



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS Videoconference Minutes March 7, 2025

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 & 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 (Manager, Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP), & Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consent Calendar

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

Action: The February 7, 2025 meeting minutes were approved.

II. BOARS Leadership Updates

Deborah Swenson, Chair & Vice Chair Volz

A special meeting of the Assembly of the Academic Senate in February focused on UC's information security investment plan, the timing of faculty cost of living adjustments, and the high cost of health plan premiums. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is planning its annual Legislative Day when the members will meet with legislators or their staff to talk about concerns shared by the California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU) and UC systems. The topics include funding for the segments, ongoing support for students, and recognition that the three systems contribute in different ways. ICAS also discussed the issue of CCC courses that had been approved for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and will not be eligible for the new California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) because they were deactivated, but there may be consensus that those courses should count for Cal-GETC.

The recent Academic Council discussed potential challenges including federal government actions affecting the National Institutes of Health and Department of Education, as well as uncertainty related to the state budget. Council also heard that there are concerns about the effects of the budget environment on research productivity, and the adverse implications of budgetary problems on the tenure process for junior faculty. Chair Cheung shared that the pool of candidates to replace President Drake has been narrowed to 30 individuals. Council also received updates on the discussions regarding potential changes to faculty discipline processes.

Vice Chair Volz reported on topics under consideration by the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) including the proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 479. Academic Council approved the proposal to permit students to take either two biological science or two physical science courses. However, Council did not approve the proposal to allow students to defer up to four courses until after transfer, and Vice Chair Volz has asked IRAP to generate data on the potential increase on faculty and administrative workload.

Vice Chair Volz reported that, during a recent intersegmental meeting, CSU representatives objected to giving students flexibility in the Cal-GETC Standards subject areas 5A and 5B, citing concerns about the impact on accreditation of their engineering programs. The reasons behind CSU's position are unclear and it is disappointing given the positive collaboration between the CCCs and UC. ACSCOTI will examine the four biology-specific Transfer Pathways to determine if any revisions are needed. One idea is to consolidate the four pathways into a single life science UC Transfer Pathway because they have the same course expectations, and this would simplify the expectations for students intending to transfer. Another idea is to allow students to complete either calculus-based physics with lab or organic chemistry with lab depending on what is available at their CCC. Vice Chair Volz contacted department chairs and deans who oversee life science programs at the UC campuses to solicit feedback from faculty about these ideas.

Chair Swenson announced that the Regents have decided that implementation of the Area C Workgroup's recommendations will be delayed one year. This decision comes amid proposed legislation introduced over the past month: Assembly Bill (AB) 684 calls for BOARS to have open meetings; AB 1217 calls for consultation with the State Board of Education (SBE) before changes are adopted; and AB 500 requires consultation with the SBE and CSU's Board of Trustees. BOARS will discuss this matter, including revising Senate Bylaw 145, later in the meeting.

III. Artificial Intelligence (AI) & the Admissions Process

Jim Steintrager, Chair, Academic Senate AI Workgroup

Immediate Past Senate Chair Steintrager, chair of the Academic Senate's AI Workgroup, explained that the focus of the Workgroup is generative AI in the context of issues under the Senate's purview and the authorities delegated to the Senate by the Regents which includes curriculum degree requirements and admissions. The AI Workgroup has subgroups on instruction; research; data stewardship; and first-year and transfer undergraduate admissions and graduate admissions into academic and professional degree programs. The effort started with the articulation of principles based on analyses of concrete cases across various domains, and the Workgroup members are interested in identifying areas where trade-offs might be necessary.

The principles formulated by UC's AI Council are appropriateness; transparency; accuracy; reliability; safety; fairness and nondiscrimination; privacy and security; human values; shared benefit and prosperity; and accountability. However, these principles were developed prior to the release of ChatGPT and broad access to generative AI technologies so they may need to be reconsidered. It was noted that the AI Council was comprised almost exclusively of administrators. The Workgroup is recommending better interfaces between the administration and standing Senate committees, which would include keeping BOARS about the utilization of AI by Admissions offices.

The Workgroup will make suggestions to BOARS about what the committee might want to consider in the future. Information gathered from admissions offices, BOARS members, and ChatGPT reveals

a variety of ways AI can impact admissions. There may be potential for admissions offices to use AI to customize communications for recruitment; provide customized advice to potential applicants via chatbots; evaluate domestic and international transcripts or responses to personal insight questions (PIQs); detect fraud in applications; identify bias in application reviews; provide personalized counseling and financial aid matching; and streamline application tasks. Chair Steintrager would like feedback from BOARS regarding what is of interest to the committee and how the committee would like to be informed about what is happening in admission offices. Many of the ways AI is currently being used appear benign or helpful for students applying to UC, but there are questions about whether there is equitable access to these tools and how AI could be used to game the PIQs.

The Workgroup will determine fundamental goals and identify where AI helps or hinders faculty in reaching these goals. For example, to address the impact of AI on assessment there should first be an understanding of what faculty want to get out of assessment. BOARS will need to look at what comprehensive review and holistic review are meant to achieve, and how both are being implemented across the system. Afterwards, it will be important to determine AI's role in reaching or missing these outcomes. The Workgroup may recommend the provision of transparency to applicants about when and how AI is being used to review applications. Another likely recommendation is for the coordination and consistency of information across the divisions, along with the sharing of best practices. Chair Steintrager underscored that it will be critical to take advantage of the Senate structure to make sure there is ongoing engagement and review of this adjustment to AI.

Discussion: Three campuses have set up chatbots and they are each structured in different ways and without any coordination. A member suggested that faculty should be deeply engaged in discussions about the use of AI. Additionally, there should be more transparency about what is under faculty jurisdiction and supervision versus what is delegated to staff, and it may be that the role of faculty needs to be expanded. It was suggested that automating the entire application process could level the playing field. There is agreement that UC should make the application process transparent and equitable. Members suggested that applicants should be prompted to make a statement about the contribution of AI in the application, and that they should be asked to write about how they attained their achievements. There are numerous questions and issues to consider and adjusting to AI will be significant work.

IV. UC Eligibility Areas Proposal

During the previous BOARS meeting, the committee discussed whether the mirroring of the Cal-GETC standards would be a reasonable way to delineate UC's expectations for the Eligibility Areas, with the potential exception of math. The aim is to have standards that are transparent to the California community college faculty who develop and teach classes that are used for transfer and to help guide students to take the right classes. Director Fischerhall had an in-depth discussion about the Eligibility Areas proposal with Admissions Directors (ADs) in January and has new details to share with BOARS based on that meeting. The conversations ADs have had with faculty suggest there might be some confusion or concern about what is being debated.

The two general pathways for transfer eligibility to UC include completing Cal-GETC or UC's seven course pattern. The question BOARS is contemplating is what the relationship between the two paths to eligibility should look like and the director stated that the seven-course pattern will remain

regardless of which of the three options the committee selects. This decision will establish the criteria the Transfer Articulation Team will use on behalf of faculty to determine which courses California community college students might use to fulfill UC's general education admissions breadth requirements. The options have been reframed: Option 1) the admissions breadth requirement criteria will be aligned with Cal-GETC criteria but will continue to exist independently in UC Senate Regulations and can be altered by BOARS at a future date; 2) the criteria in every subject matter area in Cal-GETC and the seven course pattern will not necessarily be aligned, but approvals (for most areas) would be aligned if criteria could be deemed equivalent; and 3) the admissions breadth pattern will remain distinct and there will continue to be some (minor) misalignment of approvals but guidance and communications will be improved. In all cases, the director strongly urged to committee to consider strengthening the UC eligibility area criteria and making them public.

Discussion: Based on the conversations occurring at the Cal-GETC Standards Review Committee, Vice Chair Volz has concerns about adopting the Cal-GETC criteria. UC campuses have the ability to accept IGETC or Cal-GETC or not, whereas the seven course pattern is accepted systemwide. Any proposed change to Cal-GETC would need to be reviewed so BOARS can weigh if it weakens or strengthens the requirement. The purview for major preparation would still be separate from demonstrating eligibility. Members discussed concerns about the Math for Teachers course being accepted for Cal-GETC, and current UC regulations have a specific carve out that disallows the Math for Teachers course, but it is likely that the CSU will continue to advocate for its inclusion in Cal-GETC.

Director Fischerhall shared an example of the current language for an eligibility area and suggested language drawn from feedback from faculty over the years that provides more details. A member recommended that BOARS should strive to have the language in the Eligibility Areas as aligned as possible with Cal-GETC and that any divergence should be justified in publicly available criteria. The seven course pattern criteria should be updated regardless of which of the three options BOARS chooses. The very minimal criteria for the Eligibility Areas are not publicly available at present. The Transfer Articulation team will prepare language for the Eligibility Areas for consideration by the committee.

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

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

The planned consultation with GUEA and IRAP was replaced with an urgent discussion about a draft proposed revision of Senate Bylaw (SB) 145. The Regents have requested that BOARS consider changing its bylaw to codify consultation with K-12. This request follows the debate and various hearings last fall about Area C which included complaints that the Academic Senate meetings are not open to the public and that BOARS does not consult with the K-12 segment. Chair Cheung has been in conversation with the Regents and State Government Relations at UCOP to respond to

these concerns. A draft of the proposed revision includes language about consultation with K-12 in SB 145.B.7. It also updates terminology in SB 145.B.6.

Discussion: The language should be specific regarding with whom BOARS will consult and perhaps indicate that this narrowly means the State Board of Education. Executive Director Lin explained that UCOP staff has, in the past, identified subject matter specialists to provide recommendations to the committee. It is suggested that the proposed bylaw revision be put forward along with a set of guidelines regarding consultation. The guidelines might also address consultation with the CSU system. Members suggested changes to the language regarding consultation with K-12.

Action: A motion to approve the proposed revision was made and seconded and unanimously approved.

VI. Draft Credit by Exam Policy

Tony Albano (UCD) & Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR)

This item was not discussed.

VII. Executive Session

Minutes were not taken during Executive Session.

VIII. Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 170 (UCEP) and Rescission of SB 192 (University Committee on Preparatory Education)

This matter will be handled by email.

IX. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCB: A subcommittee of the Admissions committee is looking at the standardized test issue and figuring out how to survey faculty. One of UCB's colleges invited labor economist Zach Bleemer from Princeton to present his studies on admissions including how preparedness impacts future overall economic outcomes.

UCSD: A new committee that includes members of the Admissions committee and administrators will consider the holistic review process.

UCSB: The committee is looking at math placement to see if it can be more efficient and to ensure that essential data is being captured. Another topic under discussion is the different administration structures involved with admissions.

UCI: The committee discussed reader training and the selection stage of the admission process. The committee agreed to ask for more granular data from Admissions to look at the correlation between scoring, selection, and admission results.

UCM: The committee continues to review proposals for new majors with the goal of increasing enrollment by offering more majors.

UCD: The committee received an update on admissions and discussed if major or department specific guidelines are needed for holistic review for engineering. There is also a discussion about continuing augmented review since only a small number of these reviews result in a different score.

UCR: The Admissions office informed the committee that applicants were allowed to add alternate majors and the office sent out more admissions offers as a result. However, the yield rate is currently hard to predict.

UCSC: The committee and Admissions office determined which applicants should be on the waitlist. The committee also reviewed the campus policy on transfer admission conditions and enrollment deferrals.

UCLA: The committee will review the minimum participation requirements for student athletes, and the review of special and talent based admissions will continue. In an effort to reduce the burden on faculty and staff, the committee will be downsized from seven to five members.

X. New Business

Chair Swenson will send a reminder to the committee to provide feedback on the report from the common calendar workgroup and the proposal to eliminate the Committee on Preparatory Education, and these will be discussed during the next BOARS meeting.

A member would like BOARS to consider asking the Area C Workgroup to explore how its recommendations will impact the validation of courses and provide guidance on implementation.

The videoconference adjourned at: 3:02 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Deborah Swenson, Chair