



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Academic Senate

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Videoconference Minutes

January 9, 2026

In attendance: David Volz (Chair), Nicholas Mathew (Vice Chair), Gustavo Manso (UCB), Julia Chamberlain (UCD alternate), Andrea De Vizcaya Ruiz (UCI), Kelly Kay (UCLA), Joel Spencer (UCM), Manu Sridharan (UCR), Adrian Ioana (UCSD), Michael Stryker (UCSF), Vanessa Woods (UCSB), Matthew Shahmaram (Undergraduate Student Representative), Jose Aguilar (Graduate Student Representative), Catherine Sugar (Chair, University Committee on Educational Policy), Bradley Queen (Chair, University Committee on Preparatory Education), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs (GUEA)), Chase Fischerhall (Director, A-G and Transfer Articulation Policy, GUEA), Angelica Moore (Director, Undergraduate Admission Policy and Communications, GUEA), Liz Terry (Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA), Tongshan Chang (Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP)), Matt Reed (Senior Institutional Research and Planning Analyst, IRAP), Ahmet Palazoglu (Chair, Academic Senate), Susannah Scott (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Ken Feer (Principal Policy Analyst), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: Today's agenda items and their priority with one revision were approved. Item IX was removed from the agenda.

Action: The December 5th BOARS minutes were approved.

II. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair & Susannah Scott, Vice Chair, Academic Senate

Chair Palazoglu provided an update on the Department of Justice case against UCLA. Academic Council's November and December meetings included discussions about proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual policies 015 and 016 and the Regents will vote on the new policy language this month. In November, the Regents received a presentation from Chief Financial Officer Brostrom on UC's 2026-2027 budget proposal and a proposal for the continuation of the Tuition Stability Plan, both of which were approved by the Regents. UCOP reached contract agreements with the University Professional and Technical Employees union and the California Nurses Association, avoiding a strike that would have been disruptive for the medical centers. Senate leadership shared updates on the UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) Plus and the Performance of Undergraduate Degree Programs (PUDP) task forces.

III. Chair's Updates

Chair Volz shared that Academic Council's December 17th meeting included a discussion about the Senate Artificial Intelligence (AI) Workgroup report. The Workgroup considered the impact of AI on

undergraduate and graduate admissions and offered recommendations largely focused on using AI to streamline the review and selection of applicants. However, the report does not mention the potential misuse of AI by prospective applicants while assembling a UC application, especially as it relates to submission of AI-generated responses to personal insight questions. This report will be discussed by BOARS on February 6th since some thought should be given to strengthening systemwide policies related to the use of AI to complete UC's undergraduate applications.

During the December 5th BOARS meeting, the representatives from the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO) asserted that the reason IB programs are not as prevalent as Advanced Placement (AP) programs within California is because UC does not accept the Standard Level (SL) exams for college course credit. The IBO representatives contacted Chair Volz following the meeting to ask that BOARS reconsider granting credits for SL exams. Chair Volz reviewed historical records to understand the origins of BOARS' decision to only accept the IB Higher Level (HL) exams and not the SL exams, even though the latter are accepted by many peer institutions across the country. In 2003, BOARS decided not to award course credit for SL exams because it would require a significant amount of time and investment for UC to review SL exams, and SL exams were assumed to be similar to Ordinary Level exams within the British General Certificate of Education. Chair Volz provided further background about this matter and next steps include consultation with the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) before BOARS reconsiders its position.

IV. New Scoring Scale for the Test of English as a Foreign Language iBT (TOEFL iBT)

A new scoring scale will be implemented for the Test of English as a Foreign Language internet-based test (TOEFL iBT) effective January 21, 2026. The scoring scale will change from the traditional 0-120 scale to an updated 1-6 scale. Based on the traditional 0-120 scale, UC's minimum score for demonstrating English language proficiency is 80 for undergraduate admissions. Therefore, UC's minimum score will need to be adjusted to align with the updated 1-6 scale. A brief from UCOP's Office of Undergraduate Admissions explained the data and offered a recommendation. BOARS will vote on a new minimum TOEFL iBT score during the February 6th meeting. Manager Terry explained that students can meet UC's English proficiency requirement in a variety of ways including the TOEFL, the International English Language Testing System (IELTS), and the relatively new Duolingo test. Campuses have flexibility to set the minimum TOEFL score for selection, with UCB and UCLA recommending a score of 100 and UCSD recommending a score of 83.

In addition to changing the scale from 0-120 to a scale of 1-6 in increments of 0.5, TOEFL iBT scores will be aligned with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), a recognized English proficiency framework used worldwide to provide a common standard across the different tests that are offered. Manager Terry indicated that UC's current minimum score does not map directly to a new score on the TOEFL iBT and Undergraduate Admissions' brief provides a series of concordance tables between the different exams and the CEFR levels. The tables show that the current TOEFL iBT minimum is comparably lower than scores on IELTS and Duolingo, both with regards to the CEFR level and the concordances between the different exams. The main question for BOARS is whether the new minimum score should be a higher score of 4.5, which would exclude students who previously would have been eligible, or to use the lower score of 4, which would include students who had not previously met the benchmark. Undergraduate Admissions recommends using a higher score of 4.5 to ensure consistency in the performance needed to demonstrate proficiency on the different exams.

Discussion: First year applicants are required to submit TOEFL scores when the primary language of instruction in high school is not English, whereas international students attending community college in the U.S. are not required to submit TOEFL scores when transferring to UC. Undergraduate Admissions' brief includes data on applicants' scores. Students applying for fall 2026 already understand that they should have taken the exam and will have submitted their scores by now, so the new scale will be applicable primarily for students applying for fall 2027 admission. Members expressed differing opinions about whether the minimum score should be set at 4.5 or 4.0, and it would be helpful to look at the students who are not admitted depending on the score. Chair Volz noted that an individual division can set their TOEFL iBT threshold higher. Since members expressed differing opinions, Chair Volz noted that BOARS will continue the discussion during the February 6th meeting and postpone a vote on a new minimum score until the March 6th meeting.

- V. UCLA's Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) Pilot Program
Connie Kasari, Education/Psychiatry & Biobehavioral Sciences, Co-Chair, UCLA; Alexander Spokoiny, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Co-Chair, UCLA; & Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate, UCLA

The committee was joined by representatives of UCLA's Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) Task Force to outline the campus's approach to developing the ADT pilot program. This information will be useful as other campuses consider developing ADT pathway programs. California State Assembly Bill (AB) 1291 requires UCLA to develop a pilot admission pathway for community college ADT earners. UCLA's Admissions Office provided data to help the Task Force make well-informed and sound decisions. Historically, UCLA has met and exceeded the university's goal of enrolling one resident transfer student for every two first-year students, and the demographics of the transfer students differs from those of first-year students, enhancing the diversity of the campus's overall undergraduate student population. The vast majority of transfer students, 92%, come from the California Community College (CCC) system and about 51% of transfer students appear to have earned an ADT.

The Task Force was established in fall 2023 and began by gathering data on transfer enrollment and time to degree and analyzing alignment of UCLA major preparation requirements with existing ADTs and transfer model curricula (TMC) in various community college programs. The Task Force consulted with deans, department chairs, student representatives, and faculty who had experience with transfer students. Deans shared information about how individual majors in their respective colleges are evolving and their capacity. The department chairs, faculty, and staff in the majors identified as having alignment provided information about transfer student preparation to undertake upper division coursework in those majors, and different resources and opportunities available to support transfers.

Goals of the pilot included amplifying those majors with the capacity for growth while maintaining enrollment equilibrium, expanding outreach to low-sending CCCs identified by UCOP, and aligning with campus and systemwide strategic initiatives. As mandated by AB 1291, the Task Force identified four majors in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) and four non-STEM majors and ten CCCs for the first phase of the pilot. The initial scope of the pilot is limited to the greater Los Angeles area and neighboring counties, and it should be noted that not all of the participating CCCs offer an ADT in all of the recommended majors. Once the divisional Senate approved the Task Force's recommendations, launching the pilot started with the Admissions Office implementing a communication plan which included a letter from the Undergraduate ADT

pilot coordinator to CCC transfer center directors. The first cohort of students will enroll in the pilot majors in fall 2026, and the Legislative Analyst's Office will review the pilot and issue a report in February 2027. Recommendations for assessment include tracking grade point averages (GPAs) from application through matriculation and graduation versus non-ADT transfers to determine whether ADT pilot participants have better academic outcomes than other transfer students.

Discussion: Members suggested comparing transfer students with ADTs to students who enroll at UCLA as freshmen; tracking repeating courses and other measures that show how efficiently students with ADTs are moving through the pilot majors; and looking at the academic performance and time to degree for students who transfer to UCLA with ADTs to those who transfer to the California State University (CSU) system. The Task Force utilized multiple parameters to determine which majors would participate in the pilot including if a program has the physical space to accommodate more students and whether articulation of the courses needed to earn an ADT exists. Certain majors at UCLA, such as Life Sciences majors, tend to be more impacted than others and some TMCs did not have the coursework that would align with the requirements for UCLA's major which was a key consideration. Larger CCCs have the resources to offer a broad array of courses whereas smaller CCCs do not have this ability. To date, UCLA's planning did not take into consideration the CCC students who would be drawn away from other campuses such as UCM, and this is an important issue to discuss at the systemwide level when the pilot is expanded.

VI. Dual Enrollment Overview

Catalina Cifuentes, Executive Director, College Career Readiness, Educational Services Division, Riverside County Office of Education

Executive Director Cifuentes joined BOARS to explain how dual enrollment is working in California, including the goals and challenges. The Executive Director works with 23 school districts in Riverside County serving over 430,000 K-12 students and supports college and career readiness activities in over 100 high schools. In the context of dual enrollment, this role involves helping to develop articulation agreements with CCCs and the county's school districts as well as writing coursework that entails collaborating with leadership at some UC campuses. Conversations about dual enrollment focus on increasing student participation but Executive Director Cifuentes indicated that the program is not necessarily leading to greater post-secondary enrollment.

In addition to the CCC's programs, some CSU campuses and private schools are offering dual enrollment courses. Executive Director Cifuentes shared that because Riverside County ranks last in California in the number of adults having college degrees, college-level course work is encouraged. The number of students taking some type of college coursework increased from 9K in 2021-2022 to over 19K in 2024-2025, but this has not increased enrollment into four-year institutions. The CCCs are creating more courses to attract students and advertise the California College Promise program that waives enrollment fees for eligible students. Many students who are admitted to UCR enroll in a CCC instead because they may not be aware of UC's Blue and Gold financial aid commitment.

Executive Director Cifuentes collaborated with Dr. Charles Nies, former Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at UCM, to look at the academic success of students who took dual enrollment, AP, or IB courses. This analysis showed that students from Riverside County who took AP or IB have better persistence and academic performance at UC compared to students who took dual enrollment courses. More research on the impact of dual enrollment should be conducted in light of the

significant amount of money being invested into dual enrollment. Riverside County's Office of Education is not a research institution, but it does have the most comprehensive data sharing agreements of any county in the state. The K-12 segment is seeking guidance to help students understand dual enrollment credit and whether their best fit is a CCC, CSU, or UC.

Discussion: One possible goal of dual enrollment might be enabling students to graduate from UC in three years, but Executive Director Cifuentes posited that the state's significant investment in the program is also about increasing access and opportunity for all students. The CSU campuses are utilizing dual enrollment to help reach enrollment targets. K-12 education is locally controlled so school districts have varying goals and there is no consistency around dual enrollment activities or messaging. The Executive Director is not aware of anyone from the institutions offering dual enrollment courses that are monitoring or observing the teacher of record at the high schools to ensure the rigor and expectations are the same from one classroom to the next.

Director Fischerhall reported that increasing numbers of students applying as a freshmen have full certification for the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) but do not understand that they are not competitive for admission as transfer students because they lack the requisite major preparation the rest of a lower division program would offer. Granting credit for prior learning is becoming more common and is related to conversations in the Governor's office about career education and decreasing time to completion. A member remarked that the discussion about dual enrollment is related to concerns about how much credit students receive for coursework completed before they arrive at UC.

Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu's campus colleagues are noting that high school students are taking courses online which is not indicated on their official transcripts. As BOARS thinks about devising policies limiting the number of credits, consideration should also be given to the acceptable and reasonable number of units to be transferred per term. BOARS may want to invite State Board of Education President Darling-Hammond to a discussion about dual enrollment given the worrisome information learned today which contrasts with the messaging that emphasizes the positive benefits of the strategy.

VII. Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (GUEA) & Institutional Research & Academic Planning (IRAP)

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

IRAP updated its 2015 analysis of Honors courses (including AP, IB, UC-transferrable college courses, and UC-certified honors courses), and AP vs. IB courses. The new analysis includes data from 2015-2025, as this 10-year time window brackets the potential impact of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-2021 and the elimination of standardized test requirements for admissions in 2021.

The total number of advanced courses has increased between 2016 to 2025 and completion patterns of these courses vary across demographic groups and school context. Applicants are increasingly likely to complete multiple types of advanced courses rather than just the courses in

one area, and students who complete more advanced courses tend to have higher high school and UC GPAs, and admissions, retention, and graduation rates. The number of AP and college-level courses is a stronger predictor of student success than Honors level courses. AP courses accounted for more than half of the total increase over this period and AP still drives course taking across all school groups, although the number of AP courses varied substantially by school group. The largest gains in the number of advanced courses between 2016 and 2025 were seen among high schools with UC admit rates below 50%. Director Tongshan reviewed data on advanced course completion and the predictive power of the different types of these courses.

Senior Analyst Reed looked at the relationship between academic preparation in selected A-G subject areas and performance at UC. This builds on a similar previous analysis from 2024-2025. The new analysis addresses questions about the association between high school GPA by subject area, overall UC first-year GPA and the association between the number of A-G courses by subject area and overall UC first-year GPA and persistence rates. The focus of this analysis is on history/social science, English, math, and science and consists of two multiple regression models. The analysis shows that high school GPA by subject area is associated with UC GPA, with English, history,/social science being the stronger predictors compared to math and science. High school course count by subject area is also associated with UC GPA, with math as the stronger predictor compared to other subject areas. High school type is a strong predictor, while intended field of study is a moderate predictor, in both models.

In the context of high school type and intended field of study, the differences by high school type is that UC GPA, while controlling for all the other factors, is a little lower for students from Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) Plus public schools and slightly higher for those from private schools, as compared to the largest group of schools, the non-LCFF Plus public schools. UC GPAs, controlling for other factors, are a bit higher for non-STEM fields and somewhat lower for STEM fields compared to the undeclared or unknown. High school course count is also associated with UC GPA and math is the strongest predictor, high school type is a strong predictor, and intended field of study is a moderate predictor. Overall, the high school GPA model explains a moderate amount (22%) of the variation in UC GPA and the high school course count model explains a small amount (13%). Senior Analyst Reed will look at UC first-year persistence as an outcome in the future and at specific ranges of high school GPA or high school course counts and the outcomes within those.

The analysis of UCSD's Senate-Administration Workgroup (SAWG) on Admissions report was driven by numerous questions Chair Volz received over the last few months from various stakeholders within and outside of UC. BOARS focused on the SAWG report and concerns members might have about the points raised in a preliminary analysis of the report. At BOARS' February 6th meeting, the UCSD Senate's response and potential systemwide next steps will be considered. The preliminary analysis was intended to provide UCSD with context from a systemwide perspective, to suggest additional analyses that UCSD may want to consider, and to offer insights from UC's K-12 partners and the California State Board of Education.

Discussion: One suggestion to IRAP for a future analysis of the predictive power of A-G courses is to look at variability between different UCs. The UCSD representative noted that it would be helpful for BOARS to hear from some of the authors of the SAWG report including the Math Department chair. Many UCSD faculty are unhappy with the fact that the campus is admitting students who do not have the level of preparation in math that is expected and there have been calls for resources and

action to address what is happening with the admissions process. Members shared feedback about the preliminary analysis and debated transmitting it to UCSD. The preliminary analysis points to existing policies and attempts to clarify what the stakes are for each of the parties involved while not passing judgement on the K-12 segment. A concern is that campuses are being left to tackle preparation issues individually when BOARS could pursue systemwide solutions. Based on the discussion, BOARS decided to continue to have discussions with UCSD Senate leadership. BOARS members might investigate and gather data in an effort to better understand the scope of the problems related to math preparedness on each campus.

VIII. Memo to Divisions regarding the College Board's Evidence-Based Standard Setting Process for Scoring Advanced Placement Exams

Chair Volz would like the committee to approve a joint memo from BOARS, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) to the divisions informing faculty about the College Board's shift to Evidence-Based Standard Setting (EBSS) for scoring AP exams. This memo reflects feedback received from BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE during December meetings.

Action: A motion to approve the memo was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

IX. Statement on BOARS' Guiding Principles of Comprehensive Review

This item was removed from the agenda.

X. Member Reports/Campus Updates

This item was removed from the agenda.

XI. New Business/Executive Session

This item was removed from the agenda.

The meeting adjourned at: 3:30 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: David Volz, Chair