



UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA Academic
Senate

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Videoconference Minutes

July 10, 2026

In attendance: David Volz (Chair), Nicholas Mathew (Vice Chair), Gustavo Manso (UCB), Leah Hibel (UCD), Andrea De Vizcaya Ruiz (UCI), Kelly Kay (UCLA), Joel Spencer (UCM), Kelly Huffman-Neal (UCR alternate), Adrian Ioana (UCSD), Michael Stryker (UCSF), Mahnoosh Alizadeh (UCSB alternate), Luca de Alfaro (UCSC), Jose Aguilar (Graduate Student), Matthew Shahmaram (Undergraduate Student), 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), Brenda Abrams (Policy Analyst, Academic Senate)

I. Consent Calendar

Action: A motion to replace item VI on the agenda (the Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs and Institutional Research and Academic Planning) with a discussion about the Policies and Partnerships Roadmap for First-Year Undergraduate Admissions was made, seconded, and passed unanimously. A motion to approve the revised agenda was made, seconded, and passed unanimously.

Action: The June 5th BOARS minutes were approved.

II. Chair's Updates

During the June 24th Academic Council meeting, the UCSD division chair reported that the available math placement data suggests that implementation of the campus's math index for admissions does not appear to have reduced the number of students being placed in the lower level college preparation math courses. Chair Volz commented on the public's interest in the Policies and Partnerships Roadmap and urged the committee to consider during today's deliberations the needs, circumstances, and success of UC students, UC's mission as a public university system, and the critical role of BOARS in setting undergraduate admissions policies. If necessary, there will be an opportunity this afternoon to introduce motions specific to the June 5th, 2026 vote on the Roadmap and time for discussion about the pros and cons of these motions prior to a vote. Members will also have an opportunity during New Business to introduce a motion to recommend implementation of standardized testing for the 2026-2027 admissions cycle and this motion will require unanimous approval. Chair Volz recounted members' concerns about the Special Charge being issued without input from Academic Council and mentioned that the upcoming Regents

meeting includes a presentation on the history of A-G but no Senate representatives will participate in this presentation.

III. Consultation with UC Scout

Sandra Williams-Hamp, Associate Vice Provost, Outreach and Educational Partnerships, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs; Ehren Koepf, Executive Director, UC Scout; Courtney Cunningham, Deputy Director, UC Scout

Chair Volz welcomed Associate Vice Provost (AVP) Williams-Hamp, the executive and deputy directors of UC Scout, and the chair of the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) to the videoconference. UC Scout provides online A-G courses, including Advanced Placement (AP) courses, to high school students throughout the state and today's consultation was prompted by an email from a California parent to Chair Volz about the instructional quality of a UC Scout AP chemistry course. Following a preliminary discussion with AVP Williams-Hamp and Executive Director Koepf in March, Chair Volz sent them a list of questions focused on UC Scout's governance structure and institutional operations, student demographics and enrollment, and instructional quality. UC Scout then provided a response to these questions which was added to BOARS' meeting agenda for July 10th.

AVP Williams-Hamp explained that UC Scout is one of UCOP's key strategies for expanding access to rigorous, high-quality A-G courses regardless of where students live. Executive Director Koepf and Deputy Director Cunningham provided detailed information about UC Scout's three program models, how academic quality is ensured, who the program serves, and how UC Scout advances UC's mission of expanding educational opportunity across California. UC Scout is an educational access program whose mission happens to be delivered through online curriculum. UC Scout, an official program of UC, is administered by UC Santa Cruz, accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission, and has been in operation for more than 25 years. UC Scout was expanded in response to *Williams v. California*, a landmark 2004 case that highlighted inequities in educational opportunity across California schools and reinforced the importance of ensuring students have access to the courses they need to prepare for college.

Many students utilize UC Scout because their high school does not offer the courses they need, a gap that disproportionately affects lower-income communities, rural schools, and historically underrepresented students. UC Scout's catalog of 69 approved courses spanning every A-G subject area can be delivered in three distinct ways (Basic, Plus, or On Demand), depending on the needs of schools and students, two of which (Basic and Plus) are provided at no cost to students in public schools. Each course is developed internally by UC Scout and is aligned with California standards or the College Board's AP frameworks before entering UC's A-G approval process. Every UC Scout course is created through a collaborative process by K-12 education experts from multiple disciplines who are California-credentialed teachers and UCSC employees. The program has 14 full-time credentialed teachers that possess master's or doctorate degrees. An additional 60 part-time instructors teach at traditional or online high schools. The instructional designers have university backgrounds and advanced training on how students learn, and project managers coordinate the course development process from start to finish. Before being launched, each course undergoes an independent, external peer review by credentialed educators to provide an additional layer of quality assurance.

Discussion: A member questioned why UC Scout, rather than the Department of Education, is filling gaps at high schools. Students in the On Demand program are able to take AP exams at UC Scout's Santa Clara office and students who are not local are encouraged to take the exams at nearby schools. The high schools are responsible for ensuring that students have the necessary technology, and UC Scout publicizes the technology required for the On Demand courses.

IV. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

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

Chair Palazoglu thanked the committee for developing the Policies and Partnerships Roadmap and explained that Senate leadership is trying to ensure that President Milliken and Board of Regents Chair Anguiano agree with the approach BOARS is taking. The President and Board Chair look forward to receiving well-informed and thoughtful recommendations about the use of standardized tests for admission and the A-G framework. The Regents are interested in reviewing and making sure that UC's admissions policies, especially around the A-G framework, are robust and ensure that the students admitted to UC are prepared for university-level work and subsequently the evolving workforce. To this end, Chair Anguiano plans for the Regents' Academic and Student Affairs Committee to discuss admissions policies at every meeting so they are educated about the issues when they eventually receive recommendations from BOARS. Vice Chair Scott described Senate leadership's commitment to making sure BOARS is able to carefully analyze data in the year ahead. President Milliken and Chair Anguiano would like the Senate to be as responsive as possible to time-sensitive issues.

Discussion: Members expressed various concerns about the Roadmap including reservations about *ad hoc* workgroups rather than BOARS itself conducting the review of admissions policies and that review of the A-G framework may not be as high of a priority for BOARS as review of standardized testing for admissions. Another concern is that a BOARS recommendation on standardized tests could be disregarded by the Regents, and Chair Palazoglu explained that Senate leadership will engage with President Milliken and Chair Anguiano along the way in an effort to avoid what happened six years ago. It was noted by several BOARS members that UC faculty raising alarms about the lack of math preparation are not calling for a review of the A-G framework and, based on speculations by one BOARS member, that this review is an attempt to lower admissions requirements. Asked if the Special Charge was developed in consultation with Academic Council, Senate leadership indicated that consultation was not required. Vice Chair Scott acknowledged that faculty will have differing opinions about the issues to be considered; therefore, it will be critical to have data and rational arguments to support the committee's recommendations. If there are irreconcilable differences of opinion, the Senate will need to weigh what is in the best interests of students and UC.

V. Debrief: Discussion with UC Scout

Chair Volz was unaware of UC Scout before receiving the parent's complaint, and his initial research into the program generated a multitude of questions. Chair Sugar reported that UCEP has been monitoring the UC Online program based at UCOP and, while the specifics differ, overarching concerns include that online education is an increasingly significant issue, students' exposure to online education is starting earlier, and the mechanisms for oversight of the content and quality of those courses are not the same as those regularly used for in-person courses. UC Scout provides access and opportunities for students who might otherwise be unable to take certain courses, but

Chair Sugar worries that faculty are not closely involved with the program's activities as it seems to operate outside of the Senate's jurisdiction. While the presentation indicated that BOARS is part of UC Scout's governance structure, nothing related to the program has been on this committee's agendas in years.

Discussion: The use of "UC" in the program's name implies that the courses offered by UC Scout have in some way been validated by UC faculty which does not appear to be the case based on the information presented today. It is unclear why UC Scout is housed at UCSC rather than at UCOP. Members agreed that BOARS should invite UC Scout representatives to meet with the committee again in the coming academic year for a more in-depth discussion. The decision about whether a course articulates to the A-G criteria is not dependent on modality, thus BOARS may need to assess the articulation of online courses in general. BOARS might examine the limitations of online learning and contemplate the types of learning that could be promoted as effective for college preparation. The other issue is the proliferation of for-profit vendors that offer the ability to accrue college credit which do not entail interaction with UC faculty. A member observed that relying on online instruction to help remediate problems in underserved communities is problematic in many ways and may not serve the students with the greatest need.

VI. Policies and Partnerships Roadmap for First-Year Undergraduate Admissions

Chair Volz summarized the suggestions some members have made related to the June 5th, 2026 vote on the Roadmap. BOARS could decide to keep the Roadmap in place, a motion could be made to rescind the vote (which would mean the entire Roadmap is dissolved), or a motion to amend elements of the Roadmap would lead to revisions that require the committee's approval. BOARS would need to meet in August so the current members could vote on a revised Roadmap. Another suggestion is to vote on a motion recommending that standardized testing is reinstated for the 2026-2027 admission cycle as a requirement for the Fall 2027 freshman cohort. Any member making a motion should be prepared to share it in writing so the exact language of the motion is clear to everyone.

Discussion: Each member was asked to share their thoughts about the suggestions related to the June 5th approval of the Roadmap. Most members were uncomfortable with making a decision about standardized tests during the meeting, citing the need to consult with their divisional committees or a desire to investigate current versions of the Smarter Balanced Assessment and digital SAT/ACT. One member described the need to reinstate standardized tests as urgent and remarked on the attention in the national media to the calls for addressing this quickly. Opinions about making changes to the workgroup on the A-G framework varied, with a few members arguing that there is no rationale for this review in the year ahead and others speculating that outside parties want to weaken or eliminate the course requirements. Some members asserted that BOARS should handle the review of A-G itself instead of turning this over to a workgroup, and there was consensus that the committee should be continuously and extensively reviewing the framework because of its implications for the K-12 segment. It was noted that BOARS began considering issues related to preparation, A-G, and standardized testing in 2024-2025 which raises questions about the need for the Special Charge along with concerns about how similar charges could impact how BOARS conducts business in the future.

After a lengthy discussion, members agreed that there is insufficient support for making a recommendation to reinstate standardized tests for Fall 2027. A motion to rescind the June 5th vote

to approve the Roadmap was made, and the committee thoughtfully debated the wording of the motion before it was finalized. Members also delineated BOARS' justification for introducing a motion to rescind their June 5th vote which coalesced around three major concerns. The first concern was about the Special Charge being issued to BOARS in March 2026 without formal endorsement by Academic Council. The second concern was related to the timeline embedded within the Roadmap, resulting in limited flexibility for BOARS to issue recommendations during 2026-2027 within a quicker or shorter timeframe if necessary. Lastly, members had concerns about legitimate feedback, input, and concerns that surfaced from internal and external stakeholders since BOARS' prior approval of the Roadmap on June 5th.

As part of the motion that was introduced, the majority of BOARS members concluded that workgroup charges articulated within the Roadmap should be discussed and handled directly within BOARS – rather than by separate workgroups outside of BOARS – during their regular 2026-2027 meeting cadence to provide BOARS the flexibility to examine and issue recommendations about the potential use of standardized tests in the first-year admissions process and the A-G framework, course requirements, and/or subject areas without being constrained by the timelines articulated in the Roadmap. Incorporation of the Roadmap's workgroup charges into BOARS' 2026-2027 priorities and regular meeting cadence will allow BOARS to be nimbler and issue recommendations either sooner or later than July 2027 (the original target date within the Roadmap) depending on how BOARS' deliberations proceed during 2026-2027. Consistent with how BOARS examines other undergraduate admissions-related policies, Chair Volz indicated that BOARS will continue to meaningfully engage and consult with relevant stakeholders within and outside of UC during BOARS' deliberations. Chair Volz also indicated that the committee will regularly consult with UC- and non-UC experts within the areas of standardized testing and A-G requirements on an *ad hoc* basis during 2026-2027 and beyond if necessary.

Action: The motion to rescind BOARS' June 5th, 2026 vote approving the 2026-2027 Policies and Partnerships Roadmap for First-Year Undergraduate Admissions, and that BOARS review the issues of A-G requirements and standardized testing next year was made, seconded, and approved by a vote of nine for, one against, and two abstentions.

VII. Vote on Final Draft on BOARS Transfer Subcommittee Report
José Aguilar, Transfer Subcommittee Member (UCB)

The report from the Transfer Subcommittee will be sent to Associate Vice Provost Yoon-Wu for inclusion in UCOP's response to the California State Auditor.

Discussion: Members agreed that the report is good and did not suggest any changes.

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

VIII. Member Reports/Campus Updates

This item was not discussed.

IX. New Business/Executive Session

A member introduced a motion to reassert the validity of the Standardized Testing Task Force report from 2020 and to indicate that BOARS still believes that the conclusions were valid and would be in favor of reinstating standardized testing. Chair Volz reminded the committee that this would require a unanimous vote and several members quickly stated that they would not vote to approve this motion.

Another member suggested that BOARS should take up the issue of high school grade inflation next year, and Chair Volz indicated that the committee is not responsible for the oversight of high school grading standards.

The meeting adjourned at: 2:50 PM

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Attest: David Volz, Chair