

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**                      **ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**November 6, 2015**

**I.        Consent Calendar**

1. November 6, 2015 BOARS Agenda
2. October 2, 2015 BOARS Draft Minutes

**Action: BOARS approved the consent calendar.**

**II.        Announcements**

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

C-ID Discussion at Academic Council: Several guests from the California Community Colleges and UC Irvine attended the October Council meeting to discuss the benefits of the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) for CCC students navigating the transfer path and for colleges and universities wanting to streamline course articulation reviews. UC does not currently participate in C-ID, but has been asked by the state to consider it as an additional number for UC campus courses.

Meeting of BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE chairs: The chairs of BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE met by conference call to discuss the state's request for UC to review existing policies related to granting credit for courses and exams taken outside of UC prior to matriculation, including Advanced Placement courses and College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams. It was decided that BOARS should lead the review of CLEP exams, and UCEP should focus on AP credit issues.

Transfer Streamlining Meetings: In October, the Senate chair and UC Provost convened three meetings of campus faculty delegates from 11 majors to discuss potential systemwide transfer pathways. Delegates are now seeking local approvals of agreements reached at the meetings. The pathways are a set of courses representing UC's best advice to transfers about the preparation that will ensure they are competitive for admission at all nine campuses and prepared to graduate two years after matriculation. It is understood that some campuses also may ask students to take specific additional courses outside of the Pathway after they transfer; but that students should not be disadvantaged in admission if they lack those courses. Following the approvals, there will be 21 total approved pathways.

Appointment of BOARS Members to two Subcommittees: Two BOARS subcommittees will meet to develop recommendations on specific issues for the full committee's consideration

1. *Credit for Prior Learning*: Members will include Vice Chair Henry Sanchez and representatives from UCSD, UCSB, UCD, UCM, and UCI. Discussions will focus on the state's request to review policies for granting credit for courses and exams taken outside of UC prior to matriculation, including CLEP exams, and other Credit by Examination vehicles, with the goal of providing credit that will help students graduate sooner.

2. *C-ID/Online Learning*: Members will include Chair Ralph Aldredge and representatives from UCB, UCR, UCLA, UCSC, and UCSF. The Subcommittee will consider and potentially propose for BOARS' endorsement the use of C-ID at UC, including piloting the use of C-ID for courses included in approved transfer pathways. The subcommittee will also discuss online courses that could potentially have C-ID numbers, as well as general standards for online course listings.

### **III. Consultation with UCOP**

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Lisa Garcia, Special Assistant*

UC Application Opening: Students have between November 1 and November 30 to submit applications for fall 2016 undergraduate admission. Last year, 192,000 applicants applied to an average of four UC campuses. UCOP consultants will discuss preliminary application data at the December BOARS meeting.

UC Application Review: A group of campus admissions directors has been meeting to discuss potential improvements to the UC application organized around two broad areas: first, a redesign of the application interface to improve its usability and accessibility, informed by input from students and counselors and new ADA standards; second, modifications that will improve the quality of the information gathered in the application, focused around personal statement prompts and other areas that provide students opportunities to define themselves. UCOP hopes to discuss recommendations with BOARS in December.

Enrollment: In November, the Regents will discuss scenarios for implementing increased enrollment at each campus in accordance with a plan authorized by the Legislature to give UC \$25 million in exchange for the enrollment of 5,000 more California resident undergraduates.

Coalition on College Access: UC recently declined a request from the Coalition for College Access to join an effort to design a new common application, because the Coalition wanted to involve only UC's most selective campuses and does not have a plan for transfer students.

Credit-Granting Guidelines for High School Curricular Programs: Director Trevino reminded BOARS that the committee had agreed to consider developing guidelines to help UC navigate the review of AP Capstone and similar high school curricular programs requesting UC elective credit (IB Diploma, Cambridge, and others) that do not align with UC general education curriculum. Vice Chair Sanchez noted that last year, faculty content expert reviewers certified for BOARS that UC should award elective credit for scores of 3 or higher on 9 redesigned AP exams and 5 or higher on 4 redesigned IB exams. However, the nature of the curriculum of Capstone and similar programs makes it more challenging to determine whether they align with existing AP/IB standards; for example, the Capstone curriculum does not align with an existing subject area, and its research topic changes each year, making it difficult to identify a discipline expert to conduct the review.

**Discussion:** It was noted that students who take AP classes do not tend to graduate from UC more quickly; rather, they take the coursework to accelerate through the curriculum and gain a stronger foundation for graduate school. In addition, many students are aware that UC looks favorably on AP in comprehensive review.

#### **IV. Campus Reports**

BOARS members summarized some of the issues being discussed on their admissions committees and campuses.

UCSD, UCSC, and other campuses are struggling with increasing class sizes and a growing number of majors being designated as impacted. Some are considering expanding capacity-based admissions—i.e., admitting by major and/or adding intended major as a factor in admission. UCD is considering admitting by major at the transfer level. Campuses are also mindful about the extent to which the “impacted” designation can have a negative impact on applicant behavior. In addition, UCSB is discussing strategies for increasing transfer enrollment and its possible impact on freshman enrollments; UCR is considering adding extracurricular activities to its comprehensive review criteria; and UCSD is piloting a portfolio review process for Theater Arts majors. UCB and UCLA are discussing how their admissions policies can make finer distinctions between highly qualified applicants and increase diversity in an increasingly competitive admission environment. UCB is also discussing the differences in the preparedness of students majoring in computer science through the College of Letters and Sciences pathway and the College of Engineering pathway. UCSF’s Task Force on Students Experiencing Academic Difficulties made recommendations in 2013 that are now being implemented across a broad range of campus programs and services. The undergraduate student representative noted that a UC systemwide Student of Color conference is underway at UC Berkeley. Students are interested in how UC can take advantage of the agreement with the state to enroll 5,000 new students to increase diversity on campuses.

#### **V. Consultation with Senate Leadership**

- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair*

October Council Meeting: Council reviewed feedback from Senate divisions and systemwide committees in response to the [proposed revised Presidential Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment](#). Chair Hare’s [letter](#) summarizing the Senate’s concerns is posted on the Senate website. In addition, Council members were encouraged by the information presented about C-ID. It has been suggested that UC begin by adopting C-ID numbers for large enrollment courses and/or pilot the use of C-ID tags for courses included in approved UC transfer pathways.

Transfer Streamlining: The Senate has asked campuses to respond to transfer pathway agreements created at three October meetings, by November 13. The pathways will serve transfers who want to prepare simultaneously for multiple UC campuses. A systemwide website directs students to the individual campus websites for more information about campus requirements.

Regents Work Group on Principles of Intolerance: The Regents hosted a forum at UCLA on October 26 to gather public input about a new Statement of Principles Against Intolerance being written by a joint working group that includes Senate Chair Hare.

Retirement Options Task Force: is evaluating options for a the state mandate to develop new retirement options for employees hired after July 1, 2016 – options that include a new cap on pensionable earnings based on the requirements of the California Public Employees’ Pension Reform Act (PEPRA)

Alternative Credits: Chair Hare has asked Chair Aldredge to update Council on November 23 about BOARS’ discussions regarding Alternative Credits and C-ID, as well as recommended next steps. The review of CLEP exams should involve broad faculty input and consensus into whether the exams include sufficient breadth and depth.

State Budget Audit: The state has initiated an audit of UC budget issues. The areas of focus include the use of state funds for executive compensation and the recruitment of out of state students, the extent to which nonresidents compare favorably to residents, and the “budget rebenching” process underway to rebalance per-student state funding across the campuses. The results of the audit are expected in spring 2016.

## **VI. BOARS Subcommittees**

### **Subcommittee 1: Credit for Prior Learning (Alternative Credits)**

The subcommittee discussed the state’s request to UC to review existing policies related to granting credit for [College Level Examination Program \(CLEP\) exams](#). BOARS discontinued acceptance of CLEP exams in 1980 in response to faculty concerns that the tests do not adequately measure University-level performance.

It was noted that CLEP exams are intended to provide older and/or non-traditional college students, including military personnel and working adults, an opportunity to earn credit for college-level knowledge obtained outside the classroom. In contrast, AP exams are designed for high school students. The upcoming review of CLEP initiated by BOARS should assess the extent to which the tests measure college level knowledge, prepare students for the next level of coursework in a given discipline, and align with the overall educational goals of the university. Have CLEP exams substantially improved since 1980? It was noted that very few major research institutions give credit for CLEP, and those that do, award credit for only a limited number of exams at certain score thresholds. It was noted that data from the College Board indicate that volume of CLEP test-takers at the California Community colleges is relatively low. Fewer than 200 total CLEP exams were taken by CCC students last year. CSU awards credits for some CLEP exams. It was noted that the Senate regulations give campuses the right to establish credit by examination policies. It was also suggested that UC develop its own exams, which would provide the University a greater measure of quality control, as well as revenue. Members noted that it would be useful to obtain student outcome data from colleges that accept CLEP. It was

noted that BOARS may wish to clarify that the ability to earn credit for any alternative credit vehicle, including AP, should be restricted to non-matriculated students.

It was agreed that BOARS should initiate a review of CLEP exams similar to the one used last year for revised AP and IB exams, involving faculty content expert work groups. Some of the exams can probably be categorized into broad disciplinary areas, reducing the number of expert groups needed. It was agreed that each work group should include faculty from all nine campuses when possible given the subject matter (e.g. business management courses are not offered on all campuses), and the review should begin with a subset of the 33 CLEP exams, perhaps those associated with the courses in the approved transfer pathways. BOARS will obtain inspection copies of CLEP exams and send them to content expert groups with a request that they review the exams and answer several specific questions:

1. Is the CLEP exam adequate for measuring UC-level performance, and does it adequately cover the content of a lower division course or courses in your department?
2. If so, at what minimum level of performance should credit be given and how much credit should be granted?
3. What should the credit count for? (e.g. general education requirements, elective credit, major credit.)

It was suggested that BOARS members review existing campus policies for credit by examination to help inform future discussions.

## **Subcommittee 2: (1) C-ID and (2) standards for identification and validation of online courses completed for satisfaction of “a-g” requirements or for transfer credit**

The subcommittee discussed the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID), its use at CSU and the California Community Colleges (CCC), and the possibility of endorsing its use at UC, including for courses included in approved UC Transfer Pathways. C-ID offers CSU and the CCC quality control and a model for developing the required courses in the transfer model curricula (TMCs) used to compose the Associate Degrees for Transfer. Some UC campuses already use C-ID in a limited capacity. For example, the UC Irvine School of Engineering was able to secure approval for much of their engineering majors’ course articulations based on C-ID descriptors, and is now instructing campus articulation officers to automatically articulate CCC courses and course sequences with a C-ID designation to UCI Engineering courses, reducing articulation workload considerably at the campus level.

Associate Director Lin noted that in 2013, UCOP analyzed over 2,000 CCC courses with C-ID numbers and found that 82% of those courses were already approved for UC transferability. She agreed to provide the subcommittee with updated information from this analysis for review in December. The subcommittee raised but did not embrace the idea of a UC version of C-ID. Instead, the consensus was that UC should use the current C-ID process if the University moves in the direction of a more streamlined approach across all UC campuses. The subcommittee discussed the extent to which the approval of a given C-ID descriptor should be accepted UC systemwide, and agreed that UC faculty should be closely involved in whatever level of C-ID participation UC determines is best for the system, particularly in the development

of course descriptors, to ensure descriptors are consistently and appropriately detailed and aligned with UC expectations. It was noted that some faculty prefer to have confirmation of the instructional mode (online or in-person) of courses with C-ID numbers, despite no existing process to collect and present such information.

Chair Aldredge noted that the scope of any action that might be expected of BOARS needs to be clarified, since (a) campuses can currently adopt the use of C-IDs without approval of BOARS and (b) it seems unlikely that BOARS would propose any systemwide mandates that might eliminate the discretion of campus faculty in determining whether or not particular C-IDs are appropriate for articulation.

## **VII. Statway and Mathematical Preparation**

BOARS reviewed the history of its involvement in Statway, a year-long community-college course sequence, intended for non-STEM majors, which combines introductory college-level statistics with pre-college math content. In January 2015, BOARS [approved](#) a version of Statway for UC transferability. The approval followed a 2013 [Statement on Basic Math for all Admitted UC Students](#) from BOARS and a UC faculty review of the Statway curriculum which concluded that its pre-college math content meets the minimum math requirements expected of freshmen by sufficiently covering mathematics aligned with the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM). The policy replaced an earlier requirement that transferrable courses must include an Intermediate Algebra prerequisite. BOARS also discussed a recent [resolution from the CSU Academic Senate](#) that extends CSU's Statway pilot program through Fall 2019, but also raises concerns about the extent to which Statway provides adequate algebra for college-level work. BOARS Chair Aldredge noted that he has been contacted by individuals concerned that community colleges are implementing pathways to statistics that water down the math requirement and leave students unprepared for university-level work. It has been noted, however, that the responsibility for reviewing the content of prerequisites to UC-transferable math against the expectations of the CCSSM lies with the CCC faculty, not UC.

It was noted that the Common Core State Standards are a set of standards for Math and English Language Arts adopted by California and other states. The standards are designed to set a higher bar for learning and to better prepare students for college and career through the entire K-12 pipeline.

## **VIII. Campus Compare Favorably Outcomes and Report**

In 2011, BOARS adopted a [policy](#) that the nonresident undergraduates admitted to a campus must compare favorably to the California residents admitted to that campus. BOARS later established [procedures](#) asking campuses to report annually to BOARS on the extent to which they met the standard. BOARS wrote reports in [2015](#) and [2014](#) summarizing outcomes for the prior year from a systemwide perspective. Chair Aldredge asked BOARS to consider how BOARS might modify its systemwide report to provide more information about individual campus outcomes. He suggested that campuses report outcomes to BOARS through a common template summarizing the high school academic performance measures of the residents and

nonresidents who were admitted, and the UC performance of those who enrolled. He noted that [UC policy](#) requires resident freshman applicants to have a minimum GPA of 3.0 or better in “a-g” courses with no grade lower than a C, while nonresident freshman applicants need a minimum GPA of 3.4.

**Discussion:** BOARS members noted that the overall admission rate is an imperfect measure for comparing residents and nonresidents, because nonresidents accept admissions offers at much lower rates than residents, and campuses have to admit a higher proportion to achieve an expected yield to meet enrollment targets. Chair Aldredge noted that regardless of this fact, campuses must meet their nonresident enrollment targets within the compare favorably standard, based on applicant comparability, in accordance with the compare-favorably policy.

It was noted that persistence rate is also an imperfect measure, because the high expense of UC for nonresidents, and/or adjustment difficulties for international students, may contribute to higher withdraw rates; it was agreed that a better measure is probation rate; that is, the percentage of students with GPA below 2.0 after the first year. It was also agreed that the report should provide the actual number of enrolled students for each category to which the probation and persistence data applies.

It was noted that campuses are making accommodations to account for having more limited information about some of the factors used in comprehensive review from international applicants. Such accommodations include weighting SAT higher for international applicants.

A member suggested that BOARS examine discipline-based comparisons of the UC performance of nonresidents and residents to account for the fact that nonresidents and residents tend to take different kinds of courses in their first year at UC.

## **IX. Executive Session**

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