

## Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

## Minutes of Meeting

May 3, 2019

**I. Consent Calendar**1. Approval of BOARS May 3, 2019 agenda**Action:** The agenda was approved as noticed.2. Approval of Response to Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 636.E

Members raised concerns regarding specific phrasing in the draft and proposed new language.

**Action:** The memo was approved as amended.**II. Chair's Announcements**

- Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

The systemwide review of the proposed new transfer guarantee is complete (see also Item V below). The Council views the proposal positively, but some campus concerns merit direct responses; no changes to the core of the proposal were suggested. Most concerns focused on known issues, such as capacity and the 2:1 ratio, messaging, and how to include non-Pathway, non-TAG majors. Findings from the market research into the new transfer guarantee are still being finalized, but early indications suggest that cost and location were the biggest perceived obstacles to UC matriculation by both CCC students and counselors. In that light, a transfer referral pool seems unhelpful to students. Some respondents also noted campus climate as a concern, and whether transfer students are looked down upon once on a UC campus. Members noted concern that the consultants seem to misunderstand the role of GPA in the new guarantee: there is no minimum as part of the proposal, but a better GPA indicates better academic preparation.

**Action:** Chair Comeaux will draft verbiage clarifying the new process and requirements to share with the communications working group.

An advisory group is being formed to create responses to the admission scandal and outline next steps.

**III. Consultation with the Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF)**

- Henry Sánchez, STTF Chair

Chair Sanchez outlined the questions the STTF will be considering: How does UC use standardized tests currently? How to such test indicate academic preparation? What impacts to diversity follow from the use of such tests? How is UC eligibility impacted by such tests? Are there better ways of making these assessments that can be supported with data? The STTF seeks to be transparent and deliberate, and the membership is diverse and talented. An interim report will be issued in June, but the STTF work will continue into 2019-2020.

Members asked how local process and culture disparities were being handled by the STTF. Chair Sanchez noted that the STTF will be in contact with admissions directors and other local officials. Members noted that while the usage of tests may vary by campus, current test usage seems highly correlated with student success, however imperfect an instrument they are. Others suggested that any recommended changes must be mindful of unintended consequences, such as grade inflation in other areas or test anxiety in this one. Chair Sanchez reminded members that no decision had been made, and noted that multiple factors will be considered; UC uses comprehensive review, and standardized tests are just one aspect.

The Academic Council will receive the STTF final report, and then share it with BOARS for implementation assessments. BOARS should keep abreast of STTF workings through report outs by

Chair Comeaux and UCSF Representative Hasenstaub and the task force minutes. Any final recommendations will be supported with data and consistent with UC values.

#### **IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership**

- Robert May, Academic Council Chair
- Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Vice Chair

Elsevier negotiations continue, and contingency plans are being prepared. The landscape continues to change, though, as Norway recently entered into a new contract with lots of nearly Open Access provisions. The cost of preparing documents for submission continues to be an obstacle.

New proposed APM section 011 is still out for review.

Proposed revisions to Senate By-Law 336 are out for review.

Wide discussion of the possible UCSF and Dignity Hospital affiliation is encouraged. All feedback is welcome.

#### **V. Transfer Guarantee Next Steps**

Some members remain concerned that capacity will be exceeded in certain majors in an extremely short time frame, leading to calls for guidance and exit strategies, if needed. Projections showing no imminent danger of such over-enrollment are not persuasive to those who have raised the concerns.

Messaging to students and counselors of new timelines and deadlines must occur with all due haste.

Revision of the 2-year notification for changes to major preparation requirements will help facilitate these communications. Clarification regarding GPAs is also needed, and targeted guidance for non-TAG, non-Pathway majors is still needed.

**Action:** Chair Comeaux will circulate revised language for electronic review.

#### **VI. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Student Affairs**

- Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools and Colleges
- Tongshan Chang, Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning

##### **1. 2-year advanced notice for major preparation changes**

See Item V above. BOARS will discuss this topic next month with the admission directors, at their semiannual joint meeting.

##### **2. Best Practices:**

###### **a. Underrepresented Minority Recruitment**

Members seek best practices for training readers to assess qualitative claims in personal statements and the personal insight questions.

