

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Videoconference Minutes

Friday, May 3, 2024

**Attending:** Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Nicholas Mathew (UCB), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Robert 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), Jim Rawlins (Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management, UCSD), Gary Clark (Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management, UCLA), 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 of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Anthony Simbol (Executive Director & Deputy to the Vice President, IRAP), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning), Matt Reed (Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP), James Steintrager (Chair, Academic Senate), Steven W. Cheung (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

## I. Consent Calendar

**Action:** Today's agenda was approved.

**Action:** The April 5, 2024 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved.

## II. Chair's Announcements

Academic Assembly considered a proposal to revise Senate Bylaw 55 to extend voting rights on personnel matters to Teaching Professors. One argument in support of the proposal revolved around equity and inclusiveness while an argument against was about the importance of individual departments deciding if this series should have a vote, and the proposal failed to pass by one vote. Academic Council discussed the proposed Regents policy on public and discretionary statements by academic units and the Senate has questions about implementation and enforcement. The Senate is asserting that the guidelines for posting statements on department websites developed by the University Committee on Academic Freedom in 2022 are more than adequate. Chair Knowlton remarked that certain speech might be overtly political or about controversial issues, but statements about vaccinations or climate change might be deemed political by some people and could trigger action under the proposed Regents policy.

Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Brostrom informed Council that the state budget is not good, but the investments and pensions are doing well. Council members discussed the problems with the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) including how difficult it will be for students to make decisions about which college to attend without having financial aid information. CFO Brostrom expressed concerns about how the FAFSA situation is likely to impact the demographics of the incoming freshman class. Chair Knowlton commented that the new FAFSA system is intended to be fairer, more comprehensive, and provide more aid. The CFO indicated that there is no plan to give students until June 1<sup>st</sup> to submit their statement of intent to register in part because doing so would disrupt the waitlist process.

Chair Knowlton and Area C Workgroup (ACW) Chair Adhikari met with the senior consultant to the California Assembly Higher Education Committee to explain the Workgroup's phase one report. As BOARS has seen, the workgroup's conclusion about the types of courses that can validate algebra II has been understood. However, confusion remains around the status of data science courses. A more

effective message might be to emphasize what constitutes the best preparation for UC and to identify the high school math courses that prepare students for college level math. Chairs Knowlton and Adhikari conveyed that, in the second phase, the ACW will devise guidelines for data science course content that could better prepare students for college level data science courses.

### III. Consultation with Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)

- *Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP; Matt Reed, Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP*

Director Chang reported on admissions outcomes and first- and second-year persistence rates and grade point average (GPA) at UC. The initial cohort of students admitted to UC without standardized tests was in 2021 and the director noted that there is no way to decouple the impact of going test-free from the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic which began at the same time. IRAP did not attempt to examine the impact of test-free admissions on student performance but compared admissions outcomes and the performance of students who enrolled before and after the elimination of the test requirement. There was a notable increase in freshman applications in 2021 but there is no concrete evidence that eliminating the test requirement led to this result. The admit rate declined from 2020 to 2021 across all high school GPAs which could be attributed to the substantial increase of applicants. In the absence of test scores, high school GPA becomes the most reliable indicator of academic readiness. The data suggests that removing one measure, no matter what it is, may not have a significant impact on admissions outcomes.

There is a growing trend in the percentage of applicants and enrollees with a GPA of 3.8 or higher and a sharp increase of this group from 2021 to 2022 might be related to high school GPA inflation as many students were allowed to select Pass/No Pass due to school COVID-19 policies. From 2018 to 2023, the percentage of first-generation applicants decreased but the percentage admitted among this group remained relatively flat, suggesting that eliminating the test requirement may not have significantly impacted admission outcomes in terms of the demographic composition of admitted students. The admit and enrollment rates of low-income students have been stable over this period. The number of public California source schools for applicants, admits and enrollees increased from 1,400 in 2018 to 1,600 in 2022 but eliminating the test requirement has not significantly impacted this trend over time.

