

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Nicholas Mathew (UCB), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Rob Watson (UCLA alternate), 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), Angelica Moore (Director, Undergraduate Admission Policy and Communications, Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs (GUEA)), Liz Terry (Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Steven W. Cheung, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

During the last Regents meeting, Chair Lieb announced that Nancy Lee, the chief of staff to the chief executive officer of the Walt Disney Company, has been appointed to the Board and Regent Perez was reappointed, both for 12-year terms. President Drake's remarks highlighted difficult campus climate issues including violent activities that violate principles of community. The president did report on the implementation of experiential learning opportunities for undocumented students aimed to mitigate the effects of deferring Regents policy 4407. Chair Steintrager's remarks to the Board centered on the unfair treatment of the Senate as it relates to the disapproval of Senate Regulation 630.E, the campus experience requirement for undergraduate students. The remarks described the degradation of shared governance and raised the specter of faculty unionization.

The meeting included another discussion about the Regents policy on public and discretionary statements by academic units. This updated policy is modeled on UCLA's draft policy which has not yet been endorsed by that division's Senate. There is a distinction between public and discretionary statements, the latter being unrelated to day-to-day operations. The updated policy will be sent out for expedited Senate review, and the Regents could vote on it in May. Numerous state assembly and senate bills would amend the constitutional right of UC including one that would impose state labor standards. The Senate and President Drake are vigorously fighting Assembly Constitutional Amendment (ACA) 14 as it would impair how faculty and graduate students organize their time and labor. The Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities has assessed the hazards of online education and identified principles for piloting a fully online undergraduate degree program. However, progress beyond this is proving elusive, and Vice Chair Cheung and co-chair Vice Provost Haynes, will attempt to find ways to balance the differing opinions of task force members. The task force's final report is due to the president in September.

Last week, Academic Council voted on the Senate's vice chair-elect for 2024-2025 and the Assembly will approve the appointment in April. Council also debated extending Senate membership to the health sciences clinical series and the adjunct series, which would completely change the composition of the voting members. The proposed revision to Academic Personnel Manual policy 285 to change the lecturer with security of employment (LSOEs) title to teaching professor or professor of teaching will undergo systemwide review. This proposal is separate from a proposal to give LSOEs equal voting rights in departments. Chief Financial Officer Brostrom shared that the state's budget seems to be getting worse, but UC remains committed to the enrollment plan called for in the compact with the governor. The best case scenario will be a flat budget for UC in the May revise which will allow the 4.2% salary program increase to move forward, in part, because UC's investments have done well.

Discussion: Members complained about Senate leadership's failure to consult with faculty about ACA 14 and Vice Chair Cheung will take this information back to Senate Chair Steintrager.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

Action: The March 1, 2024 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved.

III. Chair's Announcements

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) Legislative Day was an opportunity for Senate leadership of the California Community College (CCC), California State University (CSU), and UC systems to meet with legislators or their aides. During the visit with Assemblymember Berman's legislative director, ICAS members emphasized the successful creation of the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 928. Although UC meets the 2:1 freshman to transfer requirement for admissions, lobbyists like the Campaign for College Opportunity are effective at convincing the legislature that UC must accept more transfer students and make it easier to transfer. The legislative director was not sympathetic to CSU faculties' disappointment that Cal-GETC resulted in the elimination of the lifelong learning course which is known to be beneficial for student retention. Chair Knowlton shared that CSU's Board of Trustees wants Cal-GETC to be used for all first-year students. The governor's education advisor claimed that faculty are opposed to innovative education policies and that admissions requirements are not serving students.

The March 20th presentation to the Regents on the Area C Workgroup stage one report was an opportunity for Chair Steintrager, Chair Knowlton and Workgroup Chair Adhikari to explain the process and BOARS' goals for area C. It seemed the Regents are concerned that students would be harmed if there is no alternative to algebra II. The Senate tried to make the case that, regardless of what students will study in college, algebra II helps with learning general logic and problem solving. Also, since students often do not know what major they will pursue, lacking a basic background in quantitative domains could limit them in the future. In the presentation, the point was made that only a small number of students admitted to UC in a recent academic year did not take algebra II. The Regents appeared to accept this reasoning while remaining a little skeptical, and Chairs Knowlton and Adhikari will join the Board again in July to report on the second stage of the Workgroup's effort. It will be helpful for the Workgroup to identify the components of algebra II that are key for other for college level work, with the idea that more engaging high school courses might be developed to increase the completion rate. The Workgroup could develop standards for data science courses that elevate them.

Chair Knowlton advised that the committee's memo regarding the evaluation of accreditors was sent to Academic Council so a broad audience will be aware of it. The chair will participate in a meeting on Monday with the UCD and UCR representatives and representatives from the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) to discuss the two committees' responsibility for decisions about credit by exam. UCEP will determine if an external course or exam should count for course credit and graduation requirements, and that committee may conclude that campuses should have autonomy over these decisions. In contrast, BOARS would contemplate if exam scores would be used to fulfill A-G requirements and whether an A-G requirement can be satisfied by taking an external exam without having taken the associated course.

There is pressure on UC to guarantee admission to CCC students who earn associate degrees for transfer (ADTs), but ADTs are not designed for UC and are not the optimal way for students to prepare for UC. The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) is attempting to identify ways to increase transfer admissions to UC without harming students. Last month, BOARS discussed an ACSCOTI proposal that would allow students in certain science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) majors to defer four general education (GE) courses until after transferring. Chair Knowlton informed ACSCOTI that BOARS endorsed the proposal and shared concerns raised by BOARS about the workload involved with tracking courses students have taken. ACSCOTI submitted the proposal to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) and UCRJ recommended that the proposal should apply to all transfer students regardless of major. BOARS members are asked to report any objections to this change. The proposal will eventually undergo systemwide review.

Another issue ACSCOTI is considering is that several schools at different UC campuses do not accept the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and might not accept Cal-GETC, which could mean UC is not complying with AB 928. ACSCOTI needs to understand the reasons IGETC has not been accepted by some schools to identify small changes that might be made to ensure compliance with the law. ACSCOTI is involved with discipline groups comprised of CCC, CSU and UC faculty trying to figure out the major preparation required for different ADTs and where compromises can be made without harming students.

Discussion: Members questioned why the legislature is pressuring UC to improve transfer and expressed frustration about the ongoing criticism of the University in spite of its major contributions to the state. Faculty should concentrate on the recommendations and proposals made by the transfer task force since that group has relevant expertise and knowledge. With regards to A-G requirements, UC needs to provide clear justification for its standards, however it is troubling that these standards are adopted by CSU and that some high schools use A-G completion as their graduation requirement. The systematic under-resourcing of California schools leads to pressure on UC to change its standards in part because it is easier to impose policies on the University than it is to adequately fund high schools. Students do not have to complete Cal-GETC in order to transfer and the idea for the ACSCOTI proposal is that four GE courses can be completed at the UC campus to which students transfer.

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

- *Tongshan Chang, Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning; Angelica Moore, Director, Undergraduate Admission Policy & Communications, Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (GUEA); & Liz Terry, Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA*

First-year admissions offers have been sent out from the campuses and transfer offers will be sent throughout April. Problems with the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) continue to impact UC. The deadline for submitting statements for intent to register is May 15th and changing it to June 1st is under consideration but this could impact other campus systems downstream. Normally, students would have received admissions offers and financial aid packages by now so they could compare their options. There is uncertainty about if offers will be accepted especially with respect to low-income students, and campuses are concerned about whether enrollment models will hold. It is also unclear how this situation could affect waitlists.

Director Chang explained the BOARS policy requiring that out of state and international students admitted to a UC campus be at least as qualified, on average, as California residents admitted to the same campus. As a result of this policy, IRAP prepares the annual Compare Favorably report which, prior to 2021, utilized standardized test scores for the analysis. Now IRAP uses students' high school grade point average (GPA), first year UC GPA, first year persistence rates, and probation. The question for BOARS is if the analysis for 2023 should follow the same template as previous reports or if it should be changed. The report is due August 1st so there is time to revise the analysis.

Chair Knowlton reminded the members that BOARS is compelled to provide the Compare Favorably report to show that UC is not taking seats away from California students by admitting out of state students, who pay far higher tuition. When UC used standardized test scores, it was fairly easy to say that out of state students had higher test scores than in state students, but now GPA is the only effective tool for this. A concern has been that California students' GPAs may be a little inflated compared to out of state or international students. Last year, BOARS received a presentation on a project to create California comparable GPAs for nonresident applicants. Chair Knowlton appreciated this idea but does not think it would be as convincing for the legislature as the Compare Favorably report. UC now caps the percent of out of state students admitted which may alleviate some of the legislatures' concerns. The updated analysis will be shared with BOARS at the next meeting so the committee can identify any issues.

IRAP analyzed data for two of the CCC/UC transfer task force's recommendations: #1) to establish a baseline and targets for increasing the number of transfer students, and #7) to conduct a longitudinal study of obstacles and opportunities related to student enrollment and success. Director Chang reviewed the highlights of the analysis for recommendation #1, explaining that the CCC chancellor's office uses different measures to define transfer goals such as intent to transfer; transfer-directed to indicate the completion of both transfer-level math and English courses; transfer-prepared (completion of 60 UC-transferable courses with a 2.0 GPA); and transfer-ready (meeting the criteria for both transfer-directed and transfer prepared). Since 2013-2014, over 100k students met transfer-directed requirements each year and the demographics are similar across different subpopulations. If UC and CCC changed the threshold for transfer ready measure based on the required GPA by UC, 2.4, the number of transfer-ready students would not change significantly. IRAP will continue to work with the CCC chancellor's office on additional analyses to see if any other results would aid with establishing a new baseline for transfer-readiness. The analysis looked at the progression of students through each stage from transfer-directed to UC graduation. About 80% of transfer-directed students intend to transfer to a four-year institution, 66% of whom reach transfer-ready status. However, of transfer-directed students, only 25% applied to UC, 18% were admitted, and 13% eventually enrolled at UC.

To address recommendation #7, IRAP used the survey data collect in 2017 to examine obstacles and opportunities related to college choice. Of students who indicated they are concerned about attending a UC campus, 84% were concerned about their financial situation and 46% were concerned about their academic preparation. Of students who were admitted to UC but did not enroll, the percentage going to CSU has increased since 2015, with about 12% going to a CSU in recent years. IRAP also looked at transfer students' first-year persistence and graduation rates compared with freshmen. After five years, the transfer students' graduation rate is about 90% compared to 88% for freshmen, meaning transfer students complete their UC education at a higher rate. The final graduation rate of UC transfer admits who enrolled at a non-UC institution is about 73%, 16 percentage points lower than the graduation rate from UC. The UC Undergraduate Experience Survey asks students to select the obstacles and opportunities, and the main obstacles included feeling depressed, stressed, or upset; competing family responsibilities; and competing job responsibilities. IRAP compared the two-year graduation rates of students who did not select certain obstacles to those students who did which helps pinpoint where students could be supported. The analysis found that 31% of transfer students earned a graduate's degree within 10 years after they graduated from UC with a bachelor's degree compared to 40% of students who started UC as freshmen while earnings after graduation were the same for both.

Discussion: A member wondered if the Compare Favorably report could include an analysis of first year GPA for different schools or majors, but Director Chang indicated that in the past IRAP found many students are not admitted to major and the number of students in some majors if admitted to is too small for this calculation. Another suggestion is to analyze GPAs in STEM and non-STEM, however many campuses do not admit students directly into majors.

V. Systemwide Review Item: Proposed Statement on UC Quality

UCEP developed a statement on UC quality, an important document that makes the case for what faculty feel is valuable about a UC education and should be incorporated into online undergraduate degrees. The statement is out for systemwide review and members should consider if BOARS should suggest changes or amplify certain aspects of it in the context of admissions.

Discussion: The committee discussed the statement's history and its relationship to online courses and degrees. Chair Knowlton emphasized that the statement describes principles for all types of courses and the overall degree experience. One point to add is that part of the quality of a UC education is that there is something distinctive about being in a classroom with and taught by the faculty who generate the knowledge.

Action: The UCB representative volunteered to set up a Google Doc with some initial comments, and other members can contribute. The draft memo will be finalized during the May meeting.

VI. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCM: The committee continues to review new majors and there are projections for enrollment growth.

UCSC: The committee's focus is on the response to the proposed ethnic studies requirement.

UCB: This committee also discussed the ethnic studies proposal.

UCLA: The committee has been gathering information about the Hispanic serving student initiative.

UCD: The committee debated how online degree programs might work and discussed personal insight questions (PIQs) in anticipation of this topic being considered by BOARS.

UCR: The ethnic studies proposal was discussed.

UCSD: In addition to the ethnic studies proposal, the committee received an update on the admissions process. Given that other universities have again started requiring standardized test scores for admissions, the representative believes BOARS should start examining data to determine the consequences of UC's decision to go test blind. Chair Knowlton remarked that the committee might start with identifying the data to be analyzed but added that looking at outcomes will be complicated due to the pandemic. It would be problematic to use data from immediately after UC went test blind, so it may be more valid to wait some time before undertaking this evaluation. The publicly available information about the institutions again using standardized tests should be collected. The provost asked IRAP to prepare an analysis of the impact of going test-blind on admissions outcomes as well as student performance starting in 2021. This analysis should be completed in time for the committee's next meeting.

UCSF: The materials on PIQs provided by Undergraduate Admissions is limited to what is already publicly available. The representative is interested in seeing more detailed information from campuses such as how the divisions assess if readers are doing what has been requested of them. Members were asked to send Chair Knowlton any specific questions for admissions directors about reader training and quality control of holistic review.

VII. New Business

There was no New Business.

VIII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at: 1:40 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton