

I. Welcome and Announcements

Chair Jacob welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the [charge](#) of the committee. BOARS fulfills one of the core UC faculty roles—to advise the President and Academic Senate on the systemwide criteria for undergraduate admissions. The chair said he hopes to increase the committee's focus on its "Relations with Schools" mission this year, which has tremendous relevance for admissions.

BOARS has regular UCOP consultants who play a critical role in the committee and collaborate closely with the faculty representatives on policy reviews. The chair also will schedule regular executive sessions to give members the opportunity to discuss issues with no consultants present and without notes taken. It is important to provide the public with a transparent, accurate accounting of the committee's deliberations, and approved BOARS meeting minutes are uploaded to the Senate website. Members who are unable to attend a meeting should ask their local Senate office to appoint an alternate.

The Academic Council's first meeting of the year was focused largely on the [report](#) of the President's Task Force on Post-Employment Benefits and a [Dissenting Statement](#) authored by the faculty and staff members of the Task Force. There are three proposed options for pension and health benefits redesign on the table that would affect both new and current UC employees. The President is expected to announce his recommendation at the November Regents meeting, and the Regents are expected to convene a special December meeting for final action. Forums will be held on each campus in October, and Council will issue its recommendation at the end of October.

The [Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates](#) (ICAS) met yesterday in Sacramento to discuss issues of mutual concern to the UC, CSU, and California community college faculty Senates, including general education requirements, legislation affecting all three segments, plans for continued joint advocacy with state leaders on behalf of California higher education, and implementation of SB 1440, which will be discussed in greater detail by BOARS later in this meeting.

Discussion: A member suggested that BOARS establish a subcommittee to discuss outreach and retention. Another noted that it is unclear how CSU and UC can accommodate more transfer students without a significant budgetary change.

II. 2010-2011 Issues Overview

- William Jacob, BOARS Chair

The major issues before BOARS in 2010-11 include planning for the success of the [Freshman admissions Reform Policy](#) taking effect for students entering in fall 2012, and implementing the recommendations in BOARS' May 2010 [Report on Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions](#).

BOARS worked for more than four years to develop the new admissions policy approved by the Regents in February 2009 and effective in 2012. BOARS believes that meeting its goal of enrolling a student body that closely represents the diversity of California will depend largely on the applicant pool. Recruiting a more diverse applicant pool will require outreach, particularly in low API schools and diverse regions of the state.

The President has asked BOARS for a plan to implement the Comprehensive Review Report's recommendations, including incorporating read sheet data into each campus' comprehensive review, assuring individualized review of all applicants, broader implementation of holistic review processes across campuses, and sharing of holistic ratings of freshman applications.

Regent Eddie Island met with BOARS in July and challenged the committee to reaffirm its commitment to diversity and inclusion and to think creatively about new solutions and ways to implement real change. Regent Island also stated at the July Regents meeting that he expects regular updates on the progress of implementing the recommendations in BOARS' Comprehensive Review Report.

Chair Jacob will convene two subcommittees: one on transfer to discuss President Yudof's request that the Senate devise a plan to streamline the community college transfer process and align lower division transfer major requirements across campuses. The articulation and evaluation subcommittee will discuss, among other topics, Career Technical Education (CTE) and online a-g course approval criteria. In addition, an 'Area b' Task force will meet to examine the English criteria descriptions in the UC Freshman admissions requirements, and a BOARS-UCEP-UCOPE work group will explore the possibility that UC recognize the CSU General Education Breadth pattern for transfer. He noted that Santa Barbara teacher Amir Abo-Shaeer was recently awarded a MacArthur "Genius" Fellowship (the first high school teacher to do so) for his work on an engineering academy.

Chair Jacob asked for a BOARS volunteer to serve as a Senate representative to the Education Finance Model Committee, a joint Senate-Administration-Student group that discusses student affordability and financial support issues.

Action: BOARS will nominate Charles Akemann to the Education Finance Model Committee.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs
- Susan Wilbur, Admissions Director
- Don Daves-Rougeaux, Associate Admissions Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Articulation & Eligibility

Vice President Sakaki: The Office of Student Affairs develops policy and advocacy positions to promote access, affordability, and student success. Student Affairs staff design systemwide programs to increase efficiency (UC unveiled the new [ApplyUC](#) website yesterday), promote affordability through programs like the Blue and Gold Opportunity plan, track admissions outcomes and report those outcomes to the Regents, meet with Senate committees and statewide student groups, and interface with outside constituencies at counselor conferences and community meetings. Currently, the Office is looking at student welfare and mental health issues, enhancing access to military veterans, a communications plan for the new admissions policy, and a plan to bring faculty together to discuss the alignment of lower division transfer prerequisites across campuses in accordance with SR 477. The Education Financial Model Committee is discussing a uniform systemwide work/loan policy and promoting economies of scale through a systemwide student health insurance program.

Director Wilbur: The Office of Undergraduate Admissions works closely with faculty and campus admissions directors to develop policy and implement the faculty's priorities to the extent that it can. The Office manages the 'a-g' course approval process, the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) Program, and the Analytical Writing Placement Exam. It just completed its annual series of counselor conferences that were attended by 4100 counselors across California, including the first ever joint conference with CSU in Fresno with 700 participants. Unfortunately, UC had to deliver hard messages about freshman enrollment reductions, wait

lists, increases in non-resident enrollment, and increased competition at the freshman and transfer level. Counselors have embraced the 2012 admissions changes, and are focusing on strategies for student preparation.

Some California high schools are struggling to offer a full set of curricular offerings. As schools cut budgets, fewer students are able to meet all 'a-g' requirements. Specifically, more students are taking the 'area f' (visual and performing arts) requirement online, contrary to policy, although UC believes there is a good argument for leniency under the current circumstances. In addition, rising fees are forcing more students to start their college career at a CCC and increasing interest in the transfer path to UC.

Director Wilbur will be organizing a meeting of Admissions Committee chairs to discuss preparation for 2012. She encouraged BOARS member to attend holistic review workshops at UCLA on October 11 and 12.

Associate Director Daves-Rougeaux: High schools submitted 33,000 courses to Office of Admissions for a-g approval this year, although many of those were revisions rather than new courses. UC's online provider application policy will be a major focus for the department this year. The only other option for some students to fulfill area 'f' outside of an online environment is by completing the AP or IB exam. In addition to shrinking their art and music programs, some high schools are able to offer only one area 'd' laboratory science course. Current UC policy prohibits online certification for area 'd' without a certified wet lab component.

UC is close to its goal of approving 10,000 CTE courses for a-g by 2011-12. The second UC Curriculum Integration Institute is scheduled for November 7-10. The focus will be on developing academically rigorous history, social science, and English courses integrated with CTE content.

Discussion: If UC backs away from the 'f' requirement, it could encourage even more high schools to reduce or do away with art and music programs, the first casualties in a budget crunch. These courses are critical to a liberal education.

BOARS should continue discussing the impact of increasing non-resident enrollment on UC's ability to serve the California population. Online education and non-resident enrollment are both evidence of the trend toward privatization of higher education, and are two of the most important issues for BOARS to consider.

Director Wilbur noted that UC was able to offer a space to every UC eligible California resident applicant this year and will maintain that goal for fall 2011, but campuses are beginning to actively recruit more out of state and international students. The goal is to increase non-resident enrollment to 10% systemwide over the next decade. The budget is motivating this, but UC also wants to ensure that it is globally diverse.

IV. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- Daniel Simmons, Chair, Academic Council
- Robert Anderson, Vice Chair, Academic Council
- Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate

Chair Simmons welcomed BOARS members and thanked them for their service to the Academic Senate. He said the work of BOARS is fundamental to the Senate and UC and complimented the committee on the quality of its admissions reform work over the past several years.

[Post-Employment Benefits Task Force Recommendations](#): Although the PEB recommendations are not in BOARS' direct jurisdiction, they are of great general interest to UC faculty. The proposed changes represent a cut in the total remuneration of UC faculty and staff, whose compensation already lags the market. All three options on the table reduce retiree health

benefits, and although the administration says there is no change in benefits for current employees, “Options A and B” would increase the cost to current employees to remain in the current Plan to 7% (or higher) of covered compensation. In addition, the Regents just approved a plan to ramp-up employee and employer contributions to UCRP over the next three years. It is expected that the employer contribution will need to rise to 20% eventually to cover the unfunded accrued liability of the Plan, which will impact campus operating budgets enormously. The University Committee on Faculty Welfare has released a statement opposing Option A; UCFW says Options B and C might be acceptable, but only with increases to cash compensation. The Regents are expected to take final action at a special December meeting.

Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of UC: The Council recommendation calls for downsizing UC by reducing the number of employees, including faculty, though attrition; instituting a moratorium on construction; and requiring Chancellors to identify a stable source of funding for any new program and specify its impact on existing programs. The rationale is that a smaller UC would be better positioned to offer competitive compensation to attract the best faculty, without whom UC quality would suffer irreparable harm. BOARS is encouraged to comment on the implications of the recommendations for student enrollment, diversity and access. In addition, Chair Simmons has tasked an Academic Council Special Committee on a Plan for UC, which will be led by immediate past Senate Chair Harry Powell and consist of faculty members from the Commission on the Future process, to develop a faculty plan for the future of UC. UC faces the twin threats of mediocrity and privatization as it replaces ladder rank faculty with lecturers and moves to a more market based compensation system. UC law school fees now equal or exceed fees at the privates, meaning there are effectively no public law schools left in California. If the faculty do not take a position on the direction of the University, nobody will.

When BOARS submits a recommendation, report, or letter to Council, the transmittal letter should state in its first paragraph what action, if any, the committee wants Council to take. When BOARS requests that Council take action, it should also draft a proposed motion to accompany its letter or report, so Council can debate the proposed action and make amendments, if any, to the motion rather than to the committee’s report or letter.

Senate Director Winnacker noted that the Senate now asks faculty to use the Senate’s Southwest Airlines “SWABIZ” corporate booking portal to book air travel to Senate meetings. Santa Barbara travelers without access to Southwest should continue to use UCLA Travel.

V. President Yudof’s Letter to BOARS re: Holistic Review

Last year, President Yudof asked BOARS to consider extending a holistic-style review process to all campuses. BOARS did not endorse this move definitely in its Comprehensive Review report, but did recommend that selective campuses *consider* using a holistic system. It also recommended that as all campuses become more selective they subject all applicants to an individualized review. The President responded by asking BOARS to consider several recommendations: (1) all campuses incorporate electronic read sheet data into their selection process; (2) all applicants receive an individualized review; (3) all selective campuses develop a plan to use a holistic scoring system as part of the 2012 reforms; and (4) campuses collaborate on generating holistic scores.

Last year, UCOP circulated sample “read sheets” developed by UCB and UCLA to campuses. They were envisioned as a way to provide more applicant information to campuses to use as they see fit, particularly information about academic performance in school context, one of the key components of comprehensive review. The data is drawn from CEBEDS, UC Doorways, and the College Board, and include information about school environment—e.g.,

available honors and a-g courses, API rank, average SAT score, number of first generation college students—and campus specific percentile rankings, which place the student in the context of other applicants to a UC campus and systemwide. Starting this year, UCOP will offer all campuses the same data in read sheet form that UCLA and UCB now receive. Ultimately, UCOP wants to embed the data elements in Apply UC.

Chair Jacob asked members to discuss their campus' plan to incorporate read sheet data into the review process and to consider additional data elements to incorporate into the read sheet.

Merced: currently uses the information on the read sheet only when considering a student for Admissions by Exception, but the campus is developing a strategy for broader use of the data next year, when it expects to see an uptick in selectivity, particularly regarding achievement in context.

Santa Barbara: may well wish to continue its current school context approach and does not want to be forced to use the UCB or UCLA system. Its approach is a systemwide best practice that is already producing the results the President wants. BOARS should defend the best practices on each campus.

San Diego: Many UCSD faculty remain concerned about campus climate and racism, but people are divided about what to do. On the admissions committee, some believe that moving to a holistic review system will not produce a different outcome, because the problem has more to do with recruitment than admissions. UCSD admits many African-American and Latino students who choose to enroll elsewhere. There are also concerns about increasing centralization and the potential loss of local autonomy, as well as the added expense of individualized review on a campus that is already cutting back. Still, UCSD has decided to conduct a pilot this year where it will conduct holistic reviews alongside its current system and compare the results.

Riverside: As the most diverse UC campus, Riverside is not as concerned with increasing diversity as it is with improving academic quality. UCR relies heavily on an academic index for admissions decisions, and its goals are to improve that index to maximize retention and success. The campus uses the read sheet only for an augmented review if an applicant is denied, but it is discussing possible changes for 2012.

Davis: the campus admits all ELC-eligible students automatically, without an individualized review, and uses read sheet data only to compare students on the border of decisions. The admissions committee is engaged in an ongoing discussion about the value of the read sheet and how to incorporate school context data into the existing review model. The campus is also considering a move to a holistic model, but wants to evaluate the UCB and UCLA holistic models before deciding.

Discussion: BOARS's challenge is to agree on what UC should be trying to accomplish systemwide in student selection and then to figure out the best system to get there. Another challenge is to preserve local autonomy and honor local systems while working to meet systemwide goals. BOARS should demonstrate to the President that there are multiple ways of reaching the same goal.

It was noted that read sheets could be useful to all UC campuses in some way; at a minimum, helping each campus define an excellent student through consideration of context. Using the read sheets at this level this would not require campuses to move to a systemwide holistic scoring system.

It is difficult to consider context and environment fully without a human read. A possible middle ground could be to generate a holistic score for students who are not admitted automatically through ELC.

It was noted that students generally support the President's goal of moving to holistic admissions. Campuses should review students as individuals using opportunity context factors.

Making holistic scores available to all campuses this year could be useful in educating campuses about what holistic review is. Some members are concerned about holistic review being mandated.

Action: Committee analyst will produce a single pdf packet containing the read sheet, key, and collected correspondence between the president and BOARS, which members will present to their admissions committees. BOARS also requested projections reviewed by the committee last year about applicants and admits under ETR.

VI. Transfer Subcommittee (break-out)

- Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director for Transfer Policy

Issue: Associate Director Brick briefed the Transfer Subcommittee on current transfer issues. BOARS has also been asked to name a representative to the C-ID project advisory committee.

Alignment of Lower Division Major Preparation: For years, the legislature has pressured UC to simplify and streamline the transfer process. The [Transfer Preparation Paths](#) online tool is one of UC's responses. It provides information to prospective transfers about preparation requirements for specific transfer majors (so far, the top 20) that are both campus specific and show differences and similarities across campuses. The paths highlight the vast differences across UC campuses. [Senate Regulation 477](#) is another attempt to streamline transfer articulation. It says that when four campuses agree to accept a course as transferable preparation for a major it is considered articulated on all campuses. UCOP's plan to implement SR 477 involves bringing together faculty from history, psychology, biological science, math, and computer science on all campuses to explore the degree to which they might create common lower division major prerequisites. These majors were chosen because they are among the most popular transfer majors and represent a range of disciplines and complicity.

C-ID: The Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) is an effort to develop a common course numbering system for lower division major preparation courses that could be used by all three segments of higher education. An intersegmental C-ID Task Force is working on course descriptor agreements. Once approved, CCC faculty would submit course outlines to be matched against the descriptors. The ultimate goal is to articulate UC courses to the C-ID numbers, but it has been difficult to interest UC faculty in the project.

Legislation: SB 1440 requires the California Community Colleges to design Associates Degrees for transfer to CSU and compels CSU to accept them, although it the transfer AA would not guarantee transfer to a specific campus or major. The legislation allows individual CCCs to decide what will be in a transfer AA, but the CCC Senate is hoping to coordinate it centrally. AB 2302 requests the participation of UC in the development of AA degrees for transfer to UC.

Discussion: Some questioned the choice of the five majors for the alignment work groups. It was noted that UC should focus first on curricular alignment it can easily achieve—as such, Engineering might be a better choice than Biological Sciences. UC should also look at specific agreements, including [Transfer Admission Guarantees](#) (TAGs), campuses have established with individual community colleges.

Chair Jacob noted that the UC discipline groups should coordinate their work with the C-ID work groups and the CCC and CSU faculty groups discussing implementation of SB 1440, who have indicated that UC input would be valuable. He will send Vice President Sakaki language to include in UCOP's request to the deans assembling the work groups. It was also

noted that the role of the CCC transfer counselors in guiding students through the transfer process should be included in conversations.

Chair Simmons said the legislature has provided a solution without identifying a problem. The Senate wants to improve the transfer process, but is concerned that the problem has not been defined clearly, as UC is at or above capacity for transfer students, who do as well as four-year students in terms of their GPA, completion, and retention rates. One member said one of the problems is that CCC students sometimes spend years accumulating credits without gaining a degree or transferring. California is not doing a good enough job educating the underserved communities in the state who will soon be the majority population.

