



BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
Videoconference Minutes
April 4, 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), Todd Squires (UCSB Alternate), George Bulman (UCSC), Bethany Padron (Graduate Student Representative), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate 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), Katie Leslie (Associate Director, High School Articulation, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP), 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, & Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Academic Council met on April 2 and nominated the former UCSB division chair to the vice chair-elect position for the 2025-2026 academic year. Academic Assembly will vote on the nomination on April 23. Council unanimously approved the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 145.B.7. During this Council meeting, Chair Cheung reiterated the importance of confidentiality regarding the information exchanged during executive session. A member of Council recently disclosed confidential information communicated by President Drake before the recent Regents meeting to several news outlets. This act degraded Chair Cheung's relationship with senior administrators in the building which now must be repaired. The Faculty Discipline Workgroup has completed its first report on several issues of interest to the Regents related to privilege and tenure. The workgroup recommends that local processes should be followed, but any cases that take longer to be heard should be referred to a systemwide network. Chair Cheung explained the other approaches considered by the workgroup and indicated that the report has been transmitted to Provost Newman. The original charge of this workgroup, which was to address concurrent faculty misconduct and advancement cases, will be postponed to the fall.

During the March Regents meeting President Drake announced a hiring freeze effective March 31. Implementation details have been distributed to the divisions. All employment offers made on or before March 31 will be honored with some limited exceptions to be determined by divisional leadership. The Regents also directed the Office of the President (UCOP) to eliminate the use of standalone diversity statements in the hiring of new faculty and staff, which will not change Academic Personnel Manual policy 210. The systemwide Senate is establishing a task force called the UC Adaptation to Disruptions Initiative to address critical institutional concerns: restructuring

academic programs; resizing programs and the workforce; recalibrating growth objectives; and realigning funding sources with activities. A draft charge has been shared with Council and the task force will be chaired by Vice Chair Palazoglu. The first deliverable, due in mid- June, will address the most pressing concerns. UCSF memorials petitioning for extension of Senate membership to faculty with greater than 50% effort in the health sciences, clinical and adjunct professor series were voted down by the other nine divisions.

Chair Cheung has been advised by the search firm lead that a new president will be announced by mid-May and Provost Newman has made an offer to a candidate for the new vice provost for academic affairs and programs. Regents Chair Riley and President Drake will meet with some of the candidates for the UCSB chancellor position, and the president is committed to seating the new chancellor before June 2025. Chair Cheung will review the list of candidates for the UCR chancellor position which should also be filled by June. The total remuneration and benefits and employee engagement study workgroups convened by systemwide Human Resources are finally moving forward and each will include Senate faculty representatives.

II. Consent Calendar

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

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

III. BOARS Leadership Updates

Deborah Swenson, Chair & David Volz, Vice Chair Volz

The March 25 special Academic Assembly meeting was requested by a faculty member who requested that Assembly vote on a proposal to change the effective date of salary adjustments for administrators to align with the date for faculty salary range adjustments. Assembly voted against this proposal. Assembly also discussed a proposal related to the common calendar but action was not taken due to a lack of quorum. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) held its annual Legislative Day on April 1 and Vice Chair Volz thanked Analyst Abrams for planning the event at the UC Student and Policy Center in Sacramento. ICAS met with Senator Ochoa Bogh and Assembly Members Jackson and Fong, along with legislative analysts and consultants. Vice Chair Volz found it interesting to hear the perspectives of the visitors with respect to the California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU) and UC systems and about the issues and impacts at the Federal and State level on each of the segments. The visitors also shared that there is a perceived lack of collaboration across the segments.

ICAS had a set of talking points that included concerns about the defunding of higher education by the State and Federal governments. Another point was the importance of Pell Grants to students in the three systems, and the principal consultant for the State Assembly Budget Committee reported that California receives about \$6B in Pell Grants and the State issues about \$3B in Cal Grants each year. The consultant suggested that there is not enough money in the State budget to backfill any cuts to Pell Grants if they are cut. ICAS also highlighted core values shared by the segments such as diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) and discussed the potential threats to academic freedom. The final talking point was about the need for continued support for transfer students prior to transfer by way of funding for the ASSIST database and website and for basic needs after transfer. No one committed to providing additional financing for ASSIST though Vice Chair Volz learned that the CCCs received \$115M for the common course numbering (CCN) project. Student housing was

mentioned throughout the day and there may be efforts underway in Sacramento to address this issue. Vice Chair Volz indicated that there are pending bills in the Legislature to create a commission to coordinate the segments.

Chair Swenson described highlights from the Academic Council discussion about the recent decision to eliminate the use of diversity statements, noting that significant contributions to DEI in research, teaching, and service will be acknowledged in merit and promotion, as is the case for all contributions that serve the University's research, teaching and service mission. The chair remarked that the hiring freeze allows exemptions to be handled at the campus level because each division will have different critical needs. Vice Chair Volz announced that the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI), created in 2022 to deal with things such as the development of new UC Transfer Pathways, will be sunseting at the end of this summer as it has fulfilled nearly every part of its initial charge. The outstanding business is to complete the revisions of some biology-related transfer pathways and to resolve issues related to the proposed revisions to SR 479 related to subject area five in the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) and to allow students to defer up to four courses. Chair Swenson announced she will step down as the chair of BOARS in July and Vice Chair Volz will serve as chair starting in 2025-2026.

IV. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (GUEA) & Institutional Research and 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; Katie Leslie, Associate Director, High School Articulation, GUEA; Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP; & Matt Reed, Senior Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP

Director Fischerhall explained that Assembly Bill (AB) 1111 required the CCCs to implement a common course numbering system which prioritizes general education (GE) and transferable coursework. The legislation did not ask anything of the CSU or UC systems, but it implicates the intersegmental articulation processes. The CCC Chancellor's Office (CCCCO) originally had a July 2024 deadline to implement the entire system but negotiated with the Legislature to move the due date to fall 2027. There has been internal debate over the best strategy to move the CCN effort forward. One proposed strategy was to look at the most commonly articulated courses from CCC to CSU and UC but this was not done because the CCCs are required, from the Legislature's perspective, to create courses that can transfer both horizontally between their campuses and districts and vertically towards CSU and UC. The template approach prioritizes the horizontal transfer, or credit mobility, between CCCs, along with transferable and GE course work.

Six templates were created in phase one and the CCCs have adopted them to varying degrees, with some campuses aligning their coursework with the content of the templates and others being cautious in order to avoid jeopardizing any articulation with CSU and UC. All 115 CCCs have submitted at least one, and many six or more, courses aligned with the CCN course templates to be reviewed for Cal-GETC and Director Fischerhall reported that the majority of these courses are consistent with and fulfill the intended Cal-GETC area. The courses will next be reviewed against the current UC Eligibility Areas criteria and BOARS will receive an update on the outcome of this process. UC will continue the current process for reviewing each individual course outline of record for GE, transferability, and UC Eligibility Area. Each CCC and faculty within each department have

autonomy over how a course is going to be designed and the UC and CSU faculty determine what it will fulfill. However, the CCCCCO is imagining a future in which the template is the artifact that is reviewed which is something that CSU and UC will need to grapple with at both the systemwide and campus levels. BOARS should be aware that UC campuses will start seeing the commonly numbered courses starting fall 2025 and the committee may want to dedicate time to consider how to guide and inform conversations about CCN as they happen in ICAS.

Chair Swenson reminded the committee that, during the last meeting, the UCB representative proposed that BOARS should recommend reestablishing the Area C Workgroup to monitor implementation of its recommendations. Since this workgroup has completed its charge, it no longer exists. For this reason, this proposal would require a new workgroup, and a charge to guide the group. Analyst Abrams explained that BOARS should draft a charge for the new workgroup which would be submitted to Council and if approved the Committee on Committees will appoint the members.

Discussion: Members noted that the template approach, which describes the materials that need to be covered, may be limited by the inability to verify whether the template items are covered by all CCCs. Chair Swenson noted that this is not a unique problem, as there is no way to verify whether CCC faculty cover every item on their syllabi, which campuses have accepted for transfer. The chair asked members to weigh in on how to advise departments. Vice Chair Volz indicated that ACSCOTI has been responsible for recruiting UC faculty in the relevant disciplines to participate in the review and approval of the templates. However, recruitment has been difficult because the CCCs scheduled three-hour meetings on three consecutive days and the promise of being paid has been an insufficient incentive. The vice chair's suggestion to allow faculty to review templates and provide comments on their own time instead of requiring them to attend multiple meetings has not been seriously considered. The template review is a curricular issue under the authority of faculty and connected to academic freedom, and AB 1111 did not contemplate the need for faculty review and input. BOARS might support permitting approval of the templates for Cal-GETC at the systemwide level but a separate problem is that campuses do not have a mechanism for identifying problems with courses that have been approved.

Director Fischerhall clarified that the courses for which templates are being developed were identified based on enrollment numbers at CCC campuses, with a specific focus on transferable coursework. The director indicated that more UC involvement with template development would be beneficial although there are no dedicated resources or funding to support this system's participation in the CCN effort. Vice Chair Volz pointed out that the CCCs need to develop a more efficient system to evaluate and re-evaluate the templates in the future. The question of whether faculty would be comfortable with using the templates to approve courses for Cal-GETC might depend on the discipline. It will likely be difficult to reach unanimity about the templates across campuses or even within a department and this could in part be related to where and how a faculty member was trained. One idea is for the CCCs to provide the syllabi or examples of course materials that align with each template being reviewed because currently only the textbooks that might be used are identified.

The UCB representative agreed to draft the charge for a new group to monitor the implementation of the recommendations from the Area C Workgroup. Members will have the opportunity to weigh in on and refine the draft charge. It will be valuable to have a workgroup set up to respond swiftly if any issues related to Area C arise. Chair Swenson commented on the importance of thinking carefully

about the charge and the use of precise language. The charge should clearly reflect that the goal of Area C, which is the preparation of students for success in university study. Analyst Abrams suggested considering if the workgroup membership includes K-12 representatives as well as GUEA consultants and potentially CSU faculty.

V. K-12 Consultations

Earlier in the meeting, Chair Cheung announced that Council approved the proposed revision to SB 170.B to codify that BOARS will consult with K-12 stakeholders. During previous discussions about this matter, members agreed that it will be important to meet on a regular basis with the State Board of Education (SBE) president to share information and concerns.

Discussion: Meetings with the SBE president or the SBE's team might have specific agenda topics if BOARS or the SBE have emerging concerns or issues they would like to discuss. In the absence of immediate issues, these meetings would be opportunities for open-ended conversations which would enable UC the SBE to be aware of issues of concern at the college and K-12 level. Analyst Abrams explained that, in addition to revising the BOARS bylaw, Senate leadership expects that a set of guidelines for consultation will be posted on the committee's Resources webpage. The guidelines can be simple bullet points that indicate BOARS will meet with the SBE president early in the academic year to have an open-ended discussion regarding priorities for the year ahead supplemented with structured, topic-specific consultations over the course of the academic year. BOARS leadership will draft the guidelines for consultation.

VI. Draft Credit by Exam Policy

Tony Albano (UCD) & Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR)

The UCD representative provided a recap of when the work on the credit by exam policy began. The draft BOARS policy is informed by the policy developed by the University Committee on Educational Policy's (UCEP) position on credit by exam. UCOP has been receiving more requests to review exams and UCEP decided it would not consider any new exams beyond the ones that are currently approved which include the Advanced Placement (AP), International Baccalaureate, and A-Levels. The UCD and UCR representatives have been working on a policy for how BOARS might handle reviewing new exam programs for satisfaction of A-G requirements. There is no policy requiring students to take the AP course and not just the exam and this is because students who are homeschooled will not necessarily have access to the course.

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained that, prior to adoption of UC's test-free policy for admission, there was an eligibility path towards admission which was admission by exam. Admission by exam allowed students who scored high enough on various exams to be eligible for first-year admission. The broader context for this conversation includes that the State and the other segments have an interest in awarding credit for prior learning which might take the form of military credit earned, work experience and certificates, or education in a country that does not use English as its primary language for instruction.

Last year a bill was introduced to have public schools adopt the Cambridge curriculum and UCOP has been asked by Cambridge to provide exam credit. The associate vice provost noted that UCEP was included in deliberations about credit by exam a couple of years ago but systemwide Senate regulations stipulate that BOARS has authority over credit by exam. When GUEA receives a new AP

course and exam, the unit would like to have a standardized process or rubric to determine if it is appropriate for awarding UC credit and/or for admission purposes of fulfilling an A-G subject area. The College Board has announced that two new courses, AP cybersecurity and AP business principles, will be offered in the next couple of years and BOARS should start thinking about how these could fulfill an A-G area. The goal is to standardize and add more structure to the process in anticipation of more requests for consideration in the future.

Discussion: There is a national organization that conducts independent reviews of courses and tests but the program has to submit its courses and exams for review, so UC would have to encourage a testing program to use them. One concern is about the major financial incentive for these companies to offer courses and exams, and high schools already contribute toward the cost of AP. The change to the College Board's scoring verification process raises questions about the reliability of the scores. One BOARS member commented that the new verification process, which is based on evidence-based standard setting, gives more power to the College Board because it replaces the qualitative review by experts with a less structured process.

Chair Swenson shared that the College Board responded to the request from BOARS for the technical report on the new scoring process with a request that UC provide its data. UC should track the external exams or curriculum that are relevant to important prerequisite tracks. Members expressed concerns about the College Board and the unilateral change to the scoring process. UC faculty who review courses and exams are asked to recommend a cut score to BOARS. It was noted that the number of honors and AP courses that can be included in the calculation of the weighted grade point average is capped. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu observed that some issues related to credit by exam have been resolved as a result of deliberations by UCEP and BOARS in response to GUEA's 2023 briefing on the subject. The UCD representative suggested that BOARS could wait until an exam program is big enough to be established and proven before it is reviewed.

VII. Community Input on Academic Planning Council's Systemwide Academic Calendar Workgroup Draft Report

BOARS has the opportunity to opine on the report from the Academic Planning Council workgroup on moving UC's nine undergraduate campuses to a common calendar. The deadline for comments is May 20. Members of BOARS have indicated that the campuses should not change to a common calendar because the benefits are small while the costs are extensive in terms of student academic success and faculty workload. Furthermore, during this time of financial uncertainty, UC should not entertain any calendar changes until ample resources are available to assist students and faculty with making a successful transition.

Discussion: The response from BOARS will note that moving to a common calendar might not have an impact on admissions. A member commented that faculty have worked with companies to accommodate when students on semester campuses can start their internships. Quarters give students the ability to take a wider variety of courses.

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

Chair Swenson received disparate responses from members to the proposed revisions to SB 170 and the rescission of SB 192. The Committee on Preparatory Education's (UCOPE) responsibilities have diminished following the elimination of the systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam so it makes sense to sunset this committee.

Discussion: Members argued that a lack of preparedness in writing and math suggests there is a need for a committee that addresses preparatory education issues. The optics of eliminating UCOPE are not good given concerns of faculty at UC and nationally about the lack of student preparation in writing and math. Chair Swenson will draft a memo indicating that BOARS recommends against sunsetting UCOPE at this time and will send a letter to the listserv early next week for review.

IX. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCM: The committee's last meeting focused on reviewing and approving new majors.

UCD: The committee is considering taking majors into account in the review process which has not been done in the past. Another topic being discussed is whether standardized test scores should again be required for admissions.

UCI: The main topic discussed during last month's meeting was math preparation of incoming students and if the committee should advocate for the establishment of a math placement test similar to UCSD's and to UCI's writing tests. The admissions and enrollment management offices have been asked to provide additional data on student performance in their first UCI college class to see how it compares with courses taken in high school.

UCR: The committee met the admissions office which has set up events for both incoming first-year and transfer students. The office also has an initiative where the students who are not admitted are given information on how to follow a transfer pathway to gain admission to UC, and this includes teaching students about how to apply to community colleges. The committee is monitoring over-enrollment into the business analytics program.

UCLA: The committee discussed the report on the common calendar and the proposal to eliminate UCOPE and is not supportive of either.

UCB: The committee is surveying faculty about standardized tests and discussed how enrollment targets are set for particular majors. At this campus, faculty are not involved but instead targets are generated via a higher-level administrative pathway.

UCSC: The committee discussed setting enrollment targets for impacted majors which are currently handled by departments and administrators under the purview of the divisional admissions committee. A document to address this is being prepared because the committee thinks it is an inefficient process that could be handled more smoothly by the admissions office and in the admissions committee.

UCSD: A new committee was set up to review the division's admissions. The head of the math department, a member of this new committee, presented the assessment test results for students

placed into Math 2. The test results showed that the average math competency of a Math 2 student is somewhere between grades four and six, in terms of math preparation.

UCSB: The committee considered a proposal to develop a UC Lifted program to serve incarcerated students. There are no set targets for admission into letters and science while engineering has targets set by department. The committee is trying to evaluate approaches for more effectively managing enrollments. It is currently working on a pilot for engineering.

X. New Business/Executive Session

There was no New Business or Executive Session.

The videoconference adjourned at: 2:10 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Deborah Swenson, Chair