



BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Videoconference Minutes

June 6, 2025

In attendance: Deborah Swenson, Chair (UCD), Dave Volz, Vice Chair (UCR), Anant Sahai (UCB), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Lynn Vavrek (UCLA), Mike Cleary (UCM), Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR), Daniel Sievenpiper (UCSD), Michael Stryker (UCSF), Vanessa Woods (UCSB), 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), Liz Terry (Manager, Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP), Ahmet Palazoglu (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), & Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Vice Chair Palazoglu announced that James B. Milliken has been appointed as the next UC president, and the new systemwide vice provost for academic personnel and programs and the new UCR chancellor have also been appointed. It is unclear when the new UCSB chancellor will be appointed. The May revise of the governor's budget includes a 3% reduction in funding instead of the 8% cut proposed in January. Regent Riley, President Drake, and UC's State Government Relations (SGR) are continuing their advocacy in an effort to decrease the cut from 3% to 0% this year. The Regents approved a pause to the scheduled increase to employer contributions to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) as well as a stoppage of the planned short term investment pool transfer to UCRP to free up around \$800M in liquidity for campus operational expenses. The Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee endorsed the joint Senate-administrative workgroup report on faculty disciplinary policies and procedures. The workgroup's proposed guidelines for recommending and approving sanctions for misconduct in the realm of expressive activities will be distributed for systemwide review in the fall. The Regents welcomed the revision to BOARS' bylaw to codify consultation with California K-12.

On May 28th, Academic Council approved sending a proposal from UCSD and UCSF for a systemwide committee on climate change and sustainability out for review in the fall. Council reviewed feedback from a number of systemwide review items including the draft academic calendar report and revisions to Academic Personnel Manual policy 500. Council discussed possible revisions to the charge for the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity. On June 12th, Academic Assembly will entertain a resolution on the use of Trellix and similar monitoring software. The Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) has been meeting weekly since mid-April and will issue an interim report in late June. UCAD is focusing on several topics: the changing research landscape and how to support faculty; how to evaluate faculty

scholarship for merit and promotions in this changing landscape and whether the achievements relative to opportunity principles can apply; how students who might not be able to complete their education at a UC campus can access online courses to fulfill their degree requirements which raises the question of systemwide course approval and articulation; and what the processes and principles should be when it comes to restructuring programs in light of diminishing state and federal funding and possibly a shrinking graduate student population.

II. Consent Calendar

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

Action: The May 2nd, 2025 meeting minutes were approved.

III. BOARS Leadership Updates

Deborah Swenson, Chair & David Volz, Vice Chair

Chair Swenson thanked the committee members for their work on the revisions to the BOARS bylaw which was presented to the Regents on May 14th. On May 22nd, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) discussed updates to the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) Standards. Although both the California Community Colleges (CCC) and UC supported partial certification of Cal-GETC, the Academic Senate of the California State University (ASCSU) opposed the provision. Vice Chair Volz explained the Cal-GETC Standards Review Committee's deliberations related to flexibility in Subject Area 5 (Biological and Physical Sciences), Cal-GETC for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) and partial certification. During the Standards Review Committee's meeting prior to May 22nd, the ASCSU representatives seemed to agree that partial certification should be allowed and had advised the ASCSU leadership of their support, but the ASCSU leadership on ICAS unilaterally voted against it. Minor changes to the Standards as well as revisions to Area 2 (Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning) were approved by all three segments. How students will be impacted by not having partial certification is not entirely clear.

The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) has finalized several memos that will be on Academic Council's June agenda. One memo requests the sunseting of ACSCOTI and the other is a request to withdraw ACSCOTI's proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 479 which would have allowed students to defer up to four Cal-GETC courses until after transferring to UC. A third memo is a proposal to consolidate four separate biology transfer pathways into one biological sciences pathway. Vice Chair Volz indicated that, with the sunseting of ACSCOTI, some work on transfer issues may be managed by BOARS in the future. Chair Swenson shared that Assembly Bill (AB) 1217 (Fong) and AB 684 (Patel) are dead for this year, but AB 500 (Quirk Silva) is still moving Forward.

IV. UC Eligibility Areas

Chair Swenson reiterated the importance of having language for the Eligibility Areas that will be easily understood by and clarify the criteria for community college professors who are trying to develop coursework that would transfer seamlessly to UC. In addition, it is essential that the Transfer Articulation team at UCOP have more comprehensive language for implementation and to convey why a course does or does not meet transferability more transparent. The criteria preserve

the elements related to baseline transferability. Members were asked to share whether the divisional committees support the three recommendations.

Discussion: All members reported that their divisional committees are in favor of the three recommendations. The UCD committee suggested clarifying language in UC-B (Social and Behavioral Science). The UCB committee is generally supportive of alignment with Cal-GETC and simplicity where possible. The faculty members on UCM's committee with expertise in various disciplines expressed support. Members suggested minor edits to the language.

Action: A motion to approve the recommended language for the UC Eligibility Areas was made and seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to approve.

V. Draft Credit by Exam Procedures

Tony Albano (UCD) & Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR)

Since the last BOARS meeting, the UCD and UCR representatives met with Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu, Director Fischerhall, and BOARS leadership to get input on the draft credit by exam policy and procedures. Two questions for members are: if the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) approval of exams for course credit should be a separate process from the approval by BOARS for admissions so that an exam could be approved for one, but not the other; and if BOARS wants to consider exams for admissions that UCEP will not review. BOARS may want to be in alignment with UCEP and not review exams beyond those currently accepted by UC including Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB).

Chair Swenson reminded the committee that UCEP's 2024 position statement on credit by exam indicated that AP and IB are well-established entities that have earned the trust of UC faculty. However, BOARS has serious concerns about the College Board's new scoring verification system. Another question is about the quality of the courses and exams that BOARS deems as warranting recognition, and the bar for meeting A-G is very different than the bar for substituting for a UC course. The UCD and UCR representatives recommend having a formalized evaluation process utilizing a standardized rubric. The representatives reviewed faculty reports on the evaluation of four exams in the past and found there was no standardization or consistency, with some reviewers commenting on content, breadth, and if an exam aligns with what is expected in a college course while others opined on the appropriate cut score for granting credit. Chair Swenson proposes that BOARS consider the minimum criteria to be evaluated when looking at a new course or exam and deciding if expected quality is met.

Discussion: Rather than trying to assess the courses and exams, perhaps it would be better to see the correlation to performance in later courses. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu remarked that IRAP has analyzed AP scores and how they equate to performance in subsequent courses for the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) with AP English and writing courses. However, the concern is about new curriculum UC is asked to approve for credit. High schools want to enroll students in the new courses and students and families want to know what credit will be awarded, so Undergraduate Admissions does much of the evaluation before courses and exams are even offered. While it is reasonable for a student to receive some type of credit for a high-level course, there is a dramatically changing landscape with some high schools offering dual enrollment and as many APs as possible. BOARS may need to go beyond the current document and

consider issues such as the purpose of APs from the perspective of admissions and why UC wants students to take them.

Chair Swenson agrees that this topic deserves careful attention given the changing environment and various pressures and observed that the quality of the courses is paramount if credit will be awarded. In the future, BOARS could provide tentative approval of a new course or exam and, after a certain number of years, evaluate it on the basis of how well those students do at UC in the courses that follow. A member questioned how BOARS can address the issues of secure proctoring or reliable scoring, and the UCD representative indicated that the idea is to have a statement regarding UC's expectations which currently does not exist. It may be challenging to determine the rubric and criteria for determining if a course or exam is sufficient for UC credit because this may depend on the subject matter experts, but at a minimum BOARS could set decision criteria for whether curriculum or exams are reviewed or not.

It was noted that testing companies rely on UC faculty to review the content of the courses and exams, and the more credit students receive for work done before coming to UC may decrease the number of courses they will take after matriculation. Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu explained some of the factors that lead school districts to offer large numbers of AP courses and advised BOARS to think about the broader statewide context of why the curriculum exists in schools and why actual college credit students can earn is important beyond just how it reflects on a grade point average (GPA) being calculated for admission purposes. The elimination of standardized tests for admission may be contributing to why students feel the need to take so many AP courses. The committee had a lengthy discussion that touched on numerous questions and concerns related to credit by exam including data analysis that may be helpful and how BOARS might proceed.

VI. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (GUEA), Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP), Admissions Directors, & Enrollment Management Leads

Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost & Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA; Chase Fischerhall, Director, A-G & Transfer Articulation, GUEA; Liz Terry, Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA; Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP & Matt Reed, Senior Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP

Chair Swenson welcomed the Admissions Directors (ADs) and Enrollment Management Leads to the videoconference and asked about a variety of topics.

