

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Anant Sahai (UCB alternate), Tony Albano (UCD), Jerry Won Lee (UCI), Lynn Vavreck (UCLA), Frank Vahid (UCR), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), Joshua Berke (UCSF), Paul Spickard (UCSB), George Bulman (UCSC), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate Student Representative), 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 Policy and Communications, GUEA), Liz Terry (Senior Policy and Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Matt Reed (Analyst, Institutional Research and Academic Planning), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Introductions and Chair's Announcements

Chair Knowlton introduced herself and welcomed members to the first BOARS meeting of the 2023-2024 academic year. The committee's activities are of interest to the public across the state and country. One major issue this year will be transfer from the California Community College (CCC) system to the California State University (CSU) and UC systems, and many legislators are interested in streamlining the transfer process which can be complicated. One-third of UC students are transfer students and legislation can lead to students not having the best preparation for UC. BOARS will collaborate with the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues.

This year, BOARS will continue working on the addition of Area H to the A-G courses. The systemwide review last year of the committee's proposal raised concerns including if high school teachers will be able to offer the curriculum, if the requirement would be a barrier for high school students who want to attend UC, and whether it would be consistent with what high schools are developing in response to California Assembly Bill (AB) 101. Academic Council sent the proposal back to BOARS and Chair Knowlton suggested establishing an implementation workgroup to look at what high schools are doing with the goal of devising more flexible and inclusive criteria. The workgroup drafted language that was responsive to concerns raised during the systemwide review and also more practical. In June, the committee voted in support of the revised proposal. During the summer additional information about the alignment of the proposed criteria with courses in Areas A and B was collected, and this information will be considered by BOARS next month as the committee discusses preparing a proposal on Area H to submit to the Senate Academic Council. Chair Knowlton explained that creating a new subject area involves many steps and that broad support will be needed for the proposal to go forward to the Provost, the President and Regents. CSU faculty will also need to consider the impact of this additional requirement on enrollment into the CSU system.

Credit by Examination is a topic that BOARS has not had time to discuss in the past. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu remarked that UC credit is given for certain types of exams such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB). Some campuses offer UC credit for higher level Cambridge exams and, if a student petitions, for lower-level Cambridge exams too. Campus admissions directors would like to see greater consistency across the system. There is an established process for assessing AP exams but there is no process for determining if UC credit should be offered for other organizations' exams. Undergraduate

Admissions has a proposal describing what the review process might look like that includes guidelines for how staff at the Office of the President (UCOP) and on the campuses should ask the Senate for feedback on international exams and other types of curricula. Historically, Undergraduate Admissions has asked BOARS for recommendations about exams but the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) can handle these reviews if Senate leadership has determined that this is more appropriate. Undergraduate Admissions suggests that a workgroup with members of BOARS, UCEP and other relevant Senate committees should develop a policy, guidelines, and/or implementation processes whereby credit for exams can be vetted in a timely and consistent manner. Chair Knowlton asked BOARS members to consider volunteering for this workgroup and this matter will be discussed again in November. A specific angle relevant to BOARS is that students can take an AP exam to fulfill an A-G requirement without taking the course and receive UC credit.

Chair Knowlton announced that the campus admissions directors will join BOARS in November. The directors are interested in students' use of artificial intelligence (AI) to respond to the personal insight questions in the UC application. The chair reported that Council discussed California's budget and the anticipated deficit. While UC's budget should be okay overall, divisional chairs have different perspectives about the financial situation on campus. Council discussed online undergraduate degrees and the residency requirement that prevents students from getting an unapproved fully online degree. Faculty oppose online undergraduate degrees whereas administrators see them as a way to admit more students. Data shows that online undergraduate degrees only work with significant investment and do not lower costs. The California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC), approved by the Senate last year, stems from external pressure to streamline transfer but the changes for the CSUs were more substantial than those for UC. At the most recent meeting of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate, Chair Knowlton announced the formation of the Area C Workgroup and asked CSU Senate leadership to identify faculty representatives to join the effort in January.

The Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) bylaw calls for a representative from BOARS and Chair Knowlton will contact members following the meeting to find a volunteer. The analyst mentioned that after focusing intently on Writing the past several years, UCOPE is turning its attention to preparatory Math. Chair Knowlton reminded the committee that its discussions, meeting materials, and messages on the BOARS listserv are confidential, and members are discouraged from discussing sensitive matters via email. The chair plans to use executive session more frequently during meetings which will allow members to speak freely and minutes will not be taken. The student representative will be excluded from executive session but committee consultants may attend when their input and expertise will be needed. The analyst will not make audio recordings of BOARS meetings and it was noted that UCOP has received multiple California Public Records Act (CPRA) requests regarding Area C deliberations.

Discussion: A member asked about the need for the Ethnic Studies criteria given that AB 101 is a law and about the importance of the criteria being flexible. Chair Knowlton indicated that unlike AB 101, the new criteria will also apply to private high schools. The chair explained that making the criteria flexible is necessary if, for example, a small rural school does not have faculty with the expertise to teach Ethnic Studies and is unable to hire new faculty, but does have English or African American literature courses that can meet the requirement. The proposal BOARS voted on in June was not transmitted to Council because Chair Knowlton felt it would be stronger if it included information about articulation with U.S. History and English courses. It is anticipated that Council will send the new proposal out for systemwide review. AB

101 provided initial funding for teacher training but it is doubtful that funds will be available to fully train faculty to deliver the Ethnic Studies curriculum.

Last year, BOARS had a lengthy discussion about AI with the admissions directors and Chair Knowlton indicated that this topic will be on a future agenda. A member declined to respond to a reporter's questions about AI and the analyst explained that only Senate leadership should speak to the media.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The agenda was approved.

Chair Knowlton explained that data and information about courses in the July 17th videoconference minutes has been corrected by Undergraduate Admissions.

Action: The corrected July 17, 2023 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – [Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs \(GUEA\)](#) and [Institutional Research and Academic Planning \(IRAP\)](#)

- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA*
- *Chase Fischerhall, Director, A-G & Transfer Articulation Policy, GUEA*
- *Angelica Moore, Director, Undergraduate Policy & Communications, GUEA*
- *Liz Terry, Senior Policy & Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA*
- *Matt Reed, Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP*

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu provided an overview of undergraduate admissions at UC, including an explanation of the California Master Plan for Higher Education's differentiation between the CCC, CSU and UC systems as well as the expectation that UC enroll one California transfer student for every two California freshmen. Regents Policy 2102 details the undergraduate admissions process which requires that UC select from the top one-eighth of high school students and enrolls a diverse student body. Each UC campus uses the same application but campuses customize their admissions process and consider applications independently. The campuses each have their own methods for determining who is admitted and it differs for freshmen and transfer students. For freshmen, the A-G requirement is the minimum, which most UC applicants exceed, and the grade point average (GPA) is the second requirement. UC is test-free for admission and students are not allowed to submit ACT/SAT scores. Requirements to transfer into UC include completing the seven-course pattern, major preparation, and general education (GE) coursework.

As a result of California Proposition 209 and the recent Supreme Court decision on affirmative action, UC has adopted various policies to address diversity. This includes the comprehensive review policy that entails looking at multiple measures of academic achievement and assessing students within the context of their educational and personal environment and available resources and opportunities. Through the statewide path, UC identifies the top 9% of California high school students based on scores on UC's admissions index which calculates completed A-G courses and GPA. Alternatively, the local path is available to students with GPAs that meet or exceed the top 9% GPA in the context of their local high school, and if these students are not admitted to the UC campus of choice, they can be admitted from referral pool to UCM.

CCC students can take advantage of the Transfer Admission Guarantee programs at UCD, UCI, UCM, UCR, UCSB, and UCSC. Students may apply to as many UC campuses as they like but can only use a TAG at one campus, and data shows that, in practice, students use the TAG as their backup. The Pathways + program helps CCC students prepare more rigorously for a specific major and graduate in a timely manner. UCOP anticipates that the governor will sign the associate degrees for transfer (ADT) pilot program into law soon and this program will prioritize for California residents who have earned ADTs. For the pilot, UC will identify key low-sending CCCs, students must meet transfer admission and campus selection requirements, and students will be redirected if not admitted to their campus of choice. The ADT pilot will begin in 2026-2027 with eight majors at UCLA and will expand to twelve majors in 2028-2029. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained that the two-year associate degrees are fully transferrable to the CSUs and are based on transfer model curriculum developed by that system. With an ADT, students are guaranteed admission to the CSU system but not to the campus or major of their choice. Students are limited to earning 60 units to attain an ADT and must graduate from CSU with only 60 additional units.

There has been an increasing demand for a UC education over the past 30 years. In 2010-2011, there was a jump in applications when campuses sought out non-resident students and applications jumped again when UC went test-free for admission. Applications to UC dwarf applications nationwide and there has been a significant increase in applications at UCB and UCLA. The proportion of students from underrepresented groups has steadily increased over the years, but there is still more work to be done in this area. The overall pool of UC applicants is strong and the campuses are able to admit academically strong students but even the students not admitted are academically strong with many having taken numerous courses beyond the minimum A-G requirement. The number of applications from transfer students declined in 2021-2022 but the pipeline of traditional-aged CCC students is starting grow and UC is working with its partners to expand transfer. The associate vice provost noted that the transfer pool is less likely to include students from underrepresented groups compared to the freshman applicant pool.

Director Fischerhall explained that the A-G unit partners with schools and colleges across the state to work on aligning curriculum and academic expectations as well as to expand access. The unit's work related to high school articulation includes refining Advanced Mathematics in Area C, devising the new proposed Area H for Ethnic Studies, and assessing the new AP African American Studies and AP Precalculus exams. Director Fischerhall provided an overview of UC eligibility areas; the seven-course pattern; the A-G Course Management Portal (CMP), the A-G Policy Resource Guide, and the A-G course lists; and explained the process for course articulation. Depending on the significance of the changes, the articulation process can take a few years so high schools have sufficient lead time to ensure courses are reflected in their curriculum.

The transfer articulation team is responsible for reviewing CCC courses to establish baseline transferability to UC and the courses are reviewed against criteria developed by UC faculty. The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum, to be replaced by Cal-GETC in fall 2025, is informed by its own GE pattern and criteria and undergoes a separate review each spring involving the CCC, CSU and UC systems. In addition, there is campus- and department-based articulation related to fulfillment of a GE or major preparation requirement and course-to-course articulation. Given the various levels of articulation, it is imperative to understand the potential ripple effects of articulation policies.

Analyst Reed provided a brief demonstration of the data available at the UC Information Center: <https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/about-us/information-center#undergraduate-admissions>. Various dashboards provide data broken down by applicants, admits and enrollees, offering detailed information about freshmen admissions by source school and transfer students by campus and major. Analyst Reed noted that there is no dashboard for "freshman by major" since most first-year students are not admitted to a major and many are undecided/undeclared.

Discussion: Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated that the Common App was developed to meet the needs of smaller institutions. UC's admissions process asks students for more comprehensive information than the Common App and schools that use the application are restricted in terms of what they can ask, even in supplemental applications. In addition, UC would have been subject to decisions made by the organization's board. A member proposed that BOARS discuss the issue of grade bumps for honors courses. UC only grants the honors GPA bump for up to four courses, but students may be challenging themselves to perform in these courses to the detriment of their mental health.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Jim Steintrager, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Steven W. Cheung, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Steintrager shared that the Senate received a CPRA request for audio and video recordings of a previous BOARS meeting. Senate leadership was not comfortable with handing over the recordings but was willing to offer a redacted transcript even though it seemed to meet the deliberative process carve out. UC Legal initially advised that withholding the recordings could be met with a legal challenge the Senate would likely lose. However, after further discussion with Provost Newman and UC Legal, the Senate will take a strong stand to protect the deliberative process by not handing over any recordings and will be supported by UC Legal in the event of a court case.

The Regents discussed online undergraduate education and received an extensive presentation on admissions during their September retreat. The governor's initial budget included AB 1749 which would have required that UCLA guarantee admission to CCC students with ADTs. Assemblymember McCarty subsequently introduced a bill, AB 1291, that expanded the core goal of AB 1749 to all UC campuses. UC has argued that ADTs were designed for CSUs and are not well-suited for UC, especially for students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). When students need preparation for their majors, the ADT requirement to complete GE uses up the units necessary to prepare for success in a major at UC, and ADTs also do not include the lower division requirements for UC majors.

V. Area C Workgroup

Chair Knowlton explained that Area C is the Mathematics subject area and UC recommends that high school students take a fourth year of math beyond Algebra II. Taking a higher-level course can validate a lower-level one; for example, a student could skip Algebra II and take Calculus. There are UC faculty concerned that some Statistics and Data Science courses that meet the current criteria for Advanced Mathematics in the Statistics category are not sufficiently rigorous and should not validate Algebra II. The worry is that the current Area C criteria allow courses that do not adequately prepare students because they do not teach fundamentals. At the end of last year, BOARS agreed to establish a workgroup to examine these issues and 2022-2023 members and their divisional Senate chairs nominated faculty from their campuses and Chair Knowlton recommended two BOARS members to ensure a line of communication

with the workgroup. The systemwide Committee on Committees finalized the workgroup's membership, paring it down to a manageable number of representatives and balancing the expertise. The formal appointment letters will be sent out next week. The first phase of the workgroup's charge is to look at standards for Advanced Mathematics and criteria for these courses to validate foundational courses. Phase two will entail looking at the key content of foundational courses in Algebra, Geometry and Algebra II. The goal is to address the question of validation in order to have the criteria for foundational courses in place for the next academic year. CSU faculty will join the workgroup for phase two.

Discussion: Members voiced no objections to the faculty appointed to the workgroup and discussed who should chair the group. The committee agreed with Chair Knowlton's suggestion to have two chairs and members commented that the co-chairs should be unbiased as well as student-centered. The chair will consult with Senate leadership about selecting the co-chairs.

VI. Transfer Issues

The California legislature has passed different bills aimed at improving the transfer process for CCC students, including AB 928 which led to Cal-GETC and Senate Bill 1440 which created ADTs. ADTs are not required by UC but many transfer students have them and some ADTs provide good preparation for majors at UC. However, some ADTs prevent students from taking necessary courses after transferring to UC due to the 60-unit limit. UC has been reluctant to accept ADTs because of the differences between majors at the CSUs and UCs, especially in STEM fields, and UC is concerned about students being inadequately prepared. AB 1291, which replaced AB 1749, requires an ADT pilot at UC, starting with UCLA.

The UCLA representative described the campus's approach to the pilot. UCLA will form a joint task force comprised of members of the division's Senate committees on undergraduate education policy, admissions, and curriculum. The task force will draw upon the expertise of stakeholders on campus including enrollment management leads who will help identify the CCCs for the pilot and to engage college and school deans and department chairs. The campus has outlined a framework for the pilot based on several pillars: doing no harm to the excellent things happening on campus; not negatively impacting diversity on campus; supporting UCLA's aim to become a Hispanic Serving Institution; improving the status quo by enrolling students in majors that will benefit the campus; and, encouraging local CCC students to set their sights on UCLA.

Discussion: Completion of Cal-GETC with a certain GPA guarantees admission to the CSU system but not to a major. Currently UC admits students through comprehensive review which includes looking at their preparation, but with AB 1291 students with an ADT will have priority admission. There is a concern that this will result in more prepared students being displaced from UC. Refusing to implement AB 1291 would jeopardize UC's state funding. Chair Knowlton observed that implementation of ADTs for STEM majors will be a challenge for UCLA and one idea is to expand the definition of STEM disciplines. UCLA plans to identify established ADTs that closely align with its existing major preparation with the hope that low-sending CCCs will have the relevant ADTs. The campus has started thinking about data collection and internal markers, even though the Legislative Analyst's Office is responsible for the final assessment of the pilot. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu reported that UCLA has contacted UCOP regarding the evaluation.

VII. Campus Reports/Member Items

UCLA: The admissions committee discussed ADTs during its first meeting.

UCSC: The admissions committee had an orientation meeting. There is pressure to expand housing for students and one strategy is to have some students start in winter. Last year, the process for admission into Computer Science was changed and there is a concern that other high demand majors will follow suit.

UCB: The committee's orientation meeting included a discussion about AI. BOARS members would like to discuss if COVID-19 or test-free admissions has led to students having less preparation. There is uncertainty about whether students are writing the essays in their UC applications.

UCSB: During the first meeting of the year, the committee discussed concerns similar to those mentioned by other representatives. The College of Engineering has a separate admissions process and wants to limit enrollments. Faculty in other disciplines teach many more students than faculty in this college.

VIII. Further Discussion/New Business

Members should think of questions to ask the admissions directors in November. Volunteers are needed for the Credit by Exam workgroup and to represent BOARS on UCOPE.

IX. Executive Session

Videoconference adjourned at: 2:11 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton