



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Meeting Minutes

October 3, 2025

In attendance: David Volz (Chair), Nicholas Mathew (Vice Chair), Gustavo Manso (UCB), Leah Hibel (UCD), Andrea De Vizcaya Ruiz (UCI), Kelly Kay (UCLA), Joel Spencer (UCM), Manu Sridharan (UCR), Adrian Ioana (UCSD), Michael Stryker (UCSF), Vanessa Woods (UCSB), Luca de Alfaro (UCSC), Jose Aguilar (Graduate Student Representative), Matthew Shahmaram (Undergraduate Student Representative) (videoconference), Linda Darling-Hammond (President, State Board of Education), Katherine Newman (Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs, UCOP), Yvette Gullatt (Vice President, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA) (videoconference), Chase Fischerhall (Director, A-G and Transfer Articulation Policy, GUEA), Angelica Moore (Director, Undergraduate Admission Policy and Communications, GUEA), Liz Terry (Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Laura Hardy (Director, Admissions Operations, GUEA) (videoconference), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research and Planning Analyst, IRAP) (videoconference), Ahmet Palazoglu (Chair, Academic Senate), Susannah Scott (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome & Introductions

Chair Volz welcomed members to the first BOARS meeting of the 2025-2026 academic year and explained the role of the committee. Members were encouraged to familiarize themselves with the charge for BOARS. Chair Volz emphasized the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of BOARS discussions and documents, and advised that failure to respect confidentiality can lead to removal from BOARS and/or ineligibility for future systemwide Senate service. The public version of the agendas can be shared with relevant campus administrators and, while the committee's discussions can be summarized, statements should not be attributed to specific individuals. Members should be mindful that public record act requests can include emails along with other documents. The committee can utilize executive session at any time during a meeting for deliberations about sensitive matters. Members should ask the chair or analyst if there is ever uncertainty about confidentiality.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda items and their priority were approved.

III. BOARS Issues for 2025-2026

BOARS handles matters regarding freshman and transfer admissions and responds to issues and concerns raised by the campuses, systemwide Academic Senate, the Office of the President (UCOP), the Regents or by members of BOARS. The committee's work requires close collaboration

with faculty and admissions offices at the campuses, Academic Senate leadership and analysts, and other systemwide Senate committees. BOARS works closely with consultants at UCOP, with the California K-12 segment on freshman admissions issues, and with the California Community College (CCC) system on transfer admissions as any recommendations developed by BOARS have the potential to significantly impact this segment.

This year, the committee will collaborate with the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) on the evaluation of the College Board's recent changes to the scoring process for Advanced Placement (AP) exams. College Board representatives will join the November BOARS meeting. The goal of this work is to provide recommendations to UC faculty about whether the cut scores used for admissions and to award credit by exam need to be adjusted in light of this new scoring system. BOARS will also revisit the ability of the honors programs, including AP, International Baccalaureate (IB), and dual enrollment programs, to predict the performance and persistence of students that enroll at UC. This is important because these programs have played an increasing role in admissions following the elimination of standardized tests in fall 2021. Representatives from the IB will meet with BOARS in December and this will be followed by a joint task force with UCEP and UCOPE in early 2026 to further investigate this issue and determine if changes in admissions criteria are needed.

BOARS will also contend with several priorities and issues related to transfer. The first is related to UCLA's Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) pilot program required by Assembly Bill (AB) 1291. The legislation mandated that UCLA develop an ADT pilot program with eight majors that align with the transfer model curricula (TMC) for CCCs identified by UCLA. AB 1291 requires that an additional four UC campuses declare at least 12 majors similar to the TMC from select CCCs starting with the 2028-2029 cohort. Decisions about participating majors will be driven by UC faculty and, per AB 1291, the 12-major minimum doesn't apply to UCM. Members should work with their local Senate admissions committees this year to explore if their campuses would be interested in creating ADT pathways. Representatives of the UCLA task force that designed the ADT pilot program will be invited to meet with BOARS in early 2026.

The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) was created to improve the transfer process for students. Having fulfilled its charge to increase UC transfer pathways in a variety of STEM fields, ACSCOTI was sunsetted at the end of August 2025. A subcommittee of BOARS, led by the UCSB representative, will handle transfer-related matters as they emerge. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is grappling with allowing partial certification of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC). The California State University (CSU) system opposes partial certification whereas the CCCs and UC are in favor of this provision. AB 928 required the creation of a singular transfer pathway and the CSU Academic Senate was concerned that partial certification would be inconsistent with the law.

Discussion: Members are interested in having better data related to how well transfer students perform once they are at UC. Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated that Cal-GETC is not a requirement for admission to UC or CSU, but it is embedded within the ADT for admission to the CSU. ADTs were designed as preparation for the CSU system but are now expanding to UC starting with UCLA's pilot. One challenge with ADTs is that they are not always directly aligned with the major preparation UC would like.

IV. Preparation for Visit with State Board of Education President

Chair Volz described President Darling-Hammond's background and explained that the goal is for BOARS to regularly consult with the K-12 segment. The State Board of Education (SBE) is California's K-12 policy-making body for academic standards, curriculum, instructional materials, assessments, and accountability. Chair Volz, Vice Chair Mathew, and Analyst Abrams had a productive conversation with President Darling-Hammond in August 2025 that touched on several shared concerns. President Darling-Hammond will inform the committee about the current priorities for the K-12 segment.

V. Consultation with State Board of Education President Darling-Hammond

Linda Darling-Hammond, President, State Board of Education

Chair Volz welcomed President Darling-Hammond to the meeting, explaining that this is an opportunity to exchange information about key issues from the perspective of K-12 and BOARS. President Darling-Hammond remarked on how important BOARS is to the curriculum conversation in California and, by statute, BOARS defines the curriculum that is made available to all students in all public high schools in the state. Many school districts have adopted A-G as their graduation requirements; therefore, any changes BOARS recommends to Academic Council and the Regents may have the potential to have a ripple effect on K-12. For example, the recommendations made by BOARS in 2024 regarding Area C (Mathematics) continue to generate questions about the types of math courses that are recommended, suggesting that more conversations are called for.

Both nationally and in different countries, educators are debating over the abilities students need in the workforce, how to help students apply knowledge in ways focused on problem solving, and how to preserve the content and conceptual knowledge within disciplines. California is the only state with a faculty-led group that determines not only the types of courses students should take but defines the content of high school courses. The governor and state legislators are concerned about career pathways and funding has been provided to help high schools redesign approaches to learning so students will be able to use knowledge in powerful ways after graduation. President Darling-Hammond would like to engage with BOARS in thinking about how to ensure mastery of important content, the acquisition of analytic skills, and the ability to apply knowledge in new ways.

BOARS could use A-G to require different types of learning and different content in high school courses, and President Darling-Hammond described approaches to assessment being utilized in other countries. Inequality is a significant problem in California public schools that serve low-income students and students of color, and there are not enough well-trained teachers. Provost Newman stated that the idea of examining the A-G requirements was raised when President Darling-Hammond joined BOARS last year. Provost Newman also stated that such an effort would likely be a statewide commission with academics, representatives from corporations, and others. but this is not a priority for the Regents at present due to ongoing actions at the federal level. As an alternative route, Chair Volz indicated that BOARS can take the lead on re-examining A-G requirements and policies over the next couple of years, and BOARS can delegate this focused A-G effort an intra-BOARS subcommittee or task force that 1) consists of UC faculty and staff representatives; 2) consults on a regular basis with relevant stakeholders throughout the state; and 3) periodically reports back to BOARS on progress, barriers, and next steps.

Discussion: Chair Volz reported that BOARS will be scrutinizing the role of AP, IB, and dual enrollment in fulfilling A-G requirements and undergraduate admissions criteria for the UC. President Darling-Hammond stated that the IB program appears to be more rigorous than the AP program. When students understand the need to apply something being taught in high school, they make more of an effort to learn the material. A-G can be both foundational content and teach skills. Dual enrollment can be valuable because it allows students to experience the rigor of college courses and often count towards A-G and transferable college credits. Vice President Gullatt commented that the California Subject Matter Project provides teacher professional development around A-G. The SBE and UC could ask the legislature for funding to train more high school teachers. The countries with highly qualified teachers have curricula that are very different from curricula used in the United States.

VI. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair & Susannah Scott, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

During last week's Academic Council meeting, President Milliken provided an update related to actions being taken by the federal government. This included an explanation for UC's compliance with the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights' investigation into UCB's handling of Title VI complaints that required the production of case files and incident reports which included personally identifiable information of UCB students, faculty, and staff. The Regents Finance Committee received a presentation from Chief Financial Officer Brostrom on the general budget outlook for 2026-2027, employer contributions to healthcare, and the tuition stability plan. ICAS met in September and identified priorities for the year ahead including advocacy for higher education and improving student success by clarifying and aligning transfer processes. BOARS is likely to hear about the CCC-led common course numbering (CCN) project which proposes to use CCN templates instead of course outlines of record as the basis for articulation.

The Academic Senate is involved with an expanded version of the UC Adaptation to Disruptions Task Force that will include administrators along with the new Performance of Undergraduate Degree Programs Task Force. A workgroup comprised of representatives from Senate committees on Privilege and Tenure is developing guidelines for faculty discipline especially in terms of extra-mural speech and expressive activities.

VII. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs

Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions; Chase Fischerhall, Director, A-G & Transfer Articulation Policy; Laura Hardy, Director, Admissions Operations; Liz Terry, Senior Policy & Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions; & Angelica Moore, Director, Undergraduate Policy & Communications

The consultants in Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs provided an overview of the high-level admissions policies and practices administered through UCOP. Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained that the Undergraduate Admissions team has 28 staff and their work is very different from what the campus admission offices handle. Undergraduate Admissions is comprised of Admissions Operations, Policy and Communications, A-G Transfer Articulation, and Admissions Analytics which are led by Laura Hardy, Angelica Moore, Chase Fisherhall, and Liz Terry, respectively. The guiding principles for undergraduate admission are in Regents Policy 2102 which

cites that, per the California Master Plan, UC should select from the top one-eighth of the state's high school graduates. As part of its land-grant mission, UC has a commitment to the students of California, and the goal is to enroll a student body that is reflective of the state. Since each UC campus is different, the admissions policy allows each campus to establish its own local procedures for selecting students that follow the principles laid out in the Regents' policy but are customized for the needs of the specific campus as appropriate.

The Board of Regents has delegated the authority to the Academic Senate and BOARS to establish the criteria for admissions and the granting of degrees, but new Academic Senate regulations or changes to existing regulations approved by the Senate also have to be approved by the Regents. Undergraduate Admissions is delegated by the president to implement the admission policies and work with the campuses to ensure standardization and compliance. The admission process has two components for both first-year and transfer admissions, eligibility and selection. Minimum eligibility requirements are the same across all the campuses whereas selection criteria are campus and often major-specific, with each campus having its own method for determining which students it will admit, as long as it is compliant with state and federal law.

The director of the Admissions Operations unit explained that UC employs a proprietary common application that was developed in-house. Students select the campuses they want to be considered for, and each campus receives the same application to review independently.

The Policy and Communications unit oversees systemwide programming and communications on policies and guidelines governing undergraduate admission to UC. This unit engages with various constituencies, primarily campus partners and California high school and community college counselors, in efforts to support a smooth implementation of the policy.

Director Fischerhall explained that the work of the Articulation unit at UCOP ensures that California students can understand what foundational courses to take at their local high school, or the CCC where they are enrolled, that will demonstrate first-year or transfer admissions eligibility to UC. A-G is how students demonstrate first-year eligibility to UC and CSU, and the High School Articulation Unit is responsible for the implementation of the A-G policy. This implementation consists of managing A-G course lists for over 3,000 California high schools on behalf of both the UC and CSU systems and providing A-G support to these high schools. The High School Articulation unit consults with BOARS and other Academic Senate committees as they determine and refine A-G policy. Like high school articulation, transfer articulation at UC involves the practice of determining which CCC coursework will fulfill UC major and general education (GE) requirements.

The Admissions Analytics team is responsible for data analytics, reporting, and policy analyses, produces a wide variety of ad hoc analyses and briefs, and generates a number of annual reports. This unit supports the work of the admissions offices at each campus by 1) providing data to support the application review process and its staff and 2) consulting with the Academic Senate and its committees.

VIII. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)

Tongshan Chang, Director & Matt Reed, Senior Institutional Research & Planning Analyst

Director Chang explained that the UC Information website has hundreds of dashboards on admissions and student outcomes, and almost all of the dashboards contain campus-level data

which are validated and verified with campus IR units. Senior Analyst Reed provided an overview of admissions statistics that include overall counts of applicants, admits, and new enrollees for each year, systemwide and by campus. The first tab is for freshmen, the second for transfers, and the third for the total of freshman and transfers together, and there are filters so the data can be viewed by campus or by different student characteristics. The dashboards calculate admit and yield rates by campus and year. The dashboard on transfers by major is popular with students, families, and the counselors who advise them.

Users are particularly interested in the admit rate by field of study. As most freshmen are not admitted to a major or are undeclared, the dashboard has a broad list of disciplines that are comparable across campuses for freshman admissions. The same discipline lists are utilized in the transfer by majors and the fall enrollment dashboards and elsewhere on the Information Center, but disciplines are not further broken down. IRAP maintains over ten dashboards on undergraduate admission that cover a variety of topics.

IX. College Board's Validation of Evidence-Based Standard Setting

Chair Volz welcomed the chairs of UCEP, UCOPE, and the Entry Level Writing Requirement Coordinating Council (ECC) to the discussion about the College Board's new Evidence-Based Standard Setting (EBSS) scoring process. Chair Volz provided some context for this topic and explained that the goal for today is to create a set of questions to provide to the College Board before the representatives join BOARS in November 2025. BOARS met with College Board representatives in November 2024 to learn about the EBSS, but those representatives were unable to adequately respond to members' questions at that time. In response to BOARS' initial concerns about the methods and details underlying EBSS that were raised during the November 2024 meeting, the College Board provided a report to BOARS entitled "Validation Approaches for Evidence-Based Standard Setting Cut Scores" which was presented at a conference in April 2025. Representatives on the College Board's scoring research team will meet with BOARS in November 2025 to respond to BOARS' questions about EBSS. Chair Volz reiterated that, in collaboration with UCEP and UCOPE, BOARS will, based on the College Board's responses, provide recommendations to UC faculty about whether cut scores for admissions and credit by exam need to be adjusted in light of the implementation of EBSS.

Discussion: It is possible for students to take the AP exam without taking the corresponding course, but most students do complete the course. Although UCEP and UCOPE are involved with credit by exam policies, BOARS has responsibilities for credit by exam policies as spelled out in Senate regulations. The College Board made the change to its validation process without consulting with UC or CSU and there is a lack of transparency about the EBSS process. A member noted that only 2% of the subject matter experts involved with the EBSS process are at selective four-year universities.

The chair of UCEP questioned whether the statistical models used by the College Board control for potential bias and Chair Sugar has concerns about the lack of technical details in the materials on EBSS and about sweeping conclusions made by the College Board. BOARS may want to request access to the College Board's briefing books which contain raw data and information underlying AP exam score distributions. A member would like the College Board to provide a scatter plot with individual student scores based on the old scoring process and the scores based on EBSS.

Additional considerations are related to equity in terms of students who have access to numerous AP exams along with the costs of allowing students to skip large lower-division courses at UC.

In addition to addressing changes in the College Board's scoring system for AP exams, Chair Volz explained that BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE members may eventually establish a task force to take a broader look into the value of AP, IB, dual enrollment, and the various ways students can prepare for UC and gain course credit. IRAP will provide an analysis of the predictive value of honors courses for first-year UC grade point average and persistence. An analysis might look at the AP exams with historically low pass rates and at the core UC courses they are supposed to align with to see how much overlap exists. If the overlap is limited, the question is whether students should receive credit for these AP exams because they are college-level even if not the same as UC courses. In the absence of standardized tests, there is a greater incentive for students to take AP exams, but EBSS has the potential to make the scores less legible and trustworthy to admissions committees across UC. Notably, there is an absence of qualitative assessments of these exams which are not internal to the College Board. One member noted that UC and CSU faculty provide unpaid labor when they review the AP exams, yet this input does not appear to be on the record. UCOPE Chair Queen and ECC Chair Sorapure indicated that a score of 3 on the AP English Language and AP English Literature allows students to satisfy the systemwide ELWR, a score of 4 satisfies GE writing at many UC campuses, and a score of 5 satisfies an upper division writing course at some campuses. Members of BOARS and the chairs of UCEP, UCOPE, and the ECC will send their questions for the College Board to Chair Volz and these will be shared with the College Board representatives four weeks before the November meeting.

X. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCSB: The Admissions office asked the representative to inform BOARS about the new Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) exam which will start in January 2026. This exam will be scored on a new scale of 1 to 6, therefore BOARS will need to set a new minimum score for UC.

XI. Executive Session

Note: Other than action items, minutes are not taken during executive session.

The meeting adjourned at: 4:00 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: David Volz, Chair