

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of Meeting

April 1, 2016

I. Consent Calendar

1. April 1, 2016 BOARS Agenda
2. March 4, 2016 BOARS Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

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

Budget Audit Report: A report from the state auditor criticizes UC's nonresident admission practices and the "compare favorably" standard for nonresident admission. The report claims that UC deliberately lowered admissions standards for nonresidents to replace revenue lost in the budget crisis. The President's [response](#) to the auditor and a new UC report, [Straight Talk on Hot-Button Issues](#), attempts to counter the auditor's assertions, purporting that the audit is based on an outdated interpretation of the 1960 Master Plan standard for nonresident admission and that the University is meeting its Master Plan obligation to all state-funded California residents.

IGETC Standards Subcommittee: Chair Aldredge and Vice Chair Sanchez attended the March 28 meeting of the ICAS IGETC Standards Review Subcommittee. The Subcommittee approved a revision to the language of the Mathematical Concepts and Quantitative Reasoning requirement in the [IGETC Standards, Policies, and Procedures](#) handbook. The revision incorporates UC's new perspective that math courses with prerequisites of intermediate algebra or statistics courses that are part of the Carnegie model *Statway* are acceptable to fulfill the quantitative reasoning requirement.

AP Computer Science: Vice Chair Sanchez has asked faculty content experts identified by departments on UC campuses to review the College Board's new AP Computer Science Principles course and exam and make a recommendation to BOARS as to whether UC should approve elective credit for an exam score of 3 or higher. BOARS will review the recommendations at its May meeting.

Area "d" work group: Vice Chair Sanchez is chairing a faculty group that will 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) and make recommendations to BOARS for revisions, as needed. The revision will help signal UC's expectations for how the NGSS will be integrated the K-12 curriculum. The work group will hold a series of teleconference meetings starting later in April.

III. Campus Committee Reports

Several campuses are discussing issues raised in auditor's report about the compare favorably policy. Campuses are also investigating the academic performance of ELC-only students in anticipation that more will be admitted under the ELC admissions pilot program. One campus found that the ELC-only population has lower average persistence rates and GPAs, and it is requesting additional funding from the administration to support the success of the students admitted under the pilot. It was noted that a 2014 UCOP analysis of ELC-only students showed that their UC persistence rates were lower, but still strong (above 70%). It was noted that struggling students often need only a modest intervention to help them adapt and graduate.

UCB asked for letters of recommendation from students who got a "maybe" in the initial read to get more information. Thus, they had to have readers work hard to identify this group in a very compressed timeframe, resulting in some applications getting the request for letters as late as mid-December. UCM is developing a detailed process to guide the operations of the admissions committee, and UCD is discussing the extent to which the Master Plan asks UC to give priority status to CCC transfers. UCSF created a need-based Cost of Living supplement for students who do not live in student housing to help ease the financial burden of living in San Francisco. UCSF recently sponsored an ["Injustice and Health" Teach-in](#) that included a panel discussion about racism, injustice, and health care disparities.

The student representative noted that students are concerned about the potential for nonresidents to displace residents, but they are also aware that nonresident tuition revenue helps maintain affordable tuition for residents. She noted that UCI will be the first public university to offer an e-Sports scholarship program for video game players.

IV. Consultation with Senate Leadership

- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Jim Chalfant, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

Retirement Options: The Regents approved new pension plan terms for UC employees hired on or after July 1, 2016. The approved plan differs in some respects from the one proposed by the Retirement Options Task Force and [reviewed by the Senate](#), particularly in its more generous approach to the Defined Contribution supplement available to faculty. The plan responds to the Academic Council's recommendation to offer a DC supplement for faculty that begins on the first day of hire and the first dollar earned. The effect of the supplement varies with salary, but it will give Assistant Professors not in highly compensated disciplines, such as the Health Sciences, an opportunity to receive about the same replacement income as their colleagues hired under the 2013 tier.

Principles Against Intolerance: The UC Regents also adopted a [Statement of Principles Against Intolerance](#), after accepting a last minute amendment to the Statement's contextual pre-ambule proposed by the University Committee on Academic Freedom and [endorsed by Council](#). The Senate's amendment clarified that "anti-Semitic forms of anti-Zionism" rather than "anti-Zionism" should be considered discrimination, to distinguish anti-Semitism from anti-Zionism – a political viewpoint protected under the First Amendment.

Joint Committee: The Joint Committee is adjusting to several high-profile incidents of sexual harassment at UC campuses that have made headlines, but it is expected to stand by its previous recommendations that existing policies are fundamentally sound but need to be better known and understood by faculty and administrators.

Transfer Pathways: Eleven UC Transfer Pathways have been approved and added to the [systemwide Pathways website](#). In addition, the Senate has developed a procedure for adding smaller, specialized majors on specific campuses to an existing Pathway, in recognition that the Pathways may provide sufficient pre-major preparation for related majors. Several majors in physics, economics, and the life sciences at several campuses have linked to an existing Transfer Pathway that provides the expected pre-transfer preparation.

V. Consultation with UCOP – Parental Alumni Status on the Application

- *Julie Henderson, Senior Vice President – Public Affairs*
- *Geoffrey A. O’Neill, AVP - Institutional Advancement*
- *John Valva, Executive Director, Alumni and Constituent Affairs*

UCOP guests joined BOARS to discuss a proposal to add a place on the UC application for applicants to designate their parents’ UC alumni status. UCOP developed the proposal in response to the President’s request for new strategies that enhance development prospects with UC alumni. The idea is for development and alumni offices to use information about alumni status for more targeted fundraising, to help build support for the University and maintain academic excellence. The approach aligns with the President’s *UC For Life* initiative, which seeks to steward UC’s relationship with students from the moment they apply, through graduation, and then as parents of future UC applicants.

The application will request optional information about any college the parent may have attended. UCOP representatives noted that they understand that the collection of alumni information could lead to perceptions and fears about “legacy admissions”; however, UC intends to be very clear that the information will be hidden from application reviewers and cannot be used to influence admission decisions. UCOP is seeking input about the most effective means of emphasizing these points in messaging on the application and elsewhere, and of collecting information in a way that enhances UC’s relationship with students, parents, and alumni.

UCOP believes alumni parent fundraising has great potential. Many of UC’s peer institutions collect the information, and those institutions also surpass UC in alumni giving. UC’s current practice to request parental alumni information on the Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) yields information on only 5% of total applicants, and does so several months after the application. Under the proposed approach, fundraising requests to parents of applicants and admitted students could incorporate parental alumni status information for a much larger number of students, which would enable UC campuses to communicate more quickly and effectively with parents and enhance yield and outreach efforts. UCOP’s belief is that an approach that builds personal relationships with families makes good sense.

Discussion: BOARS members agreed that the UC application should not include a place for applicants to designate their parents’ UC alumni status. There was concern that requesting the information could create an impression that it has some bearing on the admission outcome. The public may not understand the intent or nuances of the approach as explained to BOARS, and it may evoke existing narratives about legacy admissions and preferences. A perception that parental alumni status is an admission factor could be particularly strong among certain populations who, when confronted with the question, may be less confident about applying to UC. The approach may also heighten expectations in some alumni about a possible advantage for their child in admissions. Any philanthropic benefits are unlikely to outweigh these potentially

negative impacts. Applicants and parents should understand clearly that the only factors UC considers in the admission decision are the elements of merit defined in comprehensive review. There are other ways of collecting alumni data, and at better times. There is no reason why the assessment of applicants with alumni parents should not occur after admissions decisions have been made. UC should focus attention instead on encouraging students who submit an SIR to report the information.

VI. Consultation with UCOP

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Kiernan Flaherty, UC Deputy to the Chief Financial Officer, State Budget Relations*
- *Julie Henderson, Senior Vice President – Public Affairs*

Fall 2016 Admit Media Release: Preliminary systemwide admissions data indicate that UC admitted 15% more California resident freshmen this year, positioning the University to meet its goal of enrolling an additional 5,000 CA undergraduates in fall 2016. The overall nonresident admission rate also slowed this year. The systemwide admission rate for residents, domestic nonresidents, and international students was 63%, 48%, and 60% respectively. The number and proportion of freshman admits from underrepresented minority groups grew significantly for African-American and Chicano/Latino students. The number of students offered admission through the referral process fell by about 2,500. The proportion of ELC-only students who received an admission offer through the referral pool fell from 30 percent to 22 percent. Preliminary data on transfer admissions will be available next month.

California Audit Report and UC Response: It is rare for a state agency to challenge an audit, but UC decided that the claims made in the audit report were so inaccurate and egregious that it needed to issue a strong defense. The audit concludes that UC has admitted many nonresidents with lower qualifications than California residents based on GPA and test scores, and that nonresidents are taking spaces on UC campuses that should be filled by residents. It also claims that the compare favorably policy was a way for the faculty to ease restrictions on nonresident admission. In its defense, the University notes that it had a number of choices when the state cut its funding by \$1 billion during the Great Recession: it could have reduced enrollment like CSU, or raised tuition even more than it did, but it chose instead to continue enrolling all state-funded residents and increase nonresident enrollment to help support access for California residents and continued academic excellence. Nonresidents also add diversity to campuses. Moreover, UC intends to increase resident enrollment at the university by 10,000 students over the next three years, contingent on state funding.

Discussion: It was noted that nonresidents must meet a higher minimum admission standard just to be considered for a UC admissions review. Moreover, under comprehensive review, applicants are evaluated on 14 standards, not just GPA and SAT. It was noted that the auditor holds UC to the 1960 Master Plan language that nonresidents should be in the “upper half of those ordinarily eligible” The legislature maintains that there has been no official revision of the 1960 Master Plan, only subsequent proposed recommendations that have never been formally adopted by the legislature. The faculty established the compare favorably policy to provide greater guidance to campuses in this context and to clarify that nonresidents should have qualifications that are better than residents. Moreover, the report neglects to mention that the state has not lived up to its own Master Plan commitment to fund CA resident enrollment. It recommends that UC not count referral pool offers from UC Merced toward the Master Plan

target, but fails to mention that no applicant is guaranteed admission to any specific UC campus. The report also disrespects UC Merced by suggesting that a referral offer to UCM should not be counted as a “real” UC admissions offer.

It was noted that UC has been asked to clarify exactly how it uses a nonresident tuition dollar to support additional resident enrollment and increase quality. It has been challenging to identify exactly how a dollar from a specific revenue source is used when those sources are mixed together in a single pool. It was noted that the acceleration of budget rebenching is helping to create more equitable per-student funding across all UC campuses. The state funds resident enrollment through an agreed-upon marginal cost rate of \$10K per student; however, this figure has not changed for years, despite inflationary increases.

VII. Next Steps for Computer Science

Following [correspondence](#) between BOARS and the Lieutenant Governor on the issue of expanding computer science education and allowing high school computer science courses to count toward the core math (area “c”) requirement for freshman admission, UCOP and other constituencies are seeking clarification from BOARS about next steps for BOARS and/or UC to address the challenges of expanding computer science education.

The Lieutenant Governor’s response to BOARS invited further dialogue about several issues. Some state and industry leaders remain hopeful about increasing the number of computer science courses that can be approved for area “c”, or for the laboratory science (“d”) requirement. BOARS’s letter alluded to a possible opportunity for future area “d” approvals in the context of the Next Generation Science Standards’ focus on Applied Science and Technology. It was agreed that the area “d” work group could opine on the issue and add additional faculty members from Computer Science. It was noted that the College Board elected to submit its new AP Computer Science Principles course to UC for the elective (area “g”) requirement.

VIII. Area “c” Requirements and Components

The CSU Senate recently passed a Resolution in Support of Requiring a Fourth Year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning for Admission to CSU. It was suggested that BOARS review and discuss the resolution in the context of the existing area “c” (mathematics) requirement for freshman admissions, and potential changes to area “c” that may better support student preparation in math and intersegmental alignment with the Common Core. It was noted that CSU will be discussing the resolution during the coming year and is interested in a dialogue with BOARS about potentially increasing UC’s area “c” requirement from three to four years.

It was noted that 93% of UC applicants take at least one advanced math course (4th year course), in high school. It was noted that it would make sense for UC to align its math requirement with CSU to the greatest extent possible and that on the surface it would appear unusual for UC to require less math. However, it was also noted that BOARS should be sensitive to the fact that some students in under-resourced high schools may have fewer opportunities to take advanced math.

ACTION: UCOP will provide admissions and demographic data on UC applicants who do not have a fourth year of math.

IX. Statement on the Impact of Calculus on UC Admissions

BOARS reviewed a revised version of the Statement that incorporates clarifications proposed by UCOP Undergraduate Admissions staff. It was noted that the Statement is intended to provide guidance to high school students and other constituencies about the impact of math preparation in the UC admissions decision in the context of the new Common Core math pathways, and to clarify that UC does not require calculus for admission. It was agreed that the final Statement should be posted on the BOARS website.

X. Next Steps for the Course Identification Numbering System Pilot

BOARS was asked to clarify next steps for the C-ID pilot program, expected outcomes, the extent of BOARS’ participation, and metrics for determining its success. It was agreed that a letter will be sent from the BOARS chair to the systemwide faculty work groups who originally approved the UC Transfer Pathways for Math, Chemistry, and Physics, asking them to review the C-ID descriptors against the course expectations for those Pathways. If the C-ID descriptor meets their expectations, and the campus approves, UC will apply C-ID descriptors to close any articulation gaps systemwide for these Pathways. BOARS will review and discuss the outcomes and decide whether to extend the pilot for the rest of the Pathways.

XI. New Business

ACTION: BOARS agreed to send the Academic Council chair a letter summarizing its concerns about the proposal to add a place on the UC application for applicants to designate their parents’ UC alumni status.

XII. Executive Session

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