

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Nicholas Matthew (UCB) (videoconference), Tony Albano (UCD), Jerry Won Lee (UCI) (videoconference), Lynn Vavreck (UCLA), Charlie Eaton (UCM), Sundararajan Venkatadriagaram (UCR alternate) (videoconference), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), Joshua Berke (UCSF), Vanessa Woods (UCSB alternate), 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 Admission Policy and Communications, GUEA) (videoconference), Liz Terry (Senior Policy and Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning) (videoconference), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, Academic Senate) (videoconference), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

Chair Steintrager discussed the California Public Records Act (CPRA) requests the Senate continues to receive about BOARS matters. Senate leadership has consulted with Provost Newman and UC Legal regarding the confidentiality of Senate committee discussions, including identifying legal exemptions that should protect documents and recordings which are part of the deliberative process and are pre-decisional. UC Legal is available to provide advice and will provide representation if necessary.

The chair of the Regents Academic and Students Affairs Committee has proposed a presentation on Area C and Data Science during the Board's upcoming meeting, but Chair Steintrager believes this should be postponed until the new Area C Workgroup completes its work. Chair Steintrager remarked that the Area H Ethnic Studies proposal has raised concerns among the Regents due to its association with the recent letter about the war in the Middle East from the UC Ethnic Studies Faculty Council. During Academic Council's October meeting, President Drake discussed online undergraduate degree programs, and the Regents are considering overturning Senate Regulation 630.E, the campus experience requirement. The Senate has no reason to propose eliminating this regulation which was just approved last year.

Discussion: There were questions about whether decisions made by BOARS are technically still pre-decisional until they are endorsed or approved by Academic Council and when meeting minutes have to be available. If members receive CPRA requests they should contact Chair Knowlton, and inquiries from the media should also be referred to the BOARS chair.

II. Chair's Announcements

Chair Knowlton described issues related to Teaching Assistants and Graduate Student Researchers (GSRs) which include making the distinction between their academic progress and the activities in their job descriptions. The chair of the Regents, Rich Leib, joined the recent Academic Council meeting and is interested in increasing access to UC which could involve online undergraduate degrees. Faculty have mixed views about online degrees and maintaining quality. Another issue discussed by Council is the extension of the deadline to appeal grades after some GSRs who filed complaints with the union about receiving a U (unsatisfactory) grades for the period of the strike, and may wish to receive a retroactive drop of U grades.

The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) is looking at legislation that could change who is admitted to UC. To avoid having procedures and policies imposed on UC, ACSCOTI is trying to identify alternatives that are viable and can simplify the transfer process without compromising preparation. There are external groups and some state legislators who would like UC to adopt associate degrees for transfer (ADTs) guarantees, which were specifically designed for the California State University (CSU) system. ADTs limit California Community College (CCC) students to 60 units and students are allowed another 60 units to complete their degree at the CSU. Students with ADTs do transfer to UC, but some majors require courses not included in the ADT, or do not require some of the courses that are prescribed by current ADTs. BOARS will discuss the idea of a UC pathway that allows students to defer more than two general education requirements, and this will require changing certain Senate bylaws.

III. Consent Calendar

Chair Knowlton announced that the Area H discussion will not be in Executive Session.

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

Action: The October 6, 2023 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President and Admission Directors and Enrollment Management Leads

- *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 Admission Policy & Communications, GUEA*
- *Liz Terry, Senior Policy & Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA*
- *Tongshan Chang, Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning*

Chair Knowlton led discussions about a variety of topics with the Undergraduate Admissions consultants and divisional Admissions Directors and Enrollment Management Leads, beginning with a brief update on Area C. Last year BOARS began considering if Data Science courses should be allowed to validate Algebra II and the UCSF and UCR representative are serving on the new Area C Workgroup (ACW) established to consider this question. The ACW's membership is comprised of Data Scientists and Mathematicians and it met for first time last week. Chair Knowlton explained that changes to the courses in Area C might be proposed based on the ACW's recommendations.

Issue: UCOP High School Articulation provided information on English and U.S. History courses that might be compatible with the proposed Area H. BOARS wants to avoid the creation of any new barriers to student access imposed by the proposal. Members, consultants, and guests were invited to share concerns about the Area H subject area.

