

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

Minutes of Meeting

June 24, 2016

Part 1: Joint Meeting with the Campus Admissions Directors

I. Welcome and Introductions

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*

The annual joint meeting is an opportunity for BOARS and the admissions directors to discuss the relationship between admissions policy and practice, and ways faculty and administrators can work together to better serve the University and its students.

II. 2016-17 Admissions and ELC-Only Pilot Outcomes

Fall 2016 Admissions: The University offered admission to about 15% more California resident freshmen and to about 14% more California Community College transfers this year compared to 2015. Campuses are using wait lists to fine-tune projected enrollments of freshmen and transfers, and UC estimates that it will exceed its target of 5,000 new California resident undergraduates. UC also admitted 13% more nonresidents this year, although Berkeley, UCLA, and San Diego will not increase nonresident enrollments above current levels. UC campuses admitted 30% more African-American freshmen in 2016, representing 4.9% of total admits, while the proportion of Chicano/Latino admits increased from 29% to 32%. UCOP will release final systemwide admissions data in early July and SIR data in late summer.

The 2016-17 state budget provides UC with \$18.5 million in permanent new funding to increase California resident undergraduate enrollment by 2,500 in 2017-18 (over the final 2016 enrollment base). The budget also asks the Regents to adopt a policy on nonresident enrollment. Assembly Bill 1711 has been amended to remove a statutorily imposed limit on nonresident enrollment; however, the current version of the bill would require UC campuses to return to an interpretation of the Master Plan requiring every nonresident to “stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible” at that specific campus, in contrast to the current focus on averages.

- It was noted that faculty are concerned about the effect of adding 5,000 students to campuses in a single year. Not all campuses have the dormitory, classroom, or laboratory space needed to accommodate the enrollments, and as a result, students may find it more difficult to get the classes they need, and will attend much larger classes, including at the upper division level. Campuses also need more Teaching Assistants, but lack funding and faculty to expand graduate programs.

Outcomes from ELC-Only/LCFF+ Pilot: The pilot program targeted UC applicants who are eligible for an admissions guarantee through the ELC-only pathway and who graduated from a high school designated as “Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+).” UC flagged applicants meeting those criteria and encouraged campuses to give them an additional review to achieve a target of 4% as a proportion of overall admits. The preliminary outcomes are positive.

77% of ELC-only applicants were admitted to at least one UC campus for fall 2016, compared to 65% for fall 2015; and 80% of students who met both the ELC-only and LCFF+ criteria were admitted by at least one campus. In addition, 58% of admits from the ELC-only group were underrepresented minorities, compared to 48% in 2015. UC met the 4% target on a systemwide basis, although the more selective UC campuses did not. UCOP will be tracking the yield and academic outcomes of the students as it implements a second year of the pilot.

- BOARS members noted that the committee was disappointed with UCOP's initial lack of detailed consultation about the pilot, and admissions directors said campus chancellors did not always acknowledge the need for directors to work with Senate admissions committees to vet and approve the pilot. Some campuses did not achieve the 4% target due to concerns about the ability of ELC-only applicants to succeed at the campus, based on prior findings showing high first-year probation rates for that population. Some campuses are augmenting academic advising services to support the success of students admitted under the pilot.

III. Compare Favorably

BOARS and the admissions directors discussed the 2015 Compare Favorably Report and the means by which BOARS evaluates campus outcomes for the compare favorably standard. The report summarizes systemwide and campus data on high school GPA and SAT scores for California residents and nonresidents admitted in 2015, and first-year UC GPA and persistence for students first enrolling in fall 2014. An attached spreadsheet flags statistically significant data points. The report states that enrollment targets for residents and nonresidents should not influence the quality or outcome of the compare favorably assessment, and that future analyses may include an assessment of outcomes by admitting unit and a comparison of Holistic Review scores.

- Admissions directors noted that the "Funding Streams" budget model, which allows campuses to retain all campus-generated funds, created a financial incentive to increase nonresident enrollment. Some directors feel caught between administrative mandates to meet enrollment targets and BOARS' mandate to meet the compare favorably policy. BOARS members emphasized that campus admissions decisions must always align with the compare favorably standard based on the qualifications of applicants at the point of admission, while admits make the final decision to enroll or not enroll.
- It was noted that some campuses consider international and domestic nonresidents together in a single applicant pool, while others separate the two populations. In addition, residency information reported on the application can change after applicants submit a statement of legal residency during the summer, although the data in the report should account for the majority of changes.

IV. Admission by Examination

BOARS and the directors discussed the Admission by Examination option for undergraduate admission described in [Senate Regulation 440](#) and on the [UC Admissions website](#). BOARS is seeking advice from the directors about the role and relevance of the policy from a campus perspective.

It was noted that the 2012 eligibility reform policy changed the Admission by Examination pathway from a guaranteed admission pathway to an “entitled to review” pathway. The policy now guarantees only a comprehensive review to applicants with a minimum qualifying “UC Score,” based on their performance on the ACT test or the SAT and two SAT Subject Tests. UC also has an Admission by Exception policy that allows campuses to enroll up to 6 percent of new freshmen who do not meet the normal eligibility requirements. If BOARS decides to maintain the policy, UCOP will need to recalibrate the UC Score conversation formula to align with the recent revisions to the SAT and ACT.

Directors noted that the title of the Admission by Examination policy is somewhat misleading, because it does not guarantee admission. Moreover, most campuses already give a comprehensive review to every application. Campuses verify eligibility after the admission decision, and may ultimately tag students eligible for the Examination pathway “Admission by Exception.” Directors noted that the population of students admitted through Examination is less diverse than other populations, and the pathway is incongruous with holistic review principles. However, some homeschooled students and foster youth use the pathway, and eliminating it could send a message that the University does not value them, though many enter UC through Admission by Exception.

V. Strategies for Expanding Student Diversity

BOARS and the admissions directors discussed efforts to expand diversity on campuses, including strategies to increase applications from underrepresented minority (URM) students and the yield of those students after they are admitted.

Directors noted that outreach plays a key role in boosting URM student interest and yield. Yield rates are higher for URM students who participate in programs and events such as campus visits, Senior Weekend, Decision Days, and family overnights. Events at urban high schools, alumni-hosted meet-and-greets, and phone calls to admitted students are also effective. Directors noted that it is also important for campuses to build relationships with local school districts and community colleges, to support K-12 in efforts to increase the number of competitive UC applicants, and to enhance relationships with the Puente project, the Umoja Community project, and other programs that serve educationally underrepresented students. Directors also described the importance of engaging UC faculty and students in efforts to support new students after they arrive on campus, and noted that campuses are analyzing outcomes from the various recruitment and yield efforts to determine what among them is most determinative in the student decision.

Directors noted that affordability is a major issue for URM students who choose not to come to UC. Some students feel they cannot afford UC, and others are influenced by more generous financial aid offers from other institutions. UC campuses do not always have access to scholarship resources that are competitive with private institutions. It was noted that one campus is centralizing information about available scholarships to help improve transparency and awareness.

VI. Geometry Requirement and Validation Options

Campus admissions directors have been receiving questions about UC’s geometry requirement for the mathematics (“c”) subject area. BOARS prepared a letter to the directors to help clarify

the requirement, its rationale, and guidance on validation options. The letter notes that effective for fall 2015 admissions, UC freshman applicants are required to take geometry, or an integrated math sequence that includes sufficient geometry, to meet the mathematics (“c”) admission requirement. Students may not validate the omission of geometry with a subsequent higher-level math course such as calculus or a standardized test score. However, 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 at the student’s high school. Campuses may admit students without geometry through “Admissions by Exception.” About 4% of fall 2016 applicants did not meet the requirement.

- It was noted that the changes to area “c” demonstrate the University’s commitment to aligning its math preparation expectations with the goals and expectations of the K-12 Common Core State Standards. Admissions directors should begin to see fewer questions about the geometry requirement as more high schools transition their curriculum to Common Core-style integrated math sequences.

PART II: BOARS Meeting

I. Consent Calendar

1. June 24, 2016 BOARS Agenda
2. June 3, 2016 BOARS Minutes

ACTION: BOARS approved the consent calendar.

II. Announcements

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

Vice President Searches: A UC search committee has concluded second round interviews for the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies position. Interviews are just beginning for the Vice President for Student Affairs. Outcomes from both searches are expected by the end of the summer.

Academic Council: In July, Council discussed changes to the Regents governance structure that will move Regents Standing Order provisions related to the organization and powers of the Senate to a new set of Regents Bylaws, and proposed limitations on Senior Management Group outside professional activities. Council also discussed resolutions on divestment from fossil fuels passed by the Santa Cruz and San Diego Senate divisions; and a proposal to replace Academic Council’s Special Committee on Agriculture and Natural Resources with a UCPB Task Force.

Budget/Enrollment Update: The Regents are expected to adopt a policy on nonresident enrollment this summer or fall. The policy may require the three UC campuses with nonresident enrollment above 20% to maintain their current levels, and allow campuses with lower enrollments allowed to rise to a comparable level.

III. UC Transfer Pathways and Comprehensive Review

BOARS reviewed proposed revisions to the [Comprehensive Review Guidelines](#) related to the selection criteria for transfer applicants. The revisions incorporate into existing selection criteria language highlighting completion of a UC Transfer Pathway as one way for applicants to demonstrate transfer readiness. In addition, the revision adds a reference to [Senate Regulation 476.C](#), which acknowledges completion of a “UC Transfer Curriculum” (the forerunner of the Transfer Pathways), as one way to guarantee a comprehensive admissions review. BOARS members expressed support for the revisions and agreed to consider at a later date minor amendments to SR 476.C, replacing references to “UC Transfer Curriculum” with “UC Transfer Pathway.”

ACTION: A motion to adopt the changes to the Comprehensive Review Guidelines was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Parental Alumni Status on the Application

- Aimée Dorr, Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs
- Julie Henderson, Senior Vice President – Public Affairs

Provost Dorr and SVP Henderson updated BOARS on a proposal to add a place on the UC application for students to designate their parents’ alumni status. BOARS sent President Napolitano a letter outlining several concerns about the proposal in April, after meeting with UCOP representatives on the topic.

Provost Dorr and SVP Henderson noted that the proposal originates with the offices of University Advancement and Public Affairs. UCOP believes that collecting alumni data at the time of application will enable more personal, targeted communication with UC alumni; give campuses more time to personalize communications with alumni parents of applicants, in some cases recognizing an existing relationship with an alumni donor; allow campuses to better handle disappointment in parents whose children are not admitted; and enhance yield activities by allowing campuses to tailor outreach and communications to parents of children who are admitted.

UCOP officials understand BOARS’ concern that collecting the information at the time of application could encourage a misperception that UC is doing “legacy” admissions and discourage some students from applying to UC. However, they believe UC can collect the information in a way that avoids these pitfalls and enhances alumni engagement. The application will include a note alongside the request for parental information clearly stating that providing the information is optional and will not be used in the admission decision. UCOP wants to address BOARS’ concerns to the greatest extent possible, and they will return to BOARS with an application prototype. UCOP is vetting the proposal with other groups and surveying campuses about the different ways they would use the data.

- BOARS members reiterated its previous concerns that requesting the information on the application could encourage a false perception about legacy admissions, upset some alumni, and have a differential effect on certain applicant populations. They noted that it would be better to collect the information after the admissions decision – for example, on the Statement of Intent to Register. Members also suggested that UCOP officials seek feedback on the proposal from alumni and high school counselors.

V. Consultation with UCOP

- Nina Robinson, Associate President – Chief Policy Advisor

Compare Favorably: The Legislature has proposed Assembly Bill 1711 to address the state audit recommendation that UC adopt a different nonresident admission policy. The President supports Compare Favorably as a good policy that is consistent with the Master Plan, and she believes AB 1711 is an inappropriate intrusion into the faculty's purview over admissions policy. UC's recent [letter opposing AB 1711](#) outlines several concerns about the bill and indicates that the President will be asking BOARS to review the Compare Favorably policy in the fall. BOARS should not interpret that request as a mandate to change the policy.

- BOARS members noted that the compare favorably standard is challenging to assess, particularly using limited measures like GPA and SAT. On some campuses, a tension exists between mandates to meet enrollment targets set by administrators and the compare favorably standard set by faculty. BOARS has been clear that admission targets should not influence the quality or outcome of the compare favorably assessment.

Nonresident Enrollment: The budget agreement asks UC to adopt a policy on nonresident enrollment. UCOP will be proposing to the Regents a policy that caps systemwide nonresident enrollment at 20%, allows the three campuses currently above 20% to maintain but not exceed their current levels, and allows campuses below 20% to increase to 20%. The effect of the cap will be to slow the rate of nonresident growth significantly at some campuses. UCOP is aware of concerns about the possible "tiering" of campuses with high nonresident enrollment in relation to those with lower nonresident enrollment – however, the chancellors are opposed to the idea of "socializing" nonresident tuition revenue across campuses.

LCFF Admissions: UC is working with Senator deLeon on a budget trailer bill ([SB 1050](#)) related to the admission of students who attend Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+) high schools. It asks UC to develop a plan to increase the admission and enrollment of LCFF+ students. The budget provides UC with \$20 million in one-time funding to help support the success of the students.

VI. Berkeley Letters of Recommendation Pilot

BOARS reviewed a report from UC Berkeley summarizing preliminary outcomes from its Letters of Recommendation Pilot Program. In the past, Berkeley requested letters only from students selected for Augmented Review. This year, Berkeley replaced Augmented Review and its five-category numerical scoring system with three categories—"yes," "possible," and "no," and wanted to request letters from everyone. Under the revised program approved by the Academic Council, applicants receiving a score of "possible" were invited to submit up to two letters of recommendation.

The report indicates that students from low-income, first-generation, and low API school backgrounds were less likely to receive an invitation to submit letters, and those who did were less likely to request letters from references and submit letters to Berkeley, compared to the overall applicant pool. However, applicants who submitted letters were admitted at a higher rate than students who did not. Berkeley has expressed its desire to expand the invitation to submit letters from the "possible" group to all applicants next year. Berkeley maintains that letters are

intended to provide more information in holistic review, and it will not penalize students who do not submit letters.

Discussion: BOARS members expressed concern that students at under-resourced high schools may have more difficulty obtaining high quality letters of recommendation, which may have a disparate impact on certain demographic groups. It was noted that Berkeley's fall 2016 admitted class is less diverse in some respects compared to last year, while the UCLA admitted class is more diverse, despite the similarity of the campuses' applicant pools. It is unclear that there is a direct correlation between decreased diversity outcomes and the Letters Pilot. The Berkeley representative argued that the number of students from low-income, first generation, and low API schools has been decreasing at Berkeley for several years as the number of applications has increased and the percentage of admitted students has decreased, making admission more competitive. Berkeley hoped that getting letters from everyone would stop the decrease in diverse admissions. Berkeley is still analyzing data to determine what role the Pilot had in outcomes. It was agreed that BOARS should review those data before issuing a recommendation on continuing or expanding the pilot for another year.

VII. Executive Session

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm

Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola, Principal Committee Analyst

Attest: Ralph Aldredge