

## BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

## Meeting Minutes

Friday, June 7, 2024

**Attending:** Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD) (videoconference), Lin He (UCB alternate), Tony Albano (UCD), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Lynn Vavrek (UCLA), Peter Sadler (UCR) (videoconference), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), Joshua Berke (UCSF), Paul Spickard (UCSB) (videoconference), George Bulman (UCSC), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate Student Representative) (videoconference), Ani Adhikari (Chair, Area C Workgroup), 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), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)) (videoconference), Matt Reed (Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP) (videoconference), 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 May 3, 2024 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved.

## II. Chair's Announcements

Academic Council considered a proposal from the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) to revise systemwide Senate Regulations (SR) 900 and SR 902 to replace "academic probation" with "academic notice." Council endorsed this proposal and transmitted it directly to Academic Assembly, foregoing systemwide review. Chair Knowlton explained that Assembly Bill (AB) 927 allows the California Community Colleges (CCC) to offer baccalaureate degrees that do not overlap with existing California State University (CSU) or UC degrees. Council discussed a process developed by the UCEP to determine if any of the degrees proposed by the CCCs duplicate UC degrees.

Chair Knowlton summarized the history of the proposed Area H – Ethnic Studies requirement. The revised proposal was distributed for systemwide review in February and hundreds of letters from outside individuals and groups were received, reflecting the broad public interest in this matter. On May 20<sup>th</sup>, Council focused on the feedback from the Senate which was largely about access at under resourced high schools. There were questions about making Ethnic Studies a graduation requirement; how out-of-state applicants would be impacted; whether courses being offered to fulfil AB 101 would meet the criteria for Area H; and waiting until AB 101 is implemented in 2025-2026 to see what challenges emerge. Reviewers noted that Area H has more refined criteria than AB 101 and will therefore offer students a richer experience of Ethnic Studies. Following Council's deliberations, Chair Steintrager recommended that the questions and concerns identified in the review should be resolved before the proposal is advanced to Academic Assembly. A firm timeline for completing this work has not been determined but it is likely to carry over to the fall.

Vice Chair Cheung explained that UC's adoption of Area H would impact the other segments, particularly the CSUs. However, since there has not yet been any consultation with the CSUs, this will be a priority for the fall. Disciplinary experts and Undergraduate Admissions representatives will meet with Council to address questions about implementation. The vote to send the proposal to Assembly will happen once Council members understand the details, and the vote by Assembly might be delayed if new members need to be brought up to speed. Chair Knowlton and Vice Chair Cheung emphasized

that the goal is for Council to gather as much existing information as possible about what to expect when the new requirement goes into effect.

The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI) would like more UC faculty involvement in the process for establishing common numbering for courses across CCC campuses and the efforts to align UC's transfer criteria. In many cases, assigning the same number for a course at different campuses is straightforward. However, there are occasions when faculty need to examine the content of a class and it has been difficult to get UC faculty to participate. ACSCOTI has also flagged the need for UC faculty to join the work on aligning the associate degrees for transfer (ADTs) with the CSU's transfer model curricula, the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC), and UC's transfer pathways. The alignment of ADTs, Cal-GETC and the transfer pathways for Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) in particular can be problematic, so it would be beneficial for UC faculty to collaborate with CCC and CSU faculty to work out the details.

**Discussion:** A member noted that if a high school does not offer a course required by UC, students are able to take them at a community college or online, and there is a major effort underway among Ethnic Studies scholars and scholars in a host of other disciplines to develop open-source curriculum high school teachers can utilize for free. Concern about the availability of resources for local school districts is a red herring and delay tactic. The proposal to add a required third year of science was contemplated for seven years before it was ultimately not approved, suggesting that the slow process is not necessarily because the subject is Ethnic Studies. Chair Knowlton asserted that adding a new admission requirement is a significant change that should be handled carefully, and progress has been made since the discussion has moved beyond the criteria to questions of implementation.

Consultation with the CSUs is essential because students that enroll in that system are more likely to have attended high schools that have challenges meeting AB 101. A member recommended asking high schools for information about access and resource issues. Another suggestion is to establish a conflict-of-interest rule that requires individuals participating in decision-making to disclose any personal financial interest in the Ethnic Studies curricula. BOARS will not be involved with the immediate next steps but the committee's leadership shall keep the members informed.

### **III. Draft Credit by Exam Policy**

*Tony Albano (UCD)*

The UCD and UCR representatives have drafted a summary of how faculty have reviewed and made recommendations about external exams in the past. The goal is to have a standardized procedure for reviewing external exams to determine if they will meet to A-G subject area requirements for admission. One question is if students can fulfill a requirement with just a score on an exam without having taken the course. The number of external exams UC is asked to review is likely to increase and currently there is no formal process to manage the reviews. The UCD representative explained that test design psychometrics include such things as scoring, scaling, reliability, and validation analysis. UC has taken for granted that these issues have been done correctly and this assumption might be safe for reputable organizations like the College Board, but smaller and newer companies without a track record might not have information on administration, proctoring, or how security is ensured. Understanding how these issues are managed will require time and energy, and perhaps BOARS should assert that if companies do not provide information about exam security or psychometric properties UC will not accept their exams. BOARS members were invited to offer feedback on the initial draft recommendations and suggestions about any additional information that should be in the policy.

**Discussion:** Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu expressed agreement with the draft recommendations and proposed that the committee should develop the rubric to be utilized for evaluating the exams as well as a policy about when exams should be reviewed. BOARS should be responsible for identifying the faculty who review the exams as it would be less efficient for Undergraduate Admissions to handle

that process. Members are concerned about standards for test security, noting that Advanced Placement (AP) exams were leaked this year. The UCD representative explained that there are industry standards which, while not enforced, are typically followed by testing companies, and this could provide BOARS with a helpful rubric for evaluating validity. The committee will aim to finalize the policy and develop the rubric in the fall and then evaluate the AP Pre-Calculus and AP African American Studies exams as test cases.

#### **IV. Consultation with Consultation with GUEA, IRAP, & Admission Directors & Enrollment Management Leads**

*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; Tongshan Chang, Director, Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP); & Matt Reed, Analyst, IRAP*

BOARS was joined by the campus Admissions Directors (ADs) and Enrollment Management Leads to discuss several topics of interest.

1. ACSCOTI's proposal to streamline transfer admissions guarantee (TAG) requirements.

**Discussion:** Associate Vice Provost (AVP) Yoon-Wu explained that ACSCOTI's proposal to streamline TAG requirements was discussed with the ADs at those campuses that participate in TAGs. The ADs agreed with the recommendations and have worked to establish more uniform administrative requirements which will be evident in the updated TAG matrix. A few differences, such as when grade point average (GPA) is calculated, still need to be reconciled. The process for TAG certification has become more complicated because students are attending multiple CCCs at the same time.

2. Geometry and its lack of any validating course: are there concerns that it deters applicants who do not meet A to G and does the use of admission by exception for a large number of applicants poses an issue?

The campuses have raised concerns about geometry to BOARS for the past 12 years after it was decided that geometry would be a requirement for freshman admission and there was no course that would validate the omission of it. There are advanced students whose applications to UC will not list geometry because they took it prior to middle school or in some cases students did not take geometry but have taken significantly more advanced math. Admission by exception allows for California students to be admitted without having geometry on their academic record. Questions include whether a student who has not taken geometry is disadvantaged and if high school counselors will advise advanced students to take geometry to be eligible for UC. UC can encourage students to apply and tell them not to worry about not having taken geometry, but students will still see the course listed as a requirement and are likely to feel discouraged or disadvantaged in some way.

**Discussion:** The impact of not seeing geometry on an application depends on the context. It will not be a concern for a sophomore taking BC Calculus but it is a different matter for a student struggling with math proficiency. The primary issue is the incorrect perception on the part of the potential applicant about if the lack of geometry will hurt them and whether they will choose to apply to UC or not. Although admissions offices do not have data related to student perception about this requirement, it is a topic constantly brought up with UC's outreach and recruitment teams and during yearly counselor conferences. Another challenge is that, to meet audit requirements, admission by exception now requires multiple sign-offs/signatures. UC policy states that students just need exposure to geometry to meet the requirement even if they do not pass the course and this is really challenging to explain to high school counselors. In previous BOARS discussions, it was suggested that the absence of

geometry was not preventing substantial numbers of students from being admitted to UC, but it would be valuable to understand if there is an administrative burden associated with this requirement.

Chair Knowlton noted that the Area C Workgroup has taken the position that validation should only occur when the majority of the content in the higher course builds upon the content of the lower course. Even very advanced and complex courses, if not fundamentally based on geometry, should not validate it. BOARS could look at students who were admitted by exception specifically because they did not take geometry and assess their academic performance in UC courses that include a large geometry component. Faculty value geometry because it teaches students to think logically which benefits them in diverse majors. Since admission by exception has a negative connotation, perhaps there should be a process to waive the geometry requirement in a way that is more strengths-based especially if BOARS is committed to removing barriers to entry. Several years ago, the plan was for California to move to integrated math which would change how the subject is taught in high school, but integrated math has not been adopted by a lot of districts and the old standard of algebra, geometry and algebra II prevails.

It would be helpful to high school counselors if UC removed the caveat in the [“Quick Reference Guide to UC Admissions”](#) about not passing geometry: “If a student completes geometry and receives a grade of D or F, the student can validate the grade deficiency by completing at least the first semester of an advanced-level math course.” A member asserted that data is needed on how many students took geometry in middle school or skipped it all together. It might be more informative to identify the number of students with deficiencies who want to apply to UC but do not, and this data could be provided by school districts. Committee members agreed that the problematic language in the Reference Guide should be revisited but it would be valuable to get the perspective of STEM faculty about the importance of geometry, along with other data, before BOARS makes any significant decisions. BOARS should review its [2016 statement on the geometry requirement](#) which is the basis for the statement in the Reference Guide. Data from 2019 shows that of the 141,000 California students who applied to UC, 1,400 did not take geometry in middle or high school but there is no analysis of the admission rate of these students compared to the average student. In depth data analysis is needed, but it might be that the framing of the admission by exception policy should be changed, not the geometry requirement. BOARS will take this issue up in the next academic year with detailed data.

### 3. Universities again using standardized tests for admissions.

This year several universities have announced that they will again require standardized tests for admissions, sparking questions about whether UC will consider using them again, the impact of not having the test scores, and if recruitment efforts have changed since going test free. In May, Director Chang presented data on first- and second-year GPA and retention rates after UC went test-free.

**Discussion:** Going test-free has been a positive for UCLA where persistence rates have stayed the same or increased slightly and overall first-year GPA has not declined. The number of applicants from underrepresented groups increased dramatically the first year after going test-free, and an AD inferred that even being test-optional discouraged high performing students from applying. A test-optional policy leads students with less social capital to self-select out of applying to UC because they do not understand the context in which their test scores will be considered. It is unclear if UC is now missing students who may not have high GPAs but whose test scores would distinguish them, but this should be balanced against the number of students who decide against applying because of low test scores.

The analysis discussed in May indicated that there has been a small decrease in the number of first-generation students since going test-free, which BOARS should monitor. A member observed that it is difficult to assign students to the appropriate classes without standardized test scores, so placement tests are used for math and writing. The test-free policy resulted in a larger applicant pool but an unintended consequence is that it is harder to be admitted. Attendees debated how GPAs and standardized test scores factor differently into admission and future success in a major.

The Standardized Testing Task Force report indicated that the tests have some predictive value, so the question becomes how well is the admissions process working without that element. While there are trade-offs, eliminating standardized test scores has not resulted in significant changes in who is admitted and these students are doing well at UC. However, a member argued that students are different now compared to five years ago and it is not safe to conclude that nothing has changed from the perspective of faculty. The ADs and Enrollment Management Leads agreed that UC should remain test-free and BOARS should monitor what is happening with holistic review to ensure important aspects of students' academic profiles are not overlooked.

