

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting

December 6, 2019

I. Consent Calendar

- Approval of BOARS December 6, 2019 agenda

Action: The agenda was approved as noticed.

II. Review Items

1. Proposed revisions to APM 240 (Deans) and APM 246 (Faculty administrators)
2. Proposed revisions to APM 120 related to Emerita/Emeritus titles

Action: The committee elected not to opine on either item.

III. Campus Reports

Berkeley: The campus chancellor has stated publicly her opposition to the continued use of standardized tests in UC admissions.

Davis: 1) Responses to the management corrective actions (MCAs) from the internal audit are being prepared. 2) The local faculty admission committee underwent reader training as an exercise. 3) Speculation about the impacts to diversity of going “test optional” need data. Self-selection for submission of scores is thought to be more likely among certain demographic groups.

Irvine: 1) The campus is considering changes to the practice of applying to majors. Trends suggest low-SES students tend to enroll in certain majors. 2) Alternatives to TOEFL for assessing English proficiency are being discussed. 3) Admission by Exception guidelines locally will need to address e-sports. 4) A new implicit bias training is being used this year. Assessment will follow.

Los Angeles: 1) A special committee to assess Admission by Exception practices is discussing what data are needed to best inform their deliberations. 2) A consultation with the engineering dean is being scheduled to educate the local faculty admission committee on that department’s application review practices. 3) The weightings for an applicant’s holistic rank are being reconsidered in light of the possibility of not using standardized tests as a factor.

Merced: 1) The local faculty admission committee is considering establishing applications and financial aid as a separate committee, instead of a dependent task force. 2) The campus missed enrollment targets this fall by 500 students. The extreme “summer melt” is being analyzed. 3) Contingency planning for enrollment in impacted majors is underway.

Riverside: 1) Responses to the internal audit’s MCAs are being prepared. 2) Discussions about how to best support at-risk students continue.

San Diego: 1) WASC just completed their campus visit as part of UCSD’s periodic re-accreditation. 2) Concerns about over-reliance on wait-lists this year were unfounded as enrollment targets were met. 3) “Undeclared” students cannot switch to an impacted major. Communications and counseling improvements are being developed. Systemwide management of impacted majors has been suggested.

San Francisco: UCSF continues not to admit undergraduates.

Santa Barbara: 1) A new athletics admission policy will soon be released. Some criteria are higher than NCAA regulations, which has upset certain stakeholders. Enforcement mechanisms for minimum play/participation standards are still being identified, and additional implementation guidance will likely be needed. 2) The lack of minimum criteria for some majors has led to a lack of student success. Pathways may be adopted to off-set this trend.

Santa Cruz: The campus will emphasize local context more strongly when reviewing applications in the future. An automated read may be added, too. These changes are intended to enhance diversity outcomes, and careful assessment will follow.

Graduate Student: Some have proposed that applications should be anonymized as an additional anti-bias step.

Undergraduate Student: 1) A march in Sacramento to support transfer students is being planned. 2) Messaging for the Blue & Gold tuition program is lacking at the CCCs, and many think greater financial aid flexibility is needed for all vulnerable populations.

IV. UCLA Admission Review

Gary Clark, Admission Director, UCLA

Youlonda Copeland-Morgan, Vice Provost, Enrollment Management, UCLA

BOARS asked UCLA to describe its holistic review process. Vice Provost Copeland-Morgan noted that UCLA’s goal is to recruit a diverse class of qualified students. The Senate has been helpful by recruiting readers and advising on training, for example. Director Clark outlined the reader training, which includes case reviews and anti-bias sessions. The major applied to does not impact the likelihood of admission, but some schools may ask for supplemental information or request a third read by a member of the school’s faculty. Applications that receive divergent

reviews are sent to a senior admission officer. Holistic ranks (1-5) are applied relative to the applicant pool; 1s and 2s are usually recommended for admission, and 3-5s can be admitted after an augmented review conducted by senior admission staff. Only 5-6% of applicants are selected for augmented review, below the 15% cap. Failure by an applicant to submit augmented review materials is not held against the applicant when a final admission decision is made.

UCLA uses neighborhood census data, but a better proxy for API would be welcomed. Going test-optional would require additional training. Convincing applicants to discuss their non-curricular leadership, such as family or community responsibilities, has proven difficult, even though the Personal Insight Questions suggest the topic. Yield obstacles include private institution competitors who can offer better financial aid packages.

V. Chair's Announcements

Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Chair Comeaux reported that the Standardized Testing Task Force expects to finish its report and recommendations over winter break, after which BOARS will receive the document on a courtesy basis, prior to its being sent for full systemwide review. Some feel that a false choice between academic preparation and socio-cultural redress has been presented. Some feel that asking an academic preparation metric to solve inherited socio-cultural inequities is unrealistic. Student success assessments are time-lagged, but external stakeholders want immediate action. Most agree that if tests are retained, they should be evaluated in the local context, not just as absolute scores.

VI. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Academic Council Chair

Mary Gauvain, Academic Council Vice Chair

- Pursuant to the Regents standing orders, an Academic Advisory Committee to the Regents Special Committee to Consider a New President has been formed.

VII. Non-Cognitive Factors in Admission

Nathan Kuncel, Marvin D. Dunnette Distinguished Professor, University of Minnesota

The goal of assessing “non-cognitive” factors is to get a sense of the applicant as a whole person. Letters of recommendation show only incremental gains in information about the applicant, but their utility could be improved with more targeted questions and directives, such

as to rate and justify rather than to ask open-ended questions. Applicant interviews are similarly non-revelatory, but structured and directed interviews work better than conversations. Assessing situational judgment and applied reasoning is an emerging field, and training consistency is essential. In context, the use of standardized tests can be indicative of student potential, but local, school-specific data and framing are necessary. Readers all fall victim to “anchors”, but that anchor should be what the institution values most in an applicant. Presenting information in such a way that leads readers to that anchor requires additional work.

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

Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director of Undergraduate Admissions

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

Tongshan Chang, Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning

1. Admission by Exception Review

The policy caps AbyE at 6% at each campus, 4% should be for low-income students missing one or two academic requirements, and the other 2% for special talent admits. Maintaining the distinction between curricular deficiency and academic shortfall is supported. The number of non-residents, especially international students, receiving AbyE is a concern to some. Local flexibility should be protected as much as possible.

AB 1383 requires certain actions within BOARS bailiwick. Subsection 2E requires one-year of participation on a team/group, but seems to be lacking nuance. The MCAs assigned monitoring of this provision to athletic departments, so it’s unclear how admissions policy is impacted. Athletics admission committees may be required to have one Senate faculty. Subsection 3B states that 3 senior administrators must approve special talent admits, but the guidelines should make clear that at least one Senate faculty must participate in the decision-making process, and could be counted as a senior official.

BOARS should consider adding AbyE outcomes to its annual Comprehensive Review report, in addition to greater detail regarding Augmented Review practices.

IX. Executive Session

Note: Item not addressed.

Adjournment 4:05 pm

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Eddie Comeaux, Chair

Attendance:

Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Chair

Madeleine Sorapure, BOARS Vice Chair

Jabari Mahiri, UCB

Deborah Swenson, UCD

Susana Cohen-Cory, UCI

Barbara Knowlton, UCLA

Jay Sharping, UCM Alternate

Sheldon Tan, UCR

Skip Pomeroy, UCSD

Andrea Hasenstaub, UCSF

Mike Gordon, UCSB

Juan Poblete, UCSC

Carlos Galan, Graduate Student

Alexis Zaragoza, Undergraduate Student