

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**  
**ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**July 6, 2012**

**PART I: BOARS MEETING**

**I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS June 2012 draft minutes.

**ACTION:** BOARS approved the June 2012 minutes.

**II. Announcements - *Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair***

The 2012-13 State budget signed by the Governor maintains Cal Grant funding for public institutions and includes \$90 million for UCRP. The budget also funds a \$125.4 million tuition buy-out for 2012-13, but delays payment on the buy-out until 2013-14 and makes it contingent on passage of the Governor's November tax increase ballot measure.

The Senate will review the Budget Rebenching Task Force report this summer and fall. Rebenching is intended to equalize the distribution of State funding to UC campuses by increasing the per-student funding of all underfunded campuses to the level of the most richly funded campus over six years. The Senate is discussing the role of enrollment management in the project, particularly the need for UCOP to work with campuses to set and enforce resident undergraduate enrollment targets to ensure that UC meets its Master Plan obligations. The Task Force endorsed the principle that a campus failing to meet its resident undergraduate enrollment target will be subject to a financial penalty sufficient to deter such practice.

On Wednesday, the Academic Council will discuss a memo from BOARS expressing concern about a UC Online Education Project (UCOE) marketing plan that identifies students at affluent public and private high schools as the primary target audience for UCOE courses. Council will also discuss whether to recommend granting UCOE a one- to two-year moratorium on its loan repayment obligation to allow it to focus on quality and serving UC students. BOARS, UCEP, and others will continue to discuss the role of non-matriculated students in UCOE courses that garner UC credit, and the effect of their presence on matriculated students and course quality.

Michael Trevino has joined UCOP as the new Director of Undergraduate Admissions, replacing Interim Director Kate Jeffery, who retired at the end of June. His first day on the job will be spent at the BOARS meeting. Vice Provost for Educational Partnerships Russell Rumberger is also leaving UCOP at the end of August. Professor Ralph Aldredge (UC Davis) has been appointed 2012-13 BOARS vice chair.

**III. Implementation of New Transfer Admissions Policy**

**Issue:** In June, the Academic Assembly [voted](#) to add the new transfer admission pathways proposed by BOARS to Senate Regulation 476. BOARS is now expected to approve a modification to the transfer selection criteria in the [Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions](#) asking campuses to choose “applicants with a high likelihood of timely graduation.”

**ACTION:** BOARS approved the amendment to the Guidelines without objection.

**Issue:** BOARS reviewed a plan for implementing the new transfer paths. The plan asks each department or program to develop, by June 2013, UC Transfer Curricula and establish the GPA minimum, between 2.4 and 3.0, which will guarantee transfer applicants a comprehensive review. The new ASSIST website will be implemented in May 2013 and updated to include the Transfer Curricula in summer 2013, after which UCOP will advertise details about the three transfer paths to Community College students. Each department or program will develop selection criteria for students applying to their major or program, in consultation with their Admissions Office, by spring 2014. Beginning in fall 2014, campuses will evaluate and select transfers for fall 2015 admission according to those criteria, and in fall 2015, the first transfers admitted through the three paths will arrive at UC.

The Office of Admissions prepared its own plan summary with additional implementation details, including adding a question to the UC application about completion of a Transfer AA degree. Shawn Brick noted that UCOP had no plans to convene additional faculty transfer curriculum groups to discuss commonalities in lower division preparation requirements; staff concluded they could identify such commonalities themselves. He offered to send a letter to department chairs asking for feedback on the commonalities identified by UCOP.

Chair Jacob said the Transfer Curricula will define the minimum requirements for a comprehensive review; they do not guarantee admission. Each department and program will be free to decide what “major preparation” means, and divisions may opt to change or keep the 2.4 GPA minimum. He encouraged UCOP to continue facilitating conversations with additional faculty discipline groups across the campuses, in an effort to develop recommended systemwide transfer paths that can form the basis of the Transfer Curricula.

ICAS has approved a new version of IGETC for STEM majors that will stand alongside the current IGETC. It will allow some students to postpone two lower-division GE courses (or 3 for UC.) The Academic Council has endorsed IGETC for STEM in principle, but to take effect, the changes will have to be approved through a formal amendment of Senate Regulation 478.

One BOARS member said potential transfers need to complete a “reality check” to determine their ability to succeed in a major at UC, and the UC Transfer Curricula provide this. Another noted that not all departments will set criteria; in such cases, a default should be established so that majors can admit students.

## **PART II: JOINT MEETING WITH CAMPUS ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS**

## **I. Announcements**

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS Chair and George Johnson, BOARS Vice Chair*
- *Charles Akemann, BOARS Member*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director, Office of Admissions*
- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Aimée Dorr, Provost and Executive Vice President*

Chair Jacob reported that the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met with Tom Adams of the CA Department of Education Instructional Resources division to discuss the Common Core State Standards. BOARS recently updated the area ‘b’ (English) and area ‘c’ (math) requirements to align with concepts in the Common Core, and UC should soon be receiving course revisions from high schools based on the changes. ICAS is also updating its [Competencies Statements](#) to align with the Common Core. Over 350 SB 1440 transfer degrees have been approved so far. ICAS is planning a white paper about the role of intermediate algebra, in response to new Community College Statistics sequences that have prerequisites other than intermediate algebra.

To address a BOARS concern about a high school advising students to skip Geometry as a shortcut to calculus, UCOP sent a letter to California high schools and the Superintendent of Schools noting that students who fail to take Geometry will not meet UC’s area ‘c’ requirement or be eligible for UC/CSU beginning in Fall 2015. The letter indicates that high school students who have just completed 9<sup>th</sup> grade will need to complete the Geometry requirement.

Professor Akemann reported that the Education Finance Model Steering Committee met recently to discuss UC’s financial aid challenges, including the effect of tuition increases on the return-to-aid model, the integrity of information reported on the FAFSA, and the effect of a down economy on the work-study component of the financial aid system.

Vice Chair Johnson reported that BOARS approved a new [policy](#) for the approval of online courses and providers to satisfy ‘a-g’ to replace its [2006 Policy](#). Under the policy, online course publishers will submit their courses to the California Learning Resource Network ([CLRN](#)) for review against the California Content Standards or the Common Core State Standards, and a set of [Standards for Quality Online Courses](#) established by the International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL). A course meeting an 80% threshold, including 15 required “power standards,” can be submitted to UC Doorways for final ‘a-g’ review. In addition, virtual schools seeking to offer ‘a-g’ courses will be required to submit a new school survey with evidence of regional accreditation and alignment with iNACOL’s [Standards for Quality Online Programs](#). Monica Lin added that UC intends to implement the policy for the course update cycle beginning February 2013, after resolving a few additional questions.

Judy Sakaki thanked BOARS and the admissions directors for their work to implement the new admissions policy and holistic review. She said Undergraduate Admissions is often the first and only place students and members of the general public interact with UC; the Office of Admissions could not do its work without the help and support of BOARS and the directors.

Provost Dorr said she views her new role as an opportunity to make a difference for the UC system, higher education, and the State of California. She noted that BOARS developed the ELC policy during her tenure as 1998-99 Academic Council chair. The Committee continues to do important work to develop fair processes and criteria for evaluating and enrolling the best, most diverse students who can go on to succeed at the University of California.

## **II. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Tongshan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Director of Admissions*

**Effect of the ELC designation:** Tongshan Chang presented updates to an analysis UCOP presented in June about the effect of the ELC designation on admissions outcomes for CA resident applicants from public high schools, incorporating additional suggestions from BOARS. The models use a logistical regression to predict the odds of admission for applicants with ELC status, controlling for SAT/ACT; unweighted GPA; SAT/ACT and unweighted GPA; school API decile and unweighted GPA; and SAT/ACT, unweighted GPA, and school API decile. One model examines the difference in effect between the 1-4% ELC and the 5-9% ELC cohorts. Another looks at the value-added of being in the very last percentile of ELC, the 9%, compared to non-ELC. The data show that ELC status has a statistically significant effect on admission decisions, and that ELC students are more likely to be admitted, even at the most selective campuses. An applicant's ELC percentile is also a significant factor in the decision. The 1-4% cohort is much more likely to be admitted than the 5-9%. One exception is that at the most selective campuses applicants in the final 9% percentile do not have a statistically significant advantage compared to non-ELC applicants.

**Discussion:** Members remarked that the data show ELC status matters at most campuses, at least in the context of a limited set of controls. It was noted that most campuses place weight on ELC status, with the notable exception of UCR. ELC is a meaningful category because it is correlated with the factors campuses want. UC will implement the new method of calculating ELC status next year; UC will analyze transcripts from one-third of schools each year instead of all schools every year to update its records about average GPAs.

**Actual Resident Admits vs Predicted Admits:** BOARS reviewed a logistical regression simulation predicting how the cohort of CA residents applying to UC in 2011 under the old admissions model might have fared under the 2012 Entitled to Review criteria—that is, the probability that applicants applying in 2011 would have been admitted under the 2012 rules. The simulation indicated that the distribution of admits was generally similar across ethnicity, income, API rank, and academic achievement categories, although the actual number of low SES and first generation students admitted under the new policy was slightly higher than predicted.

**Discussion:** It was noted that it would be difficult to determine definitively the precise reason for the outcomes, because several variables changed simultaneously. A similar level of variability would be expected between two years of data under an identical policy. At the very least, the data provide evidence that the new policy did not create disparate outcomes.

**High school ELC participation data (Shawn Brick):** A figure UCOP presented at a previous BOARS meeting understated the rate of high school participation in the ELC program. UCOP now estimates that 95% of fall 2012 applicants and 96% of admits came from high schools that participate in ELC. Many of the non-participating schools are either ineligible to participate in ELC or did not participate because they are closed or reported no graduates, have accreditation issues, or do not offer the full range of ‘a-f’ courses. The eligible schools that do not participate in ELC also tend to be very small. UCOP feels confident that the vast majority of California students interested in UC have access to the ELC program.

**Discussion:** It was noted that students at the small number of non-participating schools are missing out on a great opportunity for UC eligibility. Shawn Brick noted that UCOP is reaching out to those particular schools to encourage their participation in ELC; he said schools will have the opportunity to sign up for ELC at the upcoming fall counselor conferences.

**Freshman Outcomes and the Master Plan (Shawn Brick):** The Master Plan obligates the University to select from the top 12.5% of CA public high school graduates, which has been interpreted to mean that UC will offer a slot to students in that group. BOARS projected that the 9x9 policy would provide a guarantee to about 10.5% of the class, and that an additional 2% would be admitted under entitled to review criteria to bring UC to 12.5%; however, 14.9% of public high school graduates were admitted to UC who met either the 9x9 guarantees or ETR for fall 2012. 4.7% of those who were admitted met the statewide guarantee alone. It may be necessary for BOARS to review options for recalibrating the statewide index in light of the outcomes, to align UC with Master Plan expectations.

**Discussion:** The difference between this year’s actual guarantee pool and the expectations of the designers of the revised eligibility criteria is the larger than expected numbers of students who meet the statewide guarantee but not the ELC guarantee. Any adjustments to the guarantee then should focus on changing the statewide index. It was noted that many admitted students will decline the referral offer to Merced; UC should do what it can to ensure that the guarantee is meaningful.

### **III. Implementation of New Transfer Admissions Policy**

**Issue:** Chair Jacob asked the admissions directors to discuss their views and concerns about the implementation plan for the new transfer admissions policy. Departments will have two years to develop Transfer Curricula and selection criteria for transfer students applying to their major or program. The Transfer Curricula should ensure a baseline of preparation; they only guarantee a review, and are not intended to be an ideal set of preparatory courses.

**Discussion:** Directors expressed both praise for and concern about the policy, noting that it sends a positive message to transfer students about the need to prepare for a specific major, and allows campuses to construct Transfer Curricula according to their needs; on some campuses, however, the additional work could overwhelm staff who are already busy implementing and analyzing the transition to holistic review. Some departments are also concerned about the quality of preparation at the Community Colleges, and others fear that the policy could interfere with their ability to meet enrollment objectives. It was noted that some campuses will not consider the SB

1440 degree or CSU GE Breadth alone as acceptable preparation. Messaging will be important; campuses must be clear about where the admissions bar really is.

Chair Jacob responded that the CCCs provide high quality instruction. BOARS believes the implementation timeline is reasonable as long as campuses provide appropriate resources. ASSIST will help campuses communicate clear expectations for individual majors. Some majors may ask students who complete a SB1440 degree to also complete IGETC rather than CSU Breadth if they are interested in UC, but other majors may view the SB 1440 degree as appropriate preparation. Campuses do not have to accept CSU GE Breadth as meeting GE requirements, even though a SB 1440 student may have completed it; the current local rules on breadth requirements still apply (including IGETC). UC faculty have to be engaged and willing to discuss issues with faculty from the other segments, and need to communicate to other UC faculty that transfer students generally perform as well as native students. It was suggested that expectations for transfer students be aligned with expectations of native students entering their junior year.

#### **IV. Report to Regents on Implementation of Admissions Policy and Holistic Review**

##### **o Admissions Directors**

**Issue:** Chair Jacob and the Office of Admissions will present a joint report to the Regents in September on outcomes from the new admissions policy and the progress campuses are making in their transition to single score holistic review. Chair Jacob invited the Admissions Directors to share thoughts on these issues, as well as score sharing, financial challenges, recruitment efforts, and other topics.

**Score Sharing:** Several admissions directors reported that score sharing has helped improve the quality and timeliness of admissions decisions. Some of the campuses currently not using shared scores are considering how they might use them in the future. UCR obtained holistic scores from UCI this year to study the level of overlap between admissions decisions based on UCR's current fixed weight system, and a holistic system, and found that UCI scores may not help UCR identify students the campus would normally admit. The directors agreed that it is important for the scoring campus to clarify what scores mean for the benefit of the receiving campuses, particularly scores in the lower ranges. In addition, UC should clarify that score sharing helps campuses make better decisions about some individual applicants, but that the final decision will continue to be made locally. It was noted that score sharing can produce new efficiencies, but also involves additional work, so it is not clear that it saves money overall.

**Resources:** Several admissions directors reported that the larger non-resident applicant pool and higher non-resident enrollment targets are driving up administrative costs, particularly in the area of international applications, which take longer to review and require staff with special training. Some campuses hope to add more high-level analytical support to help them predict and understand outcomes.

**Recruitment:** Campuses are balancing their efforts to recruit residents and non-residents, and employing webinars and other technologies to reach more resident and non-resident groups and

create a stronger applicant pool. Some campuses are considering various targeted recruitment strategies to improve quality.

**Admissions Outcomes and Transition to Holistic Review:** Six campuses now use a single score holistic review system. UCR, UCM, and UCSB do not. Socioeconomic diversity increased at several campuses this year, although it is unclear that this was an effect of the holistic system, as the resident and non-resident applicant pools were also larger and more diverse overall. Diversity declined at San Diego following its first-year transition to holistic review, and UCSB is reluctant to implement a holistic review system because it feels its current system is producing good outcomes. UCLA is pleased that the “[Mare Report](#)”, which examines outcomes from the first years of the holistic system at that campus, shows that UCLA is implementing holistic scoring according to the criteria set by the faculty. Merced conducted a comprehensive read on about 50% of applicants using a UC Merced index a new norming process to ensure quality and consistency. Merced is considering how to accommodate the referral pool and more applicants as interest in the campus grows. It may not have the capacity to meet projected demand.

\*\*\*\*\*

BOARS and the Admissions Directors gave Chair Jacob a round of applause in appreciation of his service to BOARS, the Academic Senate, and the University of California.

-----

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola

Attest: Bill Jacob