One AD posited that it would be helpful for BOARS to publicly express a commitment to remaining test-free at least for the foreseeable future. Director Chang shared that the 2022 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey data showed that students are less engaged in classroom academic activities. IRAP will continue to track data on retention rates, GPA, and graduation rates and try to tease out if the lack of academic engagement is related to online learning, the pandemic, or some other factor. It is understandable that the primary focus for BOARS for the past several years has been math, but the committee is urged to turn its attention to writing and communication readiness. Recent stories in the Chronicle of Higher Education described how students are unwilling to read assignments and it is critical that faculty help students change their way of thinking.

The committee did not have time to discuss concerns about Personal Insight Questions (PIQs) during this meeting, but Chair Knowlton explained that BOARS was joined by Associate Vice Chancellor Clark and Associate Vice Chancellor Rawlins in May to consider this matter. Based on that conversation, members agreed that the effectiveness of PIQs should be studied. Chair Knowlton thanked the ADs and Enrollment Management Leads for the lively discussion and for sharing the perspectives as people so closely involved with the application and admission process.

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

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

During the May Regents meeting, Janet Reilly and Maria Anguiano were appointed as chair and vice chair of the Board. The discussion about the Regents' policy on discretionary statements on department websites was postponed again. The Board decided that UCLA will pay UCB \$10M per year for three years to make up for the latter losing revenue due to UCLA's move to Big 10 football conference. The payment plan will be reevaluated after three years, and the payments may be paused or reconfigured if UCLA's revenue drops by 10% or expenses increase significantly. The Finance and Capital Strategies Committee approved the proposed UCM Medical Education building and the preliminary plan for the San Benito housing project at UCSB.

The UC Retirement Plan's investment portfolio is performing well which will be helpful considering the State's difficult budget situation. The Governor's budget calls for a 2.9% decrement to UC's base budget on the order of about \$130M. UC intends to follow through with the enrollment growth agreed to in the compact with the governor, with the understanding that the planned 5% increase for this year will be delivered in 2025-2026. There is, however, substantial skepticism that the restoration of funds will occur and the University will face difficult decisions about maintaining the compact. One question is if UC can sustain the current practice of capping out-of-state students at 18% of enrolled students. The Senate is pleased that President Drake has agreed to a 4.2% general increase in faculty salaries which may help mitigate some financial pressure. Academic Council discussed the feedback from the systemwide review of the UCEP's proposed statement on UC quality and the statement's aspirational goals generated questions about maintaining quality in the face of budget constraints. A memo from the president regarding cybersecurity triggered concerns among faculty about required training and about tracking software being placed onto devices that are owned by faculty.

Two protest encampments are still in place at UCD and UCSB and the actions taken by the administrators to dismantle the encampments at other campuses have led to votes of no confidence or censure for several chancellors. The Regents are closely monitoring the votes (which have failed) and what is occurring on the campuses and the Senate has offered recommendations for how events like the protests and encampments are handled in the future. The president ordered an investigation into what happened at UCLA and while there are no investigations into what transpired at the other campuses, UCI faculty are interested in transparency and that division may call for an investigation. Senate leadership plans to create a standing committee comprised of faculty with expertise in situations like these that the Senate and chancellors can consult with, but one unknown is whether consultation will take place in a timely manner.

The graduate student worker strike, which is set to end on June 30<sup>th</sup>, started at UCSC and has spread to several other campuses. UC's position is that this is an unlawful strike given that the agreement with the UAW is that there should be no strikes while the contract is in place. The University's two requests to the California Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) for injunctive relief with have been denied, and UC has now requested a temporary restraining order. The burden UC must prove is that the harm caused by the strike is irreparable, and PERB has not been moved by the arguments that the University is struggling with instructional continuity. The Senate continues to collaborate on guidance for faculty with Labor Relations, Academic Personnel, and External Communications at UCOP. Faculty associations have issued statements that conflict with the Senate's positions making it difficult to provide clear information to faculty. Positive developments on this front include the establishment of a faculty advisory group that will advise Academic Personnel on the upcoming contract negotiations along with an agreement to embed three or four faculty members into the negotiations team. The Senate was critical of the last round of negotiations, so it is good be situated to provide constructive criticism and a direct faculty voice during negotiations.

## **VI. Consultation with GUEA**

*Chase Fischerhall, Director, A-G & Transfer Articulation Policy, GUEA*

Director Fischerhall will report on two topics at a future meeting: 1) the Common Course Numbering project which was prompted by AB 1111 and is being led by the CCC Chancellor's office and Academic Senate and 2) a recommendation from the eTranscript Task Force to assign A to G tags to CCC courses. Today's discussion will focus on a proposal from Transfer Articulation that BOARS consider how current UC Eligibility Areas created by this committee align with the Cal-GETC standards. The director explained that the Transfer Articulation staff at UCOP manages two distinct course review processes every year. The first process occurs between June and September, when CCC articulation officers submit course outlines via Assist.org that have been developed by their faculty and curriculum committees. Transfer Articulation staff review the outlines for baseline UC transferability in terms of equivalence to a lower division UC course's depth, scope, and rigor. The team also considers if the course can be approved under a specific UC Eligibility Area. UC's decisions are sent to the CCCs promptly and there is a window to appeal from October 1<sup>st</sup> to October 10<sup>th</sup>, and all decisions are communicated by October 31<sup>st</sup>. This process is managed by UCOP staff who have been delegated authority by UC faculty to apply these criteria to review the course outlines of record.

The second process, which happens between December and May, is the upcoming Cal-GETC submission and review, and this is not run solely by UC. Until this past spring, this process was for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum. CCC articulation officers will submit courses developed by curriculum committees for review against the criteria for a specific Cal-GETC area, criteria developed and managed by the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS). Although UC faculty participate in the development of the criteria, the criteria are not reflected in Senate regulations. The courses submitted for consideration against Cal-GETC criteria are reviewed by faculty or staff from the CCC, CSU, or UC systems and each course is read by two or three individual reviewers. However, this review does not result in approval for a Cal-GETC subject area. Instead,

representatives from the three segments engage in a reconciliation process to develop consensus about whether each course should be approved or not for a particular subject area.

Director Fischerhall indicated that there are two distinct processes in part because there are separate general education (GE) patterns that have been created by different systems for different reasons. The UC Eligibility Areas and Cal-GETC may have areas that sound like they will correspond based on their titles but this is not always the case. In keeping with efforts to streamline transfer alignment and improve various processes, Transfer Articulation is highlighting a few things that could change. One challenge is that the UC Eligibility Areas are not publicly available. When the CCCs submit a course for review, the team will report if it qualifies or not for a particular area without offering an explanation because faculty have provided minimal guidance about what courses should include. Transfer Articulation would like to make the Eligibility Areas public. A second challenge is that the Eligibility Areas do not align exactly with the Cal-GETC subject areas, and the CCCs regularly seek clarity about why a course approved for a specific Cal-GETC area are not approved for a particular Eligibility Area. Likewise, UC is asked by legislators about this lack of alignment and it is difficult to answer since the criteria is not public.

The briefing provided to BOARS outlines two essential requests and three possible options for moving forward. In addition to the request to make the UC Eligibility Areas public, Transfer Articulation asks that the Eligibility Areas be strengthened, and both of these steps will help improve the integrity of the process and the quality of UC's relationships with the other segments. Director Fischerhall explained the three options including the pros and cons of each: 1) Replace the UC Eligibility Area criteria with the Cal-GETC subject area guidelines; 2) Align UC Eligibility Area approvals with Cal-GETC approvals; and 3) Keep the UC Eligibility Area criteria distinct from other articulation criteria; do not prioritize alignment.

**Discussion:** ACSCOTI has not weighed in on these proposals but this has come up in their discussions, and many members of that committee favor the first option. The first option would entail adding language from the Cal-GETC Standards to systemwide Senate regulations, which would maintain faculty control over the criteria. The lack of general alignment stems from the Eligibility Areas being broader than the Cal-GETC Standards with the exception of math. The Eligibility Areas are broad and comprehensive because UC wants to ensure that courses include theoretical approaches and that students have a wide-ranging general education, whereas the scope of many CSU programs is narrower and Cal-GETC is a marriage between the two. Members should discuss the proposals with their campus committees and admissions directors over the summer if possible.

## **VII. Area C Workgroup Phase II Report & Recommendations** *Ani Adhikari, Chair, Area C Workgroup (UCB)*

Chair Knowlton welcomed the chair of the Area C Workgroup (ACW) to the meeting. Chair Adhikari began by thanking AVP Yoon-Wu and Analyst Reed for their help, and shared that three CSU faculty on the ICAS Mathematics Competencies Subcommittee joined the ACW in phase II. Chair Adhikari explained that the recommendations in the phase II report reiterate the conclusions drawn in phase I, noting that the ACW took a very practical approach in this stage and relied heavily on data. The data reveals that only 1% of UC applicants did not satisfy the requirement to take the lower-level sequence and the vast majority of applicants took more math beyond that sequence. The overwhelming majority of applicants have taken a great deal of math which is consistent with UC's recommendations to take four years of math if possible and to take the most rigorous courses available.

The ACW devoted significant time trying to understand what is meant by "recommended" and decided to make recommendations to students about the kind of math preparation they should have in high school depending on what they want to do at university. To inform this decision, the ACW looked at UC data on majors which are divided into ten broad categories and made a series of recommendations related to each category. ACW members agreed that the requirement for the lower-level sequence

keeps doors open for students, including those who have no idea what they want to do at university, because that preparation should enable them to take pre-calculus or mathematical statistics at UC.

The phase II charge does not mention data science but the ACW tried to address the principal question sparked by the phase I report: whether it is possible for a data science curriculum to fit into category 3. The appendix includes examples of data science content built substantially on the lower-level math sequence. Importantly, the phase II report notes that none of the existing, commonly used data science curricula build on the lower-level sequence because the design replaces math with computation. The ACW suggested what can be done to create or adjust curricula that are rich in data science and math.

**Discussion:** After the release of the phase I report there was a narrative that data science is bad and should not be taught in high school, so offering suggestions for elevating these curricula is appreciated and there is hope this will encourage the development of high school data science courses that will prepare students interested in a career in that field. One member asserted that faculty teaching data science are concerned about the quality of high school math education and are trying to discover ways to get students interested in and comfortable with numbers. Chair Adhikari emphasized that the report explicitly states that, depending on what a student wants to do at UC, a data science course could be fine in the fourth year. The report acknowledges that some schools are unable to offer a fourth year of math and recommends that students take math courses at a CCC or through UC Scout if feasible. It would be valuable if data science is not the only option for students after the lower-level math courses. Senate leadership would like the opportunity to discuss the report with the provost before it is posted on the BOARS website, and the goal is to post it by next Friday.

**Action:** Members voted unanimously to approve and transmit the report to AVP Yoon-Wu.

#### **VIII. Member Reports/Campus Updates/Priorities for 2024-2025**

**UCLA:** The ADT task force completed its work and the majors to include in the pilot will be identified.

**UCSD:** The campus committee discussed Area H and Area C and the problems with the Free Application for Federal Student Aid. Next year the committee will look at the holistic review process.

**UCI:** The committee discussed PIQs with the campus admissions representatives. Members are disappointed about not having input into the design of the holistic review process.

**UCD:** The committee received an update on waitlists and transfers and discussed standardized testing.

**UCSC:** Topics under discussion included enrollment targets, transfer issues, and Area H. The campus guidelines for holistic reviews were finalized.

**UCR:** The committee discussed the statement on UC quality. Next year the committee will consider how to make the admissions process more holistic rather than formulaic.

#### **IX. New Business**

BOARS will have a short meeting on July 12<sup>th</sup> to talk about the UC Eligibility Areas proposal.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:45 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Barbara Knowlton