Question: How is credit by exam viewed by the ADs and Enrollment Management Leads?

Discussion: The work of BOARS on draft procedures for credit by exams is appreciated and will be useful when staff are asked to explain how UC reviews external curriculum and exams. It is important for UC to think about issues of equity and rigor across different testing agencies. Chair Swenson pointed out that it is a burden on faculty who are asked to review the courses and exams and that it is difficult to determine if the courses meet the expectations of UC faculty. Since admissions offices have designated authority and expertise to determine which courses satisfy general education perhaps they could take the lead on these reviews. One AD asserted that it is critical for faculty to conduct the evaluations as they are the content experts and it will be harder for testing companies to argue with faculty when curriculum are not approved for credit.

Before considering expanding the use of credit by exam, it is important to determine if an external exam equates to a college-level course. There are concerns about students testing out of experiences that are foundational to their UC trajectory and about whether students truly understand the subject. Credit bearing exams and dual enrollment alleviate some of the pressures on lower division courses. It might be valuable to consider if credit should continue to be awarded for a score of 3 on APs. UC should establish a structure for when courses and exams can be submitted or resubmitted for consideration. Chair Swenson mentioned that BOARS is troubled by the College Board's changes to its scoring verification process, so faculty should remain in charge of reviewing external courses and exams. IB has been successful in maintaining what constitutes scores of 6 and 7 over time but this might not be true for the College Board. It is unclear if the departments that award credit for AP for their major are aware of the College Board's changes.

Question: UC has used the same set of Personal Insight Questions (PIQs) for a number of years. Are the ADs and Enrollment Management Leads satisfied with the current questions? Or would it be beneficial to modify the questions and if so, how should they be changed? Given the limits of read time, would it be better if applications had only three questions?

Discussion: The PIQs are effective and critical to the admissions process as the responses provide information about students not found elsewhere in the application, and it is impossible to know what insights would be lost if even one question is removed. Students typically meet the 350-word limit in their responses and sometimes they repeat the same information in different questions, so guidance could be provided or the questions could be reframed to help students better focus their responses. One associate vice chancellor (AVC) would advocate to require that students respond to the question about academic interests and aspirations as this is not addressed in other parts of the application. A concern is that first generation students or those who are undecided about their major may not have counseling to aid them in figuring out their academic interests. It could also be challenging for students applying to multiple majors to write about their academic interests in a way that is relevant across all of them, but this could be mitigated by asking students to write about why education is important in general. There is no appetite for changing the PIQs but BOARS is interested in knowing what is and is not working well. Since some students find it difficult to express themselves, one idea would be to lower the word count although it might be hard for other students to express everything they would like.

Question: In the absence of the SAT, grades have become increasingly important indicators of academic preparation. Do the ADs and Enrollment Management Leads have any concerns given the continuing compression of student grades, which makes student records increasingly similar, and also gives rise to student academic pressure surrounding the need for a "perfect" record? Also, do the ADs and Enrollment Management Leads notice any reductions in academic risk taking?

Discussion: Students are able to access rigorous college-level courses in a variety of ways outside their high school (e.g. dual enrollment, online offerings, AP and IB scores), so there is more external validation and triangulation than when UC first went test-free and grade inflation has been declining since the end of the pandemic. One challenge is how to change students' thinking in terms of the fear of not being admitted to UC versus wanting to explore a new subject. Having holistic or comprehensive review moves the consideration beyond the students' GPA and allows Admissions offices to look at how they challenged themselves. There are ways to contextualize how inflated some very high GPAs have become by understanding what they mean in the context of a particular school environment.

An AVC remarked that students with high test scores and low GPAs have not been successful at UC as demonstrated by a failure to engage with assignments as expected by faculty. It is important to acknowledge how difficult it is for students in California to take the SAT or ACT and that there are many students who self-select out of applying to UC because they believe their test scores are not competitive. Grade inflation seems to be an issue for students who earn low grades in high school rather than those in UC's applicant pool, and it may be more prevalent in elite private schools. Another issue is the belief that the number of APs a student has taken makes them stand out when the academic alignment with the major to which a student is applying matters more.

Question: Which other institutions do students applying to UC look at or what factors do they consider when deciding?