In terms of student performance, first- and second-year persistence rates by campus and entering cohort have remained steady for most campuses from 2018 to 2022 and a few campuses have seen an uptick in first-year persistence from 2020 to 2022. This trend continues for the second-year persistence rates for the 2020 to 2022 cohorts. Students with higher high school GPAs tend to have higher persistence rates, averaging around 96% for the first year and 95% for the second year. Director Chang explained that there has been a decline in first- and second-year persistence rates for students with lower high school GPAs, particularly those with GPAs below 3.0 who may have been admitted through the admission by exception path due to not meeting the minimum GPA requirement, and further study would be needed to understand the reasons for this decrease. Persistence rates for students in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM), non-STEM students, and students who did not declare a major upon enrollment remained stable from 2018 to 2022 across the system and at the campus level.

An analysis of persistence by Classification of Instructional Programs codes show that some majors experienced slightly increased rates while others had declining rates from 2020 to 2021. There has been a slight decline in UC GPAs since the 2019 cohort which persisted from 2020 to 2021 followed by a small increase for the 2021 and 2022 cohorts. The analysis found that first-year UC GPA decreased for STEM, non-STEM, and undeclared students from 2021 to 2022. Director Chang concluded that, because the admissions outcomes remain pretty consistent over the years, this analysis reveals that there is no substantial difference in admission outcomes and first- and second- year performance among freshman cohorts before and after the elimination of the standardized test requirement. IRAP

will continue tracking and evaluating student progress toward degree completion and post-baccalaureate experiences, and BOARS members can send suggestions for analysis to IRAP.

**Discussion:** A member suggested IRAP look at the unit load students are maintaining to see if the units passed in a year has decreased over time because persistence might not change much given how campuses support students they admitted. There could also be an assessment of campus spending on advising and advising centers decades ago compared to now. Standardized tests may have helped identify students with inadequate math preparation or who will struggle once at UC.

#### **IV. Consultation with Undergraduate Admissions**

- *Jim Rawlins, Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management, UCSD; Gary Clark, Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management, UCLA; 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 of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA*

Chair Knowlton welcomed Associate Vice Chancellors (AVC) Rawlins and Clark to the videoconference for an initial discussion about how personal insight questions (PIQs) are used for admissions. The committee would like to know if the PIQs are helping Admissions staff identify the students UC aims to enroll and if there are any problems. Members may want to bring the information heard today to their divisional committees to prepare for the June meeting with all the admissions directors. About ten years ago, when Undergraduate Admissions started to redesign the application, one of the first changes was to move away from the two personal statement prompts that resulted in essays in favor of questions that require short answers. Around this time, applications to UC increased, especially from outside California, and the Admissions directors talked about the utility of the personal statements. Admissions directors were concerned that students were simply copying and pasting essays developed for the Common Application into their application to UC which was not necessarily meaningful in UC's admissions process.

This led to the development of the PIQs with the goal of helping students understand that the focus is not on their ability to write a paper for a class, but about providing UC with deeper insights into who they are, the opportunities they have had, and the challenges they may have faced. While the application provides details related to academic performance, responses to the PIQs help put the rest of the application into context. Students can select the PIQs that resonate with them as opposed to being forced to respond to the two personal statement prompts that might not feel relevant. The PIQs send a signal about who UC wants to apply.

As central as the PIQs are to holistic review, students' responses will not be the deciding factor for admission. The value of UC's approach to holistic review is how different elements contribute to an overall sense of the applicant. In addition, it is important that students understand that the PIQ responses, GPA, or other individual parts of the application are not scored separately and contribute to but do not determine the outcome. The eight PIQs were developed in consultation with faculty, and each question is tied to at least one specific element of the comprehensive review process and selected deliberately. The purpose of this is to better illustrate elements of the comprehensive review process that could help Admissions staff make more informed decisions.

**Discussion:** Members asked how responses to the PIQs are assessed and how admissions staff know the PIQs are working as intended, AVC Rawlins explained that the aim is to find out what students have to tell UC about their academic potential, their drive, their motivation, and the challenges they are facing. The readers are trained to look for the kinds of information that align with the factors set out by BOARS, and the readers are given many examples at the start of the process and constant check-ins throughout the cycle help ensure they are doing what is expected. The main way Admissions staff can

tell if the process is working well is from the overall outcomes resulting from it. An attempt to score every PIQ answer and make a linear relationship would be missing the entire point of what Admissions is trying to learn which is the bigger picture of the students. It is not a quantitative exercise for the student, and Admissions wants to resist being too quick to quantify it on the back end.

