

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

March 1, 2019

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of BOARS March 1, 2019 agenda
Action: The agenda was approved as noticed.
- Approval of draft minutes
Action: The minutes were approved as noticed.
- Approval of Review Item memos
Action: The response to proposed SBL 336 changes will be revised and circulated via email.
Action: The Open Access response was approved as noticed.

II. Chair's Announcements*Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair*

- Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC):
UC, CSU, and CCC are working together to update the IGETC standards in response to AB 705, which suggests verbiage regarding mandatory prerequisites and remedial course work sequences. Changing external realities have made incumbent language too prescriptive.
- Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS) Legislation Day:
Faculty from UC, CSU, and CCC met with legislators and their aides. Many legislators are concerned with faculty diversity. Others discussed the potential general obligation (GO) bond of \$9B for deferred maintenance at UC and CSU (CCC is budgeted together with K-12). Student groups are also actively lobbying for greater resources for California higher education.
- Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF):
This group was formed by and reports to the Academic Council. The first meeting was held February 8, 2019, and there is no predetermined end date. The group is tasked with evaluating the use of standardized tests in the admission process at UC: Do such tests accurately reflect academic preparation and provide predictive validity of student success once at UC? Given differential grading practices at different high schools, are standardized tests a valid cross-population comparison? How would non-resident students be evaluated, absent a-g requirements, if standardized tests are eliminated as requirements? How would any changes impact student diversity, and would any changes impact the eligibility pool?
Data will be prepared by UCOP's office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning, and BOARS members should feel free to contact either Chair Comeaux or UCSF Representative Hasenstaub, BOARS' two representatives to the Task Force, with additional questions or suggestions.

III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Student Affairs*Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director of Undergraduate Admissions**Monica Lin, Director of Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools and Colleges**Tongshan Chan, Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning*

1. Online a-g Course Policy Proposal

With Rob Arena, Senior Director of Online Programs, Johns Hopkins Center for Talented Youth

With Eric Hudson, Director of Teaching and Learning, Global Online Academy

With Brad Rathgeber, Head of School and CEO, One Schoolhouse

Director Lin has revised the proposal by adding random year-end audits to address oversight concerns raised by BOARS previously. Deadlines can be changed, if needed, as well, to ensure students are not disadvantaged should courses not be articulated.

The vendor representatives sought to allay member concerns regarding perceived quality of online courses, accreditation, and testing integrity. While these vendors are accredited, they are not degree-granting; they provide only supplemental course work. Teachers are from the participating schools, and they receive additional training from the vendors regarding online delivery. Additional quality assurance is derived from best practices from independent groups, such as [iNOCAL](#) and [Quality Matters](#). Members suggested seeking WASC accreditation to enhance the national viability of online supplemental course offerings. The participating schools are in charge of monitoring testing authentication and academic integrity; most classes have small sections, which helps teachers and proctors file regular student success outcomes, which range by vendor from weekly to quarterly. Members also noted that most participating schools are independent and therefore more affluent than many public school districts and their attendees. As a consequence, the diversity statistics for online supplemental courses were found wanting.

2. Comprehensive Review Data Preview

Members continue to seek more information on the specifics sought by augmented review requests, wondering if the personal insight questions might be adjusted or if the 14 axes of comprehensive review might be revised. Asking non-applicants to take action, such as through the solicitation of letters of recommendation, continues to trouble many members. Additional data clarifications from the Provost are still pending.

IV. Consultation with the Smarter Balanced Advisory Committee

Linda Darling-Hammond, President, State Board of Education

Tony Alpert, Executive Director, Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Keric Ashley, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, California Department of Education

Michal Kurleander, Professor, UC Davis School of Education

Members reviewed a study led by UC Davis Professor Kurleander concerning the 11th Grade Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC), which the state implemented in 2014-15 to assess student achievement in high school in alignment with the Common Core curriculum. The study compared how well the SBAC, HSGPA, and SAT predicted first-year college outcomes for students enrolled at CSU and UC Davis. UCOP is awaiting data from the California Department of Education to use SBAC data for a systemwide study of UC outcomes.

Members noted that the demographic data reflect the growing segregation in California high schools, wealthy families' access to SAT prep courses, and unequal access to AP and Honors courses across high schools. Members also noted that UC uses SAT scores and high school GPAs to show UC's compliance with the Compare Favorably standard for nonresident admission. BOARS acknowledges that while these indicators are incomplete and imperfect measures for the assessment, they are widely recognizable and useful as general parameters. Some members expressed support for a broader study of the SBAC to help determine its differential value and appropriateness for use in UC admissions, as a potential replacement for the SAT or as an additional factor. Others noted that the UC Davis study showed that the SBAC test does not provide much differential value to the current tests, and despite being free, it would then become another high stakes test with differential impacts on underrepresented communities. An additional challenge is that the test is not available to all non-California students.

V. Campus Reports

Berkeley: no report.

Davis: 1) Some on campus are concerned that the new transfer guarantee, because it builds on TAGS, will cause TAG majors to become overenrolled and then eliminated, causing enrollment management difficulties. Coordinated major enrollment for the system or a referral pool for certain majors have been discussed as safety valves. 2) Since the state retired the API, the campus is seeking a replacement metric.

Irvine: 1) The campus is discussing standards for the use of augmented review, or whether it should be eliminated in favor of adding more personal insight questions. 2) A proposal for an online business school bachelor's degree is being developed.

Los Angeles: 1) Some have raised concerns regarding the efficacy of standardized testing for STEM field applicants. 2) An on-campus symposium, Beyond the Score, was held to address misperceptions held by students about the use of standardized tests in the admissions process. 3) An assessment of holistic rank as a predictor of success is underway. 4) Most requests for augmented review have been for 7th semester grades, usually following a GPA blip.

Merced: 1) The campus seeks clarity on the new transfer guarantee proposal. 2) Capacity limitations on campus have some questioning the future of the freshman referral pool.

Riverside: 1) Some have raised concerns about a perceived lack of STEM faculty on the Standardized Testing Task Force. 2) A local pilot of holistic review has shown a need for greater training of readers. 3) Concerns regarding the new transfer guarantee have been raised. Questions surrounding non-Pathway majors and/or non-TAG majors have arisen, as have questions about being expected to change TAG requirements.

San Diego: 1) Many concerns about the messaging, timing, and implementation of the new transfer guarantee have been raised. 2) The campus will utilize the "wait list" this year, since yield and summer melt issues have been encountered in previous enrollment cycles. 3) Local members have questioned the utility of TOEFL for international transfer students. 4) Parameters for [U-Link](#), a local transfer partnership program with proximate CCCs, are being reassessed.

San Francisco: No report.

Santa Barbara: 1) Local members wonder what repercussions would befall a campus that did not meet the 2:1 transfer enrollment target.

Santa Cruz: 1) Some confusion regarding Compare Favorably reporting and the new SAT has been reported. 2) Outreach to Latinx student populations is being boosted.

VI. Executive Session

Note: Item not addressed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Attendance:

Eddie Comeaux, Chair

Melissa Famulari, Vice Chair

Jill Berrick, Berkeley

Deborah Swenson, Davis

Laura O'Connor, Irvine

Barbara Knowlton, Los Angeles Alternate
Catherine Keske, Merced
David Volz, Riverside
Nancy Kwak, San Diego
Andrea Hasenstaub, San Francisco
Madeleine Sorapure, Santa Barbara
David Smith, Santa Cruz
Kevin Heller, Graduate Student Representative
Jonathan Li, Undergraduate Student Representative