UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
Minutes of Videoconference
October 4, 2024

In attendance: Deborah Swenson, Chair (UCD), Dave Volz, Vice Chair (UCR), Anant Sahai (UCB), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Lynn Vavrek (UCLA), Michael Cleary (UCM), Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR), Daniel Sievenpiper (UCSD), Michael Stryker (UCSF), Vanessa Woods (UCSB), George Bulman (UCSC), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate Student Representative), Bethany Padron (Graduate Student Representative), Steven W. Cheung (Chair, Academic Senate), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA)), 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), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research and Planning Analyst, IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I.   Welcome and Introductions

Chair Swenson welcomed the members and consultants to the first meeting of the academic year and noted that the committee will meet in-person in November.

II.   Consent Calendar

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

III.   Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership
Steven W. Cheung, Chair, Academic Council

Chair Cheung thanked members for their service on BOARS, a committee with a heavy workload that handles impactful and sensitive matters. The September Regents meeting included discussions about UC Health, compensation for senior managers, and funding for the acquisition of military weapons for campus police departments. President Drake recently announced his intention to step down and Chair Cheung will chair the Academic Advisory Committee that provides the Regents with input on the selection of a new president. There are also searches for two new chancellors and the president anticipates appointing them by June 2025. The stewardship reviews of UCSD's and UCD's chancellors are moving forward but the UCR review will not be necessary in light of the chancellor's retirement. The report of the Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Education was presented to the Regents and a successor task force will address implementation issues.

A Senate workgroup on artificial intelligence (AI) in the context of academics will be led by Immediate Past Chair Steintrager. In response to California Senate Bill 108 for funding to UC, a joint

Senate-administration workgroup will evaluate UC's processes related to faculty conduct and how violations are handled. The campus climate initiative is a response to the state legislature's requirement that each campus have a plan and those plans will be reviewed by a committee convened by the Vice Provost of Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs and co-chaired by Senate Vice Chair Palazoglu and the chair of the University Committee on Academic Freedom. Following the retirement of Chair Chalfant, Vice Chair Volz has agreed to chair the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI), which has been developing transfer pathways that community college students can utilize to gain access to UC. The California Assembly of Higher Education Committee and Education Committee will hold a joint oversight hearing on Area C and Chair Swenson has been preparing to explain the clarification from BOARS about the courses that can validate algebra II or the series Math 1-3. Chair Cheung shared updates on a faculty survey, a study of total remuneration and benefits, and the status of the mortgage origination program for Senate faculty.

IV.   Chair's Announcements
Deborah Swenson, BOARS Chair

Chair Swenson provided a brief overview of the role and responsibilities of BOARS and indicated that the legislature might introduce proposals the committee have to address. Members were reminded about confidentiality and about the importance of a trusting meeting environment where everyone can express their opinions. It was also noted that interest in the committee's deliberations can lead to public information act requests. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is a venue for coordination among the senate leadership of the California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC systems. During the September ICAS meeting, the CSU and CCC chairs shared concerns about AI and the impact of protests on the campuses. ICAS will have an updated math competencies statement this year and this is related to the effort by BOARS to clarify data science in the context of Area C.

BOARS along with ICAS will follow the Assembly Bill (AB) 928 Implementation Committee's work on developing associate degrees for transfer (ADTs). Following a brief discussion, ICAS and CSU members expressed support for UC's proposed Area H ethnic studies requirement and the Ethnic Studies Council for the CSU will send a letter of support to BOARS. The ICAS meeting also included a lengthy discussion about the common course numbering requirement for the CCCs, which has short timelines for faculty in different disciplines from the three segments to create course templates. The California General Education Transfer Curriculum Standards Review Subcommittee will continue its work on the common GE plan for UC and CSU transfers. Another topic on the ICAS agenda is the CSU's move, as a result of AB 656, into offering doctoral programs provided that there is a workforce need and the programs are not duplicative of UC's.

Chair Swenson explained the next steps with the Area H ethnic studies proposal. If approved, it would establish a requirement that students take an ethnic studies course in high school. To avoid overburdening students, the requirement does not involve an increase in coursework, as it may fulfilled by a course in another A-G subject area that provides an ethnic studies disciplinary perspective. It has taken several years of discussion to reach the point where Academic Council voted last year to endorse advancing the proposed requirement to the Assembly of the Academic Senate for consideration this coming December. If approved by the Assembly, the proposal will be advanced to the provost who will decide whether to forward the proposal to the Regents, who have final approval. If the proposal is not approved, the matter might return to BOARS.