There was a question about whether eliminating the PIQs would change the pool of admitted students and the AVCs reiterated that the PIQ responses contribute to the decisions that must be made. Even with the score from the holistic review, Admissions has to take various pressures into consideration, and without the PIQ responses there would be no other efficient way to get some of the information students share. A member asserted that there is considerable cost for applicants and readers in terms of time, thus a process to assess if the costs are worth it is needed. Chair Knowlton suggested a pilot could look at how decisions would be made with and without responses to PIQs. AVC Rawlins indicated that Admissions does evaluate the contribution of the PIQ responses and remarked that the holistic scores are not used to sort students from top to bottom by who is most and least academically capable. Furthermore, there are things that often cannot be easily quantified and AVC Rawlins feels it is important to resist over simplifying or over quantifying the admissions process.

One concern is that, if gaining a sense of the whole student is subjective, reader bias could be introduced. AVC Rawlins reassured the committee that readers are carefully trained and encouraged members to attend a training session to see the major emphasis placed on identifying bias. Admissions staff pay close attention to this when looking at the scores given to sample application files and the most experienced readers keep a watchful eye to make sure bias is not creeping into the reviews. Selective institutions such as UC require things like responses to PIQs because there is a sense that informed decisions are difficult to make without them. UC could probably enroll a cohort of academically capable students without responses to PIQs, but the written narratives inform the application review in a way that yields an appropriate student body for each campus. A member asked if UC has data that suggests the ability to write clear, persuasive, and interesting prose is a product of a particular kind of privilege or set of people. AVC Clark explained that the move away from long essays was meant to let students respond to questions that speak to them without a significant burden.

When ChatGPT has come up in previous discussions with the Admissions directors, the committee's concerns were dismissed because these large language model tools were viewed as useful for improving writing quality. However, based on today's discussion it seems that writing quality is not essential to a good PIQ response since the focus is on the content. ChatGPT can generate content so there is a serious concern and the long-term viability of the PIQ responses is doubtful. AVC Rawlins agreed that some students will use ChatGPT to help them write more fluently but pointed out that for decades there have been students, especially those with privilege, whose parents or private counselors have written their essays, and UC has not built tools to guard against that. It is possible that some applicants now have access to the same kind of help others had before, and it was noted that ChatGPT cannot define what students should say. A well-written response lacking real content or not providing insight will not make students stronger in the holistic review or improve their chances of being admitted, whereas a response with imperfect punctuation or grammar might still offer compelling information about students' circumstances or interests, thereby having a dramatic impact on the readers' evaluation. That said, the use of ChatGPT needs to be monitored and maybe in the future students should be asked if they received help of any type. Several members reported using fewer papers in their classes specifically due to the emergence of ChatGPT. It was noted that the elimination of standardized test scores for admissions gives the impression that more weight is put on the PIQs and GPA.

At UCLA and UCSD each student is given one holistic score, and the different parts of the application are not individually ranked or associated with a fixed weight. Readers are trained to read the entire application before assigning the holistic rank on a scale of one to five, and each application is read at least twice by different readers before an admission decision is made. A small number of applications

end up being read a third time by a senior staff person in the Admissions office, suggesting fairly consistent scoring of most applications by the first two readers. Members are encouraged to talk with the Admissions staff at their campuses to understand how approaches to holistic review differ, but none of the campuses give micro-scores to the different pieces.

The AVCs were asked how the review of applications can be objective or consistent when it is not entirely clear how the PIQ responses and the other elements contribute to the final score, and AVC Rawlins explained that this is connected to norming. In their training, readers are given different examples of what could make an application receive a particular score, so the review is not meant to be completely divorced from some kind of comparison process. Although scores are not assigned to a particular GPA, students with higher GPAs tend to be more likely to be admitted. Admissions directors at private universities across the country would have similar explanations regarding the role personal essays play in giving them a better understanding of the applicant. If there is a desire to influence the makeup of the student body beyond just their ability to be successful, with so many students applying to UC campuses, these contextual pieces are critical. The over 300 people who read the applications to UCLA are comprised of Admissions staff, staff from other parts of campus, and seasonal outside readers including current and former high school counselors. Each reader goes through the same in-depth training annually and the actual reading process takes several months. Faculty in some schools participate in the evaluation of certain cases. The readers at UCSD are similar to those at UCLA and AVC Rawlins mentioned that campuses try to engage good readers or multiple years while readers who are not doing well are dismissed. High school counselors are expressly forbidden from reading their own students' applications.

