

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

Minutes of Meeting
May 1, 2015

I. Consent Calendar

- BOARS minutes of April 3, 2015

ACTION: BOARS approved the March minutes.

II. Announcements

- *Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair*

Transfer Meetings: The Senate and UCOP hosted three April workshops that brought together campus representatives from ten popular transfer majors to identify a single set of major-specific lower division coursework for community college students to follow as preparation for transfer admission in each major at all nine campuses. Representatives from four life sciences majors met on April 7, and groups representing three natural sciences and three social sciences majors met on April 16 and 22. Campuses are now reviewing the transfer pathway agreements reached at the meetings. The pathways will make it easier for transfers to prepare simultaneously for admission to the same major at all UC campuses. It is expected that completion of a given pathway will ensure that an applicant with a competitive GPA is competitive for admission to the major 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 on June 5. Topics being considered for the meeting include the Next Generation Science Standards, the Common Core, UC's adjustment of the VPA requirement, UC's transfer streamlining project, and CSU's approach to the Associate Degrees for Transfer degrees in the admissions evaluation process.

III. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

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

Transfer Meetings: The goal of transfer streamlining is to make it easier for CCC transfers to prepare for multiple UC campuses and to ensure that transfers arrive at UC equally prepared as native freshmen who are entering their third year. It is not intended to change curriculum or preparation expectations, or to force individual departments to adhere their major requirements to a systemwide standard. Campuses have been clear that they do not want to depict major preparation as a set of requirements but rather as UC's best collective advice to transfers. BOARS and UCEP members have been asked to contact meeting participants and determine where campuses are in the process of approval and implementation. After campuses confirm the major preparation agreements are appropriate, a coordinated communications effort will be needed to ensure that websites and other materials send a consistent message about the details to admissions officers and students.

ICAS Legislative Day: The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates held its annual Legislative Day meeting in Sacramento on April 13. The meeting featured a series of visits with legislators, legislative aides, and staff. Many of the visitors expressed general support for increasing UC's funding, although specific proposals from the Legislature for doing so have tended to attach strings such as dramatically increased resident enrollment and nonresident tuition. Faculty from all higher education are concerned that some legislators appear to be more concerned with student throughput than maintaining educational quality.

IV. Executive Session

V. Visit with Staff from Governor's Office and Department of Finance

- Amy Costa, Advisor to the Higher Education Director of the Department of Finance
- Jason MacCannell, Special Assistant for Research to the Governor
- Christian Osmena, Education Analyst at the Department of Finance

Guests from the Governor's Office and Department of Finance joined BOARS to discuss undergraduate admissions issues. Chair Aldredge noted that BOARS is responsible for advising the Academic Senate and the President about the systemwide criteria for undergraduate admission, including transfer admission. Issues related to enrollment management are campus administrative issues and outside of BOARS' direct purview.

Guests asked whether BOARS is successfully crafting admissions policy to meet the freshman and transfer admission targets specified in the Master Plan.

It was noted that BOARS crafts policies that it believes will result in the admission of students who can succeed at UC. The Master Plan asks UC to admit the top 12.5% of California public high school graduates. In 2014, UC offered the top 12.9% of public high-school graduates a guarantee of admission to at least one campus. Another 2.4% were admitted from the Entitled to Review (ETR) pool, for a total of 15.3%, well beyond the Master Plan expectation. It was noted that ETR expands the opportunity of a comprehensive review to students who meet minimum markers of college readiness but lack the criteria for the ELC or statewide guarantee. The ETR pool includes a high percentage of first generation, underrepresented students, and students from low API-rank high schools.

One quarter of freshmen who entered UC in 2014 had not met the entry-level writing requirement (ELWR). How does this finding inform your thinking about admissions standards?

It was noted that the data underestimate UC students' writing preparation. Students who do not clear the requirement with a minimum score on the SAT/ACT or the AP English exam can fulfill the ELWR by demonstrating writing proficiency in a number of ways, including the Analytical Writing Placement Examination test in May, taking a community college course, or passing a writing test administered by the campus after enrollment.

What is BOARS doing to respond to changes in the K-12 curriculum such as the Common Core?

BOARS members noted that UC is unique in the extent to which it considers the quality of high school curriculum by requiring applicants to complete the "a-g" subject requirements, which signals their preparation to meet the demands of a UC education. UCOP and BOARS have taken

steps to align the “a-g” guidelines more closely with the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, particularly in the recent effort to convene faculty work groups to revise the [“a-g” course criteria](#) to reference the Common Core and the NGSS.

Has BOARS considered admitting students to the University rather than to individual campuses?

It was noted that until the late-1980s, UC applicants submitted a single application that ranked their choice of campuses. In 1988, UC implemented the multiple-filing system to give students more choice. Having a choice of campuses helps attract the best California students, and sells the UC experience over other alternatives. In many cases, campuses now admit applicants directly to colleges, not to the general campus. Individual campuses now have the opportunity to engage directly with interested students, and allowing campuses to develop different emphases is an advantage for both the campus and students. Campuses have different personalities and students see themselves fitting in at campuses in different ways.

*How does BOARS think about balancing the need for access with the need to maintain rigor?
How does the committee view the concept of “eligibility?”*

Achieving excellence and access are part of the same process. Eligibility is a technical definition used to describe students who earn a guarantee of admission by meeting the basic Eligibility in the Local Context or statewide index requirements. More broadly, eligibility refers to what students need to be competitive for admission. Campuses use holistic review to select ELC and statewide eligible students, as well as students identified as ETR, in recognition that merit cannot be determined by GPA and SAT alone. BOARS instituted ELC to reach high performing students in every California high school and to meet the Regents policy to serve the broad diversity of the state. The number of CA high school graduates has remained relatively flat, but the number of students who complete the “a-g” requirements and meet the eligibility bar is increasing. Schools are getting better at preparing students for UC, and the result is higher selectivity at all campuses. ELC is also allowing UC to extend its reach into lower API schools. UC finds that ELC students from under-resourced schools ultimately perform as well as other students; however, implementing measures that force UC to graduate students in a shorter amount of time could discourage UC from accepting at risk students and reduce access to those students.

What was BOARS’ rationale for the compare favorably policy, and how do you apply the standard in the context of holistic review when campuses lack comparable data for nonresident applicants?

In 2011, BOARS recognized that as UC becomes more attractive to out of state and international students and campuses ramp-up nonresident enrollments to help compensate for diminishing state support, campuses should take steps to ensure that they do not provide easier access to people who are simply willing to pay more. To assess implementation of the policy, BOARS considers available data, including the academic indicators for the resident and nonresident admit pools, and the performance of students after they enroll at UC.

How does BOARS think about the work at CSU and the CCCs around SB 1440 and the Associate Degrees for Transfer (ADTs)?

It was noted that BOARS thinks about transfer in terms of UC’s Master Plan obligation to enroll one transfer for every two California resident freshmen, and the goal of the transfer streamlining

project to help transfers navigate the UC pre-major requirements, prepare simultaneously for multiple UC campuses, and decrease time to degree. SB 1440 compelled CSU to develop consistent expectations for transfer preparation across their system. UC is trying to do the same with transfer streamlining. The ADTs have become the path of choice for many CCC students. If UC fails to recognize and accommodate them, we could miss out on some of the best students. UC found that some UC majors require fewer courses than an ADT, but in other cases—for example, the Life Sciences—the ADT does not include organic chemistry, and a UC student cannot graduate without organic chemistry.

Is BOARS concerned about the mix of freshmen and transfers at the University?

It was noted that BOARS is aware of the freshman to transfer ratio, and cognizant of how any potential change in admissions policy may affect diversity, access, and the mix of freshmen and transfers. Diversity is particularly significant for transfer admission because a large percentage of CCC transfers come from underprivileged backgrounds.

UC admits a student as either a freshman or an upper division transfer. Has BOARS considered alternatives that account for college credit earned from external sources such as AP exams?

It was noted that UC has policies for accepting credit for students' prior learning, including credit for AP and IB courses. Those achievements are valued and can make a difference in time to degree. Some students who apply directly from high schools have enough credits to start at UC as sophomores, but the specific credit awards are campus decisions, and BOARS has not looked at formally admitting as sophomores students who earn a given number of units.

VI. Consultation with UCOP – Office of Admissions

- *Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs*
- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions*

Admissions Cycle Update: Today is the deadline for admitted freshman applicants to submit Statements of Intent to Register. The deadline for transfer admits is June 1. This is the first year that every campus is using a wait list to manage enrollment, and given the high level of uncertainty about the budget and the final wait list numbers, UC has not yet released preliminary admissions data.

President Napolitano: The President continues her “conversations tour” of California Community Colleges at Riverside City College next week. She recently met with the student fellows who are involved in the Global Food Initiative to discuss their research projects, and she is hosting a national summit on undocumented students May 7-8 in Oakland; the invitation-only event will include teams of students and others from each UC campus.

VII. Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittees

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

1. General Guidelines for UC Transferrable Courses: Field Studies, Independent Study and Variable Topics Courses, and Online Courses

The Subcommittee reviewed an updated version of the General Guidelines for the “special categories” of Field Studies, Independent Study & Variable Topics Courses, and Online Courses. The document will appear as a footnote to the Transferrable Course Agreement (TCA) Guidelines. It is intended to provide general guidance to the CCCs about these special category courses, which are only reviewed locally, and assures CCC articulation officers and students that transfers who they may receive UC credit. It was noted that UC does not consider the method of course delivery (online or in-person) at the transfer level as long as the course otherwise meets the basic standards for UC transferability.

The subcommittee agreed to recommend BOARS approval of the document.

2. Recommended Actions on International Baccalaureate (IB) Exams

The subcommittee considered recommendations from UC Faculty Content Experts charged with determining whether UC should award elective credit for a score of 5, 6, or 7 on new or redesigned versions of IB exams in the following subject areas: IB Business and Management, IB Language and Literature, IB Literature, and IB Literature and Performance

The Subcommittee agreed to recommend BOARS approval of the four IB exams and noted scores for UC elective credit.

3. Full Committee review of updated TCA Guidelines for 7 established disciplinary areas and recommended actions by the two Subcommittees

BOARS was asked to review revisions to the TCA Guidelines recommended by faculty content expert workgroups in Engineering/Computer Science, English, Math, Statistics, Sciences, Social Sciences, and Visual & Performing Arts. It was noted that BOARS members also served on the Engineering and VPA workgroups. It was noted that BOARS’ decision will determine whether a student can get baseline elective credit, but the decision about articulation to a specific course or credit decision will be up to the campus.

Action: BOARS approved TCA Guidelines for Engineering/Computer Science, English, Math, Statistics, Sciences, Social Sciences, and Visual & Performing Arts

Action: BOARS unanimously approved the recommended from Subcommittee #1 for the General Guidelines for “special category” transferrable courses.

Action: BOARS unanimously approved the recommendation from Subcommittee #2 for the four IB exams.

VIII. AP Capstone Curriculum

[AP Capstone](#) is a new Diploma program from the College Board. The Capstone Diploma is awarded to students who score 3 or higher on two year-long courses—AP Seminar and AP Research—and on four other AP course exams. Successful completion of AP Seminar qualifies a student to take AP Research, which culminates in the presentation and defense of a 5,000 word research paper on a personally-chosen topic. BOARS has been asked to review the AP Seminar course and exam and the AP Research course and assessment and to decide whether UC should award elective credit, and the appropriate exam or assessment score required to receive elective

credit. UC has already approved AP Seminar for “a-g” credit. Only 11 California high schools currently offer AP Seminar. AP Research will not be implemented until next year.

A BOARS member questioned the equivalency of AP Research to a college-level course, noting that students would defend their research paper before high school faculty. Another member expressed concern that it could exacerbate existing divisions between rich and poor schools in the access they have to the AP curriculum and opportunities for UC credit and a GPA bump. There was also a question about whether schools will always have a qualified instructor on hand to teach the AP Seminar topic that will change from year to year. It was noted that UC could risk losing students to competitors if it decides not to award credit for Capstone. A member suggested that BOARS wait to make a decision until after AP Research is implemented, and that BOARS should develop a more overarching policy that defines the components a high school diploma program must include to be considered for UC credit. It was suggested that BOARS invite the UC faculty member who served on the AP Capstone Advisory Committee to discuss the program.

IX. Next Generation Science Standards: Continued Discussion of potential proposed revisions to area “d” subject requirements

Last year, a UC faculty work group revised the [area “d” criteria](#) to reference the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS), and some are now urging UC to revise the area “d” subject requirement itself ([Senate Regulation 424.A.3.d](#)) to 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.” The existing science categories in area “d” may be too narrow given the new scope of the NGSS. For example, area “d” currently allows Earth and Space Sciences courses to fulfill the requirement only if they include appropriate coverage of the fundamental sciences of biology, chemistry and physics. It is expected that high schools will want to shift science education to the more integrated/ interdisciplinary approach outlined in the NGSS. But UC’s “a-g” requirements also send a strong signal to high schools that influences what courses they design and teach. K-12 teachers are being asked to change their curriculum and teaching to meet the NGSS; at the same time, schools want their courses to be approved for “a-g”. By restricting what UC considers a science requirement, the University could be limiting the ability of school districts to implement change. It was suggested that a faculty advisory review the issue and make a recommendation to BOARS that could be circulated for systemwide Senate review.

X. Review of ICAS Natural Sciences Competency Statement

BOARS members reviewed a draft memo from BOARS to the Academic Senate chair summarizing issues with ICAS’ “Statement of Competencies in the Natural Sciences Expected of Entering Freshmen,” which BOARS identified and discussed in April. The memo notes that the statement does not align with all of the new content areas in the Next Generation Science Standards, or focus clearly on how the NGSS may change the way K-12 students could learn science and demonstrate their competencies. It also fails to consider the implications of the Statement for the area “d” subject requirement and potential changes to the language of area “d” needed to align with the NGSS. The memo states that the Statement could be stronger if it more

clearly mapped a way to potential changes in area “d” that align with NGSS concepts and science education practices.

Action: A final draft will be circulated for BOARS approval.

XI. TOEFL Sub-Scores Analysis and Minimum Score Policy

BOARS continued its discussion about the role of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) in assessing the English proficiency of non-native English-speaking applicants. BOARS reviewed a new analysis of the relationships between sub-scores from the Speaking, Listening, and Reading sections of the TOEFL, and UC first-term GPA. BOARS also discussed the possibility of raising the minimum TOEFL score of 80 to align with the predicted probation rate for international students to that of native English-speaking students. The analyses show that without controlling for other factors, TOEFL scores and sub-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.

Motion: A motion was made and seconded to increase the minimum TOEFL score to 90.

Members speaking in support of the motion noted that a recent survey showed that UC’s minimum TOEFL score of 80 was the lowest of UC’s peer institutions, which all set a minimum of 100 or higher. UC should align its requirements with those institutions. In addition, faculty have complained about an increasing number of English language competence issues in their classrooms. UC policy should help ensure that international students enter UC with good English skills and minimize the need for remediation and similar support services. UC’s role as a public University does not include providing opportunity to international students who need remediation. Other members noted that only a small number of international students need remediation and that the analysis is not particularly convincing about the predictive power of the TOEFL. It was suggested that before making a decision, BOARS review additional data on the TOEFL scores of students who actually needed remediation, the significance of the TOEFL score compared to other variables, and the correlation of the TOEFL to actual English language ability. It was noted that UCB is experimenting with Skype interviews of international applicants to get a better sense of English language skills.

Motion: A motion was made and seconded to table the original motion. The motion passed. BOARS will discuss again in June.

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