Discussion: Members revisited the different votes by BOARS over the past two years that led to the proposal being submitted to Academic Council in January 2024. It was noted that the decisions and timeline are captured in meeting minutes and in the committee's memo to Council, which was in the systemwide review materials distributed to the campuses. A member emphasized that BOARS was instructed to review, consider, and advise Council and the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction confirmed that there was no discretion for BOARS to do anything other than transmit the proposal. Members might inform the Assembly's December debate by sharing their perspectives about this matter with their campus representatives on that governing body.

V.   Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs (GUEA)
Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA; Chase Fischerhall, Director, A-G and Transfer Policy Analysis and Coordination, GUEA; Angelica Moore, Director, Undergraduate Policy and Communications, GUEA; and Liz Terry, Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA

The committee's Box folder contains resources members may find useful throughout the year, information about different legislation and initiatives, and the recent California Auditor's report on transfer. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained that the California Master Plan for Higher Education is the framework meant to reduce competition for resources among the three segments. The Master Plan codified the mission differentiation for the UC, CSU, and CCC systems and that each segment would have its own pool of eligible applicants and its own governing board. The Master Plan also stated that UC and CSU enrollment should consist of 60% upper division and 40% lower division students to ensure that the four-year campuses would always have space available for transfer students. UC's goal is to enroll one new California resident transfer student for every two new California first-year students. The other guiding principle for undergraduate admission is Regents policy 2102, which delineates the undergraduate admission process including that UC is to select from among the top 12.5 percent of California high school graduates.

UC aims to enroll a student body that is reflective of the diversity of the State, but the policy allows each campus to establish its own local procedures for selecting students following the principles laid out in Regents policy. The Office of the President developed the proprietary common application that requires students to select the campuses to which they want to be considered for admission, and each campus receives the same application and considers it independently. The application fee is $80 per campus and $95 for international students while students in need can receive a fee waiver for up to four campuses. The average number of campuses applied to has been around four over the last decade but there has been a slight increase recently. The two components of the admission process for both first-year and transfer students are eligibility and selection. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained that the minimum requirements are the same across the UC system, but the selection criteria are campus- and often major-specific, and every campus has its own method for determining which students it will admit.

Since the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996 prevents UC from using race and several other demographic characteristics in admissions, the 2023 Supreme Court decision did not impact the process. The University implemented comprehensive review whereby campuses consider multiple measures of achievement, taking into account students' educational and personal environment and the opportunities available to them. The minimum requirements for first-year admission are

completion of the college preparatory curriculum (the A-G subject areas) and having a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 and 3.4 for non-residents. In 2020, the Regents voted to eliminate the SAT/ACT from consideration for admission. The minimum requirements for transfer students include completing a set of seven general education (GE) courses across a variety of subject areas, a minimum amount of transferable coursework to ensure they qualify for junior status, and a minimum GPA of 2.4 for residents and slightly higher for non-residents.

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained the various sections of the read sheet, which provides a layer of additional information on top of the student application. Responses to the personal insight questions (PIQs) are considered by those campuses employing a holistic approach to comprehensive review. The increased popularity of ChatGPT in 2023 led Admissions to advise students that the PIQ responses should reflect the student's own ideas and experiences, be independently written by the student and reflect the student's personal writing style, while a student may receive advice about content and editing using generative AI software to assist with readability.

The Associate Vice Provost reported that increasing demand for UC over the last 30 years has far outpaced enrollment. While the proportion of students from underrepresented groups has been increasing over the last decade, the gap between applications and enrollment still exists. Overall, first-year students admitted in the current class have a weighted GPA over 4.0 and they took at least eight more courses than the minimum 15 A-G, with about half of those courses being honors advanced placement or college courses. To date, Admissions has not found evidence that the move to test-free admissions substantially impacted admissions. Data from the first two cohorts of students admitted under the test-free policy show that these classes are similar to previous cohorts on academic measures including first-year GPA and the likelihood of returning for their second year.

These students were also substantially impacted by the effects of the pandemic and more of their classes were graded as Pass/No Pass rather than assigned a letter grade. Research is emerging nationally on the long-term effects of pandemic learning-loss on this cohort, and it will be difficult to separate these factors when assessing the outcomes of going test-free. UC does not have plans to make any changes in the foreseeable future to the standardized test policy, but this will continue to be evaluated. The admission of transfer students had been on a steady upward trajectory until the pandemic, and preliminary data for Fall 2024 shows these applications are rebounding. UC is actively engaged with the CCCs to make sure there is a robust transfer applicant pool. Although the racial and ethnic diversity of the transfer pool is strong, it is less diverse than the first-year applicant pool.

