UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
Minutes of Meeting
October 2, 2015

I.   Welcome and Announcements
   o *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

Committee Overview: Chair Aldredge welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the Committee's charge—to advise the UC President and Senate agencies on the conditions for undergraduate admission. BOARS includes 14 members, including two non-voting student representatives. The Senate chair and vice chair also serve as ex-officio, non-voting members, and BOARS works closely with UCOP consultants to consider policy issues. BOARS members are encouraged to communicate with their campus committees about discussions in BOARS, and, in turn, to share local concerns and discussions with the systemwide committee. While BOARS members represent their campuses, they are expected to consider issues from a systemwide perspective.

Committee Activities: The 2014-15 Annual Report summarizes the major activities of BOARS last year. This year, BOARS will help lead the systemwide Senate response to several programmatic initiatives included in the state budget agreement, including requests to revisit policies for awarding UC credit for AP exams and other placement tests and use the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) as a supplemental numbering system for UC courses. BOARS will also discuss implementation of the new systemwide transfer pathways, review "compare favorably" outcomes for nonresident admission, and prepare its annual report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review.

BOARS Representation: Chair Aldredge represents BOARS on the Academic Council and the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), which provides a forum for UC, CSU, and CCC Senate leaders to discuss issues of common interest and concern. BOARS Vice Chair Henry Sanchez represents BOARS on the Education Financing Model Steering Committee and the Systemwide Strategic Admissions Task Force.

II.   Consultation with Senate Leadership
   o *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair*
   o *Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Chair*
   o *Mona Hsieh, Senate Office Manager*

Regents Meetings: In July, UCOP presented the annual UC Accountability Report, which features useful data on topics such as undergraduate admissions, enrollment, and student success. The Senate chair also presented a 2014 study of general campus faculty total remuneration showing the declining position of UC faculty remuneration relative to colleagues at comparison institutions. At both the July and September meetings, the Regents discussed a proposal to change the governance structure of UC Health that would delegate decision-making authority for major projects to a reconstituted Committee with both Regent and non-Regent voting members. In September, the Regents rejected a proposed *Statement of Principles against Intolerance* over

student concerns that it did not adequately address anti-Semitism. A task force that includes Chair Hare will be crafting a new statement that is responsive to the criticisms and also addresses the need to protect free speech and academic freedom.

Enrollment Funding: The Legislature recently approved a plan to provide UC with $25 million in exchange for the enrollment of 5,000 new California resident undergraduates over two years. The plan asks UC to use nonresident tuition revenue to help cover the balance of the $50 million marginal cost needed to support the enrollment of those students. The Academic Council sent a letter to President Napolitano discussing issues and concerns associated with the plan, including the potential strain of new enrollments on infrastructure and resources, the difficulty of projecting yield precisely, and the impact on instructional quality. It has also been noted that the plan does not address the thousands of unfunded students already enrolled on UC campuses.

Retirement Options Task Force: Four Senate representatives are serving on a Task Force charged by the President to design new retirement plan options for UC employees hired after July 1, 2016, as part of a budget agreement with the Governor. In exchange for new state funding, UC has agreed to design a new pension tier that includes a cap on pensionable earnings based on the requirements of the California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA). The Senate will have an opportunity to review a proposal in January on an expedited schedule.

ICAS Meeting: The September ICAS meeting featured discussions about transfer admission, ICAS' role in implementing legislation related to textbook affordability, and a new baccalaureate degree pilot program at the California Community Colleges, which allows several CCCs to offer bachelor's degree programs in certain vocational fields not currently offered at a UC or CSU campus.

Senate Travel: The Senate Office manager asked BOARS members to purchase airline tickets no less than 14 days in advance of meetings and to use SWABIZ (non-UCSB travelers) and UCLA Travel (UCSB travelers) to secure the least expensive fares. Air travelers are required to attach an itinerary to the travel reimbursement form showing proof of payment. Drivers should provide total mileage along with a map showing to-and-from addresses.

III.   **Consultation with UCOP**
   o *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
   o *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
   o *Monica Lin, Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions*

Overview of the Office of Admissions: The Office of Undergraduate Admissions manages a range of overlapping policies and functions. Staff provide policy advice to campuses and work with BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE as consultants to help inform policy discussions. The Office is also engaged in a range of pre-admissions work. The High School Articulation unit reviews and approves new or revised high school courses that satisfy the "a-g" requirements for freshman admissions, and the Transfer Articulation unit manages and maintains UC systemwide and campus-specific articulation of California Community College courses that transfer credit over to UC. High School Articulation staff are also supporting California high schools in their transition to the Common Core State Standards. The Office maintains the UC Application, which

integrates with approved "a-g" and articulated CCC courses. It recently launched a new A-G Course Management Portal, and is working with the CCC on the Next Generation redesign of the ASSIST website. Admissions works with UCOP Communications to create clear public messages about admissions policies, processes, and practices, and with the Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP) to produce and analyze admissions data used to inform policy decisions.

UC Counselor Conferences: The annual fall Counselor Conferences provide high school and community college counselors with information and training on UC admissions policies and issues. This year UC campuses hosted five conferences that served approximately 5,000 counselors from across California. An additional joint UC-CSU conference in Fresno served 800 counselors.

Current Enrollment Issues: State policymakers are primarily concerned with three admissions issues: California resident access; nonresident enrollment; and diversity. UC notes that nonresident enrollment grew over time as a direct consequence of state funding cuts; that nonresident tuition revenue allows UC to fund more resident enrollments; and that the state can increase resident enrollment by restoring UC's funding. In addition, UC notes its strong commitment to developing creative, race-neutral policies such as Eligibility in the Local Context that help advance diversity and access for underrepresented minority students within the legal confines of Proposition 209. UC believes it has made much progress, but also recognizes that there is more work to do, particularly around African-American enrollments.

UC Application Reviews: UCOP has initiated two reviews of the systemwide UC application. The first will involve a redesign of the application interface to enhance its usability and accessibility. The second is intended to improve the quality of the information gathered in the application to help campuses distinguish from among the growing number of highly qualified students. A workgroup of Admissions Directors is considering recommended adjustments that UCOP will share with BOARS in November.

Transfer Admission: UCOP and the Office of Admissions are supporting a range of initiatives designed to improve the transfer path. In addition to the new systemwide UC Transfer Pathways project, the President is touring the CCCs to discuss ways to strengthen the transfer path, and UC is upgrading its transfer communications and outreach efforts to help build relationships with potential transfers and encourage them to prepare for UC earlier in their career.

Revised SAT: The redesigned SAT test will be administered for the first time in March 2016. As more details become available about the test, UCOP will be seeking advice from BOARS about the use of the Essay section (BOARS voted to continue requiring the Essay section of the exam in 2014), concordance issues, and the use of the test in admissions. UCOP will have more to report in December.

Other Topics: UCOP will be seeking additional guidance from BOARS about the criteria for reviewing transferrable CCC courses; topics related to the area "g" elective requirement; criteria for high school courses with designated UC honors; math acceleration and the role of calculus;

and the extent to which current policies allow UC to appropriately evaluate the quality of online courses offered at high schools and community colleges.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that some UC faculty remain concerned about the authentication of student identity in community college online courses. In addition, faculty have found it difficult to determine if a particular CCC course being considered for UC articulation is being taught online. It was noted that UC has a policy for K-12 online courses, which requires courses approved for "a-g" to include quality standards aligned with the 52 standards established by iNACOL.

IV.   Update on Transfer Admission Pathways

The Governor's Budget Framework asks UC to develop specific systemwide transfer pathways for the 20 most popular majors, closely aligned to the associate degrees for transfer established by CCC and CSU. In June, campuses agreed to pathways for 10 majors: Anthropology, Biology, Biochemistry, Cell Biology, Chemistry, Economics, Mathematics, Molecular Biology, Physics, and Sociology. In October, UCOP will host meetings of faculty delegates from 11 additional majors: English Literature, Film Studies, History, Philosophy, Business Administration, Communications, Political Science, Psychology, Computer Sciences, Electrical Engineering, and Mechanical Engineering.

Delegates will review current major requirements, discuss similarities and differences across UC campuses, and develop a superset of recommendations for pre-major coursework. Transfers who meet the expectations of a given Pathway will have a clear roadmap for major preparation that positions them well for competitive admission and on-time graduation from any UC campus. Some campuses may also ask students to take specific additional courses outside of the Pathway after they transfer; but those expectations should not be a barrier to admission nor should they prevent timely graduation.

UCOP has now turned to the work of articulating the UC Pathways with specific courses available at each of the 113 CCCs, to secure complete Pathways for prospective transfers. In some cases, individual UC campuses will need to address a gap in articulation, but there are also challenges associated with gaps at the community colleges—for example, smaller CCCs may not currently offer all the courses in a given Pathway. UCOP is also engaged in a variety of outreach and communications efforts to inform constituencies about the Pathways.

It was noted that Senate Regulation 477 provides that when four or more UC campuses consider a CCC course or set of courses to be articulated for transfer preparation in a given major, the course should be considered accepted for articulation at all UC campuses.

V.   Berkeley Freshman Admissions Policy

In June 2015, BOARS adopted a recommendation that Berkeley delay implementation of its new freshman admissions policy for one year to allow campuses and UCOP more time to review its implications for the system and to communicate changes to potential applicants. One feature of the policy as originally passed was a request to all applicants for letters of recommendation,

subsequent to the official filing date, viz. January 1. (Letters had previously been requested only for students under augmented review. One of BOARS' concerns was that the policy conflicts with existing messages on the systemwide UC Application and websites and would send mixed messages to applicants. Another concern was that the move to the new holistic review scoring system could impact admission processes at UC campuses that use Berkeley scores, who would need more time to adjust their processes to the new system.

Berkeley declined to delay implementation, and the issue moved to the July 29 meeting of the Academic Council, where a compromise agreement was forged with the Berkeley Senate Chair. The agreement is that for 2015-16, Berkeley will limit their solicitation of letters to students predicted as "possible admits" through the predictive index and from any applicants ranked "possible" later in the review process and will set the date as January 15. All files will be considered even if no solicited letters are received. In addition, Berkeley has already committed to sharing scores with other campuses and will consult BOARS about plans for next year.

Berkeley representative Professor Rhodes noted that Berkeley reasoned that it has made significant changes to its admissions policy in the past without consulting BOARS; for example, when in 2012 and 2013 it eliminated 4.5 and 5 read scores, which had been useful to other campuses. Berkeley felt that major adjustments were needed to its Augmented Review system, which was passing over strong candidates and hurting diversity, and that it also needed the added efficiency brought by a unified read system incorporating augmented review into the general holistic read.

Associate Vice President Handel noted that campuses must propose to UCOP in writing any major functional change to the UC Application involving software development by October 31 to allow time for proper consultation and for UCOP to allocate appropriate resources for documenting specifications, coding and testing the functionality before August 1. The following January 31 is a secondary deadline for less significant changes to the application. The first date would apply in the event that Berkeley decides to require letters of recommendation at the time of application. The second would apply to, for example, a request to include a notation on the application asking Berkeley applicants to submit letters of recommendation to a separate site after application.

VI.   Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System
   o *Michelle Pilati, CCC Faculty Coordinator, C-ID*

Professor Pilati discussed the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) system and its implementation at CCC and CSU. The goal of C-ID is to establish uniform identification numbers for comparable lower division major preparation courses across the three higher education segments. The numbers help CCC students identify clear transfer paths into courses and majors that have been approved by CSU campuses as meeting articulation standards. UC does not currently participate in the project, but has been asked to use C-ID as an additional number for UC campus courses.

C-ID numbers are assigned based on course descriptors developed and approved by Senate-appointed intersegmental work groups. The descriptors include details about course content

based on the course outline of record. Draft descriptors are posted online for statewide vetting, and re-evaluated every five years. C-ID is powerful in that it has the potential to instantaneously articulate a CSU course with up to 113 CCCs, greatly simplifying transfer for CCC students. C-ID has become integral to other intersegmental projects, including the development of the Associate Degrees for Transfer. CCC and CSU would welcome more UC participation in the development and review of descriptors and corresponding course outlines.

Discussion: It was noted that C-ID does not identify whether a particular CCC course is taught online or in-person, a disadvantage for faculty concerned about student authentication and others issues in online courses. There was concern that because UC courses tend to include more content than CCC courses, giving a C-ID tag to a higher content UC course may not benefit student preparation. Professor Pilati responded that to receive a C-ID number, the content of a course has to match a descriptor 100%. She added that there are C-ID descriptors for both individual courses and for course sequences. It was noted that giving a C-ID designation to UC Transfer Pathway courses could help inspire some colleges to offer those courses.

VII. Credit for Prior Learning (Alternative Credits)

Issue: The state has asked UC to review existing policies related to granting credit for courses and exams taken outside of UC prior to matriculation, including Advanced Placement courses, College Level Examination Program (CLEP) tests, and other Credit by Examination vehicles, with the goal of providing credit that will help students graduate sooner.

AP/IB: It was noted that students who earn scores of 3, 4, or 5 on AP exams and scores of 5, 6 or 7 on IB Higher Level exams approved by BOARS are awarded elective credit toward a UC degree, but that individual campuses determine the specific application of those units. It was suggested that BOARS study the effect of AP and IB exam-taking on preparation for UC-level work, particularly upper division work.

CLEP: It was noted that state officials believe that some high school students have educational experiences that might allow them to successfully take CLEP tests for UC credit. UC stopped awarding CLEP test credit in 1980 in response to a faculty review revealing that the tests do not measure University-level performance adequately. BOARS members noted that one could imagine a high school student demonstrating the knowledge they gained in a high level MOOC through a test such as the CLEP. It was also suggested that UC might develop its own prior-learning credit examination. It was suggested that BOARS review, or identify representative groups of faculty to review, the content of the 33 CLEP exams to determine whether they meet expectations for a particular course across the UC system. Chair Aldredge noted that he will ask a BOARS subcommittee to discuss next steps in November.

VIII. ICAS Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen

The draft statement has been revised based on feedback received from the higher education segments during a spring 2015 review. It updates a 1988 ICAS statement to reflect the State's

adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). The final document must be adopted by each segment before ICAS takes a position. BOARS submitted comments last spring. BOARS members are invited to review the latest version and send any comments to Chair Aldredge after the meeting.

IX.   Update on Proposal to Revise Area "d"

BOARS has asked UCOC to appoint a faculty group to review and propose revisions, as needed, to UC's laboratory science requirement (area "d") to align with the K-12 Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Vice Chair Sanchez will chair the group, which will make recommendations to BOARS for possible UC systemwide Senate review.

X.   Executive Session

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