###### **b. Application Verification**

UC has some best practices, but this area of admission compliance is new. FAFSA and income verification is done outside of UC. Pell recipients can only be tracked after matriculation. Auditing applications is expensive, but UCOP has always conducted audits of a random sample of applications. Public scrutiny and/or audit findings may require UCOP to audit more applications, but additional resources would be required. Many suggest there are opportunities to revise the personal insight questions to elicit more nuanced information. The role of high school teachers and counselors in verification is unclear; whether applicants should be asked to “self-verify” is in dispute.

###### **c. Proxies for API**

Ideas and metrics are sought. Incomplete statewide data sets exist, and nationwide dashboards are considered too broad. Suggestions are welcome.

##### **3. TAG Demographic Data**

Members are asked to think carefully about what additional data they seek, and why. IRAP will work to consolidate requests from BOARS, the Provost, and others.

Action: Chair Comeaux will draft data metrics for electronic review.

4. CCC Market Research Debrief

*Note: Item deferred.*

5. Accreditation Requirement for High Schools Seeking a-g Approval

In 2002, BOARS named WASC as the official high school accrediting agency, but in 2009, BOARS adopted a new position, approving any regional accreditor. For online classes, BOARS is asked if the same regional accreditation is sufficient, or if a narrower list of accreditors is needed.

Members suggested, since online course publishers have national reach, WASC accreditation and that of another leading regional creditor, such as New England Commission on Higher Education or Middle States Commission on Higher Education, would be sufficient to guarantee academic standards.

**Action:** Director Lin will investigate co-accreditation options and report back.

## VII. Campus Reports

**Berkeley:** absent during this item.

**Davis:** 1) Discussions on the impact of the 2-year advance notice for major preparation requirements continue. 2) Additional resources for holistic review of transfer applicants are sought.

**Irvine:** 1) A proposal for an online business degree for transfer students only is going through campus review. The proposers cite physical plant capacity and the impacted status of the major as additional selling points. The distribution of fees and accessibility of on-campus resources is still in question, though. 2) A report on the impact of last year's unilaterally imposed change decreasing the number of admission evaluation criteria from 5 to 3 is expected soon. Many faculty are still upset that the administration undertook this action without consultation. 3) Some departments using augmented review report the process is becoming unwieldy, leading them to seek additional metrics to separate applicants. Best practices are appreciated.

**Los Angeles:** 1) Early reports from the upcoming fall admission cycle indicate good diversity statistics. 2) Only two students have been identified as benefiting from the admission scandal, but the press reports that further indictments are forthcoming. All ABE admits will be under scrutiny going forward. How to best integrate athletics admissions and standard admissions is under discussion. Previous reports on malfeasance in the admission process are only just now coming to light, which has caused many to question recent oversight practices.

**Merced:** 1) An admissions calendar and process map are being created. 2) Many on the campus have called for parallel reporting for the audit findings. 3) Admissions brochures and communications are being revised.

**Riverside:** 1) Fall freshman admissions are on track, but transfers may lag. 2) Twelve-thousand community members attended this year's Highlander Day, from by 4,000 from last year. 3) Holistic review training has yielded inconsistent results, so the pilot project is being paused pending further investigation.

**San Diego:** 1) The new TAG in history is still under development. 2) Best practices for streamlining supplemental reviews for special admits are sought. 3) The UCSD partnership with local community colleges, ULink, is being reassessed, with a focus on access.

**San Francisco:** No report.

**Santa Barbara:** 1) Concerns regarding cascade impacts of the 2-year advance notice for major preparation changes continue to arise. 2) Faculty representation on the athletics admission committee is being negotiated.

**Santa Cruz:** 1) The campus will use a waitlist this year, perhaps for a 100 students. 2) The campus achieved “selective” status with its transfer admits for the first time this year. 3) Concerns about the legislature’s response to the admission scandal include assessment and treatment of out-of-state applicants.

Meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Attendance:

Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair  
Melissa Famulari, BOARS Vice Chair  
Jill Berrick, UCB  
Deborah Swenson, UCD  
Julie Ferguson, UCI Alternate (via Zoom)  
Rene Ong, UCLA  
Christopher Viney, UCM Alternate (via Zoom)  
David Volz, UCR  
Nancy Kwak, UCSD  
Andrea Hasenstaub, UCSF  
Madeleine Sorapure, UCSB  
David Smith, UCSC