Discussion: One AD who met with high school counselors last week heard that students are committing to schools out of the country at higher than normal rates for various reasons and they are enrolling in schools in the United Kingdom, Australia, and Japan. Students are also considering their finances and more middle-income students may try to negotiate their financial aid packages. There are concerns about Pell Grants and Federal funding disappearing and students who traditionally did not seek aid are applying for support, including those impacted by the fires in Southern California. Students may be opting to attend a CCC for financial reasons and using a transfer admission guarantee to transfer into UC later. International students may be declining offers from UC and choosing to stay in their home countries. An AD remarked that a growing number of students may be deciding to work instead of pursuing higher education. Private institutions are offering increasingly earlier admissions. Underrepresented minority students are likely feeling like they do not belong at many universities because of the ugly rhetoric being used nationally, and they are considering Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Undocumented students may be deciding against attending college or view CCCs as safer options.

VII. Consultation with GUEA & IRAP (continued)

Chair Swenson explained that the Comprehensive Review and Compare Favorably reports for 2024 are being prepared by Undergraduate Admissions and IRAP. The reports contain data on who has applied to UC and who was admitted, which is of interest to the Regents. Chair Swenson is likely to streamline the narrative currently in the reports. Members were invited to suggest narrative to add based on their campus reports.

Discussion: If faculty want to bring about any changes in admissions outcomes, this will have to be driven by BOARS. Members have observed that students are not as well-prepared for UC as they were in the past, but one challenge is the lack of data about students who were not admitted to UC. Issues that are discussed with ADs and Enrollment Management Leads with the divisional committees are not raised when BOARS consults with them, so it is incumbent on BOARS members to bring those problems forward. Chair Swenson noted that the ADs and Enrollment Management Leads are responsible for ensuring that enrollment targets are met. The Admissions office at UCSB had concerns about grade compression and is working with the local committee on a study that will entail rereading some of the applications from two years ago and piloting a new process. The Institutional Research unit at this campus shares data and points out issues that should be examined.

VIII. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCSB: The committee is discussing a transfer pathway and proposals to approve pre-major changes for the impacted statistics program. The athletics admissions review committee provided an update on the process for reviewing student athletes being put forward for admission.

UCLA: The committee is thinking about the implications for international students whose visas may be revoked and if any policies and procedures for admissions should be reviewed.

UCB: The committee has concerns about maintaining UCB's budget amidst threats to the enrollment of international students. The working groups on standardized tests and athletics will be producing their reports.

UCD: The committee finished its report on athletics and admissions of athletes by exception has declined over the past few years. The campus is finishing the last admissions offers from the waitlist.

UCI: The representative met with the current and incoming chairs of the campus's council on educational policy and the incoming chair of the admissions to discuss concerns about the academic preparation of incoming students, especially in math. Next year these committees will explore establishing a math placement test for new students whose programs require preparatory math courses. This effort will coincide with the redesign of the calculus program.

UCSD: The admissions committee is reviewing the admissions process and a separate committee is looking at math. The current BOARS representative will chair the local committee next year and intends to advocate for being provided with data from the Admissions office and for the committee to have input into the admissions process.

UCSC: The committee discussed the UC Eligibility Areas proposal and the timing for notifying athletes in division 3 schools. Based on the updates on the statements on intent to register, the yield predictions look fairly accurate.

UCR: The committee also discussed the Eligibility Areas proposal and a proposal from the campus's budget committee to increase the enrollment of undergraduates students.

Undergraduate student representative: The student representative strongly recommends the use of lockdown browsers for proctored exams. As a student who transferred to UC, this representative believes there will be increasing numbers of transfer students as starting at a CCC allows students to explore different majors without significant financial consequences.

Graduate Student representative: The representative has learned from the difficult conversations at BOARS. One strategy for dealing with the use of ChatGPT is to engage students verbally about the content of a book along with a written assignment.

IX. New Business

Chair Swenson returned to the earlier discussion about credit by exam, remarking that the issue is complex. This matter should be taken up by a workgroup comprised of BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE representatives along with experts on testing. Senate leadership will need to weigh in on the

proposal for a workgroup but Chair Swenson asked members if this idea is supported. Vice Chair Volz and the other members expressed support for this endeavor.

X. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

The videoconference adjourned at: 2:11 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: Deborah Swenson, Chair