

The work group supports a change to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 to increase the minimum area “d” requirement from 2 units (3 recommended) to 3 units. The policy would continue to require 2 units of coursework that “provide basic knowledge in at least two of the fundamental disciplines of biology, chemistry, and physics.” The work group discussed a proposal to include language “recommending 4 units,” but it was concerned that UC recommendations become *de facto* requirements that could reduce students’ flexibility to explore other disciplines and disadvantage students in under-resourced schools. The state requires high school graduates to complete two years of science. Currently 95% of UC applicants already take more than two years of area “d” science.

The work group wants to maintain flexibility for students, so that in addition to taking a third course from the three core disciplines listed in the regulation, students could select a third course from other disciplines reflected in the NGSS, including ESS, interdisciplinary sciences, computer science, engineering, and applied sciences. However, the work group does not want that flexibility to discourage schools from implementing the full three-course model.

Discussion: BOARS members remarked on the growing high school teacher shortage in California that is particularly acute in STEM fields. They also noted that policy should enable deeper learning but not contribute to higher stress levels for high school students.

IV. Consultation with UCOP

- *Robin Holmes-Sullivan, Vice President Student Affairs*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Director, Academic Preparation and Relations with Schools & Colleges*

Freshman Admissions: UCOP shared preliminary fall 2017 freshman admission data with BOARS. A lower mandated growth goal this year (2,500 new undergraduates compared to 5,000 in 2016) had a significant impact on outcomes relative to the immediate past year. UC admitted 101,000 freshmen overall for fall 2017, a 1.2% increase compared to last year, though there was also a small decline in the overall admission rate, from 60% to 59%. UC admitted 0.4% fewer CA residents compared to last year (the two-year growth rate is about 16 %.). UC also admitted 5% more nonresidents compared to 2016 at a higher admission rate, 57%, compared to 54% last year. Campuses note that nonresidents accept admission offers at a much lower rate, and that rate is expected to fall this year due to higher tuition and the political climate.

Campuses admitted a higher proportion of CA resident freshman from historically underrepresented minority groups. The proportion grew from 37.2% in 2016 to 38.6% this year. African-American admits increased as a proportion of the total from 4.7% to 4.9%, and Chicano/Latino admits increased by 1%. Asian-Americans remain the largest ethnic group at 34.5% of admits, and white student admits fell to 23.5%. The number of admits from low-income families increased by nearly 3%, and the number of first generation college students rose by 0.4% percentage points. Final admission decisions will extend into May as campuses turn to wait lists to manage enrollment targets and other goals.

Transfer 2:1 Goal: The 2015 Budget Framework Initiative agreement with the state asks UC to meet a 2:1 freshman-to-transfer enrollment ratio. UC will meet the goal on a systemwide basis and at six of the eight participating campuses by the end of the 2017-18 academic year. However, UCSC and UCR will fall short due to a lack of qualified California Community College (CCC) transfer applicants to those campuses. The state is pressuring UC and those

campuses to do more. Representatives from the Governor's office and Department of Finance held a series of conference calls with UCSC and UCR to discuss impediments to progress. UC observed that transfer applications have declined on almost all campuses, and that UCR and UCSC's local CCC feeder schools are not producing enough UC transfer-ready applicants. UC intends to work with the CCCs to build capacity in the transfer pipeline, with a special emphasis on preparing more UC-qualified transfer applicants to UCR and UCSC.

Transfer Pathways Guide New Release: UCOP has released a new Course Finder tool on the [UC Transfer Pathways Guide](#). The tool allows prospective transfers to determine where specific Pathway courses are available through on a self-designated zip code distance search. If a student's home CCC currently offers many but not all of the course expectations in a given Pathway, the Course Finder lists Pathway courses at other nearby CCCs to help students know exactly where to complete all courses that fulfill the UC Transfer Pathway they are following. The tool also allows UC faculty to see if faculty at sister UC campuses have accepted a given CCC course for transfer. The Pathways Guide website has also been enhanced to be mobile-friendly.

Smarter Balanced: In a March 3 letter to President Napolitano, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Torlakson and State Board of Education President Kirst encouraged UC to incorporate Smarter Balanced assessments into UC's evaluation of students for undergraduate admission, in addition to or, in lieu of, existing assessments. President Napolitano replied in a letter indicating that the matter falls under the purview of the Academic Senate. President Kirst will join BOARS in May.

State Report on College Readiness: The State Auditor's recent [report](#) on the availability of "a-g" courses in California school districts provided a positive review of the University's processes to review "a-g" course submissions and its efforts to increase the availability of "a-g" across California.

V. Campus Reports/Issues

- The UCLA admissions committee is defining the parameters of an upcoming study of student success factors in admissions. The study will look "under the hood" of holistic review to analyze what elements are most predictive of student success and engagement.
- The UCSD committee has endorsed a policy for the use of letters of recommendation in augmented review.
- The UCSB committee wants to study outcome data from the new integrated high school accountability system the state will implement in 2017-18. The committee believes the system could potentially replace the Academic Performance Index.
- UCI committee members have agreed to serve as liaisons to several majors to help them increase recruitment through strategies such as clarifying career opportunities in the majors, emphasizing that multiple majors can be pathways to a given career, and highlighting undergraduate research opportunities in the majors.
- UCR and UCSC are discussing strategies for meeting the 2:1 freshman: transfer enrollment ratio goal. UCSC plans to admit students from its transfer application pool who are closer to the systemwide minimum 2.4 GPA, relax some of its major-specific transfer preparation

requirements, and access the transfer referral pool. UCR determined that lowering the minimum GPA it requires for transfer admission would have little effect on enrollments; it is focusing instead on improved messaging and outreach regarding UC financial aid and the advantage of a UC degree compared to a CSU degree.

- The UCB admissions committee is reviewing data from the latest admission cycle, studying the role of different holistic or “psychosocial” characteristics on outcomes, and the effect of process changes introduced this year, including faculty application review. The committee is also discussing the criteria for determining and measuring a “good” student. The committee has noted that the new Berkeley chancellor has a technical interest in admissions as well as broad experience with outreach and recruitment across California.
- The UCM committee is working with the administration to raise the profile of under-enrolled majors.

VI. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Shane White, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

Nonresident Admission: Leading up to the March Regents meeting, the Senate assumed that a reasonable compromise had been reached on the proposed nonresident enrollment policy. However, a week before the meeting, the Regents introduced a new 20% systemwide cap into the planned action item, and then changed the action item to a discussion item with a subsequent plan for action in May, to allow more time for discussion with legislators who wanted a smaller systemwide cap and immediate cuts at the three campuses currently above 20%.

The Senate opposes a systemwide cap because it would hurt campuses financially and stimulate an immediate race to 20%, locking out campuses with currently low nonresident enrollment. The debate highlights the resource differences across UC campuses and the lack of a coherent funding model for all campuses. The Senate has proposed a policy that would allow individual campuses to expand nonresident enrollments if they can show a precise benefit to residents on that campus.

PDST Policy: The Regents also approved amendments to Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) policy. The amended policy allows the Regents to approve PDST proposals on a multi-year basis with no fixed cap on annual increases; allows programs to tie PDST charges to tuition and fees charged by comparable programs at private universities rather than only public universities; increases an emphasis on the program’s needs and on consultation with students and other stakeholders; increases transparency regarding the program’s use of PDST; and emphasizes that the Regents will hold programs charging PDSTs to their stated diversity goals.

VII. BOARS Subcommittee on Augmented Review/Letters of Recommendation

- Eddie Comeaux, BOARS Vice Chair

Vice Chair Comeaux is leading a subcommittee charged with developing a systemwide policy on Augmented Review (AR) that includes guidelines and criteria for the use of AR on campuses and the types of additional information that might be solicited, including letters of recommendation.

The subcommittee modeled its draft systemwide policy on similar UC campus policies, including UCLA's current Supplemental Review policy and UCB's former Augmented Review policy.

The draft policy states that Augmented Review is designed to provide an additional review for a select pool of applicants (up to 5%) who fall in the margins for admission, but whose initial application yields an incomplete picture of their qualifications or presents extraordinary circumstances that invite further comment. The policy outlines three types of supplemental information a campus may request from a candidate: 1) a questionnaire inviting the candidate to elaborate on special talents and accomplishments, extraordinary circumstances, and school and home environment; 2) the candidate's 7th semester grades; and 3) two standardized letters of recommendation that focus on the candidate's cognitive and non-cognitive abilities. The policy also outlines six criteria for referring an applicant to Augmented Review.

Discussion: Some BOARS members questioned the rationale for the proposed 5% cap, noting that the AR criteria rather than an arbitrary cap should drive the proportion of students sent to AR. A member noted that BOARS should allow campuses flexibility to develop innovative admissions policies and processes that address their individual needs and goals. Another member noted that the policy should explicitly state that campuses may request other kinds of supplemental information in addition to the three listed categories. Member also expressed concern that letters of recommendation (LORs) conflict with UC principles of access and fairness because students attending under-resourced schools or from disadvantaged backgrounds will find it more difficult to obtain high-quality letters.

Vice Chair Comeaux noted that the subcommittee wanted the AR policy to be consistent with the current research literature, which supports the benefits of multiple LORs in a standardized format and the usefulness of information in the later high school years, such as 7th semester grades, in forecasting college success. The specific 5% limit was intended in part to preclude the possibility that a campus could ask all applicants for LORs. Moreover, it was noted that a cap higher than 10% could call into question the effectiveness of the initial review process and increase workload to unmanageable levels. The policy emphasizes that AR is a limited mechanism. It was noted that embedding LORs in an Augmented Review policy is a compromise that will satisfy the Regents and allow Berkeley to continue its pilot and study. It is important for UC to be able to publicly defend its admissions policies, guidelines, and processes. An open-ended AR policy would be more difficult to defend, and a more perspective policy better-received.

Action: BOARS members will share the draft AR policy with their admissions committees for review and input.

VIII. Compare Favorably Assessment and Policy

BOARS reviewed additional and revised analyses prepared by UCOP to support BOARS' review of the Compare Favorably policy. These included updated summaries of systemwide and campus data for fall 2016, revised to reflect recalculated GPAs at several campuses; a revised Compare Favorably analysis by admitting unit at UC Davis and UC San Diego with fall 2015 data added; and a revised weighted academic index analysis with added R-squared figures for UCSD admitting units.

The fall 2015 and 2016 outcomes in admitting units at the specific campuses were generally consistent with the campus-wide data, in that average SAT scores were generally lower for admitted residents compared to admitted nonresidents; and average GPAs were slightly higher.

The regression analysis attempted to predict first-year UC GPA as a function of high school GPA, test scores, or both together for international students, domestic nonresidents, and CA residents. One hypothesis was that the regressions of UC GPAs would be higher for international students and non-CA domestic students. This is because faculty have observed that while nonresidents have slightly lower high school GPAs on average compared to California residents, they perform better at UC. The results suggest that test scores are a more consistent measure across the different populations compared to GPA.

Discussion: It was noted that the analysis considers all differences to be statistically significant due to the enormous sample size; however, in some cases the graphs flag differences in high school GPA as small as one or two one-hundredths of a point (0.01 and 0.02) as potential areas of concern. These differences are trivial; BOARS should consider a meaningful difference to be no less than half a letter grade, or three-tenths of a point (0.3).

It was noted that there are many variables in addition to GPA and SAT that contribute to the regression outcomes. The outcomes are an amalgam of multiple aspects of campus admissions processes and the student's decision to accept UC's offer. It was noted that BOARS' report to the President on Compare Favorably should summarize the analyses it reviewed during the academic year to support its deliberations. BOARS should acknowledge the complexity of the policy and the unique characteristics of each campus's admissions processes, and note that performance at UC is what ultimately matters. The regression graph is a helpful visual illustration of BOARS's observations about the relative predictive influence of SAT and GPA.

IX. Simulation Analysis of UC Admissions

At the request of BOARS, UCOP commissioned a study to better understand how changes in UC's undergraduate admissions policy have influenced the student profile of admitted freshman class, to see what effect if any, comprehensive review has had on the composition of the admitted class. In other words, what would UC's freshman profile have been if campuses had used only test scores and grades to admit students?

The study employs an algorithm using a UC admissions index that mimics a more mechanized admissions process based only on GPA and standardized test scores to identify the group of students who would have been admitted through that process, compared to the real outcomes under Comprehensive Review using 14 factors.

The study shows that while California is becoming more diverse, comprehensive review has led to the admission of a higher number of students from underrepresented minority groups, especially at the more selective UC campuses, than would have been admitted using narrow academic indicators. In addition, the proportion of admitted students who attended low API schools and from low income and first generation college backgrounds was higher under comprehensive review.

A BOARS member noted that a recent [study](#) published in the New York *Times* showed that UC campus rank highly in income mobility rate; that is, the percent of students from the bottom 40 percent of income who end up in the top 40 percent of income.

X. Measuring Adversity

The College Board has just finished the first of two pilot studies of an “[Environmental Context Dashboard](#),” an index based on measurable factors in the high school environment, neighborhood environment and family environment, designed to help colleges make decisions in admissions about who is disadvantaged. The index does not consider race. One college in the pilot study reported that 20 percent of its admissions decisions might have been different using the dashboard.

XI. Executive Session

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst

Attest: Henry Sanchez