

Part I: Joint Meeting with Legislative Staff – UC Center in Sacramento**I. Introductions and Opening Comments**

Twelve staff members from the legislature and the Governor's office joined BOARS to discuss current topics in UC admissions. Academic Senate Chair Powell noted that BOARS advises the UC Senate and President on the systemwide criteria for undergraduate admission, and is identified in the Standing Orders of the Regents as having delegated authority for admissions policy. He said the meeting was the first of its kind.

Vice President for Student Affairs Sakaki noted that her office works with UC campuses, BOARS, and other Senate committees to implement policy. She said UC received a record number of undergraduate applications for fall 2013. UC is committed to supporting and enhancing access and affordability for California students and is working hard to increase community college transfer and improve transfer articulation.

BOARS Chair Johnson noted that BOARS works closely with UCOP administrators and campus admissions directors to establish and implement systemwide policy and regulate campus-level policies and practices. The Regents approved [Comprehensive Review](#) in 2001 and affirmed [holistic review](#) as its preferred method of implementation in 2011. BOARS has established Comprehensive Review [guidelines](#) which contain a set of 14 criteria to guide selection. Campuses set their own review and selection procedures based on these criteria.

II. Freshman Admissions – Policies, Outcomes, and Challenges

Chair Johnson stated that BOARS is working to find solutions to UC's admissions challenges that will help reach the goals of increasing quality, access, and diversity. BOARS developed the new [freshman eligibility policy](#) that took effect for the fall 2012 freshman class. The policy expands the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) guarantee from the top 4% to the top 9% in each school, and creates a new "Entitled to Review (ETR)" category of students who are invited to apply even if they do not meet criteria for the ELC or statewide guarantee.

One of BOARS' main goals is to admit students who will succeed at UC and persist to graduation. Data about average freshmen time-to-degree and graduation rates published in the [UC Accountability Report](#) indicate that UC is meeting these goals. In addition, UC admitted more than 13% of all California public high school graduates in 2012, indicating that the University is meeting expectations outlined in the Master Plan. Other data indicate that the new eligibility policy is a success and is allowing UC to capture highly qualified students who may not have applied in the past. Nearly 92% of applicants with an ELC guarantee and 50% of applicants in the ETR category were admitted to a campus to which they applied. There were also increases in freshman enrollments among California residents and in most demographic

categories—including underrepresented minority groups, and those who are the first in their family to attend college.

Another of BOARS' goals is to increase the diversity of the UC student body so that it more closely reflects the diversity of California, and the most recent UC freshman class is the most diverse ever. At the same time, there has been an increase in applications and academic indicators that is allowing all UC campuses to become more selective, and UC may have more difficulty meeting its diversity goals if admissions decisions are based solely on academic indicators.

III. The Referral Guarantee

Chair Johnson noted that the Master Plan does not mention the referral guarantee, but BOARS has viewed the guarantee as an important promise to California students. Merced is currently the only campus accepting referral students, and as that campus becomes more selective and the capacity of the UC system to accept more students decreases, it is possible that UC will be unable to offer a guarantee to every student in the near future. All stakeholders should consider the meaning and importance of the guarantee, and the effect of its elimination.

Discussion: Legislative staff expressed concern about the potential elimination of the referral pool. They asked what it would take for other UC campuses to participate. It was noted that other campuses stopped using the referral pool as they reached capacity and, simultaneously, increased their selectivity. Campuses have found that the referral pool is costly to operate and produces a small and unpredictable yield. They would be unlikely to return to the referral pool without additional resources. It was also noted that funding for the construction of new academic buildings at Merced will be critical to providing capacity growth for the UC system and maintaining the referral guarantee.

IV. Nonresident Admissions

BOARS has authority over admissions policy, but has not been involved in administrative discussions about enrollment policy or nonresident enrollment targets. BOARS has established [principles](#) for nonresident admission, and asked each campus to affirm that the nonresidents they admit “compare favorably” to the residents they admit.

Discussion: Legislative staff noted concern about UC increasing nonresident enrollment when it appears to have room for more residents. They urged UC to work with the state to ensure that California's universities serve California students first. BOARS members noted that faculty are divided on the issue. Some are concerned about displacing residents, but others note that nonresidents enhance diversity and tend to perform as well or better than residents. Nonresident tuition revenue also allows campuses to admit more California residents and support them financially, and to hire more faculty. Campuses say that they enroll thousands of unfunded resident undergraduates and that they have increased resident enrollment at the same time that the state has decreased funding. In addition, many of UC's comparison public institutions enroll a far greater proportion of nonresidents.

V. Transfer Admissions

The University of California remains an attractive option for California Community Colleges students, with 71% of students who apply for transfer admission accepted by at least one of the UC campuses to which they apply, and of the admitted students over 81% enroll. Once they arrive at UC, transfer students perform as well as four-year students in terms of persistence and GPA at graduation.

The UC Senate recently established [new transfer pathways](#) to encourage prospective transfers to prepare for a specific major and to align UC policy with CA Senate Bill 1440. The policy guarantees a review to transfer applicants who complete an SB 1440 Transfer AA degree with a minimum GPA. BOARS also has asked departments to establish UC Transfer Curricula defining their expected transfer preparation, and is encouraging departments to align their curricula as closely as possible to similar majors on other UC campuses and with the Transfer Model Curricula developed by the CCC and CSU. BOARS members expressed concern that applications for transfer admission from community college students declined this year.

Discussion: Legislative staff encouraged BOARS to investigate the drop in transfer applicants. It was noted that UCOP is working with the CCC chancellors to understand the factors involved. Some speculate that the economy is playing a role or that transfers may be having trouble accessing impacted or cancelled classes required for transfer.

It was noted that UCSD ended its participation in the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program over concerns that the TAG pathway was crowding out other transfer paths and high performing students, and that it was benefiting transfers at a small number of community colleges.

VI. Accountability Bill (*Kathleen Chavira, Consultant, State Senate Education Committee*)

BOARS discussed the prospects for new legislation that would develop accountability measures for the State's higher education segments. The new bill will be similar to SB 721 of 2012, vetoed by the Governor last year, which had proposed a higher education accountability framework overseen by the Legislative Analyst's Office that would establish, track, and measure goals related to student success and efficiency. The new bill will ask stakeholders to identify goals and metrics for California higher education related to student access, progress, and success; expectations for the role of the segments in meeting the state's workforce and economic needs; and the use of state resources.

Discussion: Members noted that accountability metrics are a good idea in theory, but that the intangible impacts of higher education can be difficult or impossible to capture in data. UC is a complex and unique organization. Care should be taken that metrics do not have unintended consequences.

BOARS members thanked legislative staff for taking the time to meeting with the committee and engage on the issues.

Part II: BOARS Meeting

I. Consent Calendar

- January 4, 2013 BOARS minutes

Action: BOARS approved the January minutes.

II. Announcements

- *Robert Powell, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Bill Jacob, Academic Senate Vice Chair*
- *George Johnson, BOARS Chair*

Chair Powell reported that the Governor's 2013-14 budget contains good news for UC. It funds the \$125 million tuition increase "buy out" promised for 2012-13, proposes small but steady increases to UC's base budget each year for the next few years, and transfers lease revenue bond debt service to UC, which will allow UC to restructure the debt and generate \$80 million in savings over the next ten years. However the budget does not address UC's overall needs or reverse the nearly \$1 billion in cuts UC has taken since 2007-08. The Governor has also asked UC to maintain current tuition levels over the next few years, improve time to degree, and increase faculty teaching loads.

The budget sets aside \$10 million to fund new online educational technologies for matriculated undergraduates. The Senate collaborated with Provost Dorr on an informational [session](#) about online education at the January Regents meeting that detailed online activities already in use across the UC system. UCOP will be sending an RFP to campuses requesting proposals for the creation of new lower division high enrollment systemwide online courses. The Provost has called for a systemwide conference on the future of instructional delivery technologies in April that will discuss how to allocate funds to meet the Governor's goals.

The University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity has asked the Senate to establish a liaison relationship between that committee and BOARS to consult on diversity issues related to admissions policies. The UCAAD vice chair will act as UCAAD's liaison to BOARS. Daniel Widener agreed to be the BOARS liaison to UCAAD.

III. Consultation with UCOP

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Michael Trevino, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

Fall 2013 Application Data: UCOP distributed tables breaking down fall 2013 application data into eligibility status categories—the number and percentage of applicants who were ELC eligible only, statewide index eligible only, both ELC and statewide index eligible, and Entitled to Review, along with academic and demographic profiles for each. There were also tables comparing the profiles of ELC applicants in the top 4% and the 5-9%, and the profiles of applicants who took one or more SAT Subject exam.

January Admissions Directors Meeting: The Admissions Directors discussed BOARS’ requests regarding implementation of the new transfer admissions policy, and reporting about the “compare favorably” standard. The directors want to expand the number of counselor conferences held jointly with CSU. All campuses except Merced plan to use wait lists.

Updates to Senate Regulations: Following the request of Chair Johnson, the Office of Admissions has identified several potential areas where senate regulations might be modified to reflect current practice and/or increase clarity, including a modification to [SR 476 A and B](#) rules about the admission of lower division transfers who were eligible as freshmen, and 476 D regarding the now defunct Dual Admissions Program. Chair Johnson also has identified several inconsistencies in the language of several admissions regulations, in addition to a proposed revision of SR 478 to accommodate IGETC for STEM. He noted that the full package of proposed modifications should appear on the February Council agenda to ensure a prompt systemwide review and Assembly approval in June.

Treatment of Magnet Schools in the ELC Program: UCOP uses a benchmark GPA based on past outcomes to set the eligibility cutoff for 9% ELC status in each high school that participates in ELC. UCOP calculates separate 9% benchmark GPAs for individual magnet programs operating within high schools. However, there are concerns about the accuracy of magnet program benchmark GPAs, because magnets tend to have small enrollments, so their benchmark GPAs may fluctuate more widely from year to year compared to the general high school, and because participation in a magnet is based on information reported by the student and school. Most magnet programs have higher benchmark GPAs than the larger high school, so some students may choose to report their GPAs as being part of the larger high school. One option is to eliminate the practice of separate benchmarking for magnet students.

Discussion: BOARS requested more information about what defines a magnet school, their size, who decides whether a student is identified as being in a magnet, the extent to which magnet students are enrolled in the same classes as students in the general school, what students would be displaced from ELC eligibility by folding the magnet program GPAs into the larger high school GPAs, and the extent to which the total number of ELC-eligible students would change.

IV. Nonresident “Compare Favorably” Reports

Issue: Chair Johnson has extended to February 15 the due date for campus reports about the extent to which they are meeting BOARS’ “compare favorably” standard with regard to nonresident admission.

Discussion: Members discussed possible metrics for the assessment, including traditional academic indicators such as GPA and test scores, holistic read score, and evidence of success after admission to UC. Members noted that it is difficult to compare the holistic review scores of residents and nonresidents, particularly international nonresidents and that there are multiple ways to perform such a comparison. BOARS needs assurances that campuses are meeting their obligations to California residents outlined in the Master Plan and that the nonresidents they admit are at least as likely to succeed as California residents.

V. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee

- *Monica Lin, Associate Director for Undergraduate Admissions*

Articulation staff want to work with faculty to add more specificity to the description of each “a-g” [subject area](#) to help staff assess the content of courses submitted for a-g review. They seek guidance from faculty about the academic criteria they value in courses in each subject area. It is important to maintain the integrity of schools' “a-g” course lists particularly as curriculum changes tied to the Common Core are implemented. It was noted that an intersegmental task force was convened in 2006 to clarify the criteria in the math (c) and science (d) areas. Area (b) was revised last year. However, analysts still have questions about course reviews in those areas, and areas a, e, f, and g, are even more significantly out of date. It was agreed that BOARS could identify and appoint a team of faculty to help analysts review and add specificity to each area.

VI. Data Analysis Subcommittee

The subcommittee discussed next steps for the reformulation of the statewide index, and requested that UCOP staff prepare several new indices that would capture 9% of public high school graduates. The subcommittee will review each proposed index in terms of what effect it would have had for students who applied for admission in fall 2013.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: George Johnson