



**UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA** Academic
Senate

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Videoconference Minutes

November 7, 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), Matthew Shahmaram (Undergraduate Student Representative), Linda Darling-Hammond (President, State Board of Education), Catherine Sugar (Chair, University Committee on Educational Policy), Madeleine Sorapure (Chair, Entry Level Writing Requirement Coordinating Council), Bradley Queen (Chair, University Committee on Preparatory Education), Kim Robinson (Principal Counsel, UC Legal), 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), Laura Hardy (Director, Admissions Operations, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research and Planning Analyst, IRAP), Ahmet Palazoglu (Chair, Academic Senate), Susannah Scott (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consent Calendar

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

Action: The October 3rd BOARS minutes were approved.

II. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

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

Chair Palazoglu explained the rumors about the fate of the Presidential Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) which include whether the hiring incentive will be eliminated due to UC's budget crisis. The upcoming Academic Council meeting will include a discussion about the lack of consultation with the Senate about the PPFP. The meetings of the Academic Assembly on October 9th and Academic Council on October 22nd included robust engagement with President Milliken. On October 3rd, the Council issued a statement in response to the suspensions of UCLA's grants and subsequent Department of Justice demands that affirms that any intrusion into UC's academic mission will not be accepted and defends academic freedom. During the October 22nd Council meeting, President Milliken and Board of Regents Chair Reilly reiterated their commitment to academic freedom and stance against external intrusions. Chair Palazoglu described the compact the federal government is pressuring UC and other universities to accept to be eligible for federal funding.

Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Brostrom provided Council with an overview of the 2026-2027 budget. UC has been promised by the state that some deferred funding will be restored and this would

ideally happen before a new governor is elected in 2026. The CFO described proposed modifications to the tuition stability plan that will generate funds for capital projects. The joint Administrative-Senate UC Adaptation to Disruptions Plus Task Force recently launched and will be comprised of a steering committee and workgroups on: research activities and infrastructure; academic personnel evaluations; academic program planning, evaluation and alignment; instructional opportunities and course offerings across modalities; and the future of graduate education.

III. Chair's Updates

Chair Volz indicated that, during Academic Council on October 22nd, Provost Newman continued to advocate for the two-year Degree Plus pilot that is designed to strengthen workforce preparedness for UC undergraduates by integrating rigorous undergraduate degrees with paid internship-based work experience and market-aligned certificate programs. Although the program is still within its early stages, it's unclear whether the pilot competes with UC's Extension programs and the California Community College (CCC) systems certificate-based programs.

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) continues to discuss the common course numbering (CCN) project that involves using templates instead of course outlines of record (CORs) as the sole basis for articulation of CCC courses for transfer credit to the UC and California State University (CSU) systems. UC's ICAS representatives have argued that the CCN templates lack sufficient detail to allow UC to determine if the course content is satisfactory for articulation. UC proposed that the CCC Academic Senate (ASCCC) and Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) identify existing course outlines of record (CORs) across the 115 CCC campuses with UC and CSU articulation agreements that can be aligned with the CCN templates. Chair Volz briefed ICAS on the College Board's changes to how Advanced Placement (AP) exams are scored because the CCCs and CSUs were unaware of the new Evidence Based Standard Setting (EBSS) process. The forthcoming memo about EBSS from BOARS, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) will be shared with ICAS to inform the other segments of UC's position.

Chair Volz developed a charge for a new BOARS Subcommittee on Transfer Issues which will be led by the UCSB representative. The subcommittee will provide BOARS with recommendations on UC transfer programs and practices, as well as policies specific to admissions; periodically review and report on UC programs designed to encourage and support CCC transfer to UC campuses; and, as needed and in consultation with BOARS' leadership, convene faculty for transfer-related projects and activities. The Subcommittee will start with considering strategies to allow for partial certification of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) by CCC students transferring to UC. Another project will be the creation of a systemwide template and guidance for Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) programs, based on the work of UCLA's ADT Pilot Task Force, to help promote consistency as more UC campuses adopt these degrees as sufficient transfer preparation. Undergraduate Admissions may have additional transfer issues for the Subcommittee to consider. Chair Volz asked for three members of BOARS to serve one-year terms on the Subcommittee.

IV. Executive Session

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

V. Preparation for Visit with College Board Representatives

Following BOARS' October meeting, a series of questions about EBSS, prepared in collaboration with UCEP and UCOPE, were sent to the College Board, and the College Board provided a 40-page written response and an example of a briefing book. Representatives from the College Board will join today's videoconference along with State Board of Education President Darling-Hammond, and the chairs of UCEP, UCOPE, and the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) Coordinating Council. Chair Volz indicated that changes to the AP exam scoring system potentially impact the use of credit by exam to fulfill A-G requirements, satisfaction of lower division courses as a freshman or transfer applicant, or placement decisions in subjects such as English and math. Although the College Board largely offered repetitive answers to UC's questions, there are some new details, especially in the briefing book, about how decisions about the exam scores are made and the distribution of scores. The information provided about EBSS also raises questions about the reliability of the College Board's old scoring system. The College Board argues that the higher scores based on EBSS corrects for how the previous scoring system under-predicted performance in subsequent college-level courses.

