

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

**Minutes of Meeting**  
**June 5, 2015**

**PART 1: JOINT MEETING WITH CSU ADMISSION ADVISORY COUNCIL**

**I. Announcements**

- Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair
- Barry Pasternack, Admission Advisory Council Co-Chair

BOARS Chair Aldredge noted that BOARS advises the UC President and Senate agencies on the conditions for undergraduate admission to UC. Each UC campus sends a representative to BOARS, and consultants from the systemwide administration sit with the committee to help it review admissions policy issues and analyze potential policy changes.

UC AAC Chair Pasternack noted that the AAC is charged with defining entrance requirements for CSU, ensuring that CSU's college preparation requirements align with UC's, strengthening CSU's relationships with secondary schools and colleges, identifying admissions issues affecting CSU campuses, providing feedback to the chancellor's office on selected proposed legislation and policy issues, and recommending systemwide admissions policies and guidelines. The AAC traditionally is co-chaired by a campus president and a representative from the statewide Senate.

**II. A-G Review Process**

It was noted that the "a-g" course pattern has become not only a benchmark for college preparation in California, but also a reference point for colleges and universities across the country, as they consider their relationship with high schools. The "a-g" [course criteria and guidelines](#) outline the expected content of courses in each subject area for K-12 educators and curriculum designers. UCOP and BOARS initiated a comprehensive review of the guidelines in 2013. Faculty workgroups were convened to update the criteria for each subject area to incorporate elements of the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). The revisions were completed last year.

It was noted that CSU faculty are interested in more opportunities for consultation and collaboration around proposed changes affecting the "a-g" pattern, which students aiming for both UC and CSU admissions must complete. Some CSU faculty were left guessing about the rationale for changes to the area "f" (Visual and Performing Arts) guidelines. They hope to be involved earlier and more substantially in future discussions. It was noted that area "f" was revised to allow student to fulfill the requirement with two semester-long courses, in addition to a single, year-long course, as long as the two semester courses fall in the same arts discipline and have a sequential relationship. The proposed revisions were sent to CSU, K-12, and other stakeholders during a three month public review and comment period, during which UC received no objections from CSU. UC is open to additional ways of engaging CSU faculty. It was noted that future reviews should include the AAC and the CSU Academic Preparation and Education Programs (APEP) committee.

### III. Next Generation Science Standards and area “d”

BOARS and the AAC discussed how both segments plan to address the upcoming implementation of the NGSS in K-12 and potential changes to the laboratory science (“d”) subject requirement ([Senate Regulation 424.A.3.d](#)) to align with the NGSS. It was noted that BOARS and UCOP plan to convene a faculty advisory committee to discuss a possible revision to area “d.” A central question will be whether area “d” should continue to identify the three “foundational” 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 & Applications of Science—and broaden the scope beyond only “laboratory sciences.” The effort is in its beginning stages, but UC intends to engage CSU faculty in a conversation about potential changes to area “d”, and the advisory committee will be expected to consult with the appropriate CSU bodies before making a recommendation to BOARS.

It was noted that approximately 65% of incoming CSU students (and an even higher percentage of underrepresented students) arrive with fewer than three years of science. (In contrast, 95% of UC students enter with three or more science courses.) The advisory committee should keep this in mind in considering a change to area “d” that increases the science expectation from two to three years. In addition, a growing number of schools are moving to an “A-G for All” model, in which the “a-g” pattern is the default graduation requirement. The advisory committee should also consider the impact of a change on those schools and districts. In addition, any change should include a phase-in period to ensure that current high school students are not adversely affected. It was noted that schools will need additional resources for professional development and for new instructional materials that support and incorporate the NGSS and Common Core.

It was noted that UC wants to support efforts by high schools to incorporate the NGSS into the science curriculum and shift science education to the interdisciplinary approach outlined in the NGSS. At the same time, the “a-g” requirements influence the way high schools design and teach courses. A change to area “d” could send a positive message of support to schools and districts. In addition, some under-resourced schools struggle to offer laboratory courses due to the high cost of such courses, but the NGSS introduces new flexibility about how science education is imparted to students that may not necessarily occur in a laboratory environment, which could help under-resourced schools offer more courses that meet area “d” and expand educational access to URM groups. It was noted that UC’s new A-G Course Management Portal provides registered users with access to the full course descriptions of all approved “a-g” courses, including NGSS-aligned courses that have earned area “d” approval.

### IV. Transfer Admission Topics

BOARS and the AAC discussed several issues associated with fostering and improving the transfer path.

**Implementation of the Associate Degrees for Transfer:** A recent [report](#) from the Legislative Analyst’s Office summarizes the status of the implementation of Senate Bill 1440, which requires California Community Colleges to develop 60-unit Associate Degrees for Transfer (AD-T) that guarantee admission into a CSU bachelor’s degree program (though not to a particular

campus or major) and a degree following an additional 60 units of CSU coursework. CSU and CCC have developed Transfer Model Curricula (TMC), identifying the coursework needed for an AD-T, for 33 majors.

AAC members noted that the program has been important in highlighting to potential transfers the importance of preparing for a specific major. It has also helped CCCs advocate for funding for discipline-specific courses that help students transfer. However, outcome data are too preliminary to determine yet whether SB 1440 has reduced the number of courses CSU students take to earn a baccalaureate degree. CSU gives admission priority to transfer applicants with an AD-T, and provides them a GPA “bump” of up to 0.2 points, but the AD-T does not guarantee admission to a specific program at a specific CSU, and CSU redirects some AD-T-holders who applied to an impacted major to another CSU campus or non-impacted major. However, many CCC students are unable to travel to a CSU in another region of the state, making the AD-T impractical for students interested in specific programs and campuses. For these reasons, some faculty feel it is disingenuous to advertise the AD-T as a “degree with a guarantee.” Moreover, CSU campuses in some cases have found that a 60-unit TMC does not align with the preparation and competencies required for a major, and therefore accept the TMC as valid only for certain concentrations within that major. There have also been challenges with the quality of data— in particular, the ability to validate whether a CCC student is on track to earn an AD-T and to capture a student’s degree status during the admissions process. The first TMCs are up for a five year review, and CSU is developing a procedure for the regular review of TMCs to allow for potential revisions.

**UC Transfer Pathways:** UC is engaged in an effort to streamline its transfer process to make it easier for CCC students to prepare simultaneously for admission at multiple UC campuses. Campuses are currently reviewing transfer pathway agreements for ten majors. It is expected that completion of a given pathway with a competitive GPA will ensure that an applicant is competitive for admission to the major, as prepared for upper division work as other students entering their third year, and prepared to graduate from UC in two years. As UC develops its pathways, it is noting the differences and similarities with the CSU TMC for a given major. Intersegmental alignment would be ideal, but difficult to achieve as UC does not have a GE requirement restriction and may require more or less coursework than the TMC, depending on the major. It was noted that BOARS’s transfer admission policy also emphasizes the need to evaluate applicants based on comprehensive review principles that account for a variety of cognitive and non-cognitive factors.

**Course Identification Numbering System (C-ID):** The Course Identification Numbering System (**C-ID**) identifies comparable courses across the higher education segments, particularly those commonly articulated for transfer. C-ID numbers are anchored to “course descriptors” that have been developed and approved by discipline faculty at CCC and CSU and provide a robust description of topics that will be covered in a course. Courses judged equivalent receive a C-ID number, which appears in course catalogs alongside the local course number. CSU campuses sometimes use C-ID numbers to build campus-to-campus articulation and the TMCs. UC is being asked to consider C-ID as a supplemental numbering system for UC courses. It was noted that some faculty are concerned about the difficulty of verifying that a course is being taught according to the outline in the course descriptor. It has also been difficult, in some cases, to convince enough faculty to participate in the review of course descriptors.

## **V. Application Overlap Data and Future Trends**

BOARS and AAC members reviewed data prepared by UCOP outlining the overlap between UC's fall 2013 applicant pool and CSU's 2013-14 applicant pool for both freshmen and transfers. The data show that 61% of freshman applicants to UC and 50% of transfer applicants to UC also applied to a CSU campus, and that 60% of freshman and transfer applicants who applied to both CSU and UC were admitted to UC. There were no data available on CSU admits and on overlap applicants or admits who chose to attend CSU.

It was suggested that future analyses should examine overlap trends over time. It was noted that CSU campuses which previously took all eligible students are becoming more selective, and that CSU denied admission to a total of 36,000 eligible applicants last year. CSU now extends a referral guarantee only to students with an SB 1440 degree, because it no longer has space for other eligible referral ("redirected") applicants who were not accepted to the campus to which they applied. It was noted that the state wants to conduct a new eligibility study (last done in 2009 by the now defunct CPEC) to determine if CSU and UC are drawing more than their respective Master Plan targets of 33% and 12.5%, but that the timing for a study is not ideal due to factors such as the upcoming curricular changes in K-12 and the redesign of the SAT. It was noted that a very high percentage of CSU students attend the CSU campus in their home community; examples given were San Bernardino (93%) and Fresno (80%).

There was strong concern expressed that the segments will be unable to meet population growth and demand, that more eligible and deserving students will fall through the cracks, and that the state's most vulnerable communities will be unable to access higher education. The three higher education systems should consider and address these issues together as they discuss the future of their public mission.

## **PART II: BOARS Meeting**

### **I. Consent Calendar**

- BOARS minutes of May 1, 2015

**ACTION: BOARS approved the May minutes.**

### **II. Announcements**

- Ralph Aldredge, BOARS Chair

Joint Meeting with Admissions Directors: BOARS members identified topics for the June 26 joint half-day meeting with the campus admissions directors. One will be the means by which BOARS evaluates, and communicates its evaluation, of campus outcomes for the compare favorably standard for nonresident admission. BOARS and the directors will discuss the need to ensure a critical, transparent evaluation of the campus assessments, gather and make public meaningful data, and possibly develop a common template for campus reporting. A second topic will be how campuses conduct comprehensive review for transfer applicants.

### **III. Consultation with UCOP – Office of Admissions**

- Judy Sakaki, Vice President for Student Affairs (phone)
- Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions
- Michael Treviño, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
- Monica Lin, Associate Director, Office of Admissions

Admissions Cycle Update: The normal admissions cycle has been affected by uncertainty about the state budget and UC's efforts to reduce the number of unfunded students. An unusually large number of students are on wait lists this year, and final admission numbers are still pending. As of May 27, UC had admitted over 61,500 California residents, a 1.9% decrease compared to last year, while nonresident admits increased 13% compared to last year. The decline in resident admits affected all ethnic groups, with no disproportionate impact to URMs. The total number of transfer admission offers declined 3.2% compared to last year; although there was a 4.9% increase in admissions offers to international transfers. 1,225 of the 12,000 students in the referral pool opted into considering an offer from UC Merced. UCOP is working with legislators to secure additional permanent funding for California resident enrollment growth.

Student Issues: At the May Regents meeting, President Napolitano awarded two students the President's Award for Outstanding Student Leadership, and Student Regent Saifuddin made a presentation about the extent of food insecurity at the University. UC Riverside graduate student Marcela Ramirez has been named 215-15 Student Regent Designate.

TCA Guidelines Review Part II: BOARS was asked to approve revisions to the Transferable Course Agreement (TCA) Guidelines for History and World Languages recommended by faculty work groups, and to the TCA Guidelines for Architecture, Business, College Success, Education, Health Education, and Religion, recommended by individual faculty UCOP consulted on an ad hoc basis.

**Action: a motion to approve the revisions to the TCA Guidelines was made and seconded. The motion passed unanimously.**

#### **IV. Common Core Math Pathways: Perspectives on Accelerated Pathways to Calculus**

Some parents of advanced students are concerned that the new Common Core math pathway (Algebra I-Geometry-Algebra II-Advanced math, beginning in high school) will disrupt the normal pathway to advanced mathematics in middle and high schools and disadvantage their child in UC admissions. Many California school districts are also receiving pressure from anxious parents convinced that students must complete AP Calculus to be competitive for admission to UC and other universities. These parents believe that math acceleration pathways should continue in their current form in schools, despite the prospect that the Common Core may prepare students more appropriately for college-level math and provides an option for advanced students to take an acceleration course in 8<sup>th</sup> grade or in high school that compresses two years of math in a single year and prepares them for advanced math coursework later in high school.

It has been suggested that UC provide data to schools and parents showing that UC does not require student to take AP Calculus to be competitive for admission, and issue a statement from BOARS 1) indicating that the rush to AP Calculus is not the best way to prepare for college-level math and 2) supporting efforts by districts and schools to implement thoughtful pathways through math to support students' learning and college preparation.

It was noted that a public perception about the high value UC places on accelerated math has helped turn the accelerated pathway into the default. In some cases, it has caused students to take on too much math too soon, struggle, fail, or become discouraged from entering STEM majors. It was also noted that UC should support the subset of students who want the challenge of calculus, and that some highly selective UC majors such as engineering and physics value an advanced math background that may include calculus. Members agreed that it would be helpful for BOARS to issue a statement clarifying to campus admissions offices and the public that UC does not require calculus for admission (although the statement should not make a judgement about the Common Core itself). It was noted that the UC Admissions website includes a [statement](#) about Common Core Math in the context of UC admissions and the area "c" requirement.

**Action: BOARS members Professors Zieve and DeFea will draft a statement for BOARS review on June 26.**

#### **V. PTE Academic Proposal**

Pearson Education has asked UC to recognize the Pearson Test of English Academic (PTE Academic) as an approved English language test for undergraduate international applicants who are non-native English speakers.

It was noted that the PTE Academic test has been used primarily in graduate and professional schools and that Pearson is now entering the undergraduate testing market. It was noted that most of UC's peer institutions do not currently accept PTE scores for undergraduate admission, and among the universities that do, minimum scores vary more widely than TOEFL and IELTS. Because of this and a general dearth of available PTE score data, it would be difficult to establish an accurate correlation between a minimum PTE score and current or future acceptable TOEFL and IELTS scores.

**Action: BOARS agreed to decline recognition of PTE Academic.**

## VI. Test of English as a Foreign Language

BOARS continued its discussion of 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. UCOP provided new data analyzing the relationship between TOEFL scores and academic success for international students who submitted a TOEFL score and subsequently enrolled at UC, to inform potential threshold score changes of 90 and 100 being discussed by BOARS.

A series of t-tests and proportion difference tests were run to help determine whether there are meaningful differences in various measures of success at UC at different score thresholds. These tests found that

- Students with higher TOEFL scores have significantly higher first- and second-year GPAs at UC compared to students with lower TOEFL scores.
- Students with TOEFL scores below 90 are significantly more likely to be on probation than students with TOEFL scores of 90 or above. This finding is also consistent for scores of 100 or above.
- Students with TOEFL scores over 80 have significantly higher first-year GPAs but are no less likely to be on probation than students with scores below 80.
- No statistically significant differences exist in persistence rates for students in different TOEFL score categories.

A series of regressions and logistic regressions were run on first- and second-year GPA, first- and second-year retention, four-year graduation, and six-year graduation to determine the relative predictive effect of TOEFL score, unweighted high school GPA, and SAT scores on each. These tests found that:

- Higher TOEFL score, high school GPA, and SAT score all predict higher first-year UC GPA.
- High school GPA and SAT scores are significant predictors of first- and second-year UC retention, first-year probation, and second-year GPA, while TOEFL score is not a significant predictor of first-year UC retention, first-year probation, graduation, or second year GPA.

BOARS also reviewed data drawn from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) summarizing students' self-reported engagement in class discussions, which showed no apparent relationship between TOEFL score and self-reported class participation. Another study that examined TOEFL scores of international admits by country of origin showed that only a handful of countries have more than 30% of students with TOEFL scores below 90. Finally, it was noted that UC's required score on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) is 7, which maps to a TOEFL score of 94-101.

**Discussion:** It was noted that the analysis does not provide evidence of a convincing correlation between the TOEFL and academic success; however, there is a good argument for raising the TOEFL minimum score (or lowering the IELTS minimum score) for alignment between the minimum TOEFL and IELTS scores. A reduction of the minimum acceptable IELTS for alignment with the current TOEFL minimum might require a change of the IELTS score from 7 to 6.5 (with the intention that the two minimum acceptable scores would predict similar measures of student success). It was noted that students on probation require expensive

resources, and some UC faculty have pointed to a growing number of language difficulties in classrooms.

Alternatively, raising the minimum acceptable TOEFL score for alignment with the current IELTS minimum could help ensure UC is admitting nonresidents whose performance compares favorably to residents. On the other hand, doing so could hurt international recruitment efforts. It was noted that UC policy allows campuses to set a higher than 80 minimum TOEFL score for selection. Campuses may also admit students with scores under 80 through Admission by Exception. BOARS requested new data comparing the TOEFL and IELTS scores of UC applicants, admits, and enrolled students to see if the IELTS concordance table is consistent with UC's data so that BOARS can decide if it should decrease IELTS to 6.5 to match a TOEFL score of 90 or leave IELTS at 7.

**Action: A motion was made and seconded to align the TOEFL and IELTS scores. The motion passed.**

**A motion was made and seconded to take the motion from the table that BOARS tabled in May to raise the minimum TOEFL score to 90. The motion passed.**

**A motion was made and seconded to raise the minimum TOEFL score to 90. The motion passed.**

## **VII. Consultation with Senate Leadership**

- Mary Gilly, Academic Council Chair (phone)
- Dan Hare, Academic Council Vice Chair (phone)

Campus Review of Transfer Pathways: Nearly all campuses have signed off on the transfer pathway agreements for ten majors reached at three April meetings. Chair Gilly thanked BOARS members for their efforts to move the review and approval process forward. The President is excited about the progress the Senate has made on the project. The Senate is scheduling meetings for 11 additional majors in October and welcomes suggestions for improving the process.

Budget Agreement/Regents Meeting: The long-term funding agreement between the Governor and the University includes a commitment to 4% base budget increases in each of the next four years and \$436 million in one-time pension funding over three years. In exchange, UC agreed to freeze resident tuition through 2016-17, increase NRST by 8% in each of the next two years, and implement a new pension tier for employees hired after July 1, 2016. New employees will have the choice between a Defined Contribution Plan, and a Defined Benefit Plan that limits pensionable salary to the Social Security Wage Base established by the California Public Employees' Pension Reform Act of 2013 (PEPRA). Some faculty have expressed concern that the new tier will hurt UC's competitiveness. The budget agreement also asks UC to implement or expand several programmatic innovations—including developing three-year degree pathways to increase the proportion of students who graduate in three years; reducing the number of upper division courses required for a major; expanding the use of "predictive analytics" to identify at-risk students; and revisiting current policies related to AP course credit and credit by examination.



## **VIII. AP Capstone and Development of UC Elective Credit Granting Guidelines for High School Curricular Programs**

BOARS has been asked to review the AP Seminar course and exam and the AP Research course and assessment, both part of the College Board's new [AP Capstone](#) Diploma program, and to decide whether UC should award elective credit, and the appropriate exam or assessment score required to receive elective credit.

UCB Professor Rakesh Bhandari joined BOARS to discuss his work as a consultant to the College Board on AP Capstone. He noted that the program includes some impressive components and has great potential, but he has not reviewed a sampling of high school projects completed so far to verify their quality. He believes more clarification is needed about the goals of the program. In addition, he believes it would be better for the College Board to define and evaluate research topics centrally, rather than leave those determinations to school districts. More centralization is also needed to promote a common understanding of best practices for research and tools for assessing the credibility of sources and recognizing the components of a significant research problem. He noted that it is unlikely the program could satisfy more than general education college credit at UC.

BOARS members noted that the request brings up a broader discussion of how to programmatically address high school curricular programs requesting UC elective credit that do not align with UC general education curriculum.

## **IX. Campus Issues**

UCR Request to opt-out of Holistic Review: Riverside has been reviewing options for implementing a single score holistic review process in anticipation of reaching an admission rate below 50% in 2016. (The campus projects a 57% acceptance rate this year.) UCR considered the possibility of incorporating additional factors into its existing comprehensive review process, which uses a weighting system that employs 5 of the 14 factors recommended by BOARS. It concluded that because the quality of UCR's admitted pool has steadily increased under the existing system, and because UCR continues to maintain one of the most diverse student bodies in the UC system, the high cost of moving to a single score holistic read is not justified at this time. The admissions committee does want to find a way to incorporate more non-cognitive factors into its comprehensive review formula, perhaps by modifying the current UC application to capture additional information.

New Berkeley Admission Policy: Berkeley recently approved a new freshman admissions policy that is intended to provide additional clarity, consistency, and flexibility in the context of dramatically increased selectivity and application workload. Berkeley admissions staff have been struggling to manage application workload because of the continued sharp increase in applications under existing read procedures. In addition, existing procedures were failing to make fine enough distinctions between the most accomplished students and their near competitors. Furthermore, the existing read system put Berkeley in danger of passing over very strong candidates in favor of candidates from Augmented Review. In this increasingly narrow selectivity space, Berkeley felt it needed more information than the current application provides to distinguish applicants and decided to require all applicants to submit two letters of

recommendation, which the campus already requires in augmented review and for student athletes.

The campus also found that the read scoring system had become problematic under demands from faculty to make the system more transparent. In particular the new policy addresses what was seen as an overly complex augmented review reading and scoring system by incorporating augmented review into the general holistic read. It replaces the five-category numerical scoring of applicants with three recommendation categories—“yes,” “possible,” and “no.” All files are read by an external reader who annotates the application file for the holistic factor(s) found and recommends the applicant be yes, no, or possible. Software allows readers to create a record of the holistic read factors in the application, so later readers need only verify features of earlier reads. An internal reader then assesses the file in light of the first reader’s tags and verifies or adjusts external reader’s score. The new policy will also continue the Predictive Index Review procedure as a quality control device, followed by faculty review, and a By High School review. Predictive Index Review generates an expected read recommendation based on the quantitative data by using a broad-based multivariate analysis of read factors, and compares it to the actual human read recommendation.

**Discussion:** There was strong concern expressed about Berkeley’s decision to implement a policy requiring letters of recommendation without consulting UCOP or BOARS. It was noted that the UC application, which states that letters are not required, cannot be changed in time, and that UC and Berkeley will be communicating mixed messages to the public. There was also concern about the policy itself, particularly the potential for a differential impact on students who attend under-resourced schools that may not have the capacity to generate letters. There was a request for Berkeley to prepare a statement explaining how the policy will not adversely impact applicants.

-----  
Meeting adjourned at 4:15 pm  
Minutes Prepared by Michael LaBriola  
Attest: Ralph Aldredge