

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

June 5, 2020

I. Consent Calendar1. Approval of BOARS June 5, 2020 agenda**Action:** The agenda was approved as noticed.**II. Announcements***Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair*1. Academic Council of May 27, 2020

- BOARS members should reflect on current events and how UC can respond.
- Members are thanked for meeting off-cycle last week with the California State University counterpart committee. The similarity of issues confronted and level of agreement on the need to make advances is compelling.
- The Regents acted to adopt the President's recommendation to go from "test optional" to "test blind" to no test unless a new one can be created in 5 years. The provost will convene a group to assess the feasibility of developing a new test in that time frame. The Senate is expected to have several seats at the table.

2. Other meetings

- The IGETC Standards Committee is acting on the new page and word count limits approved by the Intersegmental Council of Academic Senates (ICAS).

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership*Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair**Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair*

- The UC community must stand together during these times of crisis.
- The state budget is still in flux. Federal support remains unclear, and the tax revenues are unknown. UCOP is working on contingency plans and exploring what workforce actions may be needed to make ends meet.
- Research and Innovation Vice President Maldonado is helping to lead systemwide efforts to ramp-up research and is active in contact tracing planning.
- Campus re-opening decisions will be made over the summer.
- A new chancellor has been announced for UC Merced. Nathan Brostrom will resume his UCOP post of Chief Financial Officer.
- Federal actions targeting foreign scholars are being decried.

- Results from the faculty remote teaching survey should be available soon.
- The Regents voted unanimously to adopt President Napolitano’s proposal to go “test optional or test blind” for two years, then “test blind” for two years, during which time, the feasibility of developing a new test will be determined, and created, if found possible. The President’s recommendation also includes instructions to the Senate to reassess admissions with the goal of addressing differential admission and enrollment by demographic or socio-economic status. A working group to assess the feasibility of developing a new test within 5 years will be convened by the provost. That working group should consider questions such as: What are the principles that support the use of tests in admissions? Should the status quo ante be fixed or discarded? Should a new test reflect A-G academic goals only? Is this a political or scientific/academic decision? The Senate is expected to play a large role in the working group.

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President – Office of Student Affairs

Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools and Colleges

Tongshan Chang, Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning

1. TOEFL/Duolingo Proposal

Note: Item deferred.

2. Changes to the Statewide Eligibility Index

Two alternate calculations for the statewide index were presented to BOARS, following elimination of the ACT Writing test as a factor. Members had questions about the role of the referral pool, the distribution of students from underrepresented groups in public versus private schools, the frequency and degree of grade inflation in schools with different governance models, and what further changes to the index might be necessary given the shifting testing landscape. Whether to keep the index at 16% or restrict it to the Master Plan minimum of 12.5% impacts external audiences and decision-makers.

Action: Members will vote electronically.

3. Changes to Student Affairs

Several units in Academic Affairs, including Student Affairs, are being reorganized and consolidated. The new units will launch July 1.

V. Consultation with the Campaign for College Opportunity

Michele Siqueiros, President

Ms. Siqueiros noted the long-standing equity gaps for preparation, admission, matriculation, graduation, and beyond that the University faces. Members are encouraged to think critically about the incumbent structures and rules, and those who created them. Members are also encouraged to diversify the committee membership. Members are asked to create more slots for transfer students, create more support for A-G course availability in all California high schools, create outreach and partnership opportunities with community colleges, and create on-campus academic and social support structure for students from underrepresented groups. Transfer students should benefit from alignment between CSU

ADTs and UC Transfer Pathways. All admission personnel should have mandated implicit bias training. Careful attention should be paid to data trends in the upcoming “test optional” environment.

Members acknowledged the many issues confronting the university. Although many of the recommendations lie beyond BOARS’ ability to bring direct change, the need for consistent and constant lobbying is clear. Capacity, support services, outreach efforts, permanent funding augmentations, and training protocols must all be addressed at higher levels.

VI. Consultation with Admission Directors

Campus Admission Directors

1. How will campuses approach the “test optional” review process for the 2021 admissions cycle?

UCB: Internal discussions focus on whether to re-weight admission factors or to continue with present weightings. An analysis of last fall’s applications to determine the de facto impact of test scores is being planned.