Director Fischerhall's presentation focused on transfer articulation, work that is unique to California. At the systemwide-level, course outlines of record (CORs) are reviewed for three different types of approval: baseline transferability, UC Eligibility Areas, and California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) GE areas. These approvals are granted at the systemwide-level based on Academic Senate policy and informed closely by BOARS and Senate regulations. Baseline transferability to UC and approval in a UC Eligibility Area are granted at the systemwide-level internal to UC. The Cal-GETC review is conducted in collaboration with the CSU Chancellor's Office and involves a thorough process at the UC campus- and department-level where discipline faculty assess whether a course is appropriate for fulfillment of a campus GE requirement and appropriate for course-to-course articulation along with equivalent major

preparation. The systemwide processes happen on an annual basis in cycles and the campus-level processes happen on a rolling basis.

To be eligible for Cal-GETC review a course must be UC-transferable, however it does not need approval in an Eligibility Area but at a baseline-level with respect to the units. In general, courses are not submitted for course-to-course articulation until they have also been approved for at least baseline transferability. A course must first go through systemwide review between June and September before being considered for other approvals. Each individual COR at each CCC campus is reviewed separately and UC Senate faculty developed the criteria to inform and guide this review. The three approvals described by Director Fischerhall are distinct systemwide designations, meaning a course may be approved for Cal-GETC without being approved for a particular UC Eligibility Area.

The director described the mandates in AB 928, which included establishing a single shared GE pattern, noting that Cal-GETC was approved by UC's Academic Assembly in December 2022 as Senate Regulation (SR) 479 and will go into effect for students entering a CCC beginning in Fall 2025. The Cal-GETC subject areas roughly align with the UC Eligibility Areas that comprise the seven-course pattern, but they are not identical because they have been developed distinctly in order to create Cal-GETC. ICAS convenes disciplinary faculty from across the three segments to compare existing UC and CSU GE patterns as codified in the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). UC and CSU faculty agreed upon an 11-course 34-unit GE pattern to establish transfer admission eligibility and alignment between the two segments has been relatively successful in regards to establishing Cal-GETC.

ADTs are based in transfer model curricula (TMC) templates developed by the CSU system and each CCC campus creates its own ADT that is approved by the CCC Academic Senate. Nearly 3k ADTs are currently being offered across the CSU's 40 TMC disciplines and the degrees include coursework, major preparation, GE and electives. ADTs may not be the most efficient path to transfer for a student interested in a UC education because they may require certain CCC courses for the degree that do not count toward a chosen major at a UC campus. In spite of this divergence, CSU has been directed to revise ADTs to reflect Cal-GETC by 2025-2026 and this effort is underway with UC faculty participation in the Transfer Alignment Project. Many transfer model curricula are being revised to reflect preparation for UC and the University is also engaged in the ADT for transfer pilot program initiated by AB 1291. Another legislative effort currently moving forward is AB 1111, which directs and provides funding for the CCC system to adopt common course numbering. Director Fischerhall asserted it will be in UC's best interest to have a leadership role in these alignment efforts.

The Transfer Articulation team provided BOARS with a general recommendation for how UC Eligibility Area guidance can be improved by aligning these policies with the Cal-GETC criteria. Data shows that current approvals between UC Eligibility Areas and Cal-GETC subject areas align at rates consistently over 90% and the areas with the highest incidences of consistent alignment are English and math. Much of the discrepancy in approval seems to be due to courses not being submitted and reviewed for both patterns. UC does not automatically review every CCC course and the CCC has to opt to submit the course for review. Chair Swenson remarked that BOARS will discuss the UC Eligibility Areas and a member will be needed to work with the UCSC representative to present a recommendation to the committee. While UC faculty might prefer to take time to consider this matter, there is a risk of losing the opportunity for quality control and to maintain

systems that work well for UC. Members will be asked to share the materials on the UC Eligibility Areas with their campus committees and gather input on the three options. One of the options is likely to be the easiest to implement, another will be politically challenging, and the third would be to maintain the status quo. Director Fischerhall commented that now is the ideal time for UC to make any changes.

