

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**
BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS

Minutes of Meeting
April 3, 2015

I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS Draft Minutes of March 6, 2015

ACTION: BOARS approved the March minutes.

II. Announcements

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

April Council Meeting: Council voted to endorse a Statement on Academic Freedom and Civility proposed by the University Committee on Academic Freedom, which emphasizes the preeminent value of academic freedom in campus speech. Council also spent an hour with Regent Eloy Ortiz Oakley, and voted to nominate UC Davis Professor James Chalfant as 2015-2016 Senate Vice Chair.

Transfer Streamlining: The Senate and UCOP are scheduling meetings of campus representatives from several majors to explore the degree to which they can align their lower division transfer admission requirements. This effort to streamline transfer admission follows the Senate's [approval](#) in 2012 of amendments to Senate Regulation 476 that guarantee a comprehensive review to CCC transfers who complete any one of three preparation pathways, including the completion of an "SB 1440" Associate Degree for Transfer or a UC Transfer Curriculum in the relevant major. The meetings will focus on the development of a set of major-specific lower-division courses, the completion of which will ensure that a transfer applicant with a competitive GPA is competitive for admission and prepared to graduate from a UC within two years after matriculation.

Joint Meeting with CSU AAC: BOARS will hold its biannual half-day joint meeting with the CSU Admission Advisory Council (AAC) on June 5.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Mary Gilly, Academic Senate Chair*
- *Dan Hare, Academic Senate Vice Chair*

Transfer Streamlining Meetings: Campus representatives from four life sciences majors will meet in Oakland on April 7, followed by representatives from the natural sciences and social sciences later in April, to discuss differences and similarities in pre-major requirements in an attempt to reach agreement about the lower division courses transfer students need as preparation for those majors. The goal is to provide better information to community college transfers who want to prepare simultaneously for multiple UC campuses in the same major, and to help ensure that transfers arrive at UC better prepared to do UC-level work.

March Regents Meeting: The Regents discussed the progress of the Select Advisory Committee on the Cost Structure of the University, and the UCB Chancellor and UCB Senate Chair made a joint presentation, requested by Regent Kieffer, on the origins and structure of American undergraduate education, which inspired a discussion about admissions policy, access, and diversity. The Regents discussed UC's student veteran services and voted to exempt some military veterans and their dependents from nonresident tuition; one Regent suggested that UC should award general education credit for military service experience.

Visits by Governor's Staff: Senior policy staff members from the Governor's Office and the Department of Finance are touring UC campuses and plan to visit several southern campuses and Davis this month. UCOP has asked campuses to ensure a role for the Senate in the meetings. The staff members are also planning to attend a portion of upcoming systemwide Senate committees meetings, including BOARS on May 1. It is expected that BOARS will receive questions from them in advance. A BOARS member noted that the meeting will be an opportunity to convey important messages to policy makers about, for example, restraints that budget shortfalls place on UC's ability to accommodate eligible California residents.

IV. Consultation with UCOP

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Michael Trevino, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Han Mi Soon-Wu, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

Preliminary Admissions Outcomes: AVP Handel summarized preliminary data on freshman admissions offers for fall 2015. He noted that freshmen have until May 1 to submit a Statement of Intent to Register, and emphasized that the actual enrolled student body will differ. He said UC is currently enrolling more than 6000 unfunded undergraduates and that the President has directed campuses not to exceed last year's enrollment targets for California residents, absent additional state funding. To meet this directive, campuses were more conservative than usual in their initial set of admissions offers, which caused the total number of offers to decline compared to last year; however, they will gradually increase as campuses turn to wait lists. The enrollment cap has affected all applicant groups, including underrepresented minorities, although URM students do not appear to be affected disproportionately, and admissions directors think they can gain additional diversity through the wait lists. He noted that four of the less selective campuses participate in a nonresident referral pool but UC does not extend a referral guarantee commitment to nonresidents; in addition, all campuses, not just Merced, have access to the files of eligible California residents who were denied admission to campuses where they applied. Consultant Handel agreed to disseminate among and encourage all campus admissions directors to review the pool of applicants in the CA-resident referral pool, who were eligible for freshman admission to UC but not accepted to a campus to which they applied.

Implementation of New SAT: Last year, BOARS voted to [adopt the redesigned SAT](#) as an acceptable admissions exam effective for the 2016 cycle. The new test will be administered for the first time in March 2016. UCOP expects most students to take the current version of the SAT for the 2016 admissions cycle, but because every year a handful of UC applicants typically submit exam scores after March to clear the examination requirement, UCOP is proposing to allow students to submit scores from the new SAT next year, to clear the requirement. UC expects that by fall 2018 it will receive scores mostly from the new version of the SAT.

It was noted that UC admitted nearly 800 students last year through the [Admissions by Examination](#) pathway ([Senate Regulation 440](#)). Students entering UC this way do not meet the normal admissions requirements and have often been homeschooled. They are asked to meet a significantly higher score on the SAT or ACT than students entering through other eligibility pathways. They undergo a comprehensive review, but are not eligible for the referral pool. Some campuses also admit homeschooled students through Admission by Exception. UCOP staff were asked to provide details about the examination requirements at the next BOARS meeting.

Transfer Streamlining: The Senate is taking the lead and UCOP is providing support for the transfer streamlining meetings. UC hopes to align transfer pathways for ten majors this year and for an additional 11 majors next year. The recommendations established at the meetings will go back to the campuses for review through regular channels and processes.

V. Compare Favorably Report

BOARS reviewed a short draft report summarizing systemwide outcomes in the context of the compare favorably standard.

ACTION: BOARS approved the report with minor corrections.

VI. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittees

BOARS separated into two subcommittees to review materials provided by UCOP.

1. Revised Transferrable Course Agreement Guidelines (TCA) for Field Studies, Independent Study, Online Courses, and Variable Topics Courses

The UCOP Transfer Articulation unit uses the criteria in the TCA Guidelines to assess CCC courses for general baseline UC transferability, which does not limit the ability of campuses to make specific credit decisions. The guidelines summarize the characteristics of transferrable courses, list prerequisites (if any), and any signals of non-transferability. UCOP has been convening faculty advisory groups to review TCA guidelines for eight specific subject areas (engineering & computer science, English, history, mathematics & statistics, social science, science, visual & performing arts, and world languages) and recommend to BOARS changes or additions for each area. The BOARS subcommittee is asked to review guidelines for CCC courses in four areas that do not fit into a specific subject: field studies, independent study, distance education/online courses, and variable-topic courses.

Subcommittee members noted that it is difficult to determine transfer equivalency for research-based independent study courses and field studies courses offered at the CCC. Some of these courses may use a pass/fail assessment instead of letter grades and it is unclear that “research” at the CCC and UC reflects similar quality and expectations. It was suggested that the Guidelines require the enrolling UC campus to consider the method of student evaluation before awarding transfer credit. The subcommittee will review another revision at a later meeting.

2. Recommended Actions on AP/IB Exams

The subcommittee considered recommendations from UC Faculty Content Experts charged with determining whether UC should award elective credit for scores of 3, 4, or 5 on redesigned versions of the AP exams in the following subject areas: AP Art History, Chemistry, European History, French Language and Culture, German Language and Culture, Latin, Physics 1, Physics 2, and U.S. History and for a score of 5, 6, or 7 on IB Further Math. UC [policy](#) allows campuses to grant elective credit for scores of 3 or higher on AP exams and scores of 5 or higher on the IB exams, but campus faculty can determine the amount and kind of credit based on a given exam score, which may be higher than the minimum. The subcommittee agreed with the content experts' recommendations to accept the revised AP exams but table the IB exams pending further study.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded for BOARS to approve the nine revised AP exams and one revised IB exam. The motion passed unanimously.

AP Capstone: The subcommittee also discussed the pending UC faculty review of the new [AP Capstone](#) curriculum. AP Capstone includes two required courses: [AP Seminar](#), which some California high schools began offering this year and is a prerequisite to [AP Research](#), which will be implemented in the 2015-16 academic year. The curriculum exposes students to general research tools and principles and culminates in an academic research paper and oral presentation. Students who earn scores of 3 or higher in both AP Seminar and AP Research and on four additional AP Exams of their choosing will receive the AP Capstone "Diploma." AP Capstone has been approved for area "g," but UC needs to identify faculty content experts to determine whether a Capstone Diploma should qualify a student for UC elective credit. It is not obvious who those experts should be, because the Capstone curriculum does not align with a specific subject area.

A BOARS member noted that it would be inconsistent for BOARS to approve advanced placement credit for Capstone but not transfer credit for research-based independent study courses offered at the community colleges. The two issues should be considered together. UC should encourage interest in research and the development of research skills in K-14, but it is also important to ensure the quality and integrity of the assessment structure.

ACTION: BOARS will review the AP Capstone materials to decide whether UC should award elective credit for AP Seminar and AP Research, and the appropriate exam or assessment score required to receive elective credit.

VII. Review of ICAS Natural Sciences Competencies

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) has asked faculty from each higher education segment to review its draft "Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen." Senate Chair Gilly asked BOARS to review the statement on behalf of the UC Senate. The document updates a 1988 ICAS statement to reflect the State's adoption of the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS).

To help inform BOARS' discussion, Chair Aldredge sent questions to Arnold Bloom and Terry Nathan, two Davis professors who represent UC on the ICAS work group that wrote the Statement. Their answers were included with the agenda. They indicated that the authors of the Statement wanted to emphasize that high school students should ideally be enrolled in a science

course in each year of high school; however, they avoided recommending a mandate for four years, recognizing that many schools lack the resources to meet it and that high schools will use a variety of approaches to incorporate NGSS expectations into their curriculums. The authors also believe it is unclear that Earth and Space Science (ESS) can satisfy area “d” (laboratory science) as it stands, and suggested that UC should wait to consider changes to area “d” until it becomes clearer how high schools will modify their science curricula to implement the NGSS.

It was noted that area “d” currently requires two, and recommends three years of courses in the areas of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics; although the majority of UC admits take four science courses. Last year a UC faculty work group revised the [area “d” guidelines](#) to reference the NGSS, and BOARS has now been asked to consider revisions to area “d” that align with the NGSS. A central question is whether area “d” will continue to identify the three core laboratory science disciplines as Biology, Chemistry, and Physics, or change to reflect the four core NGSS categories—Physical Sciences, Life Sciences, Earth and Space Sciences, and Engineering, Technology and Applications of Science—and broaden the scope beyond only “laboratory sciences”.

It was noted that the assumption that ESS courses are less rigorous than biology, chemistry, and physics may be outdated, particularly now that there are national and state science standards that include ESS. California high schools will be developing science curriculum that aligns with the four new content areas under the NGSS, including integrated science courses, but the current language of area “d” is based on an old curricular framework that categorizes the sciences in a more traditional, single-disciplinary fashion. The ICAS Statement does not appear to align explicitly with the new NGSS areas, and may inadvertently suggest little change to the area “d” requirement as is. UC needs continued flexibility in redefining area “d”. It was noted that the Statement could be stronger if it more clearly mapped the way to potential changes in area “d,” and that the “a-g” requirements have a significant influence on what courses CA high schools choose to design and teach.

It was agreed that BOARS should continue to discuss potential changes to area “d” that will align the requirements more closely with the NGSS. BOARS should also consider the impact of any change on diversity and on less-resourced schools that may not be able to offer more expensive and/or larger number of courses.

ACTION: A response will be drafted for review at the May meeting.

VIII. International Application Evaluation and Analysis of TOEFL

BOARS discussed how campuses use scores from the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) to assess the English proficiency of non-native English-speaking applicants, and reviewed an analysis of the relationships between TOEFL scores and academic success at UC for cohorts of international students who submitted different ranges of scores and entered UC between 2010 and 2013. In 2012, UC established a minimum TOEFL score of 80 for applicants who complete all high school in a non-English-speaking country.

The analysis shows that without controlling for other factors, TOEFL scores are to some degree related to student academic success; students with higher scores are more likely to have higher

first and second year UC GPAs and persistence rates. Students scoring less than 90 are more likely to have GPAs below 2.00, qualifying them for academic probation.

A second analysis considers outcomes of UC international students who did not submit a TOEFL score (admitted by exception) or were not required to do so (graduated from a California high school or come from an English-speaking country). The analysis shows that international students who graduated from a CA high school had significantly higher probation rates and lower persistence rates than the other two groups. It was noted that these groups are also relatively small and the data carry a higher margin of error.

BOARS also discussed the TOEFL in 2013 and found that 80 was a relatively low minimum score compared to some peer universities that set a minimum score of 100. BOARS felt then that requiring a higher score might help UC admit international students who are more likely to succeed. BOARS also requested an analysis of the relative power of the four TOEFL sub-scores in predicting success at UC. It was noted that the Educational Testing Service only recently began sending TOEFL sub-score data to UCOP, which UCOP has been sharing with campuses. There may now be enough data for an initial analysis of the sub-scores.

A member noted that in the current environment of increasing selectivity for both residents and nonresidents, and increasing political scrutiny of nonresident admissions, UC should not be admitting nonresidents who carry significant potential impediments to success. It was noted that remedial education and other campus services that support underprepared students are costly. It would appear that raising the minimum score to 100 would align the predicted probation rate for international students to that of native English-speaking students.

ACTION: For the May meeting, UCOP will provide an analysis of sub-scores and BOARS will continue its discussion about increasing the TOEFL minimum to 100 minimum.

IX. Campus Reports

Several BOARS members reported on local admissions activities and issues.

A **San Diego** analysis concluded that the decline in students majoring in Sociology there is an effect of the campus ending its participation in the Transfer Admission Guarantee program and of the increase in nonresidents on campus. **Berkeley** is developing a concise public document explaining its admissions policies and processes, reviewing a new major-based transfer admission policy proposal, and considering how to implement finer scoring gradations for files in the upper range of holistic review, particularly for highly selective majors like engineering. **Irvine** is discussing how the recent controversy over the display of national flags in the lobby of student government offices could impact admissions. The **Santa Cruz** committee is preparing a response to the Black Experience Team report commissioned by the chancellor to recommend ways to attract and admit more ABC (African, Black, and Caribbean) students and improve campus climate for them. In anticipation of reaching a less than 50% acceptance rate this year, **Riverside** is discussing how to incorporate more of the non-cognitive comprehensive review factors into its weighting system, as well as the role of the Honors AP bump in weighting. The **Davis** committee is modifying a policy that gave registration priority to students with more completed units; AP units will no longer count toward the total after objections from international and California students. Davis was also surprised at a finding that admitted students

from disadvantaged backgrounds and a given holistic review score performed only slightly less well compared to students from higher ranking schools with the same score.

X. Executive Session

Notes were not taken for this portion of the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Ralph Aldredge