

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
Minutes of Meeting
January 8, 2016

I. Consent Calendar

1. January 8, 2016 BOARS Agenda
2. December 4, 2015 BOARS Draft Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*
- *Henry Sanchez, BOARS Vice Chair*

ICAS Meeting: The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates met on December 17 to discuss topics of interest to the three higher education segments, including the transferability of Statway and courses that integrate pre-college and college-level content. ICAS also received the final report of the CA Open Education Resources Council, which was formed to implement the requirements of [SB 1052](#). That bill asked ICAS to appoint an intersegmental Council to assemble a list of 50 lower-division courses for which low-cost or free open educational resources could be identified or developed, and incentivize their use among faculty.

C-ID Advisory Committee Meeting: The meeting of the C-ID Advisory Committee in Sacramento on December 11 touched on processes and policies for vetting and approving C-ID course descriptors. Participants also discussed how the descriptor review and approval process would need to be adjusted to accommodate the potential UC faculty involvement in C-ID.

UCEP Letter on CLEP: UCEP sent a letter to Council Chair Hare recommending a plan for the review of seven specific College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams by faculty committees composed of faculty from every undergraduate campus. The groups will opine on what course or courses a specific exam might replace, and what credit could potentially be gained by taking the exam. Academic Council will review the plan in January.

Area “d” Work Group: Vice Chair Sanchez and Associate Director Lin are developing a charge for the systemwide faculty work group that will soon examine UC’s laboratory science (“d”) undergraduate admissions requirement and recommend changes to more closely align it with the K-12 Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) categories. Tom Adams, Deputy Superintendent of the Instruction and Learning Support Branch at the California Department of Education, invited UC faculty to review the draft NGSS curriculum framework and provide input during the upcoming public comment period. The work group is expected to forward a proposal to BOARS for consideration later in the spring.

III. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair*

Regents Meeting: The January Regents meeting will feature a presentation on undergraduate application outcomes for fall 2016. In addition, a delegation of Berkeley faculty and administrators will meet with a group of Regents prior to the meeting to discuss Berkeley's new admission policy.

Transfer Pathways: The Senate office is gathering final campus department sign-offs on the Transfer Pathway agreements for 11 majors reached by faculty delegates in October.

Retirement Options Report: The Retirement Options Task Force has sent President Napolitano its recommendations for a new retirement plan for UC employees hired after July 1, 2016 that caps pensionable income at the PEPR limit, per the budget agreement with the state. The report will be released to the Senate and other constituencies for a 30-day review on January 15.

IV. Campus Reports

Several admissions committees are taking steps to address concerns about the veracity of information reported by international applicants. The UCSD committee is discussing a possible interview process for international applicants to help assess language skills, and UCB is experimenting with a Skype-based interview pilot program for international applicants. Committees are also reviewing specific international applications to help faculty members better understand the evaluation process. It was noted that UCLA recently stopped its practice of giving a second read to international applicants who score low in the first read.

UCD has taken note of what may be unclear language on public UC websites about the requirement for applicants to take 15 "a-g" courses; the extent to which a student can fulfill the Visual and Performing Arts requirement through a year-long course or two semester sequence; and the geometry requirement.

UCR is considering modifications to its comprehensive review process to better account for non-cognitive factors that reflect an applicant's leadership, commitment, and well-roundedness. UCM is also modeling changes to comprehensive review that it hopes will yield more predictive results. The UCSB committee is considering changes that will help the campus accommodate its share of 5,000 new resident enrollments, and its recent memo on enrollment issues inspired administrative action to shift enrollments away from impacted majors. UCB invited applicants in the "possible" category to submit letters of recommendation by January 15. Berkeley is also working with athletic coaches to improve screening processes for student athlete applicants.

The student representative noted that UC Irvine will host the California Higher Education Food Summit on January 21. The conference will discuss issues around student access to affordable and healthy food and food insecurity within the UC system. In addition, the Afrikan Black Coalition, a student advocacy group, was successful in its request that UC divest from private prison companies.

V. Preliminary Application Outcomes

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*

UC is poised to select an excellent undergraduate class and meet its target of 5,000 new resident enrollments. Campuses will be relying more heavily on transfer students this year to meet individual enrollment targets. UC extended the transfer application deadline to January 4, 2016 to help meet the 10% increase in applications UC estimates it will need to boost enrollments by 5,000. The extension generated 2,200 additional applications.

VI. Computer Science Letter

BOARS discussed a draft response to a letter asking UC to change admissions standards to allow high school computer science courses to count toward the core mathematics (“c”) requirement for freshman admission. The letter notes that BOARS approved revisions to the [area “c” course criteria](#) in March 2014 to state that a CS course may qualify for area “c” if it includes sufficient math content. Approved CS courses may also count toward the college-preparatory elective (“g”) requirement. The letter mentions some of the barriers to developing more high school computer science course offerings, including the lack of approved California K-12 content standards for computer science, and too few instructors with the appropriate credentials to teach computer science, particularly computer science with area “c”-level math content. The letter also notes that implementing a specific computer science requirement could disadvantage students from less-resourced schools, which are less likely to offer CS courses.

BOARS member noted that the letter should point out the need for the state to incentivize the development of more computer science courses in K-12, including those that meet the area “c” expectations.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the letter after minor modifications are incorporated after the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements & Comprehensive Review

BOARS’ Annual Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review is due January 31. UCOP provided BOARS with new tables updating application, admission, and yield data under comprehensive review included in the [January 2015 report](#). BOARS members also provided updated summaries of their campus’s comprehensive review process appearing in that report.

It was noted that as a result of a change to the statewide index approved in 2013 and first implemented in fall 2015, the number of applicants eligible only through the statewide index decreased 5,530 (19.5%) between 2014 and 2015. The change to the index also affected the number of applicants in the ELC-only and ETR pools. The number of ELC-only applicants increased 2,473 (53%) and the number of ETR applicants increased 7,062 (24%) in 2015.

It was noted that the recommendation in the 2015 report regarding the need to increase yield rates for underrepresented minorities, particularly African-Americans and American Indians, is

still valid. It was noted that UC Berkeley recently started an initiative, anchored by a \$20 million endowed scholarship fund, to boost undergraduate African-American recruitment and yield. Another recommendation in the 2015 report related to a concern about UC's ability to accommodate its Master Plan commitment to provide guaranteed admission to all eligible UC applicants. It was noted that Merced's 2020 plan to double the size of the campus will help meet this goal over the long term.

ACTION: A draft of the report will be circulated to BOARS for review and comment.

VIII. Compare Favorably Data Update

- *Tonghsan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning*

After the December BOARS meeting, Chair Aldredge sent campus admissions directors a request for GPA calculation and reporting information to help resolve small discrepancies between the GPA data collected by UCOP and those reported by campuses. Specifically, campuses have been asked for information about the extent to which they recalculate GPAs for some international students, and the extent to which they recalculate GPAs self-reported on the application after reviewing and verifying information on the actual transcript. Campuses were asked to respond to Content Manager Chang who will send BOARS complete reports for each campus after he receives feedback from all campuses.

IX. Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)

The state has asked UC to adopt C-ID numbers for CCC courses identified as equivalent to lower division UC courses. Senate Chair Hare asked BOARS to endorse a plan for the use of C-ID at UC, including for courses included in approved systemwide UC Transfer Pathways; and to consider the UC articulation processes associated with the adoption of C-ID and a process for involving UC faculty in the review of C-ID descriptors.

Chair Aldredge noted that C-ID can help students identify clear transfer paths into UC courses and majors, reduce workload on campuses, and provide more consistency in the articulation process. He asked BOARS to opine on the extent to which C-ID could be used in the review of a CCC course for transferability at the systemwide or campus level. Currently, there is individual course review at both levels. First, UCOP reviews a CCC course outline against UC faculty guidelines to determine whether the course meets basic standards for UC transferability. These agreements are reflected in the UC Transferable Course Agreements (TCAs). Next, UC faculty in a campus department review the course to determine whether it can articulate and satisfy major, breadth, or other requirements at each UC campus.

One option is to maintain the systemwide TCA review process and encourage campuses to use C-ID for course-to-course articulation after a course is approved for UC transferability. This option would allow campuses to instantly articulate a UC course with multiple CCCs offering the course approved with a specific C-ID descriptor.

Another option is to institute a parallel review during the systemwide review stage that uses select C-ID descriptors to determine UC transferability. Thus, in some cases the TCA process

would be the means to determine transferability. For other courses with a C-ID descriptor that UC faculty would first need to approve, the transferability decision would be based on the C-ID approval process. Campus faculty would then choose between accepting the C-ID number for course-to-course articulation, or continue to conduct their own reviews for such articulation. It was also noted that this process could be used for non-Transfer Pathway courses and that a separate, systemwide-only process could be used to associate C-ID numbers with courses in the UC Transfer Pathways. UC could begin by pilot testing C-ID with all courses in the 21 Transfer Pathway majors or with a subset of those majors.

Some members advocated for a policy that allows campuses to maintain local differences and control over articulation decisions. It was noted that some departments would not accept C-ID numbers because C-ID does not identify the instructional mode of a given CCC course—a disadvantage for faculty concerned about the student authentication of courses taught online. On the other hand, it was noted that systemwide articulation policy does not distinguish between online and in-person college courses; campuses require different levels of authentication, and it would be difficult to impose a higher level of authentication systemwide than is required at the campus level. In addition, it was noted that courses across segments are not “identical.” UC courses tend to include more content and be taught more quickly. There was also concern that UC not establish a process that would allow departments to disagree about a C-ID descriptor used within an approved Pathway.

It was noted that of the ~73,000 CCC courses currently approved for UC transferability, only 18% have been assigned a C-ID, so C-ID may not go very far in helping UC achieve the goal of systemwide articulation. In addition, there are ~60,000 courses UC has accepted for transfer that have no C-ID. There was concern about confusing students (and the other segments) if UC decides to use C-ID differently from the CSU. It was noted that [Senate Regulation 477](#) provides a potential mechanism for achieving systemwide articulation. SR 477 states that when four UC campuses deem a CCC course or set of courses to articulate for a major, the course or courses will also articulate at all of the remaining UC campuses, unless a campus opts out.

BOARS asked UCOP to provide examples of CCC courses commonly accepted across all nine UC campuses that have C-ID numbers, as well as examples of courses with C-ID numbers that no UC campus accepts. In addition, UCOP will attempt to determine if articulation with a particular CCC course by C-ID number implies articulation with all CSU courses that happen to articulate with the same CCC C-ID number, or if articulation between UC and CSU courses is determined by separate and independent consideration in such cases.

X. “a-g” Course Guidelines Revisions

1. Proposed revisions to the [guidelines](#) for UC-approved high school-created “a-g” honors courses eligible to receive a one point GPA “bump”

The five revisions were first discussed by BOARS in December, and are detailed in the 12-4-15 meeting minutes. The only revision eliciting discussion was the change to the general requirements for school-created honors courses (#5), which would “highly recommend” rather than require that high schools offer a non-honors equivalent at the same frequency as an honors-

level course in a given subject. BOARS members recommended that schools be asked to provide justification in cases when no non-honors equivalent is offered.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve all five revisions with the noted modification to #5. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Proposed revision to area “g” guidelines

The revision would allow courses explicitly designed for the 9th and/or 10th grade level to be approved for the college-preparatory elective requirement (“g”). Current policy stipulates that approved area “g” courses must provide academically challenging study at the same level of rigor as advanced courses in the “a-f” areas, and must be at the 11th or 12th grade level. The new policy would allow UC to accept a broader range of elective courses by allowing rigorous 9th and 10th grade courses to be accepted for area “g”. The standards for determining the rigor of a course will not change.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to approve the revision. The motion passed unanimously.

XI. Draft Statement on the Role of Calculus in UC Admissions

The statement is intended to address concerns from some parents of advanced students that the new Common Core math pathway, in which calculus may no longer be part of the normal path to advanced mathematics in middle and high schools, will disadvantage their child in UC admissions, due in part to an unstated UC calculus “requirement.” BOARS members discussed the draft statement with their local committees and some researched the actual role of calculus in admission to specific majors.

There was concern that the BOARS statement should not send the wrong message to students who want to challenge themselves with a rigorous course load that may include calculus. UC looks for evidence that students are challenging themselves, and a student who takes a less rigorous program may receive a lower comprehensive review score than one who takes a more rigorous program, even if higher grades are earned. Moreover, it would not be accurate to say that calculus is not important for admission to UC, when it has a role in admission to some disciplines. At the same time, pushing students to take calculus before they are ready may hurt their prospects. It would be interesting to measure the extent to which AP calculus may or may not have a unique or special status in relation to other advanced level courses (e.g., AP history).

ACTION: Professor Zieve will continue work on the letter for review at a future meeting.

XII. Student Policy Paper

BOARS reviewed a proposal from a UCD student arguing for a reduced focus by admissions committees on AP courses, tests, and scores to help address a lack of student diversity. The proposal argues that the AP course “arms race” benefits students in wealthy school districts with access to a large number of AP courses, over underrepresented minority students at less-

resourced schools. UC gives students a one point GPA bonus (“bump”) in the GPA calculation for completion of up to four AP or UC-certified high school honors courses.

BOARS members agreed that AP and honors courses provide students with new educational opportunities, and bemoaned the lack of access to AP courses at low resourced schools. It was also noted that UC application readers are trained to consider AP course-taking in the local context—that is, how many AP courses are offered at a school and the extent to which a student takes advantage of the offerings available, however limited they are. It was noted that BOARS has considered eliminating or reducing the GPA bump in the past, and that reducing the bump or changing the emphasis on AP courses may have little or no actual impact on diversity.

ACTION: Chair Aldredge will respond to the student.

XIII. Executive Session

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst
Attest: Ralph Aldredge