Discussion: The focus for today's visit with the College Board should be on concerns about the EBSS methodology. BOARS cares about the outcomes for students admitted to UC, so it is important to highlight that the College Board's analysis does not look at students equivalent to those at UC. It was noted that the passing score for the ELWR is set at the systemwide level whereas departments and programs make decisions independently about how AP scores are used for placement or to grant credit by exam. Members pointed out broader considerations related to assertions made by the College Board in their documents including the equating of success on AP exams with desirable learning outcomes.

VI. Visit with College Board Representatives

Trevor Packer, Senior Vice President, Advanced Placement & Instruction; Jennifer Dunn, Vice President, Psychometrics – Learning & Assessment; Amy Hendrickson, Executive Director, Psychometrics – Learning & Assessment; & Leo Cota, Senior Director, Higher Education Strategic Initiatives, Higher Education, Membership, & Access

Chair Volz welcomed the College Board representatives to the videoconference. Senior Vice President Packer thanked the committee for the questions about EBSS and stated that the College Board shares concerns BOARS has about the gap between the proficiencies students develop in high school and their experience when they arrive on a college campus. For 70 years, AP scores have been set on the 1 to 5 scale to represent comparable college grades with the idea that these scores will be valid across colleges regardless of the variations in quality or rigor. Starting in 1995, when the AP program began, to 2000, the methodology was more primitive with a single college professor overseeing an AP subject, and the pass rate of AP exams (the percentage of students who were deemed of learning at a C grade or higher) was consistently 60-80%. Beginning in 2001, when the College Board became concerned about this model and struggled to obtain sound data to make good decisions, a panel-based methodology was introduced. This move resulted in some AP subjects having pass rates as low as 37% while others increased to 96% with the ranges varying year to year.

The College Board then began adopting the EBSS model that expanded the number of college faculty on the panels, and the AP pass rate is again consistent with the historical pass rates and will be more stable over time. Senior Vice President Packer presented data comparing the grades UC students earn in different subjects to students' scores on APs. The College Board sets a high standard for AP students who are followed into college to validate these scores for several years. A campus can ask the College Board to conduct placement validity studies to inform local decisions about appropriate credit and placement scores for their campus. As a result of EBSS, the median pass rate across all AP subjects is now 70%. By way of comparison, 80% of the International Baccalaureate's exams receive a credit qualifying score and 89% of Cambridge students receive a credit qualifying score.

The College Board changed the AP exams in response to significant concerns raised by the National Research Council and the National Science Foundation. Simplistic multiple-choice questions have been replaced with questions that are stimulus-based and require that students demonstrate a set of specific skills. New AP portfolio-based courses, like the AP Seminar Program, involve building bodies of work over the school year and the students in these courses are earning higher first-year college grade point averages (GPA) and have stronger college persistence by three to five percentage points. The College Board is worried about students' reliance upon artificial intelligence and the risks of authenticity; thus, it is working with college faculty to build a secure cloud-based writing environment.

Discussion: Members asked for information regarding validation including inter-rater reliability and indicated that it would be valuable to see what occurs when the same exam is scored using both the old and the new methodology. The College Board's briefing book has details on the reliability of and confidence intervals for the ratings. In terms of how the AP exam matches the college course, the College Board shares the AP course and exam design with higher education faculty who indicate the percentage of time spent on various activities in their course and these studies have not shown more than a 10% difference. The AP course and exam design is based on what the AP program is seeing is important in the higher education courses which is then confirmed by these studies. During the transition to EBSS, there was some overlap of the methodologies used and the College Board looks at the scores resulting from older methodologies when considering modifying scores, but more time and resource intensive methods have not been applied.

The use of EBSS has restored the traditional AP standards in which the pass rate was consistently 60-80% and there is a body of strong predictive validity evidence behind those scores. The College Board indicated that they have sound inter-rater reliability calculations and training processes for how scores are assigned to individual items, and how scores are assigned to individual student papers or test questions has not changed. The College Board's studies about inter-rater reliability will be shared with BOARS although these studies have not been conducted as part of the EBSS process. It was suggested that the College Board should analyze how readers systematically assess against each other to see how raters are functioning in relation to each other over specific readings over time. A member suggested that when the College Board looks at how well students do in college the focus should be on specific learning outcomes and the skills and abilities students have.

Chair Volz explained that BOARS would like to see the workflow that illustrates how the College Board goes from the exam to EBSS to cut decisions in order to understand how bias influences cut scores. Senior Vice President Packer proposed that Executive Director Hendrickson could join

BOARS in the future to review the data for a particular subject to show how the different inputs are evaluated. The Senior Vice President acknowledged the challenges related to how a measurement instrument is accurately used to place a student on a variety of different college campuses. The College Board welcomes feedback on how the AP process might be strengthened, and Senior Vice President Packer asserted that the organization's standards are much more stringent than what is seen at college campuses in general and across other credit by examination programs in high schools.

VII. Debrief: Visit with College Board Representatives

Chair Volz invited members to share their initial perspectives about the discussion with the College Board.

Discussion: Members commented that the College Board did not provide comprehensive answers to the questions BOARS asked and that the representatives implied that the previous scoring methodology was deeply flawed. In light of this discussion, BOARS might think about whether there are simple policy options that should be pursued. Chair Volz explained that the proposed next step is for BOARS to send a memo, with UCEP and UCOPE, to the divisions to ensure that faculty are aware of the College Board's implementation of EBSS so departments and programs can make informed decisions about how AP scores are used for credit by exam. A member of UCR's Undergraduate Admissions Committee analyzed recent data for that campus for APs scored and found a shift in the score distribution for the incoming students for certain AP exams.

VIII. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs & Institutional Research Academic Planning (IRAP)

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

Director Chang provided an overview of IRAP's 2015 analysis of the relationship between AP coursework and UC admissions and completion. The analysis looked at the average number of AP semester courses taken by California resident first year applicants in high school. The high schools were grouped by the Academic Performance Index (API) ranking which was determined by the California Department of Education. The API rankings ended in 2013, so a new indicator will need to be identified for future analyses to understand performance of students in different schools. From 2006 to 2015, the average number of AP semester courses increased, from about 7.6 to 9, and applicants from high schools with higher API ranks were more likely to complete AP courses. The gap in AP course completion between higher and lower API schools widened significantly over the years: in 2006, the difference between the schools was about one semester course (or a half-year-long course) but in 2015, it was about three semester courses. The analysis found that the more AP courses completed by applicants the higher the GPAs tended to be.

Overall, applicants with more AP semester courses were more likely to be admitted to UC. In the earlier years, almost all applicants with six or more AP semester courses were admitted to at least one UC campus. But among 2015 applicants, those who completed 18 or more AP semester courses had an admit rate of nearly 90% compared with 31% for applicants without any AP

coursework. Students who completed more AP semester courses tend to have a higher first-year undergraduate GPA but completing more than 12 AP semester courses does not improve UC performance significantly in terms of first-year GPA and graduation GPA. Overall, students who completed more AP semester courses tended to have a higher four-year and six-year graduation rates. IRAP will update this analysis using data from the last ten years and the results will be presented during the January BOARS meeting. This new analysis will look at all Honors courses and may shed light on the impact of the pandemic and the elimination of standardized tests for admissions.

Discussion: The data suggests that there is a certain point at which the number of APs is not predictive of graduation rates or changes in GPA at UC. A concern is that students are taking numerous APs to be competitive for selective schools even though UC does not count them all for the official GPA.

IX. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCM: The committee is discussing transfer programs and enrollment strategies which impact admissions decisions and standards. The campus is not meeting the 2:1 ratio of first year to transfer students so there is interest in utilizing ADTs and creating other pathways for local community college students.

UCD: The committee is concerned about the College Board's elimination of the landscape data which helped provide contextual evidence around opportunity for UCD applicants, so there is an effort to identify other sources of data that can serve the same purpose.

UCI: The committee is learning more about admissions and enrollment management. President Milliken will visit the campus next week and will meet with the divisional Senate cabinet.

UCSD: A Senate-administration workgroup on admissions is looking at the lack of preparedness of the freshman class. Between 10 to 15% of first-year students do not have the minimum level of math skills and this raises questions about grade inflation because many students do not have the preparation necessary for college.

UCR: The committee looked at the academic index score the campus uses for admissions which is primarily based on GPA as well as factors such as how many APs taken and found that, for the College of Engineering, the score is not predictive of how well students do in their math placement for the 20th and 80th percentiles. The committee is contemplating how to address this concerning finding.

UCSB: The admissions office asked the representative to recommend that BOARS discuss the use of the digital SAT for satisfaction of the systemwide Entry Level Writing Requirement. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated that UCOPE has not considered the digital SAT because UC does not have the data to analyze the scores since the standardized test is not required for admission. The local committee is looking at data from this year's freshman class and finding sizable variance in how dual enrollment is flagged on transcripts.

The meeting adjourned at: 3 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: David Volz, Chair