

The Regents of the University of California

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

July 20, 2022

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, 1675 Owens Street, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons; Advisory member Cochran; Chancellors Block, Christ, Larive, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Lakireddy

In attendance: Regent-designate Tesfai, Faculty Representative Horwitz, Regents Analyst Sheridan, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Vice Presidents Brown and Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 3:35 p.m. with Committee Chair Park presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 18, 2022 were approved.

2. **REPORT ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENTS AND COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Provost Brown introduced the item. The fall 2021 Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review was one of a series of reports produced annually by the Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) in compliance with Regents Policy. Prior to enacting comprehensive review policies in 2001, the University admitted students using a narrow set of quantitative indicators. Mr. Brown noted that the fall 2021 admissions cycle was the first one without a standardized testing requirement.

Faculty Representative Horwitz stated that the implementation of comprehensive review in the fall 2002 admissions cycle did not change UC eligibility criteria; rather, comprehensive review was extended to the full applicant pool for campuses that could not accommodate all eligible applicants. BOARS did this to clarify that the faculty's definition of academic merit was based on achievement and potential, not on narrow quantitative indicators. BOARS also recognized that evaluating achievement across a broader range of criteria would require a more thorough, in-depth review. The University acknowledged that its highly competitive admissions environment called for a customized review process

to admit and enroll students who demonstrate academic excellence and reflect the diversity of the state.

BOARS Chair Madeleine Sorapure stated that the 13 factors in comprehensive review included high school grade point average (GPA), completion of honors courses, extracurricular activities, special talents, and achievement in the context of opportunity. Comprehensive review allows a campus to consider the whole student and evaluates qualities such as resilience and motivation. Local practices varied, but all campuses did incorporate academic and contextual factors into their assessment of student talent and potential. In 2021, UC admitted and enrolled more California residents than ever before. The number of applications from California residents increased 13 percent and was the highest it has ever been, which could be partly attributable to the elimination of the standardized testing requirement. Also in 2021, 16.2 percent of California public high school graduates were admitted to UC, exceeding the 12.5 percent expectation set in the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Ms. Sorapure presented a chart indicating UC's steady enrollment rate of over one-third low-income and over two-fifths first-generation California residents. While the percentage of first-generation students at UC was slightly decreasing, the number of first-generation students was increasing due to enrollment growth over the past five years. Of the California residents enrolled in fall 2021, 38.6 percent were from underrepresented groups. The mean, first-year UC GPA of California residents who entered in 2019 was 3.34; the probation rate was 3.1 percent, the lowest it had ever been; and the first-year persistence rate was 93.7 percent, the highest it had ever been.

In transfer admissions, comprehensive review had nine factors, including those specific to academic preparation at community colleges. The factors also underscore the importance of major preparation via the Transfer Pathways and Pathways+ programs. In fall 2021, California resident transfer application numbers grew 7.7 percent to an all-time high of 39,442 applications. Transfer students had lower probation rates in 2019–20 and the highest two-year graduation rates ever in 2019. Ms. Sorapure highlighted initiatives for improving undergraduate recruitment and yield, particularly of California resident African American and Native American students, such as the Native Opportunity Plan, Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships, and programs like UC SCOUT that help reduce disparities in access to preparation for high school students. With plans to increase undergraduate enrollment in this decade, BOARS recommended additional funding for faculty, staff, and student support. The ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on academic preparation and personal well-being were only beginning to be understood and would likely mean that future cohorts of students would need more support. Next year, BOARS would have data on the first-year outcomes of 2021 enrollees, who were admitted without a testing requirement. Aside from the removal of standardized testing, the pandemic may have also had an impact on application numbers. The Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues was formed this year and would represent the University on intersegmental transfer committees and initiatives.

Regent Timmons, referring to the chart of first-year outcomes in the presentation materials, asked how much overlap there was among low-income, first-generation, and Pell Grant

recipient students. Provost Brown explained that students could be in multiple categories and offered to share these data with the Regents. Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu confirmed that there was some overlap. Mr. Brown added that the overlap varied depending on ethnic group.

Regent Hernandez asked if the University was on track to achieve President Drake's enrollment growth goal of adding the equivalent of one campus' worth of students to UC. Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative, noting that this year was not indicative of UC's progress given challenges in transfer student enrollment. While the University was generally on track, more work needed to be done to close gaps in graduation rates.

Regent Blas Pedral urged the University to be mindful of the pandemic and inflation while monitoring the impact of test-free admission, as these factors could also prevent students from completing their degrees. Ms. Sorapure acknowledged that separating the effects of the pandemic and remote education from changes to the admissions policy would be challenging, adding that UC might not be able to wait until after the pandemic to collect these data.

Regent Blas Pedral, referring to the report, asked about how frequently the Academic Senate would consider adjustments to the guarantee structure. Ms. Sorapure replied that BOARS has discussed this but did not wish to make a significant change to eligibility soon after eliminating the standardized testing requirement in admissions.

Mr. Brown asked Ms. Sorapure if it was the case that BOARS examined data every year as a function of the admissions cycle. Ms. Sorapure replied in the affirmative. Mr. Brown noted that the University was slow to make changes to eligibility because of the impact they would have on students. Ms. Sorapure stated that this was correct; UC needed to consider the effect that changes would have on access and equity.

UC Santa Barbara Director of Undergraduate Admissions Lisa Przekop noted that, due to the rising cost of housing, students were working many hours, withdrawing from UC, or choosing campuses closer to home. This complicated the determination of key factors affecting retention rates.

Regent Blas Pedral expressed concern that one would conclude that test-free admissions was resulting in probation or non-completion when there are other causal factors, such as housing or pandemic-related health issues. Students who were on probation or withdrawing should be asked about these other factors. Mr. Brown expressed agreement. Ms. Sorapure shared that faculty observed the range of impacts that the pandemic has had on student behavior. Faculty were working to understand them and determine how best to work with students.

Committee Chair Park underscored that incoming students have come of age in a difficult learning environment. She encouraged the consideration of a broader set of factors affecting first year outcomes.

Regent Anguiano asked if there were data on students who were admitted to UC but did not choose to enroll, such as trends within this group and the students' rationale for not choosing UC. Mr. Brown replied that there were reports that he could share with the Committee. Ms. Yoon-Wu added that data from the National Student Clearinghouse on enrollment destinations were available in an online dashboard from the UC Information Center. Students who choose not to attend the University were often choosing private or other selective institutions. Mr. Brown offered to direct Regents to the dashboard and provide them with an analysis of the data.

Committee Chair Park, referring to the report, asked if the 32,000 students in the referral pool in 2021 were unique individuals. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied in the affirmative. These were unique individuals who were not admitted to their campus of choice. With no standardized testing requirement in 2021, the University did not have a statewide index pool, but did not wish to disadvantage students who were eligible based on that index, so UC offered admission to any student who met minimum requirements, as well as those eligible per the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program.

Committee Chair Park asked if there was a significant increase in the number of students in the referral pool compared with prior years. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied in the affirmative. In the past, students in the referral pool were eligible either via the statewide index or ELC, but, in fall 2021, the referral pool comprised all students who were entitled to review. Committee Chair Park asked how many students were typically in the referral pool prior to the pandemic. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that the pool had about 12,000 to 13,000 students. Committee Chair Park remarked that this was a significant increase.

Committee Chair Park asked how nonresidents made up nearly 24 percent of the total student population if only several campuses had higher upper limits in their nonresident enrollment. Ms. Yoon-Wu responded that in fall 2021, nonresident enrollment declined at many campuses. To offset this decline, campuses increased the percentage of incoming students while keeping nonresident enrollment flat.

Committee Chair Park asked how the Academic Senate could partner with campuses and others to improve yield rates among African American and Native American students. Mr. Horwitz replied that efforts were being made at the campus level. For instance, UC Merced partnered with local community colleges and high schools. Ms. Sorapure added that campuses were reaching out to middle and high schools and partnering with local organizations to create a pathway for African American, Native American, and Latino(a) students. Campus visits before the admissions process helped foster a sense of belonging.

Committee Chair Park reiterated her question, asking about the role of the Academic Senate or campus divisions of the Academic Senate in efforts to improve yield rates. Faculty Representative Cochran replied that faculty were very involved in enrollment efforts. At UCLA, African American faculty made presentations at open house events for parents of admitted students. These efforts were not necessarily Senate activities, but campus divisions of the Academic Senate were working with admissions offices to develop programs that would be attractive to students. Mr. Horwitz added that principal

investigators managing large laboratories invited local high school students for summer engagement, which creates an interest in applying to UC.

Committee Chair Park asked to hear more about the programs developed by admissions offices and campus divisions of the Academic Senate at a future meeting.

UCLA Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions Gary Clark emphasized the importance of faculty in yield efforts. Faculty helped coordinate programs for admitted students and their families from underrepresented backgrounds. Admitted students and their families wished to hear from faculty, students, and staff instead of administrators. Mr. Clark welcomed additional encouragement of faculty participation by the systemwide Academic Senate. Ms. Przekop stated that UC Santa Barbara was competing with private schools that were offering scholarships that UCSB was unable to offer. In her view, credit-bearing summer programs and relationships with faculty were key to increasing the number of underrepresented engineering students at UCSB. A program lasting the full summer was needed to help students feel a sense of belonging in the laboratory, and could entice students to return and continue their research. Committee Chair Park reiterated the importance of the systemwide Senate and divisional Senates in yield efforts.

Committee Chair Park asked about the group of applicants categorized as “other” who were neither eligible nor entitled to review and were not admitted by exception. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that these students’ applications did not clearly demonstrate their eligibility. Either they did not have a GPA that could be calculated or their curriculum did not align with the way A–G course completion was calculated in the application. Committee Chair Park asked if students in nontraditional settings, such as homeschooled or international students, would fit into this category. Ms. Yoon-Wu stated that this category applied to California resident students and would include students who attended schools that do not assign grades.

Committee Chair Park stated that ELC would be discussed at the September meeting.

Regent-designate Tesfai stated that knowing the demographics of those who choose not to enroll at UC, such as underrepresented groups, would help campus and systemwide efforts to increase enrollment from among those groups. At UCLA, issues of affordability have often been raised. UC might be perceived as not affordable because students might not understand their financial aid packages. UC Riverside Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Services Emily Engelschall stated that UCR surveyed admitted students who chose not to attend, and cost was a top issue. In her view, the system should consider how to better communicate the difference between the “sticker price” and net cost with financial aid to students and their families.

Committee Chair Park invited the systemwide Academic Senate to expound on the work of the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues at the September meeting. Committee Chair Park invited Student Observer Kyle Schmidt to make remarks.

Mr. Schmidt explained that a portion of his remarks addressed item A3, *Enhancing Student Transfer: CCC-UC Transfer Task Force Final Report*, which was deferred. He shared that he had transferred to UCLA from Pasadena City College, which sent a large number of transfer students to UC. Structural issues needed to be addressed to ensure that students had equal access to transfer. Mr. Schmidt stated that the central goal of the memorandum of understanding between the California Community Colleges system and the University remained unfulfilled. A UC transfer guarantee was not developed, no transfer pathways were added, and no UC campuses were added to the Transfer Admission Guarantee. In his view, a transfer guarantee was critical to addressing increased demand for a University education. Knowing where students were coming from would help UC plan its expansion. The CCC-UC Transfer Task Force's final report also sought to redefine transfer readiness, and many students were concerned that they would not be eligible for transfer after devoting many years to fulfilling current transfer requirements. According to Andrew Nickens, a student member of the Transfer Task Force from UC Davis, changes to transfer readiness needed to be more transparent. In his view, these changes could exclude thousands of students from UC. The seventh recommendation in the report was to conduct a longitudinal study of obstacles and opportunities related to enrollment at the community colleges and the University, and was intended to create a system of checks and balances for UC faculty. Students were concerned about potential biases, as faculty would be checking each other. Mr. Schmidt concluded by thanking the Regents and their collaborators for the report.

3. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DUAL ADMISSION**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

This item was deferred.

4. **ENHANCING STUDENT TRANSFER: CCC-UC TRANSFER TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

This item was deferred.

5. **AMENDMENT OF REGENTS POLICY 2110: POLICY ON AUGMENTED REVIEW IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS, AMENDMENT AND CONSOLIDATION OF REGENTS POLICY 2102: POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS WITH REGENTS POLICIES ON ADMISSION 2101, 2103, 2104, 2105, 2108, AND 2111, AND RESCISSION OF CONSOLIDATED POLICIES AS SEPARATE POLICIES**

The President of the University recommended that the Regents:

- A. Amend and consolidate Regents Policy 2102 – Policy on Undergraduate Admissions with Regents Policy 2101 – Policy on Admissions, Regents Policy 2103 – Policy on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements, Regents Policy 2104 – Policy on Comprehensive Review in Undergraduate Admissions, Regents Policy 2105 – Policy on Undergraduate Admissions by Exception, Regents Policy 2108 – Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions, and Regents Policy 2111 – Policy on Academic Verification, as shown in Attachment 1.
- B. Amend Regents Policy 2110 – Policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions, as shown in Attachment 2.
- C. Rescind consolidated policies: Regents Policy 2101 – Policy on Admissions, Regents Policy 2103 – Policy on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements, Regents Policy 2104 – Policy on Comprehensive Review in Undergraduate Admissions, Regents Policy 2105 – Policy on Undergraduate Admissions by Exception, Regents Policy 2108 – Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions, and Regents Policy 2111 – Policy on Academic Verification, as shown in Attachment 3.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Provost Brown explained that the policies related to undergraduate admission had been in need of amendment since the Regents suspended the standardized testing requirement in May 2020. When the amendment of Regents Policy 2103, Policy on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements, was being considered, the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents also examined other Regents Policies related to admissions and proposed changes consistent with good governance. Quoting Regents Policy 1000, Policy on Policies of the Regents of the University of California, Mr. Brown stated that Regents Policy should “communicate important, enduring systemwide governing principles rather than specifying operational details, restating laws or regulations, or responding to particular issues.” A working group, comprised of representatives from Academic Affairs in the Office of the President, the systemwide Academic Senate, a campus admissions office, the Office of the General Counsel, and the Regents’ Office, was formed to recommend changes. Regents Park, Pérez, Elliott, and then-Regent Lott were consulted. In general, the majority of proposed changes sought to retain the high-level principles articulated by the Regents, move implementation details to systemwide guidelines or Academic Senate regulations, clarify definitions, and rescind statements that are obsolete or do not constitute policy. More specifically, the proposed changes would consolidate seven policies into one comprehensive undergraduate admissions policy. Due to its length and level of detail, Regents Policy 2110, Policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions, would remain separate. Mr. Brown highlighted four changes in particular. First, in accordance with the Regents’ May 2020 action, the revised policy would state that standardized tests shall not to be considered as a part of the admissions process. Second, it would incorporate the Board’s commitment to ensuring that nonresident applicants “compare favorably” to

California residents, as defined by the Academic Senate. Third, the revised policy would codify existing requirements for transfer admission and include a commitment to prioritize consideration of transfer students from the California Community Colleges. Fourth, the revised policy would include language that explicitly prohibits interference and preferential treatment in the admissions process which exists elsewhere in Regents Policy and Academic Senate guidance, but should also be included in the admissions policy. Following Regents' action, the Academic Senate and BOARS would review and update corresponding Senate regulations and guidelines.

Committee Chair Park acknowledged the painstaking work of tracing the origins of, preserving, and consolidating policies.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff