



**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**

**Minutes of Videoconference**

December 6, 2024

In attendance: Deborah Swenson, Chair (UCD), Dave Volz, Vice Chair (UCR), Anant Sahai (UCB), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Lynn Vavreck (UCLA), Mike Cleary (UCM), Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR), Daniel Sievenpiper (UCSD), Michael Stryker (UCSF), Josh Berke (UCSF Alternate), Vanessa Woods (UCSB), George Bulman (UCSC), Bethany Padron (Graduate 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), Liz Terry (Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning), Steven W. Cheung (Chair, Academic Senate), Ahmet Palazoglu (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

**I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

*Steven W. Cheung, Chair and Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

The Regents approved UC's 2025-2026 budget which includes a 9.9% increase in non-resident tuition for new incoming cohorts, one-time funding for capital projects, and a 3.7% range adjustment to the salary scales. The employer contribution to the UC Retirement plan will increase to 15% while the employee contribution rate will remain the same, and the investment office notified the Regents that working capital endowment and pension for the first quarter were up by about 4.5%. Regents Perez and Sherman announced their resignations from the Board, and the governor appointed Bob Myers to fill the position vacated by Perez. The Regents are concerned about with the lack of disciplinary actions for students, staff, or faculty in response to campus disruptions. During the January meeting, Chair Cheung will explain the discipline processes in an effort to dispel the assertion that the Senate is the lead disciplinarian and the bottleneck in misconduct matters.

There is a tentative agreement to extend the contract for UAW represented student employees from the end of next May to January 2026 and no change to the agreed upon 4% salary range adjustment. The contract has a new provision for the creation of a pilot transition position program that affects the small number of graduate students who have an irreparably damaged relationship or conflict with their supervisor. The \$100M in funding for the mortgage origination program will be provided in January and the Office of the President (UCOP) is exploring selling some of those loans to campus foundations that are 501(c)(3) corporations. The UCD division is holding a vote of no confidence on President Drake related to several grievances. The academic advisory committee for the presidential search has met several times and will meet with the Regents Special Committee to review the candidate pool. The searches for the new vice provost for faculty affairs and academic programs and for the new UCR chancellor are moving forward. The search for the new UCSB chancellor is going well although the Senate's request to add faculty from the humanities and fine

arts to the advisory committee was not approved by the Regents. The Senate has proposed having the opportunity to review the final list of faculty representatives on future advisory committees. Chair Cheung and Vice Chair Palazoglu reported on the workgroups on academic calendar alignment, Academic Personnel Manual policies 015 and 016, and the doctoral education.

## **II. Consent Calendar**

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

**Action:** The November 1, 2024 meeting minutes were approved.

## **III. Chair's Announcements**

*Deborah Swenson, BOARS Chair and Dave Volz, BOARS Vice Chair*

The December 2<sup>nd</sup> Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) meeting had a focus on transfer issues such as common course numbering (CCN). The Academic Senate of the California Community College (CCC) system shared several resolutions which include adding a nutrition course to Area 5 of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC); allowing students to receive credit for Cal-GETC for Cambridge International exams; and submitting CCN templates instead of course outlines of record to UC for approval of courses for transfer. Vice Chair Volz attended a meeting of the Cal-GETC Standards Review Committee this week and accepting Cambridge for credit came up. The vice chair informed that committee about the College Board's changes to Advanced Placement (AP) score verification and advised against pressuring UC to accept Cambridge exams due to concerns about AP.

Another topic considered by the Cal-GETC Standards Review Committee was adding a section about partial certification to permit students to complete all but two courses on the Cal-GETC pattern before transfer. The group considered if four courses could be deferred and Vice Chair Volz pointed out that UC's proposal to allow four courses to be deferred is still being reviewed. The CCCs want to permit partial certification so CCC students aiming to transfer in fall 2025 can take advantage of this option if needed. The Standards Review Committee is not interested in having a Cal-GETC specific to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) as this is not the legislative intent of Assembly Bill (AB) 928. The group worries about students who are not in STEM using partial certification.

Vice Chair Volz reported that no faculty or staff from the California State University (CSU) have attended the Standards Review Committee meetings. In May, CSU decided to develop a general education (GE) pattern that mirrors Cal-GETC on the lower division side and this will go into effect in fall 2025. CSU will allow a minimum of C- to be accepted on transferable courses in Area 1 and Area 2, whereas a C is the minimum grade for UC on all courses. CSU campuses will have some autonomy for setting minimum grades for transfer in other Cal-GETC areas. AB 928 does not specify the minimum grade, but it did stipulate that there be a singular pathway for CCC students to transfer to CSU or UC.

## **IV. Consultation with CSU's Admissions Advisory Council**

*Dawn Janke (Cal-Poly SLO, CSU English Council); Dana Nakano (Stanislaus State); Kate Stevenson (CSU Northridge, CSU Math Council); April Grommo (Assistant Vice Chancellor of Strategic Enrollment Management, CSU); Brandon Tuck (Interim Presidential Associate,*

*Community Partnerships & Expanding Access, Cal-Poly Pomona); Kristin Van Gaasbeck (CSU Sacramento); & Ellen Neufeldt (CSU San Marcos)*

Chair Swenson welcomed CSU's Admissions Advisory Council (AAC) members and explained the composition of BOARS, noting that there are numerous issues that affect both CSU and UC. One topic is related to Area C and UC's affirmation of algebra II or Math 3 as a requirement and the decision that data science should not validate those courses. Chair Swenson asked for feedback on the idea of adding another requirement for data science or statistics to A-G. A second topic is the Area H proposal which, if approved by UC, will not increase the number of courses taken in high school but will require that students take a course that meets the ethnic studies criteria set by UC. Recent reports indicate that only 50% of students currently attend high schools that have courses meeting the criteria. One question is if it is useful to require that high schools transform their courses for students to be successful or if CSU is satisfied with the current requirement. AAC members are also asked how well A-G is working for CSU and what changes might be made.

**Discussion:** There is a difference between the Area C Workgroup reaffirming that the math requirement is consistent with the Common Core State standards established by the California Department of Education (CDE) and the Area H proposal telling high schools to conform to UC's ethnic studies criteria. CSU's Admissions Preparation Committee has considered ongoing problems with courses that satisfy Area C and lack of preparation for STEM fields. CSU's Math Council is concerned about Area C and was opposed to data science because of the importance of algebra II content standards. High school teachers report that 60% of entering 9th graders are performing below grade level, and it is critical to have a clear message about minimum preparation. ICAS just approved a new Mathematics Competencies Statement, to be released in January, that tries to make those standards transparent. Chair Swenson remarked that UC is sometimes told it is creating barriers, but faculty worry that students will not be successful without solid preparation.

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo is partnering with high schools to improve college readiness and views foundational math skills as critical for success in STEM. This campus has observed that high schools are combining English and ethnic studies courses, raising concerns about how this impacts students' writing success. UC's proposed ethnic studies requirement is meant to be a non-additive requirement that can be fulfilled with English or history, but it is unclear what this means for teacher preparation and subject matter expertise. UC faculty have seen a decline in writing skills although it varies depending on how selective the campuses and majors are.

The AAC met earlier this week and contemplated how CSU can support the proposed Area H as well as how the two systems can support high schools' implementation efforts. This might consist of offering training or certification to teachers and some thought might also be given to how CCC ethnic studies courses can meet the needs of high school students participating in dual enrollment. Director Fischerhall indicated that UC Scout has developed a semester-long introduction to ethnic studies course which, along with AP African American Studies, was informed by AB 101 and the proposed Area H requirement. The California Teachers Commission has not yet developed a credential focusing on ethnic studies but CSU and UC campuses are developing post-graduate supplementary certifications to expand ethnic studies pedagogical practice and discipline expertise. There is a concern about adding new requirements when it is already challenging to teach existing subjects and for students to learn. A member asserted that the proposed Area H requirement will be a barrier for the least privileged high school students who want to apply to UC. Perhaps it is time to revisit what CSU and UC ask students to learn and to

confirm it is essential content for everyone. The AAC members expressed appreciation for being invited to join BOARS and look forward to the February visit.

## **V. UC Eligibility Areas Proposal**

BOARS has been discussing the UC Eligibility Areas proposal since June and Director Fischerhall has now provided a fact sheet addressing questions raised by the committee. The fact sheet clarifies that it is not common for a course in Cal-GETC to not be part of the UC Eligibility Area pattern. The main reason a course would not also be in an Eligibility Area is that CCC did not submit the course to UC for review and not that a course does not meet UC's criteria. Practical implications of adopting option two include the cost and operational challenges. BOARS has talked about the importance retaining UC's autonomy but Chair Swenson and Vice Chair Volz believe a robust discussion about option one would be beneficial.

**Discussion:** UC-Mathematics (UC-M) is more specific than Cal-GETC in terms of prerequisites and Director Fischerhall indicated that UC has not approved courses for baseline UC transferability in mathematics that would not qualify for UC-M. The director explained that the data in the fact sheet is not weighted by enrollment numbers or incidents of offerings but is based on the existence of the course record in ASSIST from a specific institution. UCSB's committee had an in-depth discussion about option one but objects to setting different math requirements for transfer students and freshman admits. BOARS may want to formally document the transfer articulation Team's process and begin periodically reviewing courses that have been allowed to meet UC's criteria.

Cal-GETC will be reviewed annually which opens the door to potential changes that would lead to a lack of alignment with UC's seven course pattern. UC should confirm that it can veto any modifications to Cal-GETC that could lower standards, and this calls for clearly defining what constitutes lowering a standard. Chair Swenson is concerned about unintended consequences if BOARS makes a rushed decision, and Director Fischerhall confirmed that the status quo can be maintained for the next year. This would not cause confusion, but a high level of administrative complexity will persist, so ideally BOARS will make a decision this academic year. The director noted that activities related to AB 928 and CCN are creating an increasingly complex situation.

Chair Volz explained that the Cal-GETC Standards Review Committee advises ICAS and ICAS is responsible for approving the Standards. Per the ICAS bylaws, all actions require approval of a majority of each segment's members, thus a no vote by the majority of UC's faculty representatives on changes to Cal-GETC would amount to a veto. Director Fischerhall clarified that ICAS will review and vote on the entirety of the Standards document rather than on each individual change. The vote by ICAS could be derailed since CSU faculty have not been at the Standards Review Committee meetings. A member requested examples of courses in physical and biological sciences to better understand the alignment between the UC Eligibility Area and Cal-GETC. Chair Swenson would like members to share the new fact sheet with their divisional committees and the Eligibility Areas proposal will be discussed again in January and February.

## **VI. Consultation with K-12 and Public Input**

The November visit with Provost Newman highlighted legislature concern about lack of coordination between BOARS and K-12, despite dedicated staff in UCOP. For this reason, BOARS discussed how to identify and increase K-12 input. Further, though GUEA consultants interact with

K-12, thought should be given to additional ways to strengthen the collaboration with the primary and secondary segments. When BOARS contemplates items such as A-G standards, it will be desirable to demonstrate that UC has actively engaged with key stakeholders. In February, the provost will be joined by State Board of Education (SBE) President Linda Darling-Hammond. BOARS will use this as an initial opportunity to discuss the issues of the A-G framework as it serves today's students.

**Discussion:** Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu suggested that BOARS meet with representatives from the CDE or SBE on an annual basis to obtain feedback on the committee's priorities and exchange ideas. There might be specific issues that necessitate additional conversations. One suggestion is that K-12 could establish an expert advisory group to be consulted with when a policy is under consideration. It would be prudent for consultations to be informal, as needed, and well before decisions must be made. This topic will be revisited in January in preparation for the February visit with Provost Newman and President Darling-Hammond.

## **VII. (Systemwide Review) Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation (SR) 479**

Chair Swenson drafted a memo outlining the committee's feedback on the proposed revisions to SR 479 and asked if members suggest any changes in advance of submission to Senate Chair Cheung.

**Discussion:** UCD's Engineering Department commented that this is a step in the right direction, but still challenging for majors with higher credit hour requirements. The memo should state that students can complete courses in the physical and/or biological sciences.

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

*Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA; Chase Fischerhall, Associate Director, A-G & Transfer Policy Analysis & Coordination, GUEA; Angelica Moore, Director, Undergraduate Policy & Communications, GUEA; Liz Terry, Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA; & Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP*

Manager Terry shared preliminary data on fall 2025 applications.

Chair Swenson asked members about their views of restoring standardized tests for UC admissions as has been done by many universities. While it would likely still be a challenge to require the SAT/ACT again, faculty have concerns about student preparation and think these tests offer a better understanding of who is being admitted and their preparation, especially in light of grade inflation. Members should weigh in on the value of discussing this matter.

**Discussion:** UCB has a task force that will look at the standardized test issue. There are institutions that receive more detailed information about applicants than UC and faculty at those schools still want standardized test scores. BOARS should keep in mind that the Standardized Testing Task Force conducted a thorough analysis and offered clear recommendations. Director Chang will have a new analysis on admissions in the absence of SAT/ACT scores to present to BOARS on January 3<sup>rd</sup>. Some argued that these tests might not fix the grade inflation issue and that students might decide against applying to UC if they were asked to take the SAT/ACT. It might be useful to look at results of

math and English placement tests to see if they are predictive, but there are concerns about problems with these exams. Even though this is not a perfect indicator, performance in upper division courses might be a better way than SAT scores to assess preparedness.

### **Member Reports/Campus Updates**

UCSC: The committee reviewed transfer admission and admissions cancellation policies regarding who is flagged for failing classes after they have been admitted.

UCD: The members participated in mock application reviews.

UCR: The committee discussed the College Board's changes to AP score verification.

UCI: The committee has been concerned with admissions decisions and is involved in making suggestions.

UCM: Members have been learning about how students receive federal, state, and UC financial aid. Many students at UCM have a family income under \$40K and 85% are Pell grant recipients.

UCB: The committee is considering issues related to governance in terms of what can be delegated to the colleges.

UCLA: The task force working on the ADT pilots has completed its work and majors interested in growing will be involved in the pilot. The effort is now focused on defining what admissions priority looks like operationally. The task force engaged campus units in the conversations and despite concerns that department chairs would see the pilot as an imposition, units are excited about having a dedicated path to more students.

UCSB: The committee discussed the State Auditor's report on transfer and is interested in how advising can be improved. Chair Swenson suggested the advising question could be taken up by ICAS.

UDSD: Faculty on this campus have serious concerns about students' math performance.

### **IX. Executive Session**

There was no Executive Session.

The videoconference adjourned at: 2:20 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Deborah Swenson, Chair