UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   ACADEMIC SENATE
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
Minutes of Meeting
December 4, 2015

I.   Consent Calendar

1. December 4, 2015 BOARS Agenda
2. November 6, 2015 BOARS Draft Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II.   Announcements
    o *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

<u>November Academic Council Meeting</u>: Chair Aldredge and the chair of UCEP reported on their committees' discussions about the Couse Identification Numbering System (C-ID) and the College Level Examination Program. It was suggested that BOARS and UCEP work together to produce a document listing pros and cons of various approaches to the use of C-ID and to select up to five subject matter areas for which a subset of CLEP exams can be evaluated for possible credit. Council asked BOARS to lead the C-ID review and UCEP to lead the CLEP review.

<u>Area "d" Work Group</u>: UCOC has identified representatives for a systemwide faculty work group that will examine UC's laboratory science ("d") undergraduate admissions requirement, determine how area "d" will align with the K-12 Next Generation Science Standards categories, and make recommendations to BOARS for revisions, as needed, that will be circulated for UC Senate review. BOARS Vice Chair Sanchez will chair the work group.

<u>Computer Science</u>: A group of policymakers and business leaders sent a letter to BOARS asking the committee to change admissions standards to allow "academically rigorous" high school computer science courses to count toward the core math (area "c") requirement for freshman admission. Computer science education advocates have made similar requests to previous BOARS chairs.

III.   Consultation with Senate Leadership
    o *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair*

<u>November Regents Meeting</u>: The Regents approved a $1 billion project to double the size of the Merced campus by 2020, a preliminary 2016-17 UC budget, and a plan to enroll 10,000 new California resident undergraduates over the next three years (5,000 new students in 2016-17 in exchange for $25 million in state funding, and 2,500 new students in each of the following two years). As campuses begin planning for the new enrollments, they are also discussing the additional faculty, staff, classroom and lab space, and infrastructure that will be needed to accommodate the enrollments.

Special Work Groups: Chair Hare is a member of a Regents Work Group currently drafting a statement about intolerance that specifically addresses anti-Semitism as well as the need to protect free speech and academic freedom. Chair Hare also serves on a new joint committee investigating systemwide and individual campus policies and practices for reporting, investigating, and adjudicating claims of sexual misconduct involving faculty and other academic personnel.

Budget Audit: UC is undergoing an audit initiated by the Legislature that is investigating several budget issues, including 1) the impact of nonresident enrollment and the "compare favorably" standard for nonresident enrollment; 2) executive compensation and the use of state revenues and nonresident tuition; and 3) the "budget rebenching" process underway to rebalance per-student state funding across campuses. The results of the audit are expected in spring 2016.

Statway Request: The Under Secretary of the Department of Education has requested information about BOARS' evaluation of the Statway program, including the faculty reviews that led to BOARS' January 2015 decision to approve Statway.

Computer Science in "a-g": Chair Hare asked BOARS to respond to the letter asking UC to recognize high school computer science (CS) courses for the mathematics (area "c") admission requirement. It was noted that BOARS approved revisions to the area "c" course criteria in March 2014 to state (in section #5) that a CS course may qualify for area "c" if it includes sufficient math content. The Criteria also note that CS courses with a primary focus on coding methods are not sufficient to fulfill area "c". Approved CS courses can also count toward the college-preparatory elective (area "g") requirement. It was noted that the last course submission cycle was the first to incorporate the new criteria, and 11 CS courses were approved for area "c," a 75% approval rate for courses submitted. However, most CS courses, including AP Computer Science, lack an advanced level of mathematics and will be approved for area "g" only. The revisions to the area "c" criteria also meet Senate Bill 1200 (2014) which UC to develop guidelines for CS courses that satisfy area "c".

It was noted that the Computer Science label can apply to a broad variety of courses, most of which include little or no math. It is important for UC to maintain math requirements that ensure students who enter UC are prepared to succeed. It is up to high schools to meet UC's math content standards, not up to UC to change requirements. It was also noted that no math educators signed the letter to BOARS. It was also noted that many high schools lack the resources to develop mathematically rigorous CS courses. An additional barrier is that most CS high school teachers are credentialed to teach CTE, rather than math. A new state commission is developing high school CS course content standards, which could lead to a new combined math/CTE credential that could encourage high schools to offer more CS courses that meet area "c" standards.

ACTION: A response to the letter will be drafted for review at the January BOARS meeting. UCOP will also provide data about the availability of CS courses that meet area "g."

IV.   Campus Reports

BOARS members noted current local admissions issues. Several campuses are discussing how they will accommodate their share of 5,000 new resident enrollments; the effect of new enrollments on educational quality and diversity; and the expected proportion of freshmen and transfers.

Several campuses are discussing diversity issues. UCI is discussing strategies for enhancing outreach to African-American, American Indian, and undocumented students. UCR is investigating why some admitted African-American students elect to attend college elsewhere. African-American students and other students at several campuses are raising concerns about diversity, racism, low minority enrollment, support services, and other issues.

The UCSD admissions committee is considering a request from Humanities departments for a program that will allow applicants to submit an optional portfolio, following the success of a similar pilot program for Theatre Arts applicants. UCLA is discussing how it can better identify and prevent fraud in international applications, particularly around the SAT and language abilities. UCB recently mailed 2,000 requests for letters of recommendation from the new "possible" category. UCM is discussing the 2020 plan for expanding the Merced campus.

V.   Preliminary Application Outcomes
   o   *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*

Preliminary data indicate that UC received more than 203,000 applications for fall 2016 admission, a record high and a 5% increase over last year. 50% of applications were received in the two days leading up to the November 30 deadline. Overall freshman applications increased at least 4.7% on all campuses; Merced led with an 11.8% increase. Applications from California resident freshman increased about 2% compared to last year; nonresident applications increased about 10%. Applications increased from all ethnic groups except American Indians and Pacific Islanders. California Community College transfer applications also increased 5% compared to last year; however, UCOP estimates that UC will need at least a 10% increase to meet the new enrollment targets. To help meet this goal, the transfer application deadline has been extended to January 4, 2016. It is expected that campuses will also ramp-up mid-year and summer admissions to meet the targets.

VI.   Proposed Changes to the 2017-18 UC Application
   o   *Michael Trevino, Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
   o   *Michael McCawley, UC Santa Cruz Admission Director*

Earlier this year, UCOP asked a work group of admissions directors to consider changes to the UC application to improve its usability and the quality of information collected. The work group has responded with a set of recommended modifications that fall into two categories. The first are changes to existing areas of the application that currently allow for narrative responses, to allow in some cases for the collection of more data automatically, and in other cases to allow for additional narrative responses to questions about the applicant's military service, foster care experience, honors and awards, extracurricular activities, and other areas. The second replaces the two personal statement prompts with new questions (applicants are invited to select four of eight) that are intended to provide students with additional opportunities to define themselves,

elicit more authentic responses, and provide sharper insight into the applicant. The new questions will not increase the number of total words on the application or the total words collected. The work group was careful to ensure that the proposed changes align with the 14 faculty-approved Comprehensive Review criteria.

The recommendations have been received positively by student focus groups, admissions directors, and staff, and the revised application is currently undergoing user testing. The changes are intended to take effect for the fall 2017 application cycle. Additional improvements could be made for future cycles. Campuses will continue to have the flexibility to ask additional questions of some candidates. The work group will keep BOARS informed as it learns more from the user testing and gets additional feedback from external constituents.

Discussion: BOARS members expressed support for the effort and noted that the changes should be grounded in sound approaches at other universities. Members noted that for some students, the personal statement can be a source of anxiety and a barrier to applying to UC altogether. While increasing the number of options for the personal statement prompt could reduce anxiety and make it more likely that some students will apply, a larger number of questions could also deter some students. It was noted that the role of the personal statement is to gather information about applicants, not to test writing skills. It was noted that BOARS would welcome a longer term discussion about possible changes to the Comprehensive Review criteria that could help address attributes like innovation, persistence, and the quality of being a "self-starter."

VII.   Compare Favorably Outcomes and Reports

BOARS members will soon receive campus-specific data related to 2015 compare favorably outcomes and a request from Chair Aldredge for an analysis and report to BOARS. After receiving the campus reports, BOARS will prepare a systemwide report. BOARS reviewed tables prepared by UCOP comparing average high school GPA, SAT score, first-year UC GPA, first-year persistence rate, and first-year probation rate (first-year UC GPA below 2.0) for CA resident, domestic nonresident, and international applicants at each campus and systemwide. These were revised versions of the draft tables presented at the previous BOARS meeting, proposed for inclusion in BOARS' annual summary assessment of how campuses are meeting the "compare-favorably" standard (replacing the single table with systemwide aggregate data presented last year). It was decided by consensus that these versions of the tables would be included in the annual report. Furthermore, the tables with data pertaining to the previous two admissions cycles will be shared with campuses as soon as possible, so that any discrepancies in campus-reported GPAs and those recorded by UCOP can be identified.

UCOP is investigating small discrepancies noted between its own GPA data and campus-reported GPA data. The discrepancies may be due to the fact that the GPA reported on the application has to be verified and in some cases recalculated based on the actual transcript. In addition, campuses often convert international GPAs to the United States scale. It was agreed that the compare favorably reports should be based on campus transcript-verified and converted GPAs.

It was noted that the data show that on all campuses, nonresidents are more likely to withdraw from a campus after the first year. It was also noted that the compare favorably policy refers to admitted students, not enrolled students, and that residency status for tuition purposes is determined at the SIR stage.

VIII.   Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review

BOARS' Annual Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review is due January 31, 2016. UCOP has provided updates to the application, admission, and enrollment data used in January 2015 report. BOARS members are asked to review the summary of their campus's comprehensive review process appearing on pages 32 to 39 of the January 2015 report, and to update and rewrite if necessary to ensure it is still valid.

It was noted that the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) pool of admits who are not also eligible for a guarantee through the statewide index, includes a much larger proportion of underrepresented minority and first-generation college students than the general pool of admits, but those students are more often being accommodated at less selective UC campuses. It would be helpful for all campuses to maximize consideration of ELC status in admissions.

IX.   Course Identification Numbering System

The C-ID system identifies comparable lower division major preparation courses at the 113 California Community Colleges (CCC), based on course "descriptors" that define course content and objectives. Courses with aligned content are identified as similar and are given a C-ID number. The C-ID number helps CCC transfers identify courses approved as meeting articulation standards at CSU campuses and allows CSU to make more uniform decisions about transfer credit. The state has asked UC to consider C-ID as an additional number for comparable courses at UC campuses.

UC currently articulates UC and CCC courses in two stages. First, at the systemwide level, UCOP articulation staff review a CCC course outline against guidelines developed by UC faculty to determine whether the course meets basic standards for transferability and at least GE elective credit at a UC campus. 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 with a specific course in the department and earn credit for degree requirements.

A UCOP analysis found that only 18% of the 73,000 UC-transferrable CCC courses in UC's database have a C-ID descriptor and C-ID number. Another 46% of the courses could potentially qualify for C-IDs based on the discipline of the course; 28% have no C-ID available.

C-ID can help simplify the UC articulation process and reduce workload by eliminating the need for a UC campus to conduct individual reviews of courses identified as similar at up to 113 CCCs. Because a C-ID number encompasses courses at multiple CCCs that have been vetted and approved as similar, UC faculty would need to review only the single descriptor tied to the C-ID

number. On the other hand, there are ways that C-ID could limit UC's freedom to control curriculum content. For example, some Statway courses submitted for articulation with introductory statistics are being denied a C-ID number because the C-ID descriptor requires transferrable math courses to have an Intermediate Algebra prerequisite. This conflicts with UC's approach to Statway.

BOARS members discussed several options for UC's participation in C-ID. One is for BOARS to encourage campuses to use C-IDs for local course-to-course articulation. UC faculty could review existing C-ID descriptors and flag the acceptable ones, and also be encouraged to participate in the intersegmental faculty work groups who develop and review course descriptors that align with the C-ID numbers. Another option is to maintain UC's existing TCA review process. BOARS may also want to discuss standards for transferrable courses offered in an online instructional mode.

ACTION: A summary of options will be provided to BOARS members for discussion in local committees.

X.   Honors "a-g" Policy Revisions

BOARS reviewed five proposed revisions to the [guidelines](#) for UC-approved high school-created "a-g" honors courses eligible to receive a one point GPA "bump." Four revisions relate to specific subject areas, and one relates to the general requirements for school-created honors courses. The revisions to areas "b", "f", and "e" were proposed by faculty work groups.

1. Area "b" (English). The area "b" work group proposes reducing the prerequisite for honors-level courses from two years of college preparatory composition and reading, to one year, to align with the new general honors guideline allowing 10th grade courses to be eligible for a UC honors designation.

2. Area "f" (Visual and Performing Arts). The area "f" work group proposes reducing the prerequisite for honors-level courses from two years of college preparatory work in the discipline, to one year, to align with the new general honors guideline allowing 10th grade courses to be eligible for a UC honors designation.

3. Area "e" (Language other than English). The area "e" work group proposes tying LOTE honors course requirements to language proficiency levels, rather than the student's grade level, to align with the new general honors guideline allowing 10th grade courses to be eligible for a UC honors designation. For example, given that a 10th grade student may be in a 4th or 5th year of a foreign language, the Guidelines would require LOTE courses to be advanced level (at least level 3) to receive a UC honors designation. It also proposes exempting advanced LOTE courses from the guideline requiring schools to offer a non-honors equivalent at the same frequency as the honors-level course in that subject.

4. Area "g" (college preparatory elective). No subject-specific honors guidelines are currently listed for area "g". The proposal is to refer to the general "a-g" honors guidelines as the criteria for area "g" honors courses.

5. Finally, a change is proposed to the general requirements for school-created honors courses. It would be "highly recommended" that high schools offer a non-honors equivalent at the same frequency as an honors-level course in a given subject, rather than required that they do so.

ACTION: BOARS will discuss the proposed changes with their admissions committees.

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

BOARS reviewed a revised statement first discussed by BOARS at the end of last year addressing concerns from some parents of advanced students that the new Common Core math pathway will disrupt the normal path to advanced mathematics in middle and high schools and disadvantage their child in UC admissions. In short, it will be more difficult to take calculus in high school under the Common Core.

The statement notes that taking calculus in junior year is not important for UC admission, that no single course, including calculus, determines admission to UC, and that every UC campus admits a significant fraction of students who have taken only the three of years of math required for basic UC eligibility. It notes that students who take advanced math before they are ready can become frustrated and lose interest in the topic. Moreover, poor performance in calculus is more likely to weaken a student's application than to strengthen it; and the UC admit rate is substantially lower among students who scored a "C" or lower in calculus. The statement also notes, on the other hand, that taking calculus in high school has advantages for students interested in certain fields, and it recommends that high schools maintain calculus and other advanced math courses as options for enthusiastic and well-prepared students.

There was some concern that the statement sends an unclear message in saying "no campus gives special weight to calculus in admissions," when some campuses may be considering calculus in decisions about admission to certain majors such as engineering.

ACTION: **BOARS members will bring the statement back to their committees for review and input, and will check and confirm the role of calculus in admissions decisions for specific majors.**

XII.   Executive Session

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