Discussion: A member asked if there is guidance regarding the use of the demographic categories listed in Regents Policy 2102 in light of the 2023 Supreme Court ruling and asserted that Proposition 209 stipulated that UC cannot look at certain information about any individual applicant. There is a concern about whether this data should be presented to BOARS. Chair Swenson commented that a presentation on the application review process in November will show how students are reviewed and clarified that reviewers do not see race, ethnicity or other identifiers. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated that demographic information is collected in order to understand the outcomes resulting from UC's policies and the admissions process, and if disparate impacts are found, adjustments can be made. Eligibility in the local context is another policy that utilizes a race-neutral approach and the Associate Vice Provost shared that UC Legal has not advised UC to make any changes to how data is utilized.

Members also commented about how the responses to PIQs are rated and suggested a study. How PIQs are used varies by campus and each campus has its specific way of handling the selection of students. UCR's approach to comprehensive review is to use an academic index score, which is a compilation of different variables with different weights and this campus is not looking at responses to PIQs. Other campuses use a holistic way of looking at comprehensive review by introducing multiple measures and bringing in information from responses to the PIQs. Each campus has priorities so there are numerous different factors that come into play in the selection process.

VI.   Consultation with Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)
    Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP and Matt Reed, Senior Institutional Research and Planning Analyst, IRAP

IRAP provides data analysis to UC leadership and Senate committees to support decision-making. Director Chang's team focuses on admissions and student success data analysis as well as the systemwide study of the student experience. There are several data reporting platforms, the largest being the UC Information Center, which includes hundreds of dashboards on undergraduate admissions at the systemwide- and campus-levels. Director Chang thanked Chair Swenson and Vice Chair Volz for meeting to discuss ideas for data analysis, and discussions are underway within IRAP about the suggestions related to A-G courses and the UC Eligibility Areas.

The UC Information Center has 12 publicly available dashboards related to undergraduate admissions including a new dashboard on freshman admission by discipline. The undergraduate admissions summary dashboard is the most general repository of the counts of applicants, admits, and enrollees from 1994 to 2023. Typically, IRAP reports on fall admissions cycles but there can be data for the full year for transfer students because they enter at different times of the year. The data can be broken down by year, campus or systemwide, race and ethnicity, and public or private schools in California and schools outside of California and by California resident, domestic non-California resident and international students. The data can also be filtered by the number of A-G and honors courses, gender identity and sexual orientation, residency or resource school type.

There are dashboards for Fall freshmen and transfer student enrollments as well as 1st Generation students that provide admit and yield rates. The dashboard on transfer students shows data by UC major, discipline, or by the Federal classification of instructional program or zip codes.

IRAP redacts data when the cell sizes get small enough to potentially allow a student to be identified. It is important that the public understands that even though data shows certain results in past years it does not reflect a student's chances of being admitted. Some of the data can be tricky to interpret so questions should be directed to campus admissions offices. Senior Analyst Reed explained how the data on disciplines and undeclared majors is analyzed and presented. A popular dashboard shows admissions by source high school or community college by applicants, admits, enrollees, and by race, ethnicity, university-wide, and by campus. The dashboards now have detailed gender identity categories and the categorization of race and ethnicity is more comparable with what is used by the California K-12 system.

VII.   Preparation for November Consultation with Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs Newman

Chair Swenson reported that Provost Newman will meet with BOARS in November and again in February with State Board of Education President Darling Hammond. BOARS leadership and Chair Cheung had a preliminary conversation with the provost who was asked by President Darling Hammond if the A-G requirements should be reconsidered since they were established a long time ago. This is a good opportunity for BOARS to engage with important partners involved in many decisions related to admissions and to demonstrate that BOARS members want to share their expertise. Provost Newman would like to solicit ideas and opinions from BOARS about whether UC is doing what is needed to prepare students to be college ready.

Discussion: In response to questions about preparing talking points for the visit with the provost, the analyst commented that the provost views this as an open-ended, preliminary discussion to gather information. During the call with Provost Newman, Vice Chair Volz raised concerns regarding the decline in reading and writing amongst UC students and this could be a topic for the meeting with President Darling Hammond. A member asserted that the actual content of high school courses should be scrutinized in the context of UC's A-G requirements. California and Oregon are alone in reviewing courses and designating if they are honors or regular courses.

UC's recommendation that students take three years of math in high school sets a high standard but the graduation requirements for math in California are in the bottom 3 states of the country. Chair Swenson remarked that the State legislature has taken away the ability for students to take remedial math at a CCC while algebra two is a graduation requirement in some states. The chair encouraged members to express their individual opinions during the provost's visit. Currently, many campus student success programs have been created by campuses, since they are essential for the support of students regardless of how they come to UC.

VIII.   (Systemwide Review) Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 479 (California General Education Transfer Curriculum)

Chair Swenson provided background on ACSCOTI's proposed changes to SR 479. ADTs are now capped at 66 units of lower division preparation and must encompass Cal-GETC, and satisfying these constraints in a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) major is

problematic. First-year students are not told to complete all GE requirements in the first two years thus it is unclear why this would be asked of transfer students. This proposal preserves the 66-unit cap while allowing students in STEM to defer up to four of the Cal-GETC requirements until they are at UC so they will have better major preparation. A second aspect of the proposal is related to the requirement in CSU's GE pattern for a physical science and a biological science. It is better for students transferring into a major at UC that does not have a biology prerequisite to take courses that fit with the major. Chair Swenson asked members to consult with their campus committee about the proposal and BOARS will vote on this matter in November. The chair remarked that many systemwide review items will be issued over the year, but BOARS will only opine on matters that are relevant to its charge.

Discussion: A transfer student might be Cal-GETC certified but not have what is needed for a UC transfer pathway and vice versa, and ACSCOTI was trying to address this last year. The language about Subject area 5 might be adjusted to be more specific. Director Fischerhall reported that Cal-GETC is a shared path to eligibility but does not preclude students from using UC's seven-course pattern to demonstrate eligibility. ICAS is considering an option for partial Cal-GETC, which mirrors what is done with IGETC and there are signs that the legislature may be open to this. BOARS considered the ACSCOTI proposal last March and offered feedback. It is likely that faculty will support prioritizing major over GE preparation. A member asked if this proposal would force students to plan to transfer to UC rather than CSU upon starting in a CCC, and Chair Swenson believes this change will work for both four-year systems.

IX.   Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCB: The committee's first meeting entailed identifying topics of interest. One topic is discussion of direct admission into majors as opposed to admission of students as undeclared. Another topic is how to consider alternate or secondary major choices in the admissions process. A subcommittee will look at potentially requiring standardized tests again in light of other universities reintroducing them. This will involve uncovering any faculty concerns about what the test-free policy means for student preparedness. Chair Swenson stated that the Regents will have to vote to bring back standardized tests, noting that it has become logistically difficult for students to take these tests in California.

UCLA: The committee will look at the report from the campus ADT task force. The task force process, a collaboration between the divisional Senate and administration, went well. There is also an interest in standardized tests.

UCSC: The committee discussed the issue of admission to divisions or majors which has only been done with computer science because it was impacted. When they met with BOARS last year, the Admissions Directors expressed a preference against bringing back standardized tests because the tests deter students from applying to UC.

UCSB: This campus only admits by major for engineering and disproportionate interests in various majors creates issues, but a good solution has not been identified. The committee would like to take a deep dive into the application review process.

UCM: A near-term goal is to evaluate this year's enrollment data because UCM missed its enrollment target. The debacle with the Free Application for Federal Student Aid has led to

questions about how it can be improved, and the campus was selected to work with the Department of Education to pilot the next round. The committee is also looking at proposals for new majors and how to increase applicants and enrollments numbers.

UCI: The committee has not met yet but it will discuss accepting students directly into a major. The campus changed the budget model to reward more to departments and schools for major credit hours, which may prompt some schools to cut enrollments and others to increase them. Last year's discussion about the committee's dissatisfaction with its level of input into the design and review of applications will continue.

X.   Priorities and Goals for 2024-2025

Chair Swenson asked a member to work with the UCSC representative on the UC Eligibility Areas proposal. Members were invited to suggested topics for the committee to consider this year.

Discussion: The committee discussed the decision made by the Regents on the use of standardized tests for admissions. The provost at the time did not accept the report from the Standardized Testing Task Force and this calls into question the status of shared governance. Some Regents will make it difficult to bring back the tests. Director Chang described the analysis reviewed by BOARS last year, which showed no significant difference in student performance, first and second year persistence rates, and performance in math courses. A new analysis completed by IRAP should be ready to share with the committee in November and BOARS is invited to make suggestions on how to improve analysis.

XI.   New Business

Chair Swenson will send members a reminder about the work they have been asked to do before the November meeting.

XII.   Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

The videoconference adjourned at: 2:00 pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst
Attest: Deborah Swenson, Chair