to the area d list should prove straightforward. Only about half of California high schools offer academic preparation in computer science, though.
    Action: BOARS approved unanimously revisions to the incumbent academic areas in area d.
    Action: BOARS will revisit in February proposed courses to be included under computer science.

2. <u>a-g Online Course Approval</u>
    In order to streamline the articulation process of online courses, manage UCOP workload, and reflect changes in the market since the current policy was adopted in 2012, Director Lin proposed a model of a-g online course approval that would allow high schools to self-approve courses offered by third parties. BOARS members raised several concerns. Many wondered about quality control since local schools would want to support their expenditures, even if academic outcomes are less than stellar. Many wondered about the level of local instructor involvement. Others suggested that UCOP develop parameters and minimum standards under which local school districts could operate.
    Action: Director Lin will revise the proposal and present additional materials next month.

V.   Executive Session
Note: During executive session, no notes are taken.

Adjournment 1:45 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst
Attest: Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Attendance:
  Eddie Comeaux, Chair
  Melissa Famulari, Vice Chair
  Mark Brilliant, UCB
  Deborah Swenson, UCD
  Laura O'Connor, UCI
  Rene Ong, UCLA
  Catherine Keske, UCM
  David Volz, UCR
  Andrea Hasenstaub, UCSF
  Madeleine Sorapure, UCSB
  David Smith, UCSC