

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Videoconference Minutes

Friday, July 12, 2024

Attending: Barbara Knowlton, Chair (UCLA), Deborah Swenson, Vice Chair (UCD), Nicholas Mathew (UCB), Yuri Shirman (UCI), Lynn Vavrek (UCLA), Sundar Venkatadriagaram (UCR), Akos Rona-Tas (UCSD), Joshua Berke (UCSF), George Bulman (UCSC), Jeremy Vargas (Undergraduate Student Representative), Chase Fischerhall (Director, A-G & Transfer Articulation Policy, Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (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 (Institutional Research & Planning Analyst, IRAP), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda was approved.

Action: The June 7, 2024 BOARS videoconference minutes were approved.

II. Chair's Announcements

Academic Assembly approved the proposal from the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) to replace "probation" with "notice" in Senate Regulation (SR) 900 and SR 902. Assembly also approved changing "Lecturer with Security of Employment" to "Professor of Teaching" in Senate Bylaw 55. Academic Council's discussion of the proposed Area H requirement included presentations by members of the Ethnic Studies Implementation Workgroup and Undergraduate Admissions. Some members of Council asserted that A to G is about preparation and the proposed Ethnic Studies requirement is not necessary for preparation, thus it could be a barrier. Another perspective is that the proposed requirement offers guidance on how to develop college preparatory level Ethnic Studies courses. Council did not vote on this matter, but Chair Knowlton thinks there may be coalescence around making Area H a recommendation due to worries that some high schools will not be able to implement the courses.

III. AP Pre-Calculus and AP African American Studies Exams to Meet A to G Requirements

The committee will vote on accepting the Advanced Placement (AP) Pre-Calculus and AP African American Studies exams to satisfy A to G requirements. The AP Pre-Calculus course is currently accepted as an Area C course, meaning a student who does not take the exam but earns a good grade on the course will satisfy Area C as a fourth year of math. AP Pre-Calculus can also validate algebra II. The questions for BOARS are whether taking only the AP Pre-Calculus exam and earning a certain score counts as the pre-calculus course and whether getting a good grade on the exam can fix a deficient grade for the course as well as validate algebra II. With AP U.S. History, there is a precedent for earning a good grade on the exam fixing a deficient grade and for taking the AP exam to count for the course. UCEP reviewed the AP Pre-Calculus course and decided that college credit should not be conferred for it. Given that the AP Pre-Calculus course is accepted for A to G, Chair Knowlton believes it is reasonable for the exam to also count.

The chair explained that UCEP concluded that the AP African American Studies exam meets college-level standards and recommended that college credit should be awarded for a score of three or above. Currently, Area A credit is granted for the AP African American Studies course and this course could be used to fulfill UC's American History requirement. However, this AP exam does not fulfill the high school U.S. History graduation requirement, so students will also have to take an approved U.S. History course. It will be up to individual departments and schools to decide if this exam fulfills a specific

requirement or not. BOARS is asked to determine if a student who only takes the AP African American Studies exam (and not the course) can satisfy Area A and to set the cut score.

Discussion: Undergraduate Admissions does not have data on how many students are taking pre-calculus in high school. Director Fischerhall explained that the AP Pre-Calculus course and exam are fairly new so the number of students who have taken it will be small. Under the Area C Workgroup's new guidelines, AP Pre-Calculus will qualify as a third- or fourth-year course and validate algebra II. The score on the AP Pre-Calculus exam would make a student eligible to apply to UC and have their application reviewed. BOARS is trusting the College Board to have a process to ensure that the AP Pre-Calculus exam is meaningful and valid. The typical cut score used at UC for AP exams is a three and requiring a score of four would have to be justified. Members expressed concerns about whether taking an exam is sufficient proof that students have mastered the material and decided that a cut score of three is too low. The committee agreed to set a cut score of four and above on the AP Pre-Calculus exam to satisfy Area C and fix deficient grades on algebra II and pre-calculus. As this is a new AP exam, this policy will be revisited in three years when data is available.

A member asked why the African American Studies course should be deemed sufficient to satisfy UC's U.S. History entry requirement if it does not satisfy the high school U.S. History graduation requirement and inquired if it would be more appropriate to make it a half year instead of full year course like the U.S. Government course. Director Fischerhall explained that the content of the U.S. Government course is roughly half the content of the AP African American Studies course. The state has not yet reviewed the AP African American Studies exam or made the decision that it is not appropriate for the U.S. History high school graduation requirement. This AP exam is distinct in that it focuses on the African American experience and it is a college-level course.

Chair Knowlton posited that a student who earns a D in U.S. History could graduate from high school but would be eligible to apply to UC and CSU if they earned a C or above on the AP African American Studies course. A member remarked that the content of the AP African American Studies course is similar to the U.S. History course and it appears to be a similar intellectual exercise, so the courses should be treated the same. It would be challenging for BOARS to justify requiring a score of four on the AP African American Studies exam when a score of three on AP U.S. History allows a student to satisfy the Area A requirement. The Undergraduate Admissions consultants indicated that validation of a deficient grade is limited to the math and language other than English requirements where the coursework is sequential, so the AP African American Studies exam should not be used to validate a deficient score in AP U.S. History.

Action: A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously approved to allow a score of four or five on the AP Pre-Calculus exam to satisfy Area C and to validate deficient grades on algebra II and pre-calculus. BOARS will revisit this in three years.

Action: A motion was made, seconded and unanimously approved to allow a score of three on the AP African American Studies exam to substitute for the AP African American Studies course.

IV. UC Eligibility Areas Proposal

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

Chair Knowlton explained that BOARS will not vote on the UC Eligibility Areas proposal today because more information is needed and this matter should be taken up by a subcommittee in the fall. Director Fischerhall reported that BOARS needs to make a final decision before December 2024 to give the Transfer Articulation team enough time to align implementation with the California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) and various other legislative mandates in play. The director reminded the committee of the two separate general education (GE) patterns that were described during the June meeting. The first GE pattern, managed by UC and documented in UC regulations, lays out which

courses will help a student demonstrate eligibility by fulfilling the seven course pattern. The second GE pattern is jointly managed by the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates which includes representatives from the California Community College (CCC), California State University and UC systems. BOARS is asked to consider how similar the two patterns are, if there are substantial distinctions between them and if the differences should be preserved or minimized.

The director presented a rough analysis of data from ASSIST including CCC courses in each subject area that have been submitted, reviewed, and approved for UC Eligibility Areas and/or Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) over the past five years. The percentages reflected across these areas are similar over the last 15 academic years. The analysis shows that under 8% of courses in English, math, humanities, and behavioral and social sciences have only a UC Eligibility Area approval or only IGETC approval. The percentages vary but do not rise above 8% in any area, so the overlap is significant with over 92% of courses submitted for review being approved in both relevant subject areas. However, there are a few considerations for specific subject areas.

One question is if math preparation for incoming transfer students will be compromised. The brief on the UC Eligibility Areas suggested that math might be an exception given that it is a narrower area with a specific minimum prerequisite that is different from IGETC. The criteria for UC-Math requires a level of knowledge surpassing intermediate algebra, and math courses not appropriate for this UC Eligibility Area are almost never granted the UC baseline transferability required to be considered for IGETC. The UC-Math guidelines state no course without at least intermediate algebra or something surpassing that as a prerequisite can be approved for UC-Math. If the Transfer Articulation team cannot determine if a course fulfills the minimum UC-Math criteria it is not approved.

Discussion: Chair Knowlton indicated that there are somewhat different expectations in terms of how broadly prepared transfer students are compared to freshman applicants. Members of UCLA's admissions committee have a strong preference for the third option which is for UC to not make any changes; is firmly against the first option because it limits UC faculty participation in these decisions; and might be okay with the second option. The UCSC faculty consulted would prefer the third option but understand it might not be a viable position to take. Although these faculty feel that UC should make an effort to align the GE patterns, they think that the wording of options one and two suggests that math standards are being lowered.

Since the proposals related to UC Eligibility Areas also involve Cal-GETC and UC baseline transferability, it makes sense to have a subcommittee of BOARS carefully investigate what is needed before any decisions are made. Chair Knowlton suggested that while selecting option one would be the most politically expedient decision, UC would be ceding its authority and it may open the door to admitting some students with courses that faculty think are inadequate. The Transfer Articulation team would like to collect more information about the physical and biological sciences and members agreed that more information and discussion is needed before a vote is taken. The UCSC representative volunteered to participate on the workgroup.

V. Recommendation on Geometry Validation for Deficient Grades

Chair Knowlton explained that algebra I, geometry, and algebra II are the foundational math courses and in 2016 BOARS determined that there are no courses that can validate geometry. Even high school students taking differential equations and linear algebra at a community college, but who have not taken geometry would need to take it. This is consistent with the Area C Workgroup's stage 2 report which establishes that a course should not validate another course unless it depends on the majority of the information in that course. The current UC policy for the geometry requirement allows a higher level math course to validate a deficient grade in geometry.

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu suggested that BOARS may want to re-examine the policy and has given the committee proposals to consider. The first proposal is to eliminate the ability to validate geometry with another course; the second proposal is to find courses that build on fundamental geometry knowledge and allow them to make up for either omission of or a deficient grade in geometry; and the third proposal is to maintain the status quo. Some faculty feel that the material in geometry is distinct from what is learned in other courses, but the requirement that students in very advanced math must take geometry to be eligible to apply to UC might be up for discussion. Revising the policy on geometry could necessitate changing Senate regulations and subject matter experts would need to determine if there are courses that validate geometry.

Discussion: If geometry is a requirement it should be treated like all the other requirements so failing the course should not be permissible. One question is if a combination of several courses could validate geometry and a workgroup could be created to study this idea. Data from Undergraduate Admissions indicates that only 61 students in the last five years reported a D or F in geometry, therefore eliminating this exception should not harm a significant number of students. Students who have not taken geometry but have taken very advanced math can be admitted by exception. Undergraduate Admissions does not have any data on the number of students who do not apply because of the geometry requirement, but the office does receive three or four inquiries a week about the requirement. It would be beneficial for UC to offer clearer information about the requirement to counselors so students are not discouraged from applying.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to recommend that unless a course substantially covers geometry it cannot validate the omission of or a deficient grade in geometry. This recommendation was unanimously approved.

VI. Member Reports/Campus Updates

UCI: The committee discussed the UC Eligibility Areas proposals.

UCSD: The committee is preparing to evaluate the holistic review process next year, and if other campuses are doing similar evaluations it would be good to collaborate.

UCB: The representative will provide the incoming representative with a cheat sheet on topics under discussion at BOARS.

UCR: The committee considered issues related to admissions, enrollment, and the Free Application for Federal Student Aid.

VII. New Business/Executive Session

Chair Knowlton thanked the members for their service and the UCOP staff for their support. Members gave the chair a round of applause.

Meeting adjourned at: 12 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Barbara Knowlton