

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Videoconference Minutes

Friday, March 1, 2024

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Nicholas Mathew (UCB), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Lynn Vavreck (UCLA), Charlie Eaton (UCM), Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), Joshua Berke (UCSF), Paul Spickard (UCSB), George Bulman (UCSC), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate Student Representative), 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 (Senior Policy and Research Specialist, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, 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*

The Regents' proposed policy on posting political statements on department websites is undergoing an expedited systemwide review, and Chair Steintrager noted that implementation will be complicated. Academic Council discussed the Regents action on Senate Regulation (SR) 630.E which set a maximum number of online courses that undergraduates can take toward their degrees. With little discussion and no opportunity for the Senate to answer questions, the Regents voted to disapprove the proposed regulation on February 14th. The Board also affirmed campus autonomy and the Senate is trying to determine if this means that the Compendium processes related to undergraduate programs will need to be modified. In light of recent announcements about major universities deciding to require standardized test scores for admission, Chair Steintrager posited that UC should study the impact of the Regents' decision to not use these scores at UC. The Senate had concerns that not requiring standardized test scores would negatively impact the diversity of the student body.

Chair Steintrager indicated that the state budget situation is not good. The state's plan is to hold back the 5% increase called for in the compact and for UC's enrollment to grow as stipulated, but more concrete information will be available after the May revise. The current thinking is that the rate of inflation makes it important to follow through on the salary plans for faculty and unrepresented staff. Provost Newman's congress on artificial intelligence took place yesterday, and the provost is planning congresses on online education, research, and academic freedom. Later in March, there will be a presentation to the Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee on the Area C Workgroup recommendations. The proposed Assembly Constitutional Amendment 6 (ACA-6), which has been reintroduced after not passing last year, would impose state labor regulations on UC. The Office of the President pushed back on ACA-6 because it is not consistent with how UC organizes its labor and to protect the autonomy of the University. The Senate is preparing an opposition letter to the proposed amendment to express the faculty perspective about the legislation.

Discussion: The Standardized Testing Task Force recommended exploring alternatives to the SAT and ACT, and the Feasibility Study Workgroup subsequently decided that the Smarter Balanced Assessment has limitations and that it would not be viable for UC to design its own exam. Director Chang indicated that IRAP is starting to examine data related to standardized test scores, noting that it could be difficult to decouple the impact of COVID-19 and test free admissions on student performance after their first or second year. It might be that UC is making greater use of Advanced Placement (AP)

exams in the absence of SAT/ACT, resulting in unintended consequences since AP exams are more expensive and more selective in some ways.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

Action: The February 2, 2024 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved with a correction.

III. Chair's Announcements

The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) is looking forward to receiving the committee's feedback on its proposals related to deferring some general education (GE) requirements and to streamline criteria for transfer admission guarantees. ACSCOTI is focused on Assembly Bill 928 which aims to make the processes for transferring to UC and the California State University (CSU) systems as similar as possible to make it easier for students. However, preparation for some majors at CSU and UC differs and associate degrees for transfer (ADTs) are set up to support students who are transferring to the CSU system not to UC. Trying to shoehorn the preparation that UC would like into an ADT is difficult. ACSCOTI had a lengthy discussion with the vice president for Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs and the associate vice president for State Government Relations about communicating the progress UC is making on identifying when ADTs can be beneficial to students heading to UC.

The Academic Assembly met on February 22 and the main agenda topic was a proposed change to Senate Bylaw 55 to give teaching professors (also known as lecturers with security of employment) full voting rights. Although the proposal was supported by several Senate committees, there was opposition against a blanket policy and a preference for leaving decisions about teaching professors' voting rights up to individual departments. The vote on this matter was tabled until the Assembly's next meeting. Academic Council discussed the implications of the Regents vote to disapprove SR 630.E, and Chair Knowlton explained that the campus experience requirement was proposed in part because there are implications for the accreditation of online undergraduate degree programs (OUDPs). The Regents' stated motivations to have OUDPs include increasing access for students in remote areas or who cannot afford to come to a UC campus. Chair Knowlton indicated that there are equity issues related to online programs including low rates of completion.

Discussion: The committee expressed concerns about shared governance and the Regents desire for OUDPs. The analyst shared that the new Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Undergraduate Education is just starting its work and it is unclear why the Regents would not wait until its report before acting on SR 630.E. While it is possible that the administration could provide funding to faculty as an incentive to teach in OUDPs, an open question is whether there could be a mandate from the Regents to offer these programs.

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); 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*

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained the most common external exams used for credit by exam are AP, International Baccalaureate (IB), and Cambridge A Levels, however new courses and exams are being developed and offered in high schools. The Cambridge curriculum is gaining in relevance and

is being offered like the IB in U.S. high schools, including in California. When a new AP exam is introduced or if there is a significant curricular update, there is a standard process which entails Undergraduate Admissions asking faculty in the relevant discipline, identified by the Senate, to review the content of the course and exam. The faculty recommend if systemwide credit should be offered for the exam for a specific score. More organizations are asking UC to review their curriculum and there are questions about if UC gives preference to AP and IB and whether new exam boards will be honored in the admissions process. However, awarding of credit may also be related to articulation and, while BOARS has made decisions about credit by exam in the past, there is a question about the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) or the Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) being involved in this process. Undergraduate Admissions has drafted a problem statement which recommends how BOARS and the other two committees might identify the process.

Chair Knowlton discussed credit by exam with UCEP and that committee has a higher bar because it will consider granting credit for a comparable college course whereas BOARS is looking at an exam showing proficiency. BOARS may be open to allowing more exams if there are no issues with security or integrity but there are other questions members should contemplate. For example, it is not clear if a high school student who received a score of 5 on the AP Calculus exam, but did not take the course, can satisfy the Area C requirement. Taking these exams may be a good way for students, particularly those who were homeschooled or whose education was interrupted, to fulfill the A-G requirements. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated that credit by exam can have an impact on transfer admissions since AP credit will be used towards fulfilling the minimum transferable units to apply as a junior level transfer. It is important for students to know in advance if they are eligible to apply for transfer admission.

Discussion: Campuses will decide if a score on an exam will count for credit toward a major or a degree. The associate vice provost explained that there are new exams that individual campuses are approving for credit, and BOARS may want standards for whether these exams meet A-G requirements. One UC campus may allow transfer students to transfer these exam credits but another campus might not permit it, and it would be in UC's best interest to establish systemwide credit by exam policies and minimize the differences among campuses. Chair Knowlton indicated that BOARS could collaborate with UCEP to develop the policies and the analyst explained that UCEP members do not appear to support expanding the use of credit by exam for credit toward a degree. When the admissions directors met with BOARS in November they were in favor of expanding the use of credit by exam to satisfy A-G requirements and indicated that there are a few new exams that are becoming more common for which students could be awarded credit.

UC faculty have recommended against offering credit for some AP exams after they were reviewed. It was noted that there is no rubric for evaluating any of these exams. Exams that do not require that students have taken a course could be novel and innovative so it would be valuable to have standards related to the length and content of the exam and its administration. Undergraduate Admissions requests this information for the reviews, and Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu shared that since the College Board has not given UC access to the materials needed to thoroughly review the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) the faculty have declared that no credit will be offered for it. The California Community College (CCC) and CSU systems give students credit for CLEP because they have a focus on granting credit for prior learning.

There is a question about whether decisions about awarding credit for certain exams will change the applicant pool or influence who is admitted to UC. Chair Knowlton speculated that a student could demonstrate their eligibility for review and satisfaction of an A-G requirement by passing an exam that shows that they have covered the material. If UCEP decides course credit can be awarded for an exam, it would be difficult for BOARS to argue that same exam cannot be used to satisfy an A-G requirement. Director Fischerhall remarked that the CSUs may be mandated to accept or do something

by the legislature and, although UC is not required to follow suit, it would be helpful to figure out how to communicate with the state regarding UC's position with respect to credit by exam.

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained that UCOPE decided that AP Seminar and AP Research could be used to satisfy the Entry Level Writing Requirement while BOARS concluded that these courses did not align with a specific UC subject area for UC elective credit. A member is concerned about creating more pathways that could allow students to circumvent the standard admissions requirements and suggested that the campuses should be directly involved with identifying the faculty who review the exams for quality rather than leaving the selection of faculty up to Undergraduate Admissions. Chair Knowlton proposed asking the admissions directors to provide information about the most common exams beyond AP and IB that should be evaluated and to suggest how they should be viewed in the admissions context. The associate vice provost stated that it would be valuable to have criteria for when Undergraduate Admissions will agree to bring a new exam to BOARS for review. Undergraduate Admissions wants to ensure consistency, equity, and integrity at the systemwide level in how these exams are reviewed and for how new exams are considered. It could make sense to develop criteria based on the exams that have historically been used. The BOARS members who work on the criteria could also think about whether the exams should regularly be reviewed again by subject matter experts after a specific period of time, not just when curricular changes are made.

Action: The UCD and UCR representatives volunteered to work on the criteria for reviewing exams for credit by exam and prepare a draft to share with BOARS in May.

V. Criteria for Evaluating High School Accreditors

- *Vice Chair Swenson (UCD), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), & Paul Spickard (UCSB)*

Since it is not possible for UCOP to evaluate all of the high schools, UC relies on accreditors to verify that the schools are offering instruction at the required level and to supervise their A-G lists. The need for criteria to evaluate accreditors originally came up at BOARS in 2020 when the committee decided to allow regional accreditors to manage this work. It was agreed that the preference would be for schools to be accredited by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) and to require a detailed explanation if schools want to use a different accreditor. Vice Chair Swenson worked with the UCSD and UCSB representatives to devise recommendations that preserve the current process. In line with the recent UCEP decision about regional and institutional accreditors, the first recommendation is that accreditation for California high school A-G lists be limited to the current set of accepted accreditors. Vice Chair Swenson noted that the CSU's are now accepting a much larger set of accreditors and the workgroup does not agree with expanding the approved agencies.

The second recommendation is a continued preference for evaluation by WSCUC but if a high school wants to use another accreditor, it must make a compelling argument for another currently accepted accreditor. The third recommendation is to update the references to accreditors, given changes in designations/names if needed, as spurred by the 2018 changes in Department of Education accreditor references and as specified in UCEP's decision. The fourth recommendation is to implement quality checks in an effort to strike a balance between the maintenance of UC standards and uniformity, while avoiding the downsides of monopoly. The UCSD representative added that while UC does not want schools to shop for accreditation, there is a desire to avoid creating a monopoly. Monitoring and accountability could involve looking at how students perform at UC based on the accreditation their high school received, and UC might ask the agencies to regularly report the complaints they receive. Another issue, according to the UCSB representative is the proliferation of accrediting agencies in the last decade which are unlike the regional agencies that have similar principles. High schools in other states are turning to alternative accreditors that may have limited views of education, and UC should avoid this situation.

Discussion: Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu appreciates that the recommendations are consistent with UCEP's recent decisions. The UCSB representative indicated that it is not clear how Cognia should be handled. Cognia is the accreditor for 65 of the almost 3k schools that are registered in the A-G course management portal and it accredits what appear to be online high schools. Director Fischerhall indicated that Cognia is the only significant outlier as the vast majority of high schools are accredited by WSCUC, and UC does not have a way to measure Cognia's outcomes or quality. This organization was rebranded in 2019 after three regional accreditors merged, and Cognia is one reason Undergraduate Admissions wanted BOARS to develop criteria and independent measures to evaluate accreditors. It is likely that increasing numbers of students applying to UC in the future will have degrees from online high schools, so this deserves attention.

A high school or school serving grades 9-12 must have active accreditation to establish and maintain an A-G list in UC's A-G Course Management Portal (CMP). The process involves the broader accreditation of the high school itself, similar to how UC campuses go through accreditation every seven years. The accreditors meet with the high school to observe classes and the school performs a self-study which leads to recommendations about changes that should be made in an ongoing quality control process. Director Fischerhall confirmed that when a school applies or reapplies for accreditation, an explanation about why WSCUC is being used will be required.

Action: A motion to approve the four recommendations was made and seconded, and the committee voted unanimously in support of it.

VI. Proposals from Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)

Chair Knowlton reminded members that a student with a transfer admission guarantee (TAG) agreement and a certain grade point average (GPA) will be guaranteed admission at six UC campuses. TAGs are useful for enrollment management especially for majors that have room for students. UCB, UCLA and UCSD do not offer TAGs because it would be difficult to manage enrollment and these campuses have several very highly impacted majors. Since TAGs grew organically on each campus the criteria vary and ACSCOTI suggested that the justification for the differences should be re-examined to determine if the criteria can be standardized, which would be beneficial.

Admissions directors are generally supportive of this proposal and a first step may be to come up with examples of criteria that could be standardized for their review, with faculty having final approval. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu clarified that ACSCOTI is recommending standardization of the administrative requirements for TAGs, but every campus would still maintain its own major preparation and GPA requirements. The associate vice provost shared the ACSCOTI proposal with the admission directors who indicated that some of the administrative requirements were requested specifically by school deans, so these administrators would need to be consulted and any changes should be agreed upon by them and divisional committees. The admissions directors are already working on this matter and would like to have any changes decided upon by May when the updated TAG matrix will be published.

BOARS is asked to endorse a set of proposals from ACSCOTI related to the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) and approval of this proposal will demonstrate faculty support to the AB 928 Implementation Committee. Chair Knowlton explained that students can complete GE requirements for CSU or UC at a community college by fulfilling Cal-GETC, allowing students to focus only on the courses required for their majors after transferring. Students can also transfer without having completed Cal-GETC and take the GE courses required by their UC campus. ACSCOTI is proposing that students using Cal-GETC be permitted to complete four courses after they transfer to a UC campus instead of just two. This flexibility will allow students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields in particular to complete courses needed for appropriate preparation for their major before transferring.

Discussion: UCR's admissions committee was unaware of the campus's unique requirement and the admissions directors will consult with the relevant departments regarding the need for that condition. UCLA's committee observed that the different requirements and pieces of legislation makes the case for simplification, but as this campus develops its associate degrees for transfer, there are questions about the implications if all transfer students will have priority in admissions. There is confusion about who is driving the changes and perhaps the various programs for students transferring to the UC system should be reprioritized. Chair Knowlton responded that the pressure is coming from the legislature which views the transfer system as complex in spite of metrics showing that UC meets the 2:1 freshman to transfer student admission ratio and that transfer students have great outcomes including high two-year graduation rates. TAGs will not work well for UCLA because, even with a 4.0 required GPA in certain courses, there would be more students than this campus could admit.

The analyst mentioned external advocacy groups that have immense influence on state lawmakers and remarked that UC's data showing positive outcomes is dismissed. UCB does not offer TAGs but the committee wants to ensure that faculty are involved with decisions about curriculum. From the perspective of the people handling admissions, it is helpful for students to have multiple ways to transfer to UC so the campus can reach its desired outcomes. Therefore, there is a question about how UC acquiesces with what the state wants without completely relinquishing the autonomy necessary for managing the transfer system.

The ACSCOTI proposal to permit students to complete Cal-GETC after transferring raised concerns about decreasing demand for some GE courses at the CCCs leading to an increased demand for them at UC and it would be good to understand the scale of this. Administrators at UCSC requested more details about eligibility, such as if the policy would apply to students who transfer to UC as sophomores. The administrators also pointed out the workload associated with having to acquire students' Cal-GETC certification from the CCCs. Chair Knowlton confirmed that ACSCOTI's second proposal is specific to physics because that committee is examining how to make ADTs work for specific STEM majors. UCSC's committee agrees with ACSCOTI's third proposal to give students who complete a UC Transfer Pathway and partial Cal-GETC (which does not yet exist officially, per ICAS) the same priority admission as students with ADTs.

UCR's committee is concerned that ACSCOTI's first proposal to have separate GE requirement completion pathways for freshmen and transfer students will cause implementation issues and impose a burden on advising staff. This committee appreciates the flexibility the second proposal will afford students in physics but would like more time to study the third proposal. Vice Chair Swenson observed that the changes outlined in the three ACSCOTI proposals will benefit students by giving them the flexibility to start preparing for their major while at a CCC and to complete some GE requirements after transferring. The admissions committee at UCD did not object to the first and second proposals but opined that the proposal for equal treatment for partial completion of Cal-GETC would create work. UCD does not consider whether a student has completed GE beyond the minimum seven course pattern, focusing instead on major preparation and achievement as demonstrated by GPA in transferable coursework. It is unclear how this campus will verify ADTs in the application process or assess the Cal-GETC coursework students have completed.

Chair Knowlton remarked that critics of UC want every student who obtains an ADT and a certain GPA to be guaranteed admission to UC, but this simplistic approach is problematic. ACSCOTI is trying to identify ways to comply with AB 928 that will not harm students. The chair will share the members' feedback with ACSCOTI.

Action: A motion to endorse the three ACSCOTI proposals was made, seconded, and followed by a unanimous vote.

VII. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCSC: In January the committee discussed various admissions scenarios. Topics discussed during the most recent meeting included transfer, Area C, and the systemwide review of the Area H proposal.

UCD: The committee focused on the ACSCOTI proposals.

UCLA: The ADT task force is getting underway and the committee is soliciting input on the Area H proposal from relevant campus stakeholders.

UCSD: In February, the committee talked about the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) glitch and the campus extended the SIR deadline for first-year students by two weeks. There will be other problems as a result of what happened including difficulty foreseeing melt and whether the campus will reach its enrollment target. Agenda topics also included Area C and Area H, how to evaluate and report on the effectiveness of holistic review, and possible experiments with outreach to admitted students to ensure they come to campus.

UCB: This campus committee also discussed the budget implications from the FAFSA delay. There were also discussions about Area C and Area H.

UCR: For the fall admissions cycle, the campus will pilot the inclusion of college courses in some first-year calculations. The committee discussed the ACSCOTI proposals and Area C.

UCM: The committee is reviewing proposals for new majors including the predicted enrollment in them, but there are concerns about the availability of resources for these majors. Application rates to the campus are good and it is hoped this leads to enrollment growth. The campus is thinking about how to handle online degrees and BOARS members are invited to contact the representative if they want to participate in a multi-campus conversation. UCM anticipates using admissions by exception more this year as the campus was well below what is permitted last year.

UCI: The committee discussed the ACSCOTI proposals and dissatisfaction with how its input is taken into account by the admissions office.

VIII. New Business

The UCSC campus admissions directors have reported that students may have advanced math but not geometry and believe this should be examined. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu indicated it would be challenging to explain to students who have taken multivariate calculus or other very advanced math courses that the lack of geometry is a problem. Additionally, it is not clear if students are not being admitted to UC because they have not taken geometry or if admissions by exception is used to address this.

The UCSF representative would like to discuss personal insight questions at a future meeting.

IX. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:30 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton