

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Meeting Minutes

Friday, February 2, 2024

**Attending:** Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Nicholas Mathew (UCB), Susan Gentry (UCD alternate) (videoconference), Yuri Shirman (UCI) (videoconference), Lynn Vavreck (UCLA) (videoconference), Charlie Eaton (UCM) (videoconference), Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR) (videoconference), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), Joshua Berke (UCSF), Paul Spickard (UCSB) (videoconference), George Bulman (UCSC), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate Student Representative), Bethany Padron (Graduate Student Representative) (videoconference), Ani Adhikari (Chair, Area C Workgroup, UCB), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs (GUEA)), Katie Leslie (Associate Director, High School (A-G), GUEA), Angelica Moore (Director, Undergraduate Admission Policy and Communications, GUEA), Liz Terry (Senior Policy and Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)) (videoconference), Matt Reed (Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Monica Lin (Executive Director, Academic Senate), 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 reported that last week's Regents' meeting included discussions about proposed policies on employing undocumented students and posting political statements on department websites. This past Wednesday, Academic Council discussed the proposed Area H – Ethnic Studies requirement and members voted to send the proposal out for systemwide review. There are questions about the Area C Workgroup's phase I recommendations related to implementation and the guidance that high schools will require. Chair Steintrager supports the Workgroup's recommendations but pointed out that the public will need clear information about implementation. The governor's budget, which has just been released, is now subject to the May revise. While UC's compact with the governor is still in place, the expected 5% increase is being deferred by one year.

**II. Consent Calendar**

**Action:** Today's agenda was approved.

**Action:** The January 5, 2024 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved with corrections.

**III. Chair's Announcements**

This item was not discussed.

**IV. Consultation with Undergraduate Admissions & Institutional Research & Academic Planning**

- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (GUEA)*
- *Katie Leslie, Associate Director, High School Articulation (A-G), 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 (IRAP)*
- *Matt Reed, Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP*

Chair Knowlton explained that Undergraduate Admissions prepared a frequently asked questions (FAQs) document to help ensure the faithful implementation of the Area C Workgroup's (ACW) phase I recommendations. The FAQ document is for internal use by the Office of the President but should be finalized by the time the ACW report becomes publicly available so Undergraduate Admissions can respond to inquiries. Undergraduate Admissions staff attempted to identify the kinds of questions high schools are likely to ask about the recommendations. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu requested that BOARS review the draft FAQs to confirm the accuracy of the proposed responses. Once the language in the FAQs is solidified, Undergraduate Admissions will begin devising language for public announcements and the UCOP website.

**Discussion:** Data from Undergraduate Admissions shows that only 33 students systemwide validated algebra II with a statistics course in 2021-2022 and these students probably took Advanced Placement Statistics. A key point is that the ACW has not recommended any changes to policy but rather a clarification of existing BOARS policy. The FAQs aim to make it clear that UC is supportive of the innovation and experimentation happening in high schools, but this cannot come at the expense of core mathematics courses and some courses do not prepare students as well for college-level math as well as others. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated that the submission cycle for review of courses for the 2024-2025 academic year began on February 1<sup>st</sup> and it would be disruptive to students currently in high school to implement the proposed recommendations now. Undergraduate Admissions advised that the policy clarification should go into effect for 2025-2026 to give the Office of the President enough time to provide the necessary guidance to schools and for students to be informed. One message BOARS wants to send is that data science courses are valuable ways to learn data literacy. Members expressed concerns about equity, the lack of advising in some high schools, and the inability of some schools to help students gain the skills needed to prepare for algebra II. The committee also considered the recommendation that the recommended fourth year of math should build on the previous three years.

## **V. Member Reports/Campus Updates**

This item was not discussed.

## **VI. Consultation with the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)**

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, ACSCOTI (UCD) (videoconference)*
- *Onuttom Narayan, Vice Chair, ACSCOTI (UCSC)*

BOARS has been asked to review proposals from ACSCOTI regarding streamlining the campus-specific transfer admissions guarantee requirements and regarding partial completion of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC). Chair Chalfant remarked that it would be particularly valuable for this committee to support the position that general education (GE) requirements should not displace major preparation. The ACSCOTI chair explained that the Assembly Bill 928 Implementation Committee recently called for the creation of new transfer model curricula leading to associate degrees for transfer (ADTs) in certain science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) majors. However, ACSCOTI has concluded that ADTs have constraints which will not work for many STEM majors. UC faces external pressure to accept ADTs and to extend the same transfer guarantees as the California State University (CSU) system. UC's guarantees are major specific and apply to essentially every major, not just the ones that track to ADTs, however, critics object to campuses having differing rules. ACSCOTI argues it is possible to make the process of securing TAG agreements more consistent across the six campuses offering them, an effort that would entail BOARS working with campus admissions directors to align criteria that are unrelated to academics. Chair Chalfant thinks streamlining the criteria may be appreciated by UC's critics, many of which have significant influence.

Vice Chair Narayan pointed out that TAGs emerged as a way to promote transfer without an overarching policy, and this resulted in each campus developing its own administrative procedures. Each campus's conditions for TAGs might be reasonable, but there are nine unique restrictions which the TAG matrix on the UCOP website clearly illustrates. The matrix should also denote all requirements campuses have so that transfer students are not surprised by unwritten policies. While ACSCOTI posits that some conditions might be simplified or removed, BOARS members should review the TAG matrix with their campus admissions directors to determine if their unique criteria are genuinely needed. Alternatively, to foster coordination across the campuses, the admissions directors might meet first and bring recommendations to their divisional Senate admissions committees. Chair Chalfant emphasized the importance of faculty making decisions about the courses required for a major. Streamlining the criteria for TAGs would be a straightforward change that could simplify transfer and demonstrate to legislators that UC is responsive to their concerns.

Assembly Bill 928 calls for the creation of ADTs that will prepare students for both the California State University and UC systems. From the beginning, ACSCOTI has asserted that it will not be possible to fit all of the Cal-GETC courses along with all the courses UC deems relevant for major preparation into even a modified 66-unit ADT, especially not for majors like chemistry and chemical engineering. ACSCOTI proposes that students be allowed to fulfill Cal-GETC across four years if this would enable them to complete what is essential for major preparation. UC would advise transfer students in a major with demanding lower division major preparation units to take all the courses in the UC transfer pathway and as much Cal-GETC as they can, and these students would be given priority admission. With encouragement from BOARS, each campus could permit students to defer four courses to create some room under the unit cap. One downside of this proposal is it may decrease the number of students taking the local GE patterns campuses are invested in, but this is outweighed by the value of students being well-prepared for their major. Members will discuss this proposal with their divisional committees to confirm that there is agreement before BOARS offers its endorsement.

**Discussion:** When the admissions directors join BOARS in June, Chair Knowlton would like to hear about their progress toward aligning the TAG criteria. ACSCOTI is not inclined to recommend that UCB, UCLA, and UCSD adopt TAG agreements because these would not be a useful way to go about enrollment management at these campuses.

## **VII. Credit by Exam Workgroup with the Committee on Educational Policy**

This item was not discussed.

## **VIII. Area C Workgroup Phase I Report and Recommendations**

- *Ani Adhikari, Chair, Area C Workgroup (UCB)*

Chair Knowlton welcomed the chair of the Area C Workgroup (ACW), Ani Adhikari, who joined BOARS to discuss the goals of phase II of the workgroup's charge and to continue discussing the FAQs about the phase I recommendations. Chair Adhikari explained that the ACW has tried to balance UC's mission to serve California students with maintaining excellence and is making decisions based on data. The ACW assumes that math is required for entrance into UC and that there is a need to closely examine the content of required math courses as well as to articulate what constitutes data science. The ACW members have listened respectfully to one another and are trying to do their best for UC.

The chair of BOARS described the committee's earlier discussion about the definition of advanced math and the different categories of advanced math that would be appropriate for a fourth year course. Some advanced math courses may validate algebra II whereas others are sufficiently advanced to be a recommended fourth year course such as AP statistics, but do not validate algebra II. There is another category of math courses that are interdisciplinary in nature and are not more advanced, like data science, which might be more appropriate for Area G than Area C. Chair Knowlton posited that the

ACW or another group of subject matter experts could provide more clarity about the standards for data science courses that would place them in the advanced math category that would extend math understanding past the foundation courses. Chair Adhikari remarked that the ACW could make recommendations to BOARS about what the fourth year of math should be and suggest if Senate regulations need to change. The CSU faculty participating on the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senate's Mathematics Competencies Subcommittee will join the ACW for phase II and Chair Adhikari appreciates that these faculty have already been considering the types of math preparation student should have for different disciplines.

**Discussion:** UC faculty who expect students to be well-prepared for college math might not recognize that some school districts can only offer a minimal number of math classes to all of their students. Algebra II is a barrier course for many students and it is often not taught effectively. It would be helpful if the ACW could recommend different ways to teach math but this would be difficult to do in four months. Chair Adhikari asserted that it would be an achievement if the ACW is able to identify the elements of algebra that are crucial to what students will do in the future. Furthermore, this information could be shared widely through video recordings demonstrating how these concepts should be taught. The committee talked about the ways UC could support the professional development of K-12 educators.

The ACW would like the A-G Articulation unit to share examples of classes where articulation was difficult to determine and this will inform the group's thinking. The workgroup recommended establishing a set of experts to review classes when whether or not they meet the standards is unclear, and Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu remarked that having such a faculty review process could be helpful especially in the early stages of implementation. Chair Adhikari participated in BOARS' continued discussion about Undergraduate Admissions' FAQ document. It was agreed that the ACW will consider the FAQs and send feedback to the Associate Vice Provost and Chair Knowlton. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu will also send the workgroup chair a list of the various webpages where language will have to be changed. Once the FAQs are finalized, ACW's phase I report will be formally transmitted to the Associate Vice Provost and it will become publicly available at this point.

## **IX. Executive Session**

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:41 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton