I. Consent Calendar

1. February 5, 2016 BOARS Draft Agenda
2. January 8, 2016 BOARS Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

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

Response to Computer Science Letter: The Lieutenant Governor has responded to BOARS’ January 14 letter on the issue of expanding computer science education and allowing high school computer science courses to count toward the core mathematics (area “c”) requirement for freshman admission. His letter to BOARS invites further dialogue about the possibility of broadening the scope of computer science courses that could be approved for areas “c” or “d”, the need to expand opportunity to students in lower resourced schools, as well as the lack of K-12 content standards for CS and credentialing issues that may be hindering progress.

Admissions Directors Meeting: Chair Aldredge participated in a recent meeting of campus admissions directors who are interested in BOARS’ proposed statement on calculus and the upcoming “compare favorably” review of nonresident admission outcomes. Directors are also seeking clarification about a high school student’s ability to validate the geometry requirement. There is some concern that a student who has not taken geometry is not eligible for UC even if the student has validated geometry with higher level math. Some campuses are admitting these students through Admissions by Exception. BOARS should discuss the issue at a future meeting.

III. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair

January Regents Meeting: Chair Hare’s comments focused on how campuses will meet the challenge of enrolling 10,000 more resident undergraduates over the next three years, and concerns that UC quality could suffer without a proportional number of additional faculty, staff, and physical infrastructure to support a larger student population. UCOP made a presentation on fall 2016 undergraduate application outcomes, and an ensuing discussion noted that the enrollment plan is also an opportunity to increase diversity. The Regents also approved a new student advisor position and tabled a set of proposed increases to professional degree supplemental tuition.
Work Group on Principles of Intolerance: The Work Group has forwarded a revised proposed Statement against Intolerance to the chair of the Regents. The Statement condemns acts of intolerance, addresses the need to protect free speech and academic freedom, and distinguishes protected speech from the consequences of unprotected acts of intolerance. An appendix to the Statement lists specific examples of intolerance.

Joint Committee on Faculty Discipline: The Joint Committee is investigating campus and systemwide policies and processes for the investigation, adjudication, and discipline of sexual misconduct cases involving UC faculty. It has found less need to change written policy than to improve understanding about existing policies and to increase the consistency of Title IX policy implementation across campuses.

January Academic Council meeting: Council endorsed a plan for the evaluation of seven College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams for possible UC credit by systemwide UC faculty committees. Each committee will determine the extent to which a given exam measures UC-level knowledge, covers in sufficient breadth and depth the content of a lower division UC course or courses, and prepares students for the next level of coursework in a given department. Senate division chairs were asked to provide lists of faculty content experts for the committees, who will report to BOARS and UCEP. If any exam is determined to be acceptable, there will be a follow up discussion about how individual campus departments might use it.

Council also discussed a decision by UCOP to implement a program monitoring UC internet traffic for suspicious patterns of activity, following a cyber-attack on UCLA last year. The University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) issued a statement about UCOP’s response to the cyber-attack. Council also endorsed best practices recommended by the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity, for hiring President’s Postdoctoral Fellows and Chancellor’s Fellows into UC faculty positions. Council also discussed the Report and Recommendations of the Retirement Options Task Force, currently under systemwide review. The Senate is gathering responses from divisions and systemwide committees and will send its perspectives to the President by February 15.

IV. Campus Reports

Several campus committees are discussing strategies for accommodating their campus’s share of new resident enrollments; the housing, faculty, and laboratory space needed to accommodate the enrollments; and the extent to which enrollment pressure could disproportionately impact specific disciplines and majors. UCI and UCR are discussing how to improve outreach to increase the enrollment of African-American and Native American students. UCR is discussing the role of non-cognitive factors, such as high school leadership activities and community service work, in predicting first-year success. UCSB is discussing new admissions measures that aim to assist impacted departments by shifting some selection of students towards departments in the humanities and social sciences with capacity to grow. Separately, the committee is analyzing data about the academic performance of international students by major to assist in the selection of students or to produce recommendations for the campus to help students with language deficiencies. UCD is examining factors that may contribute to a slightly higher average time-to-degree at Davis compared to other campuses. UCLA is gathering data on admission to the
campus across the 9x9 spectrum. UCLA also clarified that all international applications receive two reads, but that applications with low initial holistic scores are read only by staff. The UCSD committee is discussing a request from the chancellor to accept more ELC-only students, strategies for increasing the yield of URM and high achieving students, and Turning the Tide, a Harvard University report that recommends ways to reshape the college admissions process. UCM is moving to bring the activities and meeting frequency of its Admissions Committee in line with those of other UC campuses. A group of Berkeley faculty met with a group of Regents to discuss strategies for increasing diversity and Berkeley’s new policy on letters of recommendation. It was noted that 38% of Berkeley applicants were in the group invited to submit letters of recommendation; 98% of those invited to send letters actually did. UCSF is holding a Town Hall meeting to discuss the report of the Retirement Options Task Force.

V. Consultation with UCOP
   o Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions
   o Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
   o Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions
   o Lisa Garcia, Special Assistant, Systemwide Admissions Initiatives

Regents Presentation: At the January Regents meeting, the Office of Admissions presented fall 2016 application outcomes, noting that UC has received enough high-quality applications to allow it to meet the plan approved by the Regents to enroll 5,000 new CA residents next year. The presentation also emphasized that UC’s comprehensive review policy allows UC to take into account multiple factors, not just GPA and SAT.

ELC Initiative: A new pilot program initiated by UCOP is promoting the admission of more applicants eligible for UC through the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) path only, and who attend under-resourced high schools designated as Local Control Funding Formula (LCFF) “Plus.” President Napolitano proposed the pilot to the Council of Chancellors as a way to increase diversity through current policy. The ELC-only group is relatively small (10,000), but includes a significant number of students from underrepresented populations. About 5,000 of the 10,000 ELC-only students attend LCFF+ high schools. Currently 34% of ELC students are not admitted to a campus to which they apply, and enter the referral pool to be eligible for an offer from UC Merced. UCOP hopes the pilot will result in the admission of more ELC-only students directly to campuses across the system, and also produce a higher yield of those students. Students admitted from the ELC-only pool perform well in comparison to other eligibility groups. UCOP will begin flagging both cohorts of students in the next application pool.

Discussion: BOARS members agreed that ELC is a significant pathway to UC for diverse students, but noted that there are also challenges associated with taking more ELC-only students. Members requested application, admission, and SIR data related to the ELC-only group for each campus, as well as data about their UC performance. UCOP agreed to provide data on ELC-only students by campus.

VI. Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements & Comprehensive Review
The report to the Regents is now due by February 12. Tables and figures have been updated to reflect outcomes from 2015, and BOARS members have verified and updated the section on campus score sharing. Members noted that yield rates for African Americans and Native Americans continue to fall short of goals and expectations, despite repeated attempts to move the needle with outreach and better messaging about financial aid. A new model is needed. It was noted that generous financial offers draw minority students away from UC, and that without an existing critical mass cohort of minority students on a campus, it is more difficult to attract additional students from similar backgrounds. It was noted that the increased enrollment targets may have a significant impact the referral pool in the future.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded for BOARS to approve the report pending minor corrections. The motion passed unanimously.

VII. Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID)

BOARS reviewed a revised proposal for UC’s participation in C-ID. The proposal is to maintain the existing first-level, systemwide articulation review process to determine initial UC transferability of California Community College (CCC) courses; and then to pilot the use of C-IDs at the second level of review for course-to-course articulation of a select number of UC Transfer Pathways to establish UC systemwide articulation for as many Pathway course expectations as possible. At its January meeting, the Academic Council supported BOARS’ consideration of this pilot approach to C-ID.

UCOP articulation staff analyzed a sampling of Transfer Pathways to determine which ones have C-ID descriptors attached to each of the systemwide Pathway course expectations the UC faculty have agreed upon. The Mathematics, Chemistry, and Physics Pathways were selected for the pilot based on their having a high level of overlapping course expectations. All include the same basic math sequence: Single Variable Calculus, Multivariable Calculus, and Differential Equations. As a result, there are fewer than a dozen C-ID descriptors that would require UC to review for the three pathways. It is anticipated that UC faculty from the relevant discipline would review each course expectation against the relevant C-ID descriptor to determine a match. It is also expected that the faculty’s approval of a C-ID descriptor for a course in a given pathway would also apply to the same course in other pathways—e.g., a chemistry course descriptor certified by chemistry faculty for the Chemistry Transfer Pathway would also satisfy the same chemistry course requirement in the Physics Transfer Pathway.

It was noted that the pilot will help UC fill gaps in the articulation of courses in the three pathways on all nine campuses, and be a positive demonstration of UC’s progress on C-ID for the current year. It was agreed that the proposal should emphasize the pilot nature of the plan for UC’s participation. It was noted that an articulation agreement on a campus can include multiple C-ID numbers and that a CSU course with a C-ID course descriptor does not imply or guarantee CSU-to-UC campus articulation of the course.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded that BOARS approve the proposal and convey the decision to the Academic Council.
VIII. Implementation of the Redesigned SAT

The College Board will administer a redesigned version of the SAT exam for the first time in March 2016. In June 2014, BOARS voted to adopt the 2016 SAT as an acceptable test effective for 2016 UC admissions, following a meeting with the College Board and a review of the specifications for the 2016 test. BOARS is now asked to make implementation decisions about the test for fall 2017 admissions. The old test includes three sections – Math, Critical Reading, and Writing, with an Essay included in the Writing score. The 2016 test includes two sections – Math, and Evidence-Based Reading & Writing (the latter includes a Reading test and a Writing and Language test). In addition, the new test has an Essay section, which is now optional. BOARS decided in 2014 to require UC applicants to complete the Essay.

Transition Period: In 2014, BOARS recommended that there be a transition period during which prospective UC students could submit scores from both the existing SAT and from the redesigned SAT. The old SAT was administered for the final time in January 2016. UCOP now asks BOARS to opine more precisely on the length of the transition period in which UC will continue to accept the old SAT. UCOP recommends that applicants be allowed to submit scores for the old exam through the fall 2019 admissions cycle, to accommodate any current high school students that may have taken that exam. The class of 2019 includes students who are currently high school freshmen. BOARS agreed that SAT scores prior to March 2016 will be accepted for high school graduates through the class of 2019.

Statewide Index: BOARS is also asked to decide how scores from the new test will be used in the statewide index that determines whether a student ranks in the top 9% of high school graduates. In May 2016, the College Board will release concordance tables for the new SAT sections that translate scores between the old and new tests. However, the 2016 Essay is on a different scoring system, and there is no way to easily concord it for use in the statewide index. Currently, UC combines scores on the SAT Math and Critical Reading sections and translates them into a “UC Score.” It then converts the Writing section score into a UC Score that is combined with the first UC Score into a total UC Score that determines the top 9%. For the 2016 test, UCOP is recommending that the UC Score be derived by converting scores from sections in the 2016 test into equivalent scores used for sections in the current test, in the following manner:

- Translate 2016 SAT (Math) section to old SAT Math
- Translate 2016 SAT (Reading test) score to old SAT Critical Reading
- Combine translated Critical Reading + Math total to produce a UC Score.
- Translate 2016 SAT (Writing & Language test) score to old SAT Writing and UC Score equivalent.
- Add the two UC Scores together to produce the UC Score total.

Admission by Exam: Admission by Exam is based on minimum scores from the ACT with Writing or SAT Reasoning Test and two SAT Subject Tests. Since the 2012 admission policy was silent on Admission by Exam, the 2006 formula and UC Score translation tables enacted for fall 2006 remain active. It is recommended that UC continue to use the 2006 formula and UC Score translation tables enacted for fall 2006, using concordance tables for the 2016 SAT.
Area “b” requirement: Currently, applicants who present an SAT Writing section score of 560 can satisfy the first three years of the four-year area “b” requirement. A score of 680 can satisfy the entire requirement. It is proposed that UC use concordance scores for the new SAT Writing & Language test to the old SAT Writing section equivalent, until data are available for the new SAT Essay score that UC can use to conduct validity research on freshman outcomes.

English Proficiency: Students who have taken fewer than three years of high school in which the primary language of instruction was English need to demonstrate English proficiency. Currently an SAT Writing section score of 560 or higher demonstrates proficiency. It is proposed that UC use concordance score for new SAT Writing & Language test score to the SAT Writing section equivalent.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded for BOARS to approve the recommendations for the five areas, including the transition plan requiring applicants to submit scores from the new SAT only, beginning with the high school graduating class of 2020. The motion passed unanimously.

A BOARS member noted that students who express themselves in non-standard English writing in the vernacular of local communities and environments, should be supported, and their writing acknowledged as valuable.

IX. Compare Favorably Data Update
   ○ Tonghsan Chang, Content Manager, Institutional Research and Academic Planning

All campuses have responded to UCOP’s request for information about the extent to which they recalculate GPAs after verifying information on the official transcript against missing or incorrect self-reported application information, or to account for variances in international GPA scales. Content Manager Chang indicated that he has enough information to assemble the campus compare favorably reports, and will provide those reports in time for the March BOARSS meeting.

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

BOARS reviewed a revised draft statement on the role of calculus in admissions. The statement is intended to address 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. Professor Zieve has revised the statement to address questions and concerns noted by BOARS members in January.

The statement notes that studying calculus in high school is especially helpful for students majoring in disciplines with highly sequential coursework such as engineering, math, and the physical sciences. It was noted that economics should be added to the list of disciplines.

ACTION: a motion was made and seconded to approve the statement. The motion passed unanimously.
UCOP articulation staff have asked to review the statement to ensure it contains no unintentionally confusing messages. Chair Aldredge will inform BOARS about any substantive changes proposed for the approved letter.

XI. BOARS Statement on Consultation

BOARS reviewed a draft statement affirming the value of system-wide discussions and consultations about changes being considered for admissions practices and policies at the individual campuses.

“BOARS affirms the value of systemwide discussions and consultations regarding changes being considered for admissions practices and policies at the individual campuses. To this end, faculty representatives are encouraged to provide updates on substantive changes being considered at their campus at monthly BOARS meetings. Time will be made available at the meetings for this purpose.”

It was noted that intention is not to require campuses to submit a policy/practice change for formal approval/vote at BOARS, nor for BOARS to micromanage local decision making, but to promote the sharing of best practices and potential changes with systemwide implications.

ACTION: It was agreed that BOARS members will share the draft statement with their committees.

XII. Executive Session

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