

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

ACADEMIC SENATE

Minutes of Meeting

May 6, 2016

I. Consent Calendar

1. May 6, 2016 BOARS Agenda
2. April 1, 2016 BOARS Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

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

Joint Meeting with Admissions Directors: BOARS members identified potential topics for the June 24 joint half-day meeting with the campus admissions directors. Several campus Associate Vice Chancellors for Enrollment Management will also attend the meeting. Members agreed that BOARS and the directors should discuss the compare favorably standard for nonresident admission, results from the ELC-only pilot, strategies for expanding diversity, and ways to foster more communication among faculty and admissions directors and between campuses and UCOP.

III. Consultation with Senate Leadership

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

Parental Alumni Status on UC Application: The President has decided to delay implementation of a UCOP proposal to add a place on the UC application for students to designate their parents' UC alumni status. The delay will allow UCOP time to consider and address concerns raised by BOARS and others.

CLEP Exam Review: The Academic Senate will delay consideration of the potential use of College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exams for UC credit after learning that the College Board is willing to provide full exams to faculty review teams only in proctored, in-person sessions, or test guides that include only sample questions. The Senate has noted that a thorough and rigorous appraisal requires the review of questions from current exams and the opportunity for reviewers to consult with faculty colleagues about exam content.

Health Care Changes: Beginning in 2017, Anthem Blue Cross will replace Blue Shield as the third-party administrator for UC's self-funded health plans, including UC Care and the UC Health Savings Plan.

Faculty Salaries: The president has approved a 3% salary increase program for faculty effective July 1, 2016. The plan will be similar to the one implemented last year. A 1.5% increase will be applied to the academic salary scales across-the-board, and the remaining 1.5% through a

discretionary salary program designed by the campus to address issues of inequity, inversion, and compression.

IV. Campus Admission Committee Reports

Berkeley is evaluating outcomes from its letters of recommendation pilot program; Irvine is discussing security protocols to ensure the integrity of SAT and ACT scores submitted by international applicants; and Davis Senate committees are discussing the President's decision to place the Davis chancellor on investigatory leave. The Merced admissions and financial aid subcommittee is discussing how it and the enrollment management subcommittee will integrate efforts on admissions and enrollment planning issues. San Diego is reviewing outcomes for students admitted through the portfolio review pilot program, as it considers expanding the program from theater arts and humanities to other majors. Santa Barbara has asked the administration to provide additional support and academic advising to help ELC students succeed and graduate, and is collaborating with department chairs on admissions and enrollment planning to assist impacted majors. UCSF is implementing a need-based housing supplement for students to help offset the high cost of rental housing.

Several BOARS members reported that their committees review sample applications of students from different holistic score ranges and "at the margins" of admissibility who were either offered or denied admission, to help the faculty understand how their admissions policies are being implemented, and to evaluate tie-breaking decisions. It was noted that the Berkeley committee reviews the 100 "weakest" applications from the admitted pool, and the Riverside committee follows the progress of admitted students from the margins to help inform the committee's consideration of academic success in high school.

V. New Business – Increasing Access and Diversity

Issue: BOARS member Lytle-Hernandez noted that the state audit report asks UC to increase its commitment to Californians and to diversity. She asked BOARS to consider alternative structures for the "9-by-9" eligibility policy that may help expand access to the University and result in admitted classes that better reflect the state's population. One possibility is to expand the 9% Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) guarantee to a larger proportion of high school graduates.

Discussion: BOARS members noted that expanding the ELC guarantee may not have a significant impact on access and diversity unless the more selective UC campuses agree to accommodate more ELC students. There was also concern that ELC status is based on a student's GPA performance in "a-g" courses only, and therefore not fully consistent with a holistic review process that considers 14 factors. It was noted that BOARS should consider the extent to which campuses are able to provide the resources needed to support the success of additional ELC students at UC. Those populations may include a higher proportion of low-income, URM, and students from underserved high schools who may find it more difficult to adjust to the UC culture and environment. It was noted that the size of UC campuses and classrooms may make other institutions a better choice for some students who need more personal support, although it was also noted that UC has an institutional responsibility to create

the conditions that ensure the success of all students. One way to help URM students feel welcomed and part of a supportive campus community is to build a critical mass of diversity.

VI. Consultation with UCOP

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*

Admissions Outcomes: UC expects to admit 16% more California residents this year, placing the University on a path to meet its enrollment target of 5,000 new resident undergraduates. Five of the nine undergraduate campuses are using wait lists to help meet their individual enrollment targets. Admissions data for transfers are not available yet.

Transfer Pathways: UCOP is working with campus point people to identify articulation gaps between specific California Community Colleges (CCCs) and the nine undergraduate UC campuses for specific course expectations of the first 10 [UC Transfer Pathways](#), in order to establish UC systemwide articulation with more CCCs and expand the number of CCCs with complete Pathways. Articulation gaps exist for various reasons, including misaligned course expectations or the lack of a course offering at a particular CCC.

UC Response to Audit: UC continues to push back on several claims made in the state audit report: that BOARS changed to a “compare favorably” policy as an explicit strategy to increase nonresident enrollment; that UC is prioritizing the admission of nonresidents over residents; and that UC is admitting many nonresidents who are less qualified than residents. In its defense, UC emphasizes that BOARS implemented the compare favorably policy to hold individual campuses accountable for the students they admit; that UC’s comprehensive review policy considers 14 factors, not just GPA and test scores; that UC policy prioritizes residents over nonresidents; and that 85% of UC undergraduates are California residents. In addition, the compare favorably policy recognizes that the 1960 Master Plan language requiring nonresidents to be in the upper half of the eligibility pool is no longer relevant in the context of eligibility reform and increased campus selectivity. Moreover, the 1960 language is a systemwide standard and would have allowed individual campuses to admit nonresidents who are far less qualified.

Legislation: SCA 12 is a proposed state constitutional amendment that if passed into law would require UC to give priority in admissions to applicants who are California residents. The proposed Assembly Bill 1711 includes a provision requiring UC to enroll no more than 15.5% undergraduate nonresidents systemwide, as a condition of state funding.

ELC Admissions Pilot Program: The pilot program promotes the admission of students 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.” UCOP identified for campuses the 8,000 ELC-only applicants across the system, as well as the 5,000 subset who met the LCFF criteria. The goal was to admit and yield more students across the system. Initial results are promising: compared to last year, ELC-only applicants received one additional admissions offer on average, and the proportion of ELC-only students sent to the referral pool decreased from 30% to 20%. UCOP wants to review data on yield and the UC performance of the students, before making a decision about continuing the pilot.

VII. Compare Favorably Reports and Policy

BOARS reviewed campus reports on 2015 “compare favorably” outcomes and discussed next steps for the systemwide summary report. BOARS also reviewed tables summarizing average unweighted high school GPA and average test score for three residency categories at each campus, indicating statistically significant data points. The tables also included data comparing average first-year UC GPA, first-year persistence rate, and probation rate.

The data show that on a systemwide basis, admitted nonresidents, on average, have stronger qualifications than residents, based on their high school GPA and SAT score, and on their first-year GPA performance at UC. The data also indicate that although most individual campuses are meeting the compare favorably standard, resident admits on several specific campuses had higher overall average GPAs and/or test scores compared to the overall corresponding average for at least one nonresident group. The campus reports discussed challenges associated with maintaining the standard, as well as efforts to meet the standard and overcome deficiencies.

A member questioned the value of performing the compare favorably analysis on a campus-wide basis when individual colleges and majors make admissions decisions based on variable minimum requirements. Aggregating dissimilar units to the campus level can suggest misleading conclusions. It was also noted that comparing overall GPA and SAT averages to assess the standard may not be sufficient; one also needs to consider the marginal admits. A member questioned the value of basing compare favorably on high school GPA and SAT, which are only two components of the 14-point comprehensive review policy campuses use to admit students, and when UC has argued against the audit’s focus on those two factors. It was suggested that BOARS use holistic review score as a basis for comparison, but it was noted that the HR score means different things on different campuses. A member argued that SAT score, as a standardized benchmark, may be a better comparison measure than GPA, because variable grading practices and standards across California, other states, and foreign institutions make a direct comparison between two given GPAs more difficult. A member questioned the value of including comparisons of persistence and probation rates that are influenced by factors other than the “quality” of the student—for example, economics and difficulty adjusting to a new culture, particularly for international students.

It was noted that BOARS requires the compare favorably policy to be met not only on a systemwide basis but also by individual campuses. BOARS established the policy to communicate a clear message to campuses about its expectation that nonresidents have stronger qualifications than residents. The data provide a transparent, objective, quantitative assessment of the compare favorably standard, and they make clear to campuses what BOARS will measure and what steps, if any, they need to take to overcome any deficiencies and improve future outcomes. It was noted that the admissions process seeks to predict which students are likely to succeed on campuses. It was agreed that UC GPA and persistence are relevant to demonstrating success but the tables should not compare probation rate. It was noted that UC is competing globally with other elite universities for a limited number of the best international students.

ACTION: BOARS will review a draft summary report at the June 3 meeting.

VIII. Geometry Validation Options

- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

UCOP provided an overview of the geometry requirement for freshman admission and avenues for validation. In 2009, an intersegmental area “c” task force agreed that geometry is critical to college-level math preparation and recommended that higher-level courses are not appropriate substitutions. BOARS agreed, and effective for fall 2015 admissions, freshman applicants are required to take Geometry, or an integrated math sequence that includes sufficient geometry, to meet the mathematics (“c”) admission requirement. (The integrated math sequence, Mathematics II, aligned with K-12 Common Core State Standards is one example.) Students may not validate the omission of Geometry with a higher-level math course such as Calculus or a standardized test score. Students may validate a deficient grade in Geometry by completing at least the first semester of an advanced-level math course or a “challenge” exam administered locally at the student’s high school. Students without Geometry may be admitted through “Admissions by Exception.” Two-thirds of the applicants without a reported Geometry course are international. It was suggested that BOARS release a clarifying statement outlining the rationale behind the geometry requirement and reiterating the validation options.

ACTION: BOARS will review a draft clarifying statement at the June 3 meeting.

IX. Area “c” and a Fourth Year of Math

- *Monica Lin, Associate Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

BOARS discussed UC’s math requirement in the context of the CSU Senate’s recent resolution “In Support of Requiring a Fourth Year of Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning for Admission to CSU.” Under area “c,” UC currently requires three years and recommends four years of math for admission. Associate Director Lin noted that more than 95% of fall 2016 UC applicants took at least one advanced math course (above and beyond Intermediate Algebra or Mathematics III) in high school, with 88.1% of UC applicants having taken math during all four years of high school. At the April meeting, BOARS requested admissions and demographic data on the UC applicants who do not take any advanced math in high school. The data indicate that applicants with no advanced math coursework or only one advanced math course were more likely to be Chicano/Latino or female.

Associate Director Lin also noted that her CSU colleagues clarified that the CSU Senate Committee that developed the resolution did not intend for UC to change its area “c” requirement to four years of math. It does want to support students’ continuous exposure to coursework that engages and strengthens their quantitative reasoning (QR) skills, through a variety of levels and disciplines that might include a fourth year of advanced math, remedial math, or some other QR-based course outside of mathematics.

X. AP Computer Science Principles Course and Exam

- *Henry Sanchez, BOARS Vice Chair*

BOARS reviewed the written recommendations from UC faculty content experts charged with determining whether UC should award elective credit for scores of “3” or higher on the new [AP Computer Science Principles exam](#). It was noted that UC policy allows campus faculty to

determine the amount and kind of credit based on a given exam score, which may be higher than the minimum. The reviews from the content experts were generally positive.

ACTION: A motion was made and seconded for BOARS to approve the exam. The motion passed unanimously.

XI. Executive Session

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