Discussion: An assistant vice chancellor (AVC) reported hearing high school district representatives describe struggles with bouncing back from the pandemic and overall challenges with updating their high school graduation requirements. It is anticipated that high schools will have difficulty implementing Area H just as there have been issues with schools' inability offer the complete array of A-G courses. It was noted that schools have some lead time since the new high school graduation requirement does not have to be implemented until 2025 for the graduating class of 2029. Another AVC noted that many independent and parochial high schools are as under-resourced as public high schools and would have difficulty offering courses compliant with the proposed Area H. A member questioned if Area H would add an extra requirement for schools already having to implement what is required by Assembly Bill (AB) 101, and it was noted that the Ethnic Studies Implementation Workgroup's feedback was that Area H is closely aligned with AB 101, although the latter is broader and more flexible.

The information about the English and U.S. History courses in today's agenda packet was helpful. Asked if there are courses that satisfy AB 101 but not Area H, Director Fischerhall explained that the sampling of courses that were shared represent a range of numerous Ethnic Studies courses that are currently offered in California high schools. These classes were not developed specifically for AB 101 or in light of the proposed Area H. Thus, it is currently unknown what range of courses will be used by school districts to fulfill AB 101 and whether these courses will fall short of the proposed Area H standards. Further, while some of the classes were deemed to be likely to meet the level of rigor that qualifies a course for UC admissions in Area A (History) or Area B (English), the course quality was not uniformly high. Thus, meeting the Area H standard within an ongoing subject area requirement could be challenging for some districts. UC Scout could be a resource for high schools needing Ethnic Studies courses but one issue is whether a district qualifies to offer the courses for free since the per-student charge is otherwise \$500 for a one semester course. The access issue is about affordability and the cost structure of UC Scout should be examined.

Issue: There is pressure on UC from legislators and others to accept ADTs as a priority route for UC transfer. Chair Knowlton is serving on ACSCOTI which, in addition to trying to simplify the transfer process, wants to identify barriers to transfer and one focus is on ensuring that students are prepared once they get to UC.

Discussion: ADTs do not simplify transfer in the ways people assert, whereas the UC transfer pathways have simplified transfer from the CCCs and have made UC more accessible. UC prioritizes preparation for the major because there is evidence that this leads to success. The graduation rate is higher for students who transfer to UC than it is for students who transfer to the CSUs. Continued work on transfer pathways is beneficial to prospective transfer students. ACSCOTI is looking at the majors where ADTs may be aligned and has found that some transfer pathways and ADTs are close to being aligned. The charge for the UCLA Senate task force on ADTs has been approved and the division's Committee on Committees has been asked to identify the members. The task force will meet at least once before fall quarter ends, begin working in earnest in winter, and complete its work in spring. Campus stakeholders will be involved with reviewing data and discussing the development of the ADT program. The task force recommendations will first be sent to UCLA's committees on admissions and undergraduate policy for approval.

ADTs differ by CSU campus and by major, and a concern is there could end up being a different ADT for every UC major. What UCLA does with its ADT program will inform what other UC campuses do in the future. UC might consider if a transfer student with an ADT should be awarded credit for prior learning which is currently not offered at the UC. Another concern is that there will be a trade-off between access and time to degree. UCLA already has the highest transfer graduation rate, and it is unclear how ADTs will impact the 2-year time to degree. The implementation of ADTs at UC might create a problem that will have to be addressed in several years. On the other hand, the use of ADTs might allow UC to enroll populations that have historically not been served. UC should consider how to increase enrollment of California students and how to fund higher enrollment. BOARS might think about modifying the balance of in-state and out-of-state students. Chair Knowlton explained that the requirement to enroll one transfer student for every two freshmen cannot be changed since it is in the Master Plan. The Campaign for College Opportunity thinks UC should increase the number of transfer students which could lead to enrolling fewer freshmen. Expanding the transfer admission guarantee (TAG) program to campuses that are at capacity would displace students with high grade point averages but no TAG. TAGs for campuses and majors that are at capacity make enrollment management more difficult. For campuses and majors that are not overenrolled, TAGS are beneficial for students.

One reason students attend a CCC is because the first two years are essentially free, and the perception is that starting at a CCC is the more affordable pathway to a four-year degree. UC needs

better messaging about its affordability and the robust financial aid available. Although UC is affordable for low-income students, middle income students not eligible for the Blue and Gold program or Pell Grants, make the CCC a reasonable choice for students in this income bracket. The pressure to graduate in two years and emphasis on time to degree are part of UC's 2030 goals. A shorter time to degree means more students can go through UC. Students in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math fields with an ADT often cannot complete the necessary courses at UC in two years.

Issue: Chair Knowlton invited attendees to comment on credit by exam and A-G Courses. The Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB) exams are well known, but one question is how conservative UC should be when it comes to offering credit for other organizations' exams.

Discussion: Undergraduate students are very internationalized, but UC policies have not internationalized to the same degree. Students who have taken the curriculum but are not given credit by exam take up seats in UC classes. It was also noted that students do not always submit their scores because credit is not offered by UC. Cambridge now offers its curriculum and exams in the U.S. and the number of students applying to UC who have taken Cambridge is increasing. Some AVCs suggested that UC should look beyond the AP and IB and investigate other countries' government exams, for example the multiple different examining boards throughout India and the French baccalaureate. Ivy League schools and UC's peer institutions give credit for many of the other international exams, leading students to question why UC does not.

This is an opportune time to study the top-sending programs or countries and their exams. While some exams do not have high security, others have security that is at least as stringent as for exams that are awarded credit now. Since carefully inspecting the exams is a lot of work, thought should be given to streamlining the review process. UC could start with exams used by a significant number of students, and students who have taken less common exams would continue petitioning for credit. One approach could be to award basic unit credit and set a blanket maximum number of units as a starting point, with the understanding that course credit must be approved by each divisional Senate. UCSB is the only campus that has articulated A-level courses the same way other campuses have AP/IB.

Issue: Members were invited to raise other issues with the divisional Admissions Directors and Enrollment Management Leads. There was an inquiry about the role of personal insight questions (PIQs) in the application process, how students' responses are assessed, and how Admissions ensures the consistency of the assessments. Another question was about instructions to students on the use of ChatGPT to write their applications to UC.

Discussion: The goal of asking the PIQs is not to evaluate students' writing ability but to better understand who the student is and gain insights into students that other schools might get through letters of recommendation. Admissions offices have students' grades, information about their high school and extracurricular activities but the responses to the PIQs offer an idea of who the students will be at UC or engage with the campus community. It is important to look beyond academic performance and consider how students have impacted their school and broader community. Students can describe any struggles or challenges they have faced. PIQ responses are instrumental in providing a sense of the student and their voice that adds to the quantitative information in the application. However, the responses are evaluated in the totality of the application and will either be a neutral factor or provide additional understanding not otherwise available. The responses will not supersede everything else. Applications are reviewed twice bringing a fair amount of quality control to the process, and readers participate in anti-bias training. The available data on PIQs indicates that they are not predictive, but BOARS would like to have more discussion about this topic.

Regarding ChatGPT, the Admissions representatives know that students are using this generative artificial intelligence (AI) and give students guidance including advising that ChatGPT will not produce

the students' personal stories. Since other applicants have been helped by their parents and highly paid counselors for years, some commented that ChatGPT could be viewed as an equalizer. AVP Yoon-Wu emphasized that students are not encouraged to use ChatGPT but this tool could be viewed as similar to a student getting advice from their parents. While students can use AI for editing, it does not add value to their PIQ responses. It is likely readers will be able to tell the difference between what has been written by a student versus ChatGPT. Admissions encourages students to use their authentic voice, stressing the importance of the students' active participation in the process. It might benefit BOARS members to participate in reader training to gain a better understanding of the holistic review process. Currently there is no mechanism to ask students if they have used ChatGPT just as there is no mechanism to ask if students received help from their parents. BOARS members discussed devising an experiment to study the use and impact of ChatGPT and Admissions directors are curious about how faculty are addressing AI in their classrooms. This topic will be discussed again during the next joint meeting with the Admissions Directors and Enrollment Management Leads in June.

V. Courses for Area H - Ethnic Studies

Chair Knowlton provided an overview of BOARS recent discussions about Area H Ethnic Studies and the agenda packet contained the criteria for the Ethnic Studies courses. The goal today is to decide whether to transmit the proposal for the Area H requirement to Academic Council for systemwide review. The chair explained that this past June, the committee accepted the criteria devised by the Ethnic Studies Implementation Work Group (ESIWG). Now one consideration is whether requiring students to complete a course that satisfies the proposed Area H Ethnic Studies curriculum will be a barrier for high school students who want to attend UC. Members are asked to determine if the current proposal is responsive to the concerns identified in the systemwide review. Chair Knowlton suggested that if concerns about access and about the criteria potentially making it difficult for students to fulfill this new subject area persist, the committee might consider proposing Area H as a recommendation rather than a requirement. A high school student who does not fulfill the Area H recommendation would not be excluded from the UC and CSU systems, in particular if their school does not offer an ethnic studies course that meets the Area H standards.

Discussion: An example of the implementation of an admissions recommendation rather than a requirement involves Area D and a third year of science. Faculty supported requiring three years of science but the provost at that time decided a third year should only be recommended because some under-resourced high schools can only offer two years. BOARS approved Area H as an admissions requirement in 2021 and transmitted the proposed requirement to Council. Council sent the proposal out for systemwide review but did not vote on it, and the subsequent decision by BOARS to establish the ESIWG was based on concerns identified during the review. A member objected to introducing Area H as a recommendation now given that BOARS deliberations in 2022-2023 and the ESIWG's discussions were about a requirement. The committee could start with a vote to transmit Area H to Council as a proposed requirement, and if that vote fails, a motion could be made to send it forward as a recommendation.

Members debated about the actions taken up to this point and weighed the pros and cons of Area H being a requirement versus a recommendation and whether concerns about access were readily addressable. Members expressed disparate opinions about next steps. A requirement might be viewed by high schools as subverting the local autonomy inherent in AB101 whereas a recommendation would mean that students are not excluded from applying if they have only taken an AB 101-compliant course that falls short of the proposed Area H requirement. A recommendation would apply to private schools which are not subject to AB101. Director Fischerhall explained that the eight English and U.S. History courses in the agenda packet were selected using a key word proxy search which was used to gain a sampling of the Ethnic Studies courses currently offered in California high schools. The director cautioned against viewing these courses as examples of AB 101 or Area H courses because they were submitted to UC for review against the criteria for English or U.S. History. Therefore, it should not

necessarily be surprising if these existing courses are not a fit for the Ethnic Studies subject area. AVP Yoon-Wu remarked that Undergraduate Admissions will not know that a History course is being used to fulfill a requirement for Area H. The vice provost added that the ESIWG's task was to develop criteria that could be implemented as a requirement.

A motion to transmit the proposal for Area H as an admissions requirement was followed by further discussion. There was a question about the number of low-resourced high schools versus schools in high socioeconomic areas that have Ethnic Studies courses, and Director Fischerhall remarked that schools in densely populated urban areas have more of these courses on their A-G list than suburban schools, although this varies widely. Schools in rural areas currently have the least offerings in this area. Concerns about the ability of high schools to hire and train staff and purchase the new textbooks needed to teach Ethnic Studies curriculum when funding is in doubt are legitimate, as are concerns about further impeding access to the UC from already low-sending regions of California. The motion to transmit the proposed Area H requirement, voted on by BOARS in June, to Council for systemwide review was seconded. In an anonymous vote, six members voted against transmitting the proposal, five voted in favor, and one member abstained.

There was an objection to entertaining a motion to transmit the Area H proposal as an admissions recommendation to Council because divisional committees had only considered an Ethnic Studies requirement. Some members asserted that Chair Knowlton should have provided them with a written briefing on an Area H recommendation before today's meeting. Further discussion was tabled.

VI. California High School Accreditation

This issue was not discussed.

VII. Regional/ Institutional Accreditation Terminology

This issue was not discussed.

VIII. Campus Reports/Member Items

This issue was not discussed.

IX. Further Discussion/New Business

This issues was not discussed.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:08 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton