

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting
February 6, 2015

I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS draft minutes of January 9, 2015

Action: BOARS approved the January meeting minutes.

II. Announcements

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

Report to the Regents: BOARS submitted its [*Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review*](#) to the Regents in late January. The report includes data on application, admission, and yield outcomes under comprehensive review up to 2014. It is expected that the Regents will maintain a January 31 deadline for the report in future years.

February ICAS Meeting: ICAS discussed a new pilot program signed into law by Governor Brown that will allow up to 15 California Community Colleges (CCC) to offer bachelor's degree programs in certain vocational fields not currently offered at a UC or CSU campus. ICAS also received an update on implementation of the Associate Degrees for Transfer (AA-T) program, which guarantees AA-T degree-holders admission to CSU, but not necessarily to their first choice campus or major; it was reported that CSU does not have a referral pool and has not been able to find space for some students with the degree. Finally, ICAS will be asking key faculty groups at each segment to review a new *Statement on Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen*, which updates a 1988 ICAS statement to reflect current practices in science education.

III. 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*

"A-G" Course Management Portal: UCOP launched a new [*Course Management Portal*](#) on February 1. The redesigned website, previously known as UC Doorways, will make it easier for high schools to submit courses for "a-g" review and will streamline the approval process at UCOP, which receives between 25,000 and 35,000 submissions for new and revised courses each year. The Portal is also an open resource that allows anyone to review the components of any approved course.

Transferable Course Agreement (TCA) Guidelines: UCOP is convening faculty content expert work groups to review the systemwide Transferable Course Agreement (TCA) Guidelines in

eight subject areas and recommend updates to BOARS. The Guidelines reflect the minimum course content required for basic UC transferability. Campuses will continue to conduct a second level of review to decide specific credit awards for completion of approved courses. UCOP hopes to finalize recommendations in time for BOARS to review in May.

Letter to Prospective Transfers: President Napolitano recently sent a letter to 100,000 first year California Community College students who indicated an interest in obtaining a four-year degree, encouraging them to consider UC and begin their transfer preparation early.

Enrollment Targets: It will be a challenging year for campus admissions directors. Because the final outcome of the state budget is still uncertain, UCOP has asked campuses to not exceed last year's resident enrollment targets. Campuses will use wait lists to be as precise as possible. UC enrolls 6,000 students for which it has never received state funding.

ASSIST Next Generation: [ASSIST](#) is the official repository of transfer articulation course agreements for California public higher education. The website contains over 300,000 agreements that allow CCC students to see how a course will be treated in the transfer process. The Next Generation redesign scheduled for completion in January 2016 will make the website easier to use, improve the quality of course data, provide automated feedback to students about their preparation progress, and improve the linkage and flow of information on the website to downstream systems.

A BOARS member suggested that the information in ASSIST could be linked with the CCC transcript database to support an automated transfer evaluation system.

IV. Streamlining Transfer Admission

UCOP consultants noted that President Napolitano wants to do more to improve the transfer path to UC. Prospective CCC transfers are now applying to more UC campuses on average, and those who wish to prepare for multiple campuses in the same major are finding it difficult to navigate the different pre-major preparation requirements across the system. As a result, some students take more units than they need, and some fail to transfer. UC is a public institution and has an obligation to make transfer easier for CCC students.

Last year, the President's [Transfer Action Team](#) (TAT) made a number of recommendations for clarifying the transfer process and increasing the representation of transfers from colleges across the state. Recommendation 3 of the report discusses the need to align the preparation requirements for specific majors across UC campuses to make it easier for students to prepare simultaneously for multiple campuses and be competitive for admission. It calls on campus faculty to identify a common set of lower-division course requirements ("Transfer Model Curriculum" or TMC) for UC's most popular majors that would prepare a student for admission to any UC campus offering that major. The TMCs would build on the existing UC Transfer Preparation Paths, which highlight differences and similarities in preparation requirements across campuses, and the Senate's recent efforts to improve transfer, including BOARS' [major-based transfer admission policy](#) and the new [transfer pathways](#) in Senate Regulation 476.

UCOP surveyed campuses to collect information about pre-major requirements for the most popular 21 majors, and now wants to bring together key individuals from those majors to explore the degree to which they can resolve differences and align prerequisites. The effort would meet state goals and also align with [Senate Regulation 477](#), which says that when four UC campuses agree to accept a CCC course as transferable preparation for a specific major, it should be considered articulated at all UC campuses. The proposal would allow campuses to maintain curricular variation and would not prevent specific majors or campuses from requiring additional coursework after transfer.

Discussion: BOARS members expressed general support for the plan to convene the curricular groups, noting that streamlining transfer is an opportunity to help students and also attract and enroll better prepared students. Many faculty would welcome the opportunity to share views about course requirements and alignment, and easing the transfer path could also help boost enrollment in shrinking fields. It was noted that some majors, like chemistry for example, have sub-disciplines with substantively different transfer prerequisites, and admissions offices may not always make decisions based strictly on their stated requirements.

The student representative noted that his conversations with real UC transfer students confirm how difficult and frustrating it can be to prepare for multiple universities and to find accurate information on the outdated ASSIST website. He said the complexity of the process makes it logical for prospective transfers to concentrate on preparation for a single campus, and that UC's especially complicated requirements make transferring here seem like an achievement beyond reach for many.

V. Compare Favorably Reports

Seven campuses have responded to Chair Aldredge's request for reports about the extent to which they met BOARS' compare favorably standard for nonresident admission in 2014. All campuses reported that they are meeting the standard and described a variety of approaches used to assess it—including comparisons of academic performance measures and holistic review scores of residents and nonresidents who were admitted and who enrolled, as well as analyses of the post-matriculation performance of both groups. Some noted the difficulty of making a true comparison between residents and nonresidents due to the lack of equivalent local context information used in comprehensive review.

Discussion: A BOARS member noted that UC's message about nonresident enrollment should emphasize that UC is meeting and exceeding its enrollment target for funded California residents and that nonresident tuition helps fund additional resident enrollment. It was noted that adherence to the compare favorably standard will become even easier as the number of nonresident applications increases and campuses become more selective. It was agreed that BOARS will discuss again and submit a systemwide report summarizing the campus reports.

VI. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

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

January Regents Meeting: The Regents approved the establishment of a Select Advisory Committee on the Cost Structure of the University. The “Committee of Two” will involve a series of meetings between the Governor, President Napolitano, and their staff to discuss ideas for reducing UC’s costs. The topics will include those previously suggested by the Governor – three-year degrees, online education, and improving the transfer process – as well as those added by President Napolitano – graduate student research and the role of research at a research university.

State Budget: The Governor’s 2015-16 [State Budget Proposal](#) ties a 4% funding increase for UC to an expectation that tuition and nonresident enrollment remain at current levels. The budget also requires the Regents to act on the recommendations of the Committee of Two and revisit recommendations from the December 2010 report of the UC Commission on the Future. UC has noted that campuses make decisions on admissions, enrollment, and financial aid well in advance of the conclusion of the state budget process in June, making precise coordination with the process difficult.

Faculty Engagement Plan: Chair Gilly recently asked campus Senate offices to disseminate a letter to all faculty from the President with information and talking points about the UC budget and stabilization plan and encouraging faculty to take an active role in talking publicly about the excellence of the university and how their teaching, research, and public service contributes to that excellence.

Senate Travel: The Academic Senate Office manager reported that the Senate’s new travel reimbursement [form](#) is posted on the Senate website. All air travelers must attach an itinerary to the form that shows proof of payment. Drivers should provide total mileage along with to-and-from addresses.

VII. Executive Session

Notes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

VIII. Consultation with President Napolitano

President Napolitano joined BOARS to discuss opportunities for making additional progress on enhancing the community college transfer pathway, including the implementation of Recommendation 3 from the [Transfer Action Team report](#), which focuses on streamlining transfer student admissions requirements.

Chair Aldredge thanked President Napolitano for consulting with BOARS and for her efforts to improve transfer. He noted that BOARS recently added new transfer pathways to Senate Regulation 476 and a new comprehensive review criterion to the *Comprehensive Review Guidelines*, both recognizing students who complete, or are on track to complete, an associate degree for transfer offered by a California Community College. BOARS also recognizes that there is still more work to do to implement Recommendation 3.

President Napolitano thanked BOARS members for their important work on behalf of the university, adding that undergraduate admissions is a key component of shared governance at UC, and an area where faculty and administrators should work together toward common objectives. She noted that UC's new Long-Range Stability Plan for Tuition and Financial Aid has opened up a host of questions about UC. Transfer is receiving attention in part because UC lacks an "SB 1440" transfer degree guarantee, and because many are concerned about the difficulty of the transfer path to UC and students who need to take extra coursework to satisfy multiple sets of campus-specific preparation requirements. There is also concern that UC is running just below the undergraduate enrollment target ratio outlined in the Master Plan, which asks UC to enroll one transfer student for every two freshmen. UC has an obligation to make the transfer path to UC as clear and as straightforward as possible and to make it easier for prospective transfers to prepare for more than one campus simultaneously. She emphasized the urgency of acting now, as the state budget develops, to demonstrate the university's commitment. She encouraged campuses to review and streamline their major preparation requirements so that a single pathway can suffice for all campuses. She urged BOARS to work with faculty on the campuses to encourage and facilitate the completion of as many agreements as possible by fall 2015 with more in the queue for the following year. She noted that she wants to protect the university from a SB 1440-style mandate and keep admissions in the faculty domain.

Chair Aldredge noted that UC's [Transfer Admission Guarantee](#) (TAG) program surpasses the SB 1440 guarantee by ensuring transfers a place at a specific UC campus. 25-30% of UC's CCC transfer enrollments come from TAGs. The campuses that do not participate in the TAG program were concerned that the TAG pathway was crowding out other transfer paths and high performing students and benefiting transfers at a small number of colleges. Those campuses also have the strongest relationship with local CCCs.

Questions & Answers

Q: *How will the Select Advisory Committee approach the need to balance UC's Master Plan commitment to California residents and its budgetary need to admit nonresidents? Are you concerned that the ramp-up in nonresident enrollment will eventually conflict with UC's Master Plan obligation? Do you have an optimal number in mind for nonresident enrollment?*

A: I expect the Advisory Committee, the so-called "Committee of Two," to take a deep look at UC's role, its importance to California, the necessary level of state support, and different models of higher education. We will have focused conversations about topics requested by the Governor, such as online education and enrollment, and I have requested a discussion about the role and impact of research in a research university.

I have directed the campuses to maintain last year's resident undergraduate enrollment targets. Nonresident enrollment has reached a tipping point at some campuses, and without some change there could be a conflict, but we have been clear that nonresident tuition pays for unfunded residents and helps UC meet its Master Plan commitment. Some chancellors think their campus is at about the right level with nonresidents, but others are just beginning to ramp-up, and I am wary of imposing a cap that could leave campuses at an unequal place.

The state is projecting that an increasing number of students will achieve UC eligibility, which is a good thing, but I am concerned about a potential brain drain in California if the higher

education segments cannot meet the increasing demand for access. UC sees promise in alternative budget plans proposed by the Assembly Speaker and Senate President pro tem that fund new enrollments at UC.

Q: I am concerned that the vast majority (64%) of UC's international students come from a single country, while we claim that international enrollment brings new ideas and contributes to diversity.

A: Today's UC students will graduate into a more globally connected world, and it is important for UC to expose them to different perspectives and prepare them to engage in that world. It is important both to have international students on campus and to integrate them with other students so there is an actual exchange in and out of the classroom. I am not involved in decisions about country of origin. We do have a significant initiative underway with Mexico that is building new collaborations and student exchanges between UC and Mexican universities and research centers.

Q: Enrollment planning requires an understanding of the incremental cost of educating a UC student, but I have yet to see a cost of instruction formula that makes sense.

AB 94 requires UC to submit a biannual report disaggregating the different costs of educating an undergraduate, graduate, STEM student, medical student and others. However, the university has not traditionally kept data this way; it calculates a consolidated average cost of instruction that accounts for how the UC research mission is intertwined with all aspects of instruction and education. UC's report will be clear that at a research university, where faculty teach and do research in ways that involve both undergraduate and graduate students, the numbers requested by the state do not fit into neat categories. It will also note the difference between the amount UC spends per student and the real cost of educating a UC student.

IX. Streamlining Transfer Admission

Chair Aldredge asked BOARS members to work with their campus colleagues to assemble a list of the faculty and administrators who are responsible for evaluating and/or deciding transfer preparation requirements.

He noted that BOARS intended the new pathways in Senate Regulation 476 to guarantee a comprehensive review, not admission, and that UC should be clear about the preparation that will realistically make a student competitive for transfer admission. A 2.4 GPA, for example, will not be competitive at most campuses. It was noted that this question can be decoupled from efforts to streamline and align transfer curriculum, and that students will respond positively to the message that they will be competitive for UC admission by taking a specific set of courses. It was noted that some faculty may resist anything they perceive to be a systemwide mandate or a threat to campus autonomy. Streamlining will be more successful if faculty take ownership and the intent and benefits of the project are clarified at the outset. It was noted that faculty at all campuses, even those from majors with substantial levels of consistency in their requirements, will benefit from a systemwide discussion about requirements.

Action: UCOP will forward BOARS members a list of 10 majors that are the first candidates for “streamlining,” asking members to identify individuals on their campus who should be consulted about the recommendation and serve as the primary campus contacts for advice.

X. Member Reports/Campus Issues

Proposal to Revise UC Application: As UC Riverside moves to holistic review, it is concerned that the current systemwide application does not sufficiently capture information about non-cognitive comprehensive review factors and makes it difficult to separate application padding from true dedication to extracurricular activities and leadership activities, community service, special talents and facing adversity. UCR wants to modify the application to incorporate more of the 14 comprehensive review factors, automate and quantify written data by adding drop down menus to the application, and encourage students to provide more succinct answers to more specific essay prompts. Other campus admissions directors have noted similar concerns. Five campuses are using campus-specific supplemental application questions that go beyond the basic UC application for a small segment of their applicant pools. However, UCR is concerned that a supplemental application will be costly and discourage potential applicants from applying to the campus.

Associate Director Handel noted that the open-ended application prompt used by UC is common across the country, but UCOP has convened a group of admissions directors and associate vice chancellors for enrollment to review the application and consider potential improvements. One idea may be to add a test section on the application. UC also needs to be aware of state law and policy.

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