November 23, 2011

Robert Anderson  
Chair, Academic Council

Re: BOARS Proposal on Transfer Admissions

Dear Bob,

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon the BOARS Proposal on Transfer Admissions. Upon receipt, I requested review by the Faculty Executive Committees, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS), and the Undergraduate Council (UgC). The Executive Board, which speaks for the division on such matters, reviewed all responses, which I am attaching for your information.

The UCLA Academic Senate endorses the BOARS Proposal on Transfer Admissions. Committees expressed general appreciation for efforts of BOARS to develop this major-based transfer admission process that parallels the Freshman Admission Policy to be implemented in the fall of 2012. Even so, Executive Board recommended some key modifications that would serve to strengthen the proposal.

- The Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science FEC raised the concern that the proposal “indicates that students should only be admitted who can complete the B.S. degree within two years. Some parts of the proposal use the language ‘approximately two years’ while other parts use the language ‘two years.’ The reality for engineering majors is that there are not enough of the required courses available at community colleges for even a well-prepared transfer student to realistically complete an engineering B.S. degree in two years. For some engineering majors, it may only take 2 years and a quarter. For other engineering majors it may take as long as three years.” We recommend that the proposal be modified to recognize this limitation.

- The Undergraduate Council stressed that, although due consideration should be given to preparatory work for a specified major in the transfer admission process, “a holistic review must be the guiding principle, overriding decisions primarily based on major preparation in some cases.” We recommend that this statement be added to the policy.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Andrew Leuchter  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Jaime R. Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
November 7, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair  
Academic Senate

From: Tyrone Howard, Chair  
Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

Re: Senate Item for Review: BOARS Proposal on Transfer Admissions

On behalf of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, I am writing with regard to the BOARS proposal to revise UC’s transfer policy to emphasize major preparation in transfer admission. The Committee discussed and endorsed the proposal at its October 21, 2011 meeting. Below is the summary of concerns and opinions that were expressed during the discussion.

- It should be clarified that the proposed changes may have little impact on UCLA which already heavily emphasizes major preparation in transfer admission. In addition, given that UCLA’s transfer admission is highly competitive, our transfer admission process is inevitably selective, and we can admit only a portion of “applicants with credentials indicating the strongest likelihood of completing their major in approximately two years.” Without more state support, the proposed proposal would not increase UCLA’s accessibility to qualified transfer applicants.

- Members questioned if and how the consistency of coursework from community colleges can be monitored and controlled as the issue relates to how those courses compare to UCLA’s preparatory courses.

- Some members raised concern about the lack of representation from humanities in the UCOP’s discussion on the UC Common Core of Major Preparation (cf. Interim Progress Report on Implementing AB 2302: Associate Degree Pathway to the University of California, p.5) and stressed the importance of reading and writing skills, concurring with the University Committee on Preparatory Education (cf. BOARS Proposal, Possible Concerns and BOARS’ Views #5).

The Committee thanks you for the opportunity to opine on the proposal and welcomes an invitation to review future drafts that respond to the concern voiced in this letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (x74824; thoward@gseis.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Principal Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim (x51194; jkim@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate  
Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant to the Senate Leadership, Academic Senate
November 7, 2011

To: Professor Andrew Leuchter, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Professor Richard L. Weiss, Chair
       Undergraduate Council

In Re: Undergraduate Council Response to BOARS Proposal on Transfer Admissions

On behalf of the Undergraduate Council, I would like to extend the Council’s appreciation for seeking our input and thank you for the opportunity to review and opine on the BOARS Proposed Policy on Transfer Admissions. The Council discussed the proposal at its October 28, 2011 meeting, and the membership unanimously endorsed the proposal, while agreeing that the following concerns should be conveyed:

- One of the proposed pathways to transfer admission is to complete an SB 1440 Associate Degree for Transfer with a minimum GPA set by each campus. Members questioned how this Associate Degree program is related to each campus and individual majors and felt that clarifications should be provided.

- The current pathway option of completion of the minimum criteria of seven courses specified in Senate Regulation 476 does not address the proposal’s call for increasing UC’s emphasis on major preparation in transfer admission. The proposal states that “UC will admit applicants with credentials indicating the strongest likelihood of completing their major in approximately two years.” If so, it seems that the entitlement to review should be limited to those who complete a pathway option that is specifically designed to show relevant credentials. What is the rationale for keeping the current pathway which has little to do with major preparation?

- Some members were skeptical about how effectively the new pathways can prepare transfer applicants, considering that the quality of courses offered at various colleges is not consistent and that the breadth and depth of those courses may not be comparable to that of UCLA’s preparation courses.

- Members questioned how accessible preparation courses are to transfer applicants as it would impact UC’s accessibility once UC’s emphasis on major preparation is increased. Also, it may influence applicants’ major choices; some applicants may decide to apply to a major of which preparation courses are available to them in order to increase their eligibility, hoping to change major once admitted. If the proposal is to be implemented, an ongoing review and evaluation of its impact should be required in these regards.

- The membership reiterated that while due consideration should be given to preparatory work for a specified major in transfer admission processes, a holistic review must be the guiding principle, overriding decisions primarily based on major preparation in some cases.
The Council remains interested in following how these concerns may be addressed and would welcome an invitation to review future drafts. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me (x53621; weiss@chem.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Principal Policy Analyst Jisoo Kim (x51194; jkim@senate.ucla.edu).

cc:     Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate
        Jisoo Kim, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
        Dorothy Ayer, Executive Assistant to the Senate Leadership, Academic Senate
October 31, 2011

To: Andrew Leuchter, Chair  
    Academic Senate

From: Michael Meranze, Chair  
      UCLA College Faculty Executive Committee

Re: College FEC response to the BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal

Thank you on behalf of the College Faculty Executive Committee for the opportunity to review and opine on BOARS policy proposal on transfer admissions. We discussed the proposal at our meeting of October 28, 2011 after Dean/Vice Provost Smith introduced the proposal and offered background. After thoughtful discussion, the membership voted unanimously to approve the recommendations by BOARS (9 Approve, 0 oppose, 0 abstain).

UCLA has long emphasized major preparation as a key component in the comprehensive review of transfer applications. While the proposal does little to affect our transfer admissions policies, the FEC is convinced that emphasizing major preparatory courses in the transfer curriculum will orient students to major disciplinary questions earlier in their academic career and begin to develop those skills critical to achieving success in their chosen major. Just as important, it will undoubtedly improve transfer students’ ability to complete their major and degree requirements within six quarters after matriculation.

Our membership appreciates the consultative process. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at meranze@history.ucla.edu. Kyle Stewart McJunkin, Academic Administrator, is also available to assist you and he can be reached at (310) 825-3223 or kmcjunkin@college.ucla.edu.

cc: Jaime Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, Academic Senate  
    Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education Initiatives
MEMORANDUM

Faculty Executive Committee

TO: Jaime Balboa, CAO
    Academic Senate
    3125 Murphy Hall

FROM: Alan J. Laub, Professor
      Chair, HSSEAS FEC

DATE: November 4, 2011

RE: RESPONSE TO BOARS TRANSFER ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL

We have read the BOARS Transfer Admissions Proposal and have the following comments:

1. We agree whole-heartedly that transfer admissions should be made on the basis of the completion of major preparation courses and on the performance in those courses.

2. This is already the basis for all transfer admissions decisions to the UCLA Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science so there is no resource issue for us to continue to adhere to this principle for admissions.

3. Our only concern with the proposal is that it indicates that students should only be admitted who can complete the B.S. degree within two years. Some parts of the proposal use the language "approximately two years" while other parts use the language "two years". The reality for all engineering majors is that there are not enough of the required courses available at community colleges for even a well-prepared transfer student to realistically complete an engineering B.S. degree in two years. For some engineering majors, it may only take 2 years and a quarter. For other engineering majors it may take as long as three years. We hope that in a final version of this proposal the language can be crafted to accommodate majors like ours.
Dear Jaime -

The DGSOM FEC discussed this policy proposal at our meeting on November 2nd, and the Committee asked that the following feedback be communicated to you and the Senate leadership.

The Committee was encouraged that attention was being devoted to ensuring the likelihood of academic success of students transferring into UCLA after starting their studies elsewhere. Still, there was considerable concern that new policies not impede the flow of well qualified students from disadvantaged backgrounds into UCLA. At the School of Medicine, students from disadvantaged backgrounds perform well during medical school, and there is a natural interest in recruiting talented UCLA undergraduates to the DGSOM. The Committee was optimistic that the new policies would be sensitive to ensuring a diverse student body in a way that does not shut out appropriately-prepared students from disadvantaged backgrounds as an unintended consequence.

The Committee, Chair, and Vice-Chair of the DGSOM FEC appreciate the opportunity to vet and comment upon these important changes in UC policy.

Sincerely,

Ian A. Cook, M.D
Chair, DGSOM FEC

Jonathan S. Jahr, M.D.
Vice-Chair, DGSOM FEC
Memorandum

Faculty Executive Committee, School of Theater Film and Television

November 9, 2011

Andrew Leuchter, Chair, Academic Senate

Dear Andrew,

Below are the responses from the Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Theater, Film and Television for the five review items we have recently received.

Item #1 - Review of New APM 668, Negotiated Salary Program

After extensive dialog the committee opposes the implementation of the proposed “Negotiated Salary Program”. The committee expressed the following concerns:

1) That the NSP policy/program weakens the central administration responsibility to provide fair and appropriate salary for its entire faculty.
2) That the NSP policy/program has the potential to create large disparities between “marketable” and “non-marketable” disciplines.
3) That the NSP policy/program would generate additional burdens on academic departments because of the required one/two year commitment stipulation.
4) Confusion about the mechanism by which Chairs would engage in “NSP negotiations” and approve “NSP proposals”.
5) Confusion about the potential use of “Professional Fees” for NSP.

Motion: We applaud and appreciate the President’s and Chancellors’ efforts to increase salaries for faculty across the board. However, we do not endorse this proposal to increase compensation through resources that the faculty themselves are required to earn or secure for the school.

The motion passed. The vote was unanimous.

Item #2 – Review of New APM 670, Health Sciences Compensation Program

The faculty found the proposed APM discipline-specific and decided to abstain from responding.

Motion: To abstain from responding.

The motion passed unanimously.
The committee reviewed the data and conclusions of the study conducted by Professor Pauline Yahr.

**Motion:** To encourage the university to continue to understand the dynamics according to ethnicity and gender and to take actions to bring fair and equal levels of pay for its entire faculty.

*The motion passed unanimously*

**Item #4 – Revision by UCEP to Senate Regulation 610 addressing “Residency”**

The committee reviewed the proposed policy clarification and new policy language.

**Motion:** To endorse the policy revisions as written.

*The motion passed unanimously*

**Item #5 – BOARS Policy on Transfer Admissions**

The committee had an extensive dialog regarding the proposed policy. Concerns were expressed about the potential student pool limiting factor of the proposal. The committee also felt that the proposal does not generally apply to the fields of study in our School. Yet, generally it was seen as a positive step for the University.

**Motion:** To endorse the proposed BOARS policy as a mechanism to more effectively bridge the transfer process and to facilitate graduation in the appropriate time.

*The motion passed unanimously*

Sincerely,

Fabian Wagmister

*Associate Professor, Department of Film, Television and Digital Media*

*FEC Chair, School of Theater, Film and Television*