VII. Report from the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

BOARS Vice Chair Johnson reported that the Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee will be reviewing applications from 15 online providers. The subcommittee discussed quality, fairness, equity, and security concerns about online education. It is interested in reviewing analyses from academic experts and outcome data about UC students who have taken online a-g, to determine the effectiveness of distance instruction, as well as the role an online education background might have in selection decisions. At its next meeting, the subcommittee will review applications distributed today by Don Daves-Rougeaux from potential online providers for approval using the criteria approved by BOARS in 2007. They will also consider some applications for a-g course approval.

VIII. Comprehensive Review Guidelines

Issue: The Office of Admissions distributed its recommended modifications to the 2001 [Guiding Principles for Comprehensive Review](#), which are based on recommendations BOARS makes in its May 2010 CR Report. The changes incorporate four new principles into the existing eight principles and also modify one existing principle slightly. Director Wilbur led the committee through each of UCOP's proposed changes.

Director Wilbur also reviewed new procedures for determining the ELC cohort. Starting next year, UC will no longer send letters to students informing them that they have an ELC "guarantee." Instead, UC will collect transcripts for the top 15% cohort at each school and send them a letter stating that they have been identified as among the school's top students and encouraging them to apply. If they do apply, UC will match GPA information with the transcript to see if they qualify for the 9% ELC and tag that for the campus. UC is confident that it can identify the complete top 9% by asking for the top 15%. Later, UC will analyze transcripts from 1/3 of high schools each year to update its records about average GPAs. The vendor will also send information about ELC segments of 1% each up to 9%. The changes are driven by the need to reduce costs, but UC believes the new process will maintain the stimulating effect of ELC.

Discussion: It was noted that principle #3 should not unintentionally limit or ban the practice on some campuses of admitting all ELC students. Director Wilbur assured members that the principles do not do this, and in fact, new principle #10 states that campus selection criteria should give priority to ELC applicants.

Members noted that principle #8, which states that no applicant will be denied admission without an individualized review, is being met by campuses. This is not holistic review, but it is important for human eyes to review every denial.

There was a great deal of discussion about UCOP's reconfiguration of BOARS' proposal that admissions processes weigh academic accomplishments and personal achievements comparably. Some felt that neither the new language nor BOARS' original language met the

original intent to prevent too much weight being placed on academic criteria alone. There were a number of suggestions for revisions.

BOARS should take steps to monitor and ensure that the entire 9% ELC cohort is accepted by campuses the students actually want to attend, so that no subgroup is relegated to the referral pool.

Action: Members approved the changes and will review new language for #9 over email.

IX. Systemwide Review of Academic Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University

Issue: The Council recommendation calls for downsizing UC by reducing the number of employees, including faculty, though attrition; instituting a moratorium on construction; and requiring Chancellors to identify a stable source of funding for any new program and specify its impact on existing programs. President Yudof has asked the Senate to consider the implications for enrollment and class size, faculty workload and quality, student-faculty ratios, graduate education, and faculty diversity.

Discussion: From a BOARS perspective, the implications of downsizing relate closely to undergraduate student diversity and access. Reducing the overall number of students UC accepts could seriously jeopardize the goals BOARS has been working for over the last several years. There are diversity implications to downsizing the undergraduate population. Once a campus begins to accept fewer undergraduates, the ones who do not make the cut are likely to be from the lowest GPA/SAT quintile group, who are more likely to come from underserved populations. In this way, downsizing is likely to decrease diversity and access for underserved California populations. It was noted that downsizing access in this way would make the UC system complicit in reproducing educational segregation, which has implications for social stability, because a generation from now, the majority population of the state will not have access to higher education.

Another noted that it may be more likely that UC will decide to maintain the same overall enrollment level by enrolling more tuition-bearing non-resident undergraduates and fewer California resident students. The downsized undergraduate population then will be California students. It was noted that California higher education includes fewer non-residents than any other state. Increasing the number of non-resident undergraduates could also provide a source of revenue to pay for educating residents.

If enrollment holds steady, the realistic focus of downsizing would be faculty and staff, meaning that UC will be looking at the difficult task of maintaining quality with fewer faculty and staff. Fewer faculty will mean fewer graduate students, teaching assistants, and research support and increased teaching pressure on the remaining graduate students. In addition, students may choose not to apply to UC when they realize that fewer faculty will increase their time and expense to degree, and provide them a less excellent education. This too is a diversity issue but fewer faculty will hurt the entire pool of applications.

Action: Committee analyst will draft a memo for BOARS to discuss.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Bill Jacob