

I. Welcome and Announcements

- *Bill Jacob, BOARS chair*

Chair Jacob welcomed BOARS members and reviewed the [charge](#) of the committee. BOARS advises the Academic Senate and UC President on matters relating to the criteria for admission to the University, the evaluation of applicants, and the certification of California secondary school and community college courses in meeting the requirements for undergraduate and transfer admission.

BOARS members are encouraged to consider issues from a systemwide perspective. They should share discussions about systemwide issues with their local committees, and in turn, share local concerns and issues with BOARS. BOARS will schedule regular executive sessions to give members the opportunity to discuss issues off the record. Members should treat agendas and committee documents as confidential unless otherwise noted.

Chair Jacob represents BOARS on the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. In September, Council discussed a [Salary Equity Study](#) written by a former chair of the University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, which suggests that UC is out of compliance with respect to pay equity for female faculty. UC administrators also briefed Council about a multi-year funding plan UCOP believes will help place UC on a more predictable and sustainable fiscal basis. The plan ties different levels of state support to different levels of tuition increases over a four year period. The Regents have pushed back on the plan, wanting to investigate the extent to which increased state advocacy and corporate fundraising could help generate revenue, before adopting such a plan. Finally, the UC General Counsel discussed [SB 185](#) with Council, proposed legislation that directs CSU and requests UC to consider race, gender, and ethnicity as relevant factors in their admission policies. UC Counsel believes the bill is constitutionally incompatible with Proposition 209 and would have no impact.

The BOARS chair, along with the Senate chair and vice chair, attend meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) to discuss issues of shared concern to the UC, CSU, and California Community College faculty, including general education requirements, legislation affecting all three segments, and higher education advocacy. ICAS is seeking more input from UC faculty in the development of Transfer Model Curricula.

Later this month, along with several UC admissions directors, Chair Jacob will speak at the College Board about the new admissions policy. He and other UC people are also meeting at the California Department of Education sponsored by Superintendent of Public Instruction Tom Torlakson to discuss the California's implementation of the Common Core State Standards and the role higher education can play in this process.

Discussion: It is important to have a sustainable funding plan, but the concept of increasing advocacy to restore state funding is inconsistent with the recent tuition increases; the two work

against each other because raising tuition lets the state off the hook. UCOP should also evaluate the implications of increasing tuition on the quality of the resident and nonresident student body.

Professor Akemann, who represents BOARS on the Education Finance Model Committee, has requested data about how the ability of UC students to find work-study jobs required for financial aid.

II. 2011-12 Issues Overview

o Bill Jacob, BOARS chair

Chair Jacob has been working with UCOP staff to develop research questions and data analyses that will help BOARS evaluate the Freshman Admissions Reform Policy; the first data, related to the application pool, will be available at the December 9 meeting.

He said the original impetus behind the expansion of the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) pool and the elimination of the Subject Test requirement was to remove unnecessary barriers and broaden access. BOARS was particularly motivated by a 2004 CPEC Report to the CA Legislature showing that 10,000 California high school graduates with 'a-g' GPAs of 3.5 and above were ineligible for UC only because of missing SAT Subject tests.

The referral pool will be stronger than ever under the new policy, and it is important that too many competitive students and/or ELC students are not relegated to the referral pool. All campuses should consider admitting a portion of the referral pool and the ELC pool. Interim Director Jeffery noted that Merced changed its referral process last year by asking referral students to indicate in advance if they were interested in attending Merced, and then offering admission only to those students who indicated interest. UCM believes it will be able to accommodate the 2012 referral pool only if it can offer spring term admission to some students.

BOARS will also monitor progress of the holistic review score sharing plan, the impact of budget cuts on admissions related functions, and the appropriate funding of admissions functions on campuses. BOARS and its Transfer Subcommittee will continue work on BOARS' [transfer admissions proposal](#) based on feedback from a targeted review on the campuses. The BOARS Articulation and Evaluation Subcommittee will continue to discuss the criteria for online 'a-g' courses as well as review specific courses and provider applications.

In addition to SB 185, BOARS will monitor other relevant bills, including [AB 130](#) (the Dream Act); [SB 611](#) (funding for the UC Curriculum Institutes); and [SB 612](#) (subject matter projects) that are on the Governor's desk for action.

III. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

o Martha Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate

Executive Director Winnacker said the role of the Academic Senate office is to provide the administrative, logistical and analytical support necessary to ensure that Senate bodies can conduct their business. The committee analyst is available to draft agendas, minutes, committee memos and reports, to share institutional knowledge, and to help ensure proper protocol. The Senate [asks](#) non-Santa Barbara travelers to use the Senate's dedicated site on SWABIZ to book

or change airline travel and to follow UC policy with regard to travel [reimbursements](#). She said the Senate values the brainpower, institutional knowledge, and commitment BOARS members bring to the systemwide Senate.

IV. Consultation with the UCOP Office of Admissions

- *Kate Jeffery, Interim Director of Admissions*
- *Shawn Brick, Associate Admissions Director, Transfer Policy*

Personnel changes and searches in the Office of Admissions:

Three of the four leadership positions in the Office of Admissions are currently vacant or filled with temporary appointments. The old Director of Undergraduate Admissions position has been split into two FTEs: an Executive Director focused on policy, and a Director responsible for interacting with campuses and the community. UCOP has completed a national search to fill the Executive Director position and plans to make a final decision about its preferred candidate in the near future. Monica Lin, the new Associate Director for Undergraduate Admissions, joins UCOP on October 26. She will be responsible for high school articulation and ‘a-g’ review issues.

Fall 2011 Counselor Conferences:

The annual Counselor Conferences are UC’s chance to deliver systemwide and campus admissions messages to high school and community college counselors across California, and to address their questions. This year, UC hosted two joint conferences with CSU in addition to four UC-only events. Counselors raised several issues related to the 2012 policy. Some are confused by UC’s [messaging](#) about SAT Subject Tests; they note that while campuses will no longer require Subject Tests, UC provides a list of departments recommending specific tests with a message that they “add merit” in some cases; counselors suspect that the tests may actually be an unstated requirement. They are also concerned that campuses that normally have guaranteed a spot to the full 4% ELC pool will be unable to extend that guarantee to the top 9%; and that students will no longer know their ELC status until after they apply (although some are happy that the entire pool of students will be reviewed for ELC status). Some counselors are also confused about UC’s message that it is enrolling nonresidents only above State funded enrollment. Others want UC to expand the number of approved online courses to address the growing number of high schools that use online education to meet the needs of their students.

Participation in Tuition Assistance Program for Active Duty Military Personnel:

UC has been under pressure to be more open and accommodating to returning military veterans. Last year, BOARS endorsed a proposal from the Office of Student Affairs to remove current restrictions on the acceptance of military coursework for transfer to UC that allows UC to accept American Council on Education (ACE) credit standards to award academic credit for courses completed as part of military education. The Tuition Assistance Program for active duty military personnel covers tuition for regular and reserve service members. At UC, it is a small program that only about 40 students use. UC is concerned about a new MOU the Department of Defense is requiring participating institutions to sign to maintain student eligibility; the MOU is highly prescriptive about academic standards and policies, especially related to transfer policy. It would require UC to accept any course in the ACE registry, rather than only those that meet transfer standards, and to accept test scores that UC does not normally recognize. UC wants to support veterans, but it will not reduce its admissions standards to accommodate them. UC and other

research universities are advocating for changes in the MOU that do not dilute standards, while CSU has indicated that it will sign it.

Research Agenda for Assessing Non-Resident Admissions and the New Admissions Policy:

UCOP has prepared a document outlining research questions about new admissions policy the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Students Affairs will analyze over the coming year to help BOARS measure the success of the policy. The agenda is a living document. It proposes a timeline for studying the applicant pool, the admit pool, and the SIR pool as data become available.

Financial Aid Initiative for Middle-Income Families:

UC's current financial aid programs are among the most generous in the country for lower income families, but there is concern about the increasing burden tuition increases are placing on the middle class. UCOP is developing a new financial aid proposal that would extend financial support further into the middle class by expanding the Blue and Gold Plan income cap for full tuition support from \$80,000 to \$90,000, and providing 50% tuition relief to students with household incomes between \$90,000 and \$120,000. UC is aware that the federal needs methodology is not as fair and sensitive as it could be. UC is considering an alternative methodology that looks at the income of non-custodial parents and assets.

Discussion: The research agenda should answer basic questions such as whether there has been an increase in applications; it will be particularly important to see the distribution of applicants in the ELC pool early in the data gathering and research cycle.

There are anecdotal reports about nonresidents unhappy with their experience at certain campuses. UC should gather information about this more broadly and systematically. UC needs to do a better job of taking care of its lower division students more generally, so they are not paying more but receiving less. Additional climate questions could be added to the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). It was also suggested that BOARS send representatives to attend each of the Counselors Conferences next year.

V. Admissions Reform Policy

Chair Jacob asked BOARS to consider how campuses can accommodate students who might not have been UC-eligible in the past. He said the policy's goal of bringing new talent to UC is manifested most clearly in the expanded ELC pool, and in the pool of students who will be "entitled to review" but not part of the statewide or ELC guarantee. All campuses should ideally consider the referral pool, which will include talented applicants with an ELC guarantee who were not offered admission to any campus to which they applied.

Discussion: Members agreed that campuses would welcome the opportunity to consider talented referral pool students. It was noted that students do not always make the most strategic or informed application choices, and would be happy to go to another UC campus they hadn't considered initially. It was noted that UCSB admits a significant number of students through a unique school context program that admits the top UC eligible Santa Barbara applicants from each California high school up to 3% of the size of the school's graduating class. UCSB would be interested in referral pool students who did not apply to UCSB but would have been in the school context pool if they had. Campuses should strive to meet the original goals of the policy,

which include bringing additional populations and hidden talent to UC. It was also noted that referral pool yield is traditionally very low, and involves a lot of work for little reward; honoring the 9x9 guarantee may not go much beyond a symbolic value. The biggest barriers to implementing a referral pool review are resources and timing, as campuses will have to wait for other campuses to make their decisions. UC needs a way to establish the 9x9 pools early in the process.

The Davis representative reported that Davis will end its practice of offering admission to all ELC applicants, because the campus does not have capacity to move from 4% to 9% and noted that the recruitment tool aspect of ELC has been diluted. In addition, Davis will now have a uniform process for selection on a residency blind basis. However, campuses will have access to ELC gradations between 1% and 9%, and Davis will use a high ranking as a plus factor. Riverside does not expect the new ELC construct to impact the campus, which already has a very diverse student body.

The research agenda should look at how many applicants from the new 9% ELC pool would not have met eligibility requirements in the past, and then how many students from that population were admitted compared to the past. It should also address yield, because it is important for UC not only to admit some “Entitled to Review” students who are not in a guaranteed pool, but also to actually enroll some of those students. Finally, BOARS should look at how many students took SAT Subject Tests.

It was noted that campuses are unsure about their plans to use wait lists this year. Wait list decisions are unpredictable because they are driven by yield from the admit pool.

Action: BOARS members will discuss the referral pool questions with their local committees, and consult with campus admissions directors about how prepared they feel to handle the 2012 admissions cycle and the new influx of “ETR” and nonresident applications.

VI. Plan for Sharing Read Scores

Issue: Last year, BOARS drafted a plan for sharing holistic review scores across campuses. It states that all comprehensive review scores and flags for supplemental review cases should be shared openly throughout the system. The UCLA Admissions Committee, however, adopted a resolution stating that UCLA would share its scores only with UC campuses that use UCLA scores in their admissions process (UCI, UCSD, UCSC, and UCD).

Discussion: Chair Jacob said UCLA has been very helpful in teaching other campuses how to use holistic scores, but the resolution is disappointing. The BOARS policy is intended to help all campuses plan and estimate enrollment and compare outcomes to their own comprehensive review processes. The UCLA representative said he thought the resolution was the result of concerns about the costs involved and the idea that sharing scores could disadvantage UCLA in the competition for some students.

It was noted that UCLA should not be concerned about campuses stealing applicants from each other. There may be some competition among campuses for nonresidents, but there are an abundance of qualified resident applicants in the pool that get divided among the most selective campuses. It was also noted that the less selective campuses are worried about losing their very best applicants to the more selective campuses, and that most students select campuses based on mythologies attached to the campus as well as proximity to home.

Action: The UCLA representative will bring Chair Jacob’s message back to his committee.

VII. Review Items

Systemwide Senate Review of UCEP’s Proposed amendments to Senate Regulation 610:

UCEP’s amendment to [SR 610](#) clarifies what it means for a student to be “in residence.” It was prompted by a UC Rules and Jurisdiction ruling that “residency” for purposes of earning a degree does not depend on a student’s physical location, only that they be enrolled in a UC program of study. Senate Chair Anderson noted that it would be helpful for BOARS to give an opinion on the amendment.

Allowing LGBT Applicants to Self-identify on the Application:

Issue: The Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges recently adopted a resolution in support of allowing students to voluntarily report their sexual orientation and gender identity on college and district forms where other demographic data are collected.

Discussion: Some members thought it would be useful to collect LGBT data—for example, to inform campus climate assessments or track whether such students are choosing or avoiding certain campuses; however, they were not sure the application is the best place to collect it. Other members were opposed to collecting the data, citing concerns about privacy and noting that sexual orientation is unrelated to the admission process. Moreover, the question might be awkward for young people to answer especially with parents reading the application over their shoulder. It was noted that the UCUES survey collects LGBT data on enrolled students; there is also a systemwide climate survey being developed.

Action: BOARS will continue the discussion on these two topics next month.

VIII. Executive Session

BOARS members and UCOP consultants met in executive session.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm
Minutes prepared by Michael LaBriola
Attest: Bill Jacob