

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools

Minutes of Meeting

November 4, 2022

I. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

*Susan Cochran, Academic Council Chair*

*James Steintrager, Academic Council Vice Chair*

- Regents: 1) At the upcoming Board meeting, the Senate will present the results of the second faculty survey on COVID impacts. 2) The Health Services Committee again discussed affiliations with hospitals and groups that limit care based on policy restrictions. UC Health maintains that because many affiliates are in rural areas and have many MediCal patients, it is good to offer access to UC-quality care. Affiliations also increase the catchment area for complicated procedures. But the policy-based restrictions limit care options for women's health, gender non-conforming treatments, and end of life care. The Senate presented a panel of practitioners and experts to illustrate specific situations.
- Academic Council: 1) Comments on draft policies regarding abusive conduct and conflict of commitments have been sent to President Drake. 2) Regent Chair Leib visited the Council. Among other topics, he asked about academic preparation and performance in the post-standardized testing environment. Variable academic preparation was widely reported. But the impact of COVID and other variables must also be considered. Hopefully useful data can be generated to help assess the situation.
- Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS): 1) CSU is having difficulty getting its Senate to approve the proposed Cal-GETC. If the Senates do not come to agreement, administrators will make the decision. 2) In response to AB928, a committee has been formed to address transfer issues in just six meetings. The group includes administrators, faculty, students, for-profit private groups, and legislative staff. Common course numbering has proven difficult for the CCCs. The unit cap imposed by the legislature complicates adding Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs) in STEM disciplines.
- Labor Issues: The UAW has authorized a strike among represented academic employees. Guidance is forthcoming from the chancellors, but members are encouraged to follow-up with divisional chairs.

II. Chair's Announcements

*Barbara Knowlton, BOARS Chair*

1. Academic Council of October 26, 2022

- As BOARS had also noted, feedback on the abusive conduct policy called for a better definition of terms, a revision of the objective/reasonable standard, and cross-policy interaction considerations.
  - The Regents are concerned about access. A-G completion among certain demographic groups is also a concern. Most will continue to push for more online courses to meet enrollment goals.
  - The University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP) has issued two reports, one on academic integrity and one on online degree requirements. BOARS will discuss both next month.
2. Other Committees
- As noted, ICAS focused mostly on Cal-GETC considerations.
3. Consent Calendar
- DRAFT Minutes of October 7, 2022  
Note: Item deferred to electronic approval.

### III. **Systemwide Review Items**

#### ➤ Determine Committee Position

- Proposed Senate Regulation 479 (Cal-GETC)

*Chair Knowlton, Lead Reviewer*

Chair Knowlton presented a summary of changes and an overview of recent events. UC has concerns about major preparation, especially for STEM disciplines. Completion of the general education (GE) transfer curriculum is not a requirement for transfer to UC, and some departments suggest waiting to take GE courses until after transfer to emphasize major preparation and prevent major overload post-transfer. As Chair Cochran noted, if the Senates fail to reach agreement, the administrations will make the decisions. The legislative goal is to increase total transfers and diversity within transfers by easing the transfer process. CCC instructors are worried about losing courses, and will default into ADT tracks unless they opt-out. CSUs are discussing their GE breadth requirement.

➤ Analyst Feer will draft a memo for electronic approval.

- Entry Level Writing Requirement Task Force Report and Recommendations

*UCLA Representative Watson, Lead Reviewer*

There are concerns about equity because writing preparation varies by background. Campuses are expected to meet students where they are and provide appropriate support for academic success. Campuses will develop their own tools and track best practices through an oversight body. There are concerns about summer courses and limited lecturer availability during that term. Central funding is recommended to support local pilots. Workload concerns for evaluations have also arisen. At least one campus plans to trade lecturer teaching hours as compensation for reading. The potential loss of the SAT Writing test as a diagnostic tool would negatively impact workload.

➤ Analyst Feer will draft a memo for electronic approval.

- Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 630 (Residency)

*UCM Representative Eaton and UCSC Representative Giuliano, Lead Reviewers*

Note: Any concerns should be sent to Analyst Feer after the meeting.

- Presidential Policy on Vaccination Programs

*UCSF Representative Berke, Lead Reviewer*

The proposal reorganized existing language and adds nothing new.

➤ Analyst Feer will draft a memo for electronic approval.

#### **IV. BOARS Business**

##### **1. Campus Updates**

UCB: 1) Systemwide review items were discussed. 2) Members underwent reader training. 3) It was noted that many students take geometry prior 8<sup>th</sup> grade, yet fail to show completion of the course in the online application. Changes to the form are suggested. 4) The business schools has proposed taking direct admits for first-year students while phasing out transfer admission to the school.

UCD: 1) Transfer discussions are dominant. Strategies to keep meeting the 2:1 goal are sought.

UCI: 1) Systemwide review items were discussed. Student debt and housing were raised in response to residency and online course considerations. 2) Members underwent reader training. More about the selection process will be provided next month. Major-specific concerns and central admissions will be discussed. 3) New indicators to replace standardized tests and compensate for grade inflation are being considered. 4) Students are taking fewer units per term, leading to concerns about meeting enrollment targets per student FTE.

UCLA: 1) An admissions overview was presented. 2) Review items were discussed. Academic quality concerns were raised in response to the residency item. 3) The campus is exploring applying for HSI status. 4) Many are concerned about the dual-admission pilot program and academic preparation. 5) Low enrollments in the humanities are becoming a concern.

UCM: 1) Student institutional debt is a concern regarding drop-outs and under-enrollment.

UCR: 1) Alternatives to ELWR are not yet fully developed, and some students may have to take several courses, delaying major academic work. 2) Concerns about the residency proposal include the distinction between lectures and field work as licensing and accreditation requirements may differ.

UCSD: 1) New members were on-boarded. 2) The reading of ever-increasing applications has raised workload concerns.

UCSF: The campus continues not to admit undergraduates.

UCSB: 1) New member orientation continues. 2) New admission software is being launched. 3) Enrollment of under-represented groups has improved. 4) How to compensate for grade inflation is not yet clear, especially because of COVID and other admission changes. 5) A loss of institutional knowledge in the admission office will take time to restore. 6) Best practices for minimizing time to degree in impacted majors are needed.

UCSC: 1) Local discussions have focused on transfer issues and “screens” for academic preparation. 2) Better yield estimators are needed, especially for computer science. 3) Follow-up on the Compare Favorably alternative considered last year is sought.

**V. Consultation with the Office of the President – Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs**

**Consultation with Admission Directors and Enrollment Management Leads**

1. Enrollment Management Concerns

The group considers the referral pool guarantee of admission to UC to the top 1/8 of students graduating California public high schools, even to a campus to which one did not apply. Since the referral pool was implemented, changes to admission have been significant, including adoption of the 9X9 policy, adoption of Comprehensive Review, and changes to the state index. Due to grade inflation under COVID and other changes, more students are meeting the statewide eligibility, but still there is a low take rate from the referral pool. The timeline for those who receive referrals to decide is short. The availability of and access to certain majors may play a role. There is considerable attention to students who are only eligible in the local context (ELC). Not all schools participate in ELC, and ELC relies on local GPAs. Forcing admission to referral pool students would not increase the total number of California residents enrolled, and could lead to unintended consequences. Use of “guarantee”, “eligible”, and “competitive” in messaging was discussed. “Entitled to Review” (ETR) was originally proposed as an alternative to guarantee, but its usage is now different.

2. Transfer Issues

Does taking more major courses improve the likelihood of admission? Messaging is confusing on the issue. Some think that over-all competitiveness is more important, and that competitive students are more likely to over-prepare. Impacted majors are also a factor. The use of “screens” has caused at least one campus to deny admission to a large proportion of students accepted at other UC campuses in the same major. Not all majors have screens, though. Meeting the 2:1 enrollment goal has led to some flexibility when assessing major preparation. Student support and success must be considered, and communications should be tidier.

3. Lasting Changes due to COVID or Elimination of Standardized Tests

While clear data are not yet available, widespread reports of learning loss due to COVID have been reported, especially in math preparation, and particularly among students from low socio-economic backgrounds and/or underrepresented groups. Learning loss impacts are expected to last for a generation, but how UC should respond is unclear. It is difficult to teach a class of differently prepared students. More high school and on-campus resources are needed for student support to ensure student success. Students who learn online receive less support, especially in the form of academic advising and counseling. Diversity outcomes have not changed trajectory, and California’s demographic trends suggest difficulty in changing it. Fewer students enrolling at the CCCs have raised concerns about meeting the 2:1 expectation, and begs the question of whether UC should compromise its academic standards in order not to miss enrollment targets. At least one campus has refused to lower standards, while others may, depending on additional factors. The public and political pressure to enroll more transfers complicates decision-making. Some suggested that a “good faith” effort during trying times

should prevent punishment to any UC that does not meet certain targets during this time of transition.

**VI. Conforming Amendments to Senate Regulations**

*Barbara Knowlton, BOARS Chair*

The proposed changes are in response to amendments to Regents policies and the removal of standardized tests from the admission process. Discussion will continue next month.

**VII. Further Discussion and New Business**

BOARS will meet in person next month.

Adjournment: 3:15 pm.

Minutes prepared by Kenneth Feer, Principal Analyst

Attest: Barbara Knowlton, BOARS Chair

Attendance:

Barbara Knowlton, BOARS Chair

Wallace Cleaves, BOARS Vice Chair

Sophie Volpp, UCB

John Stachowicz, UCD

Sergio Gago Masague, UCI

Robert Watson, UCLA

Mike Cleary, UCM Alternate

Peter Sadler, UCR

Akos Rona-Tas, UCSD

Joshua Berke, UCSF

Greg Mitchel, UCSB

Laura Giuliano, UCSC