UCD: A similar analysis of previous applications is planned. Equity-based outcomes will be emphasized.

UCLA: The campus is largely “test optional” for this fall, and additional guidelines for application readers are being developed.

UCR: The campus must move rapidly from a fixed weight, formula review, but resource limitations and the learning curve involved in shifting to full comprehensive review make such a transition difficult. One current proposal is to review each application with a test twice - once with the test and once without it, and then use the higher review score.

UCSD: The campus is still early in the planning process. Discussions focus on what specific information a test reveals about an applicant and the proxies that might exist for such data. Assessing academic preparation and projecting academic success are the goals of application review, but private institutions have shown mixed results in this area after having gone “test optional.”

UCSB: Academic factors will continue to be emphasized, and reader training will be enhanced. Software limitations make conducting detailed statistical analyses on campus difficult. Maintaining gains in equity metrics is a principle goal.

The other campuses reported having similar discussions and encountering similar obstacles.

Several members noted that it would be difficult to switch back to “test required” after five years of being “test optional” or “test blind.” The ability of California high schools to prepare students for another test - and administer it - is unclear. The ability of a test to indicate the most important characteristics of a successful UC undergraduate also remains unclear. The fact that transfer applicants need not submit a standardized test score continues to raise questions about the utility of such tests.

2. Enhancements to Reader Training

Each campus has at least implicit bias training session, and refreshers are being planned at several campuses at different points during the review cycle. Budget cuts may reduce the number of readers and contribute to fatigue.

A separate need exists to combat bias against a certain high school or region.

More training for high school counselors is also advisable. Many are overwhelmed, and the loss of testing metrics necessitates new training and communications for both counselors and students, especially those in under-resourced schools. A glossary and/or process map might prove useful.

3. Deferments

So far, there has not been an increase in requested deferments. Campuses are encouraged to remain flexible and transparent.

4. Accommodating Students Impacted by COVID-19

The Common App added a COVID-specific question, but it is optional. Some students may feel compelled to have such a story. The UC application will not have a specific COVID question, but applicants still have the option to answer the “biggest obstacle” PIQ or to use the additional information section. Again, flexibility for those who may have shown academic slippage during COVID is encouraged.

5. Non-resident Evaluation Metrics

Both for admission evaluation and the Compare Favorably reporting requirement, clear standards for non-resident admissions are needed. The lack of A-G coursework outside of California makes comparison difficult. Most campuses use the same procedures to evaluate non-resident applicants, but with different enrollment targets in mind. Most campuses also focus on international students’ academic English preparation.

Clarity on the goals of Compare Favorably would help. Applicant statistics, academic success on campus, or social/academic contribution after graduation are all potential metrics, depending on the aim of the requirement.

VII. California High School Accreditation – Cognia

Claudia Carter, Senior Vice President, Evaluation Services

Annette Bohling, Chief Global Accreditation Officer

Cognia also uses a peer review process, and uses an equity lens for all evaluations and considerations. Cognia prioritizes student learning and engagement. Rather than a compliance-driven, top-down method, Cognia encourages continual improvement in student outcomes. Assessment options include surveys administered and assessed by more than 500 permanent US staff. If a school fails its accreditation assessment on a first application, it must reapply. Previously accredited schools that slip can be placed “under review”; if no improvement is made, schools are then “under conditions”; if still no improvement is made, they are dropped. The goal is keep schools in a state of constant growth.

Members sought specific data on the number and types of schools accredited, their demographic breakdowns, their locations, and failure rates, which will be prepared and shared.

VIII. Executive Session

Note: Other than action items, no notes are taken during Executive Session.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Attendance:

Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Madeleine Sorapure, BOARS Vice Chair

Deborah Swenson, UCD

Susan Cohen Cory, UCI

Barbara Knowlton, UCLA

Matthew Hibbing, UCM

Sheldon Tan, UCR

Skip Pomeroy, UCSD

Andrea Hasenstaub, UCSF

Mike Gordon, UCSB

Juan Poblete, UCSC

Carlos Galan, Graduate Student Representative

Alexis Zaragoza, Undergraduate Student Representative