A member proposed that BOARS explore how PIQ responses are related to the rest of the information in the application and decisions about a student's admission by using text processing. Rather than looking at individual responses, insight might be gained by evaluating hundreds of them to see if any patterns emerge. AVC Rawlins would worry about trusting technology to generate a measure that aligns with how readers are trained to use the PIQ responses and stressed the importance of not going about this evaluation the wrong way. Another idea would be to examine if applicants' scores differ at all based on which questions they answered, and AVC Clark remarked that UCLA has looked at which PIQs are responded to most frequently but not at any correlation with admissions outcomes. AVC Rawlins indicated that there is a small number of very competitive majors where, no matter how well a student does in the holistic review, the score may do less to get them admitted, so any study needs to factor in the major selected.

It was observed that the context worth taking seriously is something that the PIQs more or less coerce, as students are asked about things like leadership and innovation and then there are questions about overcoming obstacles which some people may value more highly. That there are questions about leadership but not things like modesty encodes a certain value system which goes to the point about how UC signals its values through the PIQs. In light of this key function of the PIQs, it is critical to be attentive to the values reflected by these questions. Faculty have students who are disparately prepared, and through the admissions process it seems there is an attempt to adjust for largely socioeconomic underprivilege and a lack of resourcing in certain California schools.

One takeaway from today's discussion may be that conditions of low transparency are not something to be suspicious of, describe as merely subjective, or needing to be quantified. These conditions instead help the campuses enroll a student body that is sufficiently diverse, interesting, and representative of people who may not otherwise have the opportunity to get the education that UC provides because they come from certain backgrounds or under-resourced schools. Adding more metrics or evaluating the assessments might not help since UC already has a great deal of information about California students and BOARS may need to agree that one goal of this institution is to ensure that as many students from as many different backgrounds as possible are encouraged to apply and realize their potential at UC.

AVC Clark confirmed that Admissions offices review the personal insight questions annually and ask whether changes should be made. However, it is imperative that faculty and Admissions directors think about if there is anything the PIQs are not revealing that is an element or a characteristic for which more information should be cultivated. A member reiterated the concern about needing an analysis of what is happening with the PIQs, not necessarily to quantify the responses, but perhaps to confirm that the reader training is the best it can be and to see if any patterns emerge. Members thanked the AVCs for the information they shared today, and AVC Rawlins and AVC Clark thanked BOARS for the invitation and welcomed follow-up questions.

## **V. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *James Steintrager, Chair, & Steven W. Cheung, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Steintrager reported that the Regents policy on what is posted on department websites will again be considered by the Board in a couple of weeks, but it is likely that action on this item will be postponed. Senate leadership is spending a good amount of time on issues related to the protest encampments on most of the UC campuses including a long meeting with the Board. The Regents are trying to figure out how they can help manage campus safety and how involved they should be, and there is also concern about the lack of centralized control since the chancellors are taking differing approaches. The UAW, in support of the protests, has authorized a strike vote as early as next week and there is growing consternation because this would be a wildcat strike across the system. UCOP has been developing guidance for contract negotiations with the UAW but there has not been any contingency planning should a strike occur before the negotiations reopen. A long-term implication of a wildcat strike is that it appears UC's partners have not been negotiating in good faith.

In addition to conversations about free speech, discussions about the protestors' demands, including divestment, are slowly starting at the divisions. Students are interested in not only targeted investments related to the Israel Palestine conflict but investments in anything related to arms manufacturing. There has been a lot of back and forth between certain chancellors and students, with students indicating they will engage on their own terms. Attempts to talk and negotiate will not be smooth or easy and any progress will probably be incremental. Chair Steintrager is encouraging division chairs to learn from what is happening at UCLA and to let administrators know that the divisional Senate expects to be kept informed and consulted about matters under its purview such as cancelling classes.

Vice Chair Cheung reported that President Drake issued a letter expressing support for a 4.2% increase to base salaries contingent on no new surprises with the state budget. UC is awaiting the tax receipt numbers which will serve as the basis for the Governor's May budget revise. Chair Steintrager mentioned that letters on cybersecurity and compliance were recently distributed to the campuses and the Senate is seeking clarification of some of the content. Finally, the Senate office is devising better protocols for processing and reviewing proposed legislation that would impact UC.

## **VI. Debrief: Discussion Regarding Personal Insight Questions**

Chair Knowlton believes it would be valuable for a pilot to look at holistic scores based on the whole application and scores without the PIQ responses. There could be some correlation where students who have slightly lower academic performance might get higher scores if they write about challenges but students without much to share could have lower scores. It also could be the case that diversity increases based on the PIQ responses. Such a pilot would not be difficult to do and could help address many of the committee's worries about whether the PIQs add to the admissions process.

**Discussion:** A few years ago, UCR conducted a pilot similar to what the chair described where it compared admissions outcomes from before the campus used holistic review to outcomes after holistic review was adopted, but the representative does not know the status of that study. Since holistic review

has been utilized for the past ten years, it should be possible to analyze the impact of PIQs that have only been used for a few years. UCI has an additional review mechanism whereby a department conducts its own augmented review and provides scores to the Admissions office so that students are admitted to the major based on the department's recommendations. This process worked well in the physics department, leading to an increased class size and better retention in the major, and the representative found that the PIQ responses were rarely useful in evaluating a students' preparedness or promise of being successful in physics at UCI.

A representative shared that two articles described analyzing essay texts from UC and finding a correlation between the socioeconomic status of the students and the essays. It would be useful to conduct a statistical analysis to uncover if there is a correlation between the admission decision and the texts as well as the outcomes in terms of retention and GPA. There could also be a small-scale experiment, at the campus or systemwide levels, to study the applicant pool to know how the PIQ responses work. There are a variety of ways BOARS could proceed but having any kind of study that explores the issues under discussion would be better than leaving it to the Admissions Directors. Even if every aspect of the process is not completely transparent, it is important to be transparent to the public about the underlying values being pursued during the admissions process or UC could potentially lose the public's trust.

In addition to using the PIQs as part of the holistic review, UCSC has readers score the PIQ responses individually along specific dimensions including diversity, maturity, resilience, leadership, and other things that would be desirable characteristics in students. While not a systematic study, the campus has tried to look at whether those scores are progressive or regressive, and despite how the readers are trained the scores end up being largely regressive. For example, when looking at something like scoring on diversity or resilience, it is the lower income students who are doing less well on their scores for these components, which is disheartening because the whole point was to identify certain students and characteristics through their PIQ responses. The responses are also not predictive of how well the students will score on the rest of the application. The UCSC representative does not think this means that that PIQs are not valuable in the holistic context of viewing the whole application because other potentially desirable traits for a diverse group of students might be identified.

A member noted that by definition, with holistic assessment, there will be aspects of a student's application that are going to be tough to measure without large control groups to make comparisons over time. BOARS could invest significant time and energy into fiddling around with the peripheral parts of the application, advocating for the reintroduction of standardized test scores, or arguing about eliminating the PIQs when the reality is the Admissions staff are being asked to deal with and adjust for social and economic problems stemming from massive inequality and under resourcing. BOARS may need to acknowledge that, unless UC is capable of producing a quasi-objective assessment that ranks students in order, this is an unbelievably politically freighted process that is complicated to the point of entropy. Another observation is that there is inadequate investment by the campuses in mentoring and the resources or structures needed if UC truly believes in enrolling students who have been poorly prepared but have great potential. Chair Knowlton recommended that local committees contemplate these issues and in June the committee can discuss collecting data for some type of study to look at the impact of PIQs. Members should also share any relevant campus data with BOARS and let the committee know if any divisions plan to tackle this issue.

## **VII. Progress Report: Credit by Exam Policy**

- *Chair Knowlton, Tony Albano (UCD), & Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR)*

The credit by exam issue is multifaceted and Chair Knowlton has met with Undergraduate Admissions consultants and the chair of the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) to determine how to divide the decisions to be made about whether credit can be conferred for an exam score. There is a question about awarding college credit which is in UCEP's purview, and that committee is being more

conservative, deeming that classroom experience has more value than a score on a final exam. Rather than making a systemwide policy, UCEP prefers to leave it to the campuses to decide if a certain score on an external exam should substitute for a UC course. A separate question is whether the score on an external exam can signify competency and count for satisfaction of A-G for admissions. UCEP reviewed the new Advanced Placement (AP) Pre-Calculus class and decided that it is not equivalent to a college course, but BOARS will use different criteria when judging this course. Undergraduate Admissions has determined that the AP Pre-Calculus course covers the pre-calculus criteria so students should get credit for Area C and this course also validates algebra II.

BOARS will need to consider if a student who does not take the AP Pre-Calculus course but passes that exam with a certain score should get credit for Area C. Chair Knowlton indicated that increasing numbers of students are taking an AP exam without taking the affiliated course, so this is what a BOARS policy might address. There might be a situation where BOARS decides that taking an exam should not satisfy an A-G requirement because the committee finds that something experiential is fundamental. UC is very familiar with the College Board and AP and has a sense of the integrity and faculty evaluation of those exams, and the same can be said for the International Baccalaureate (IB) and A-Levels. However, international applicants are taking exams like the Indian National Exams and UC has not accepted these to date, and the Admissions Directors have suggested that BOARS might want to consider them. The BOARS subcommittee might decide that the use of external exams to satisfy A-G should not be expanded beyond those currently accepted or it might look at the international exams which are becoming more common and decide they should be assessed.

The UCD and UCR representatives have been reviewing the background information about how external exams have been assessed by BOARS in the past, with the goal of determining if the assessment can be standardized with a rubric or procedure to use going forward or if it has to be more open-ended. The background materials include principles that past faculty reviewers have come up with such as clear criteria for assigning a particular score, and some of this might form a basis for the criteria BOARS will use for the newer exams. Chair Knowlton added that BOARS will look at the AP Pre-Calculus and AP African American Studies exams to decide if students should receive credit for an A-G requirement. The committee will discuss this further in June.

**Discussion:** Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu reported that a bill has been introduced in the California Legislature proposing the adoption of the Cambridge program by California public high schools. Many of the Cambridge programs are proliferating in Florida, and Undergraduate Admissions is aware of two schools in California with established A-G course lists that have adopted the Cambridge International curriculum. Director Fischerhall clarified that the AP African American Studies course has been approved to fulfill Area A. The director explained that, historically, when a program like the College Board has an A-G list that has been approved, a course will be submitted to UCOP for the standard review process by the analysts who take into account UC faculty policy guidance to assess whether or not that particular course meets the threshold to fulfill the A-G category. This is a separate and distinct process from the review to determine if it is appropriate for an exam to fulfill that A-G category or if that exam makes a student eligible to get college credit of some kind. The College Board submits a course for a specific category and the High School Articulation team assesses it against the criteria used in the past.

### **VIII. Systemwide Review Item: Proposed Statement on UC Quality**

Chair Knowlton explained that BOARS can opine on the proposed statement on UC quality.

**Discussion:** The UCB representative started a document and a few other members have contributed their comments. Members shared the reactions of their divisional committees to the proposed statement and will add more feedback to the draft memo.



## **IX. Member Reports/Campus Updates**

UCSC: The committee finalized its memo on the proposed Area H requirement and the proposed statement on UC quality was discussed. It also contemplated issues related to holistic review for the fall cohort and looked at discrepancies in the ways applications are reviewed.

UCLA: The committee provided comments on the proposed Area H requirement. Another focus has been on a systematic way for the committee to review special and talent-based admissions units on the campus, and the first year's worth of data has been requested from each of those units.

UCI: There was a short meeting to discuss comments on the Area H requirement proposal as well as the proposed statement on UC quality.

UCR: This committee also considered the statement on UC quality and had questions about its purpose and how quality in online instruction might be measured. The proposed Area H requirement was also discussed.

UCD: The committee discussed standardized tests and their value in Engineering and math heavy majors. This led to a discussion about the utility of placement exams and options to improving admissions in this challenging area.

UCSD: The committee is writing memos on the Area H proposal as well as the statement on UC quality, and there was a discussion about the Area C Workgroup's phase I report. The Admissions staff described concerns related to FAFSA including how the delay will impact diversity.

UCB: In addition to FAFSA, the committee discussed student athlete admissions. The committee received an update on the direct admit process into the Haas School of Business and reviewed data on how well it is working particularly in terms of the diversity of the class. This will be an important model for other departments interested in direct admit.

UCM: The committee prepared its memo on the proposed Area H requirement and continued approving new majors.

## **X. New Business**

BOARS members received several letters from the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) regarding transfer pathways. There is a question about what level of approval is needed and Chair Knowlton asked if members want to look at the transfer pathways proposed by ACSCOTI. The proposed pathways will be made available and unless issues are identified they will be approved by default. ACSCOTI works closely with discipline faculty to develop the pathways.

Meeting adjourned at: 2:20 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton