

**I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS draft minutes of November 7, 2014

**Action:** BOARS approved the November meeting minutes.

**II. Announcements**

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

**November 24 Academic Council Meeting:** President Napolitano and Council discussed the Regents' approval of a [Long-Term Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid](#). The plan will increase tuition up to 5% annually for the next five years, with the exact amount to be determined by the amount of support provided by the state. The plan will also provide funding to support 1% annual increases in California resident enrollments, a portion of which will address the cost of 7,000 enrolled students for whom UC has never received state funding.

**Assembly Meeting:** The Assembly of the Academic Senate meets in Oakland on December 10. The agenda includes a report from Chair Aldredge on current issues in undergraduate admissions.

**III. UC Irvine Statement on New Admission Pilots**

**Issue:** In response to a BOARS decision last year that a UCI pilot program for freshman admission to the School of Biological Sciences was not consistent with systemwide comprehensive review policy, the UCI Senate is considering a policy for future admissions pilots, which mandates that all pilots adhere to BOARS' [definition](#) of comprehensive review, including the use of multiple measures to assess an applicant's achievement and promise.

**Discussion:** It was noted that several UC campuses have policies governing admission by school or major, and that while administrators tend to have authority over enrollment targets, faculty should set admissions procedures that ensure no fixed proportion of applicants is admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.

**IV. Nonresident Outcomes and Compare Favorably Reports**

**Issue:** BOARS' June 2011 [policy](#) on nonresident admission requires campuses to report annually to BOARS on the extent to which the nonresidents they admit "compare favorably" to the residents they admit. BOARS reviewed data prepared by UCOP comparing admission rates for domestic and international nonresidents to California residents by average academic index score, unweighted high school GPA, SAT score, and read score. Following the meeting, each BOARS member will receive data for their individual campus and a request that they work with their committee and admissions office to prepare an analysis of 2014 outcomes and the extent to which they are meeting the "compare favorably" standard.

**Discussion:** Institutional Research Content Manager Chang noted that BOARS members should inform UCOP about any discrepancies between the UCOP and locally-produced data. A BOARS member noted that the overall admission rate is not a relevant measure for assessing the compare favorably standard, because nonresident applications have been increasing disproportionately to resident applications and because the acceptance rate of admitted residents and nonresidents differs substantially; campuses must admit nonresidents at a higher rate to achieve the desired yield. It was noted that in general, lower GPAs and test scores and higher read scores for admitted residents may reflect compliance with the policy, but since campuses base the admissions decision on a comprehensive review of applicants, it is difficult to assess “compare favorably” on narrow academic indicators alone. It was also noted that the read score is not indicative of an admissions decision and that some campuses use different applications and readers for resident and nonresident applications. It was noted that international students tend to have higher standardized test scores and lower GPAs compared to residents, which may reflect different grading policies in foreign high schools.

**Action:** The committee analyst will forward each BOARS member the campus-specific data and a request to report to BOARS by January 31.

## **V. Next Generation Science Standards and area “d”**

Stanford Professor Helen Quinn joined BOARS to discuss how UC might adjust its admissions policies to reflect California’s adoption of the [Next Generation Science Standards](#) (NGSS), the National Research Council’s framework for K-12 science education. Professor Quinn chairs the California Science Framework Committee for K-12, which is considering course models that align with the NGSS. California high schools are thinking about how to integrate the NGSS standards into their programs, and teachers want to modify their courses, but some are concerned that UC may not approve them for the Laboratory Science ([area “d”](#)) [admission requirement](#). BOARS may wish to consider revising area “d” to align its expectations more closely with the NGSS’s expectations for high school curricula, to ensure that high schools teach laboratory courses according to NGSS concepts.

Professor Quinn said the Standards reflect a more holistic, evidence-based view of science education. They define student performance expectations for scientific and engineering practices that emphasize critical thinking and the acquisition of skills, not just knowledge; they identify cross-cutting concepts that are important across all the sciences; and they outline core ideas in four interdisciplinary areas—Physical Science, Life Science, Earth, Environmental, & Space Science (EESS), and Engineering, Technology, & Applications of Science.

Currently, area “d” requires two and recommends three years of coursework from at least two of the “fundamental disciplines” of biology, chemistry, and physics. What counts as “laboratory science” in high schools is largely determined by the UC standards. Modifying the language to incorporate the NGSS will be a strong statement from UC that will give schools permission to change.

Associate Director Lin noted that a faculty work group revised the [area “d” course Guidelines](#) last year to reference the NGSS, which positions UC to increase its support of the NGSS; however, Senate Regulation 424.A.3.d still requires laboratory science courses to align closely with biology, chemistry, and physics content to be approved for area “d.” EESS courses with

appropriate biology, chemistry, or physics content have been approved for “d”, but approval is difficult. She added that UC does not currently approve high school online courses for “a-g” that lack a hands-on laboratory requirement.

**Discussion:** It was noted that BOARS could propose modifying area “d” to include EESS or map to the four core interdisciplinary areas of the NGSS, while also increasing the required and recommended courses to three and four respectively. BOARS could also issue a statement in support of the inclusion of integrated course sequences that meet area “d.” It was noted that BOARS has in the past [rejected proposals](#) to add EESS to the list of laboratory science courses eligible for area “d” credit, and that UC faculty have not traditionally considered EESS courses to be as rigorous as courses in biology, chemistry, and physics, although Professor Quinn noted that EESS courses under the new standards would be more rigorous. A member suggested that BOARS instead focus on ways to improve the content of high school courses that can meet the existing content requirements of area “d”. A member requested data on laboratory coursework taken by UC applicants and admits. Another expressed concern that a change could accelerate existing disparities in high schools that lack resources to support laboratory science courses. There was also a question about the extent to which the need to pull schools toward greater Common Core alignment is broader than just laboratory science.

## **VI. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President, Student Affairs*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Adam Parker, Admissions Policy Coordinator*

**Application Outcomes:** More than half of the total applications for 2015-16 undergraduate admission were submitted over Thanksgiving weekend, just before the November 30 deadline. The Apply UC system worked flawlessly. Demand for a UC education continues to increase. Preliminary data indicate that UC received 193,849 freshman and transfer applications, a 5% systemwide increase over last year, and the highest total ever. Freshman applications increased at all campuses, and there was a small systemwide increase in applications from prospective California Community Colleges transfers. California resident freshman applications increased by 3,000, and nonresident applications increased by 6,500, or 6%. There were across-the-board increases in most student demographic categories.

**Transfer Initiative:** The Office of Student Affairs is supporting the implementation of the [Transfer Action Team](#) recommendation for a “Presidential Conversations” tour of California Community Colleges. The President recently met with 18 CCC presidents in Sacramento to discuss how UC and the CCCs can join forces to strengthen the transfer pathway, including working more closely with high schools to emphasize the affordability of the transfer path and improving technology to bring better information to students. The President indicated that she wants to learn more about the benefits and limitations of the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program in use at several UC campuses.

**Tuition Plan:** Student Affairs has been working with student leaders to inform them about the [Long-Term Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid](#) and to engage student leaders in a campaign to increase student advocacy in Sacramento.

Content Expert Workgroups: Chair Aldredge recently wrote to department chairs in eight disciplines to request nominations of faculty to serve on standing content expert workgroups that will consider specific issues requiring deep subject matter knowledge and advise BOARS to help the committee make informed decisions on, for example, revisions planned for the systemwide Transferable Course Agreement (TCA) Guidelines. 26 faculty have expressed interest so far, and work will begin in January.

Briefing Paper on College-Level Curriculum: UCOP distributed a discussion paper on “National Trends Regarding High School Student Participation in College-Level Curriculum and Courses.” The paper lists selected research related to the availability of AP, IB, and college-level (dual credit) courses taken in high school, student enrollments in those courses, and evidence from various studies showing that taking accelerated courses in high school correlates with positive college-level academic outcomes.

Associate Vice President Handel noted that UC policy encourages students to take challenging coursework and admissions readers evaluate the extent to which students have taken advantage of and performed well in challenging course work to help gauge their readiness for UC. In addition, UC offers a GPA “bump” to freshman applicants who successfully complete certain kinds of accelerated courses, and individual UC campuses award college credit to admitted students who have completed certain courses.

For a future BOARS meeting, UCOP will prepare a UC-specific paper that will include data about UC student participation in accelerated courses, trends in student access to the courses, the impact and predictive value of advanced coursework on UC student preparation and outcomes, and data about how campuses use such courses in the admissions process.

## **VII. Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements & Comprehensive Review**

BOARS has been asked to produce an “Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review” for the Regents by January 31. The report will combine elements of BOARS’ [September 2012](#) Report on Comprehensive Review and its [November 2013](#) report on the Impact of the New Freshman Eligibility Policy.

BOARS members discussed the expected elements and structure of the report and summarized their efforts to update the description of their campus’s comprehensive review process included in the 2012 report.

UCOP provided updated application, admission, and enrollment data used in the 2012 report and will provide updated data from the 2013 report, including data disaggregating the UC performance of specific student populations by eligibility status.

## **VIII. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office**

- *Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

November Regents meeting: The Regents approved a [Long-Term Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid](#) over the objections of the Governor and other state officials. It passed easily with many Regents criticizing the state for being an unreliable partner. Two days before the meeting,

the Governor appointed two new Regents – Outgoing Assembly Speaker John Pérez and Long Beach City College President Eloy Ortiz Oakley – who both voted against the proposal. At the meeting, the Governor urged UC to change its cost structure and proposed the formation of a commission to study ideas like offering a three-year degree, expanding online education, and increasing disciplinary consolidations across campuses. (The Governor is now rethinking the proposed commission.) Assembly Speaker Toni Atkins also proposed a reform plan that would provide an additional \$50 million in funding for UC, freeze tuition, increase faculty teaching and cut executive compensation and nonresident enrollment. More recently Senator Lara proposed a constitutional amendment that would remove some of UC’s autonomy. Student protestors attending the meeting criticized UC for raising tuition and the state for not providing UC with more funding. The student Regent also criticized the Governor’s three-year degree and online education proposals. The Senate was informed about the details of the plan only two days before its release, and is working to strengthen the shared governance tradition of transparent budget consultation with UCPB and other key Senate groups.

Total Remuneration Study: Chair Gilly has asked Senate division chairs to coordinate meetings between their campus EVC and the chairs of campus CAP, Planning and Budget, Affirmative Action, and Faculty Welfare committees to share perspectives on options for allocating future faculty salary increases and for addressing the 10% gap in UC faculty total remuneration outlined in a just-completed [study](#). The Senate hopes to submit a recommendation to the Regents in early 2015.

Doctoral Student Support: The Senate has been reviewing a set of proposals for better supporting doctoral students, related to non-resident supplemental tuition (NRST), competitiveness in net stipends, professional development, and diversity. The Senate and Provost Dorr had hoped to present a final recommendation to the Regents in January; however, the Senate review revealed a consensus for maintaining existing campus policies and practices around NRST and multi-year offers and members of the Regents expressed disappointment that they would not be presented with a comprehensive action plan for discussion and a vote. As a result, Chair Gilly believes it is better to withdraw the item from the January Regents agenda and submit a report to the Regents at a later date detailing a plan for working with the campuses on the issues.

## **IX. BOARS Proposal for Adjusting the Eligibility Construct**

Issue: Chair Aldredge noted that there is no consensus in BOARS for moving forward with the proposal to adjust the “9-by-9” eligibility construct to “7-by-7,” although Irvine has submitted a memo supporting the change.

Discussion: It was noted that the 9-by-9 policy was intended to provide a guarantee to the top 10% of California public high school graduates, with campuses filling out the rest of the 12.5% Master Plan target with students from the Entitled to Review pool. BOARS’ original motivation for the 7-by-7 proposal included the need to reduce the guarantee to the 10% policy target and to address an expectation that UC Merced would not be able to accommodate all students in the referral pool; however, Merced is now looking for more students to meet its enrollment target, reducing the urgency of one problem, and [BOARS’ change to the statewide index](#) taking effect in 2015 is expected to help address the need to reduce the guarantee pool. It was also noted that over the long term, a rising number of “a-g”-completing students and UC-eligible applicants may increase pressure on the referral guarantee and bring the issue back to the forefront.

There was a question about the extent to which BOARS should take responsibility for problems beyond its control, such as enrollment funding, or other problems that may be better addressed administratively. A member suggested that BOARS consider a guaranteed transfer or dual enrollment arrangement with the community colleges as an option for eligible students who are not admitted to a campus to which they applied.

**Action:** A motion was made and seconded to table the 7-by-7 proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

## **X. Campus Reports**

Members noted issues being discussed on their admissions committees and campuses. At **UCB**, a committee is meeting to discuss the implementation of a new [student-athlete admissions policy](#). **UCSB**'s new Executive Vice Chancellor is engaging the admissions committee on major-based enrollment and enrollment caps for impacted majors. **UCI** is discussing a proposal to move some writing classes to Extension to help meet a growing need for remedial English classes for international students. **UCSC** is considering a conditional admission ESL track for international applicants that would require them to complete ESL coursework before receiving an offer of full admission. The **UCD** office of admissions is training faculty on the admissions committee in holistic review. The **UCSD** committee has voted to approve a three-year pilot plan for capacity-based admission, under which departments would specify their capacity and an enrollment target, and an applicant's choice of major would be a tie-breaker in the admissions process. **UCM** places applicants to the School of Engineering who lack an advanced math course in their background into the "undeclared" category while their capacity to perform in the engineering major is evaluated.

## **XI. Executive Session**

*Notes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.*

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm  
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Ralph Aldredge