

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA** **ACADEMIC SENATE**  
**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**  
**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 26, 2015**

**Part 1: Joint Meeting with the Campus Admissions Directors**

**I. Announcements**

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

**Admissions Outcomes:** Uncertainty about the state budget and enrollment funding made the 2015-16 admissions cycle more dynamic than usual. The President directed campuses to maintain last year's enrollment targets for California residents to ensure that resident enrollment not exceed state funding. Campuses were more conservative in their initial set of offers and relied more heavily on wait lists to meet the precise targets. Although offers of admission to CA residents fell slightly compared to last year, UC expects to enroll the same number of residents this fall. The diversity of the admitted freshman and transfer class changed little compared to last year, and UC expects to enroll a slightly higher proportion of underrepresented minority students in fall 2015. The number of nonresidents admitted to the University increased about 12% overall compared to last year, although there were no increases at UCLA or UCB. The just-signed state budget provides \$25 million to support the enrollment of 5,000 new residents over the next two years, but is it too late for the funding to have an impact on fall 2015 admissions. UCOP will release more detailed admissions data to the public on July 2.

**UC Application Review:** UCOP is initiating two reviews of the systemwide UC application. The first involves a redesign of the application interface to enhance its usability and accessibility. The redesign will be available next year. A second workgroup of Admissions Directors will be considering adjustments to the content of application for fall 2017 implementation.

**Transfer Pathways:** UC Senate and administrative leaders met with CSU and CCC colleagues earlier this week to discuss the new UC Transfer Pathways for ten majors. A [website](#) detailing the pathways will go live on July 1, and President Napolitano will introduce the pathways at a joint press conference with intersegmental higher education leaders on July 7.

**Discussion:** It was noted that the state rejected UC's request for \$100 million to fund 10,000 new undergraduate enrollments over the next four years. The state did provide \$25 million for 5,000 resident enrollments, and is asking UC to use Nonresident Supplemental Tuition (NRST) to cover the full \$10,000 needed to educate each new student. The state did not provide funding for the 6,500 unfunded undergraduates currently enrolled at UC. UC is planning an 8% increase to NRST effective for fall 2015, which admissions directors noted may affect nonresident yield, particularly from the more price-sensitive domestic nonresident admit pool.

**II. Future Compare Favorably Analyses**

BOARS and the Admissions Directors discussed the means by which BOARS evaluates, and communicates its evaluation, of campus outcomes for the [compare favorably standard](#) for

nonresident admission. Chair Aldredge noted that BOARS asks campuses to assess and report to BOARS annually on the extent to which they are meeting the compare favorably standard. Campuses can demonstrate their compliance in a variety of ways—for example, by comparing the GPAs, SAT scores, and holistic review scores of admitted residents and nonresidents, as well as the performance of each group at UC. As interest grows in UC from outside the state, UC has been able to attract increasingly higher-quality pools of nonresident applicants. However, public scrutiny of nonresident admission has also grown, and some perceive that admission to UC is easier as a nonresident. BOARS has been discussing ways to ensure a critical, transparent evaluation of campus assessments, to gather and make public meaningful data, and to develop a common template for campus reporting.

***Discussion:*** Admissions directors noted that because California residents have a much higher yield rate than nonresidents, campuses must admit a higher proportion of nonresidents to achieve the expected yield and meet enrollment targets. This makes a simple comparison of “admission rate” an unreliable measure for assessing the compare favorably standard. The Directors also noted that it is difficult to compare the experiences and opportunities of California residents and nonresidents, but that campuses are learning more about the variances and nuances of educational systems in other states and countries and incorporating them into the review. These efforts include converting international GPAs to the US scale and establishing comparison group data about international applicants from specific institutions. It was agreed that it is important to the assessment of compare favorably to consider student success at UC – particularly first-year academic performance and retention.

### **III. Systemwide Transfer Pathways**

Senate Chair Gilly noted that the [Transfer Action Team report](#) revealed that California Community College (CCC) students often have difficulty preparing simultaneously for transfer into a similar major at multiple UC campuses. In April, the Academic Senate and UCOP convened faculty from ten of the most popular majors to establish UC systemwide pre-major preparation transfer pathways. Campus representatives from the next 11 majors will begin meeting in October.

Associate Vice President Handel noted that BOARS and the directors will be considering next steps for implementing the systemwide pathways—including the need to improve the articulation of individual CCC courses with individual UC campuses, communicate information to CCC students about courses available at their local college that will satisfy a pathway, and establish a process for vetting a campus’s proposed change to a pre-major requirement that affect a pathway.

It was noted the pathways are not intended to be a set of requirements but rather UC’s best collective advice to transfers about preparation that will ensure they are competitive for admission to a major at all nine UC campuses and prepared to graduate two years after matriculation. The systemwide website will refer students to individual campus websites for a complete list of expected major preparation coursework and information about minimum GPA requirements for the campus and specific courses. It was agreed that there should be a clear mechanism to ensure the systemwide communication and review of potential curricular changes that affect a pathway.

#### **IV. TOEFL Minimum Score**

On June 5, BOARS voted to increase from 80 to 90 the minimum score on the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) required for non-native English-speaking applicants. BOARS and the directors discussed the timing of implementation of the increased minimum score and its impact for campuses.

Several directors noted that the vast majority of international admits to their campus already have TOEFL scores above 90, although one director noted that 50% of incoming international admits to her campus have a TOEFL score below 90, and the higher minimum score might impair the campus's ability to meet enrollment targets. It was also noted that campuses may require a minimum score higher than the systemwide minimum and use Admission by Exception for students who do not meet the minimum. It was noted that the TOEFL is a single test that does not necessarily capture the full picture of English proficiency, and that it is difficult to monitor the integrity of a test taken in a foreign country. It was noted that at least one campus is interviewing international applicants through Skype to get a clearer sense of their English language skills. It was agreed that the potentially negative impact of the higher minimum score on some campuses warrants another conversation in BOARS.

#### **V. Admissions Directors Application Review Workgroup**

A workgroup of Admissions Directors (UCSC, UCR, UCB, and UCLA) will be reviewing the UC application and making recommendations for changes that reduce redundancies and enhance the information captured, particularly about the student's learning environment, non-cognitive comprehensive review factors such as extracurricular activities and special talents, and additional information that may be requested in later supplemental or augmented review stages which highlight academic potential. The workgroup will consult BOARS about a preliminary set of recommendations in fall 2015.

#### **VI. BOARS Consultation on Matters Relating to the Admission of Undergraduates**

Berkeley's decision to implement a new admissions policy without consulting systemwide bodies has prompted campus admissions directors to request guidance about the type and extent of consultation they should solicit from BOARS about undergraduate admissions policies and practices.

Chair Aldredge noted that individual campuses have the autonomy to develop individual comprehensive review policies and practices, but BOARS expects those processes to be consistent with systemwide comprehensive review principles. BOARS has occasionally requested changes to a campus policy it has found to be inconsistent with systemwide principles.

Admissions directors and BOARS members noted that elements of the new Berkeley policy will impact freshman admission processes at other UC campuses. For example, the policy replaces the five-category numerical scoring system with a three-category system, and UC campuses that use Berkeley holistic review scores will need time to adjust their own processes to account for the new system. There was also concern that Berkeley's new policy on letters of

recommendation conflicts with the message on the systemwide UC Application that letters are optional. In addition to these concerns, BOARS members and Directors expressed concern that the policy on letters and the elimination of augmented review will have a differential impact on underrepresented students and students who attend large or under-resourced high schools.

Individuals representing Berkeley noted that the Berkeley faculty felt that significant policy changes were needed to address dramatically increased selectivity and application workload. The old policy was designed for 35,000 applications and a 30% admit rate, while Berkeley received 79,000 applications and had a 15% admit rate in 2015. Berkeley consulted broadly—with high school counselors, students, and others—about letters of recommendations. Berkeley is confident that the new policy will enhance their ability to evaluate students and not disadvantage students or establish unfair obstacles. A high percentage of Berkeley applicants already submit letters of recommendation to other institutions through the Common Application. Berkeley will make clear to all applicants that they have until January to submit the two letters of recommendation.

## **PART II: BOARS Meeting**

### **I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS minutes of June 5, 2015

**ACTION: BOARS approved the June 5 minutes.**

### **II. Consultation with Senate Leadership**

- Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair
- Dan Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair

Budget Agreement: The budget agreement with the state requires UC to develop a new pension tier for employees hired after July 1, 2016. The President will be assembling an advisory group to develop specific recommendations. It is expected that 2-4 Senate members will serve on the advisory group. Some faculty are concerned that the new tier will hurt UC's competitiveness and change faculty behavior, as the DB plan helps attract top faculty, retain them mid-career, and encourage retirement at an appropriate age.

BOARS Review of Proposed Programmatic Innovations: The budget agreement also asks UC to implement or expand several programmatic initiatives that require Senate involvement. These include developing three-year degree specifications for 10 of the top 15 majors on each campus; reviewing curricular requirements for 75% of majors and reducing, when possible, the number of required upper division courses to 45; revisiting current policies for awarding UC credit for AP exams, the College Level Examination Program (CLEP), and other placement tests; and using the Course Identification Numbering System as a supplemental numbering system for UC courses. Chair Gilly has asked BOARS and UCEP to coordinate campus reporting and to lead efforts that require systemwide involvement.

### **III. New Berkeley Admissions Policy**

UCOP Student Affairs noted several concerns about the new Berkeley admissions policy:

- 1) The lack of advance warning about the policy changes gives sister UC campuses that rely on Berkeley scores little time to adjust, and creates a situation in which high school students will receive conflicting information about application requirements from the UC Application and the campus.
- 2) The policy for letters of recommendation could have a disparate impact on students from low API schools due to the wide variance of available counselor resources across California. It may be more difficult for some students to obtain a high quality letter of recommendation at those schools, if they are able to obtain one at all.
- 3) The policy for letters of recommendation could have a disparate impact on low-income students, students from low API high schools, underrepresented minorities, and first-generation students interested in Berkeley.
- 4) The policy could discourage some students to apply to Berkeley, which may have a cascading impact on applications to other UC campuses.
- 5) The policy will not be part of UC Application Help Desk Call Center protocol.

Berkeley's representative to BOARS noted that there is strong pressure from the Berkeley faculty to admit good students, increase diversity, and make finer distinctions between the most accomplished students. Admissions staff believe that the new policy will reduce their workload burden and enable them to obtain better information about students. Berkeley faculty will monitor outcomes closely for any adverse effects. Letters of recommendation will be optional at least for the first year. Many of Berkeley's underrepresented students come from the Augmented Review process, which asks for letters of recommendation, and Berkeley is confident that asking for letters from other applicants will not present a burden to any group. Berkeley is working to communicate to schools the kind of information they are looking for in a letter. Letters will be requested from teachers, not counselors.

BOARS members expressed concern that implementation of the policy is being rushed without a full understanding of its implications for Berkeley or for other campuses. They noted that UC faculty should view their campus as part of a system and faculty colleagues on other UC campuses as allies. Bringing the policy to BOARS would have helped illuminate its potential effect on other campuses. It is critical for UC to communicate clear and consistent admissions information to students, parents, and schools to avoid misunderstandings.

**ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to recommend to the Berkeley Senate division that Berkeley delay implementation of the new freshman admissions policy for one year; i.e., so that the policy would become effective with applicants applying for admission to UC Berkeley for fall 2017. The motion passed 7-2.**

#### **IV. Common Core Math: UC's Perspective on accelerated pathways to calculus**

BOARS members Professors Zieve and DeFea drafted a statement on behalf of BOARS responding to concerns being expressed by some parents of advanced students that the new Common Core math pathway will disrupt the normal path to advanced math in middle and high schools and disadvantage their child in UC admissions. These parents are concerned that students will have fewer opportunities to take AP Calculus, a course they perceive as necessary to be competitive for admission to UC and other universities.

The statement authors found that 95% of total applicants admitted to UC have taken at least one advanced math course; however, the statement notes that no single class, including AP Calculus, determines an admissions decision, and the perception that UC favors applicants who take AP Calculus in their junior year has encouraged some students to take advanced math before they are ready, which can lead to frustration and loss of interest in STEM fields. The authors have been careful in the statement not to discourage enthusiastic and well-prepared students from taking AP math courses, but the statement also notes that poor performance in an advanced class such as AP Calculus is more likely to weaken a student's application than to strengthen it, and while the UC admit rate is slightly higher among the group that has taken AP Calculus; it is substantially lower among students getting a C or lower.

***Discussion:*** BOARS members noted that it would be useful to obtain statistics on whether students with AP Calculus are admitted at a higher rate and on the effect of taking AP courses in general, rather than AP Calculus specifically. It was noted that question reflects a “chicken or the egg” dilemma; that is, is the high rate of AP Calculus course-taking driven by an assumption that UC favors AP Calculus, or by a real UC admissions preference for AP Calculus? It was noted that the statement should clarify that it is advantageous to take AP Calculus for entrance to some majors, but it might also express UC's acceptance of other advanced math courses, such as AP Statistics, as on an equal footing with calculus coursework. A member noted that UC may be overvaluing AP and contributing to the increasing pressure on high school students by offering a GPA “bump” for honors and AP courses.

## **V. Revised Advanced Placement Exams**

BOARS reviewed recommendations from UC faculty content experts charged with determining whether UC should award elective credit for scores of 3 or higher on redesigned versions of the AP exams in Biology, Spanish Literature and Culture, and Spanish Language and Culture.

**ACTION:** A motion was made and seconded to approve awarding elective credit for redesigned Advanced Placement exam scores of 3 or higher for the three revised AP exams. The motion passed unanimously.

## **VI. Proposed Revisions to Senate Regulation 417 and 621**

UCOP has asked BOARS to consider modifications to two Academic Senate regulations. The first, to [SR 417](#), addresses students who complete coursework at a college while enrolled in high school. The revision removes the word “Community” from “Community College coursework” to clarify the intent of the regulation that all college/university credits, including those from both two- and four-year institutions should be treated the same. The second, to [SR 621](#), addresses the standardized examination credit students may present to the University. It replaces the phrase “Advanced Placement Examination Credit” with “Standardized Examination Credit” and notes that the standardized exams for which the university awards credit may include those from the College Board, International Baccalaureate, Advanced Level and any other exam BOARS determines is acceptable for transfer credit, to clarify that the possibilities are not limited to what may have been available in 1983 when the regulation was written.

**ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to forward the revisions to Academic Council for review. The motion passed unanimously.**

## **VII. Concordance of TOEFL and IELTS Scores**

BOARS discussed the concordance of TOEFL and International English Language Testing System (IELTS) scores in the context of its decision to increase the minimum TOEFL requirement from 80 to 90. The concordance tables for IELTS showed that a TOEFL score of 80 or 90 aligns with an IELTS score of 6.5, while UC's current minimum IELTS score of 7.0 corresponds to a TOEFL score of 94-101. BOARS requested data on UC applicants and admits to assess their consistency with the concordance table. There were limited data available for the comparison, but UCOP provided summary statistics comparing admit rates, average GPA, and probation rates for students who submitted either a TOEFL or IELTS score with their application between 2007 and 2014. The analysis suggests that an IELTS score of 6.5 would correspond more closely to a TOEFL score range of 80-90 than the current minimum IELTS score of 7.0.

***Discussion:*** BOARS members referred back to the morning discussion with admissions directors about the TOEFL, which revealed that a higher minimum TOEFL score could impair the ability of campuses with fewer international applicants to meet their nonresident enrollment targets. It was noted that individual campuses have the ability to set a minimum score that is higher than the systemwide minimum. It was also noted that one campus that recently raised its minimum to 95 and has not seen an effect on international admissions.

**ACTION: A motion was made and seconded to change the minimum TOEFL score from 90 back to 80. There was then a motion to amend the motion on the floor, to include an adjustment of the IELTS minimum score from 7.0 to 6.5 in order to more closely correspond with the TOEFL range of 79-93 as reflected in the concordance table. The motion to amend passed, and then the original motion passed.**

## **VIII. UC Elective Credit-Granting Guidelines for High School Curricular Programs**

- o Henry Sanchez, BOARS Vice Chair

BOARS has been asked to review [AP Capstone](#), a new Diploma program from the College Board – specifically the AP Seminar course and exam and the AP Research course and assessment – to decide whether UC should award elective credit, and the appropriate exam or assessment score required to receive elective credit. The request brings up a broader question about how to programmatically address high school curricular programs requesting UC elective credit that do not align with UC general education curriculum. It has been suggested that BOARS develop guidelines to help UC navigate not only Capstone but future programs to ensure rigor. BOARS will discuss this topic next year.

## **IX. BOARS Priorities for 2015-16**

BOARS members identified several issues for continued work and discussion in the next academic year:

- Finalize statement about common core math pathways, and perhaps develop another statement articulating the non-cognitive experiences and characteristics faculty seek in a student.
- Discuss which policy issues and practices campuses are expected to bring to BOARS for consultation or approval.
- Discuss policies and practices for transfer comprehensive review in the context of the state's request that UC increase transfer enrollments to the 2:1 target in the Master Plan
- Address admissions-related programmatic innovations noted in the budget agreement, including a request to revisit current policies related to awarding UC credit for AP courses, the College-Level Examination Program (CLEP), military coursework and experience, and to consider using the Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID) as a supplemental numbering system for UC courses
- Discuss how UC should respond to the implementation of the Next Generation Science Standards in high schools, which may include a proposed to revise the area "d" requirement.
- Revisit the policy prohibiting students from fulfilling the Visual and Performing Arts (area "f") requirement with online courses.

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