

graduate level only shall be members also of the Academic Senate, but, in the discretion of the Academic Senate, may be excluded from participation in activities of the Senate that relate to curricula of other schools and colleges of the University. Membership in the Senate shall not lapse because of leave of absence or by virtue of transference to emeritus status.

- **Report from the President's Council on the National Laboratories**
Chand Viswanathan, Academic Council
- **Announcement of the Academic Council's Selection of a Recipient of the 2001-2002 Oliver Johnson Award** (information)
Chand Viswanathan, Academic Council

The Oliver Johnson Award for Service to the Academic Senate is given biennially to a member of the UC faculty who has performed outstanding service to the Senate. Its broader goal is to honor, through the award to the recipient, all members of the faculty who have contributed their time and talent to the Senate.

Nominations for the award come through Divisional Committees on Committees to the universitywide Committee on Committees. UCOC, in turn, submits the names of two nominees to the Academic Council, which makes the final decision on the award. At its meeting of April 24, the Council selected an award recipient for 2001-2002. Council Chair Viswanathan is today apprising the Assembly of the Council's decision.

B. University Committee on Committees (UCOC)
Concepcion Valadez, Chair

- Appointments of Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs, 2002-2003 (information)

C. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)
Dorothy Perry, Chair

- Approval of BOARS' Recommendations on Admissions Testing (discussion/action). Recommendations to be approved:

1. BOARS Should Continue to Work with Testing Agencies to Develop Improved Admissions Tests

2. BOARS Will Bring Its Recommendations for Improved Admissions Tests to the Divisions, the Academic Council, and the Assembly for Review and Approval.

The Assembly is being asked to approve the two recommendations above from the Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools.

In the mid-1990s, BOARS began a study of admissions issues that resulted in a 1999 committee recommendation — subsequently approved by the Assembly and the UC Regents — that UC revise its Eligibility Index so as to place twice as much weight on the SAT II examinations as on the SAT I examination. BOARS received a fresh impetus to continue with its analysis when, in February 2001, President Atkinson asked the Academic Senate to consider eliminating the SAT I as a University of California undergraduate admissions requirement. The President proposed that the Senate consider achievement-based examinations in lieu of the SAT I.

Over the past fifteen months, BOARS has undertaken an intensive study of admissions testing at the University. In January 2002, the committee issued a discussion paper, the conclusions of which are described in greater depth below. The committee endorsed the continued use of admissions tests at UC and proposed a set of principles on which it believes the University should base its use of admissions tests. The committee also recommended that the UC faculty consider adopting a new array of tests to be developed in tandem with the two large national testing agencies, ACT, Inc., and the College Board. Until the new array is in place, the current tests (SAT I or ACT and SAT IIs) will continue to be required.

In the months since BOARS released its paper, ACT has announced its intention to enhance the existing ACT exam — already curriculum-based — by adding a writing sample for California test-takers. Meanwhile, the College Board has announced its intention to develop a new curriculum-based test whose provisions would likewise be consistent with the array suggested by BOARS. (See the table below for comparisons.)

BOARS is bringing to the Assembly today two resolutions that are intended to allow the committee to pursue the work it has begun, while making clear that any recommendations from BOARS regarding changes in admissions tests will first come before the Senate Divisions, the Academic Council, and the Assembly of the Senate for review and approval.

At its meeting of April 24, 2002, the Academic Council approved, by vote of 14-0-1, a motion in support of BOARS' continued work on development of improved tests. It also approved, by vote of 13-0-1, a motion in support of the review and approval process noted above for any new tests that BOARS recommends. By vote of 12-1-1, the Berkeley Divisional Chair dissenting, the Council voted to send both BOARS recommendations to the Assembly for its consideration.

Justification from BOARS Chair Perry:

BOARS has reviewed the history of UC's admissions test policy and considered at length the usefulness of admissions tests, and the relative value of tests that purport to measure aptitude versus those that are achievement-based. BOARS endorses the continued use of admissions tests and recommends that UC's use of tests be based on the set of principles reproduced at the end of this text. Key among these principles is that admissions tests bear a demonstrable relationship to the UC-prescribed college preparatory curriculum.

In considering the relative usefulness of different types of tests, BOARS observed that the SAT I grew out of the intelligence testing movement and was originally designed to identify students with potential to succeed, with less emphasis on their mastery of a college preparatory curriculum. (In addition, the College Board, which owns the SAT I, also developed achievement-based subject examinations—the "SAT IIs"—in a large number of college preparatory subjects. In 1959, the American College Testing company (ACT, Inc.) was formed to create an achievement-based college admissions test, the ACT. UC currently requires all applicants to take the SAT I or ACT as well as SAT II achievement tests in writing, math, and a third field of the applicant's choice.

UC is in a unique position to consider the relative statistical properties of achievement-based tests like the SAT II (and ACT) versus those of aptitude-type tests like the SAT I, because a very large number of our applicants take both the SAT I and the SAT II. At BOARS' request, Office of the President staff studied the relationship between UC students' scores on the SAT I and the SAT II and their performance at UC, to determine whether one type of test is significantly better than another at identifying students who will do well (as measured by first-year UC GPA). This analysis concluded that the best predictor of success at UC is high school GPA, but that admissions tests do add a statistically significant increment to our ability to identify students likely to succeed. They also concluded that the SAT II achievement tests are slightly better predictors of freshman GPA than the SAT I, but that the difference between the two tests is not substantial.

Given that neither type of test stands out as a substantially better predictor, BOARS concluded that decisions about the relative value of the different kinds of tests should be based on educational policy grounds, rather than statistical properties. In considering these educational policy questions, BOARS concluded that achievement- type tests have substantial benefits over aptitude tests.

Primary among these advantages is that achievement tests are consistent with and reinforce our primary message to high school students (embodied in the

University's A-G and scholarship requirements), which is that they should take rigorous courses and do well in these courses, and UC will evaluate them based on their mastery of a challenging college preparatory curriculum. Because achievement tests are sensitive to instruction, they provide strong incentives for high schools to enhance both the rigor of curriculum and the quality of instruction. They can also provide diagnostic information to students and to schools on areas that need improvement. And while it would be unrealistic to expect that the test preparation industry will wither as a result of a change in University policy, BOARS members felt that achievement tests mitigate some of the pernicious effects of test preparation in that the best way to prepare for an achievement test is to study the material the test covers rather than learn ways to "game" the test itself. Finally, BOARS members concluded that a move toward achievement-based tests would eliminate some of the "baggage" associated with aptitude-type tests, in that—rightly or not—aptitude tests are still associated in the minds of many with intelligence tests. Many students are mystified and frightened by these tests and interpret a low score as an indication that they are not bright enough. Low scores on achievement tests indicate that the student has not mastered the material — a result of inadequate preparation or poor quality instruction, but not innate weakness on the part of the individual taking the test.

A full description of BOARS' deliberations and findings, as well as the detailed statistical results described in general terms above, can be found in the discussion paper "The Use of Admissions Tests by the University of California," posted on the website: <http://www.ucop.edu/news/sat/boars.html>.

BOARS' Principles for the Use of Admissions Tests at the University of California

1. Admissions tests will be used at the University of California
 - to assess academic preparation and achievement of UC applicants;
 - to predict success at UC beyond that predicted by high school GPA;
 - to aid in establishing UC eligibility; and
 - to aid in selecting students for admission at individual UC campuses
2. The desired properties of admissions tests to be used for these purposes include the following.
 - An admissions test should be a reliable measurement that provides uniform assessment and should be fair across demographic groups.
 - An admissions test should measure levels of mastery of content in UC-approved high school preparatory coursework and should provide information to students, parents, and educators enabling them to identify academic strengths and weaknesses.

- An admissions test should be demonstrably useful in predicting student success at UC and provide information beyond that which is contained in other parts of the application. (It is recognized that predictors of success are currently limited, and generally only include first-year college GPA and graduation rate. As this field advances, better predictors should be identified and used in validating admissions tests.)
- An admissions test should be useful in a way that justifies its social and monetary costs.

Over the course of the past year, BOARS members have had extensive interactions with representatives of the nation's two major admissions testing agencies, ACT, Inc. and the College Board. Both agencies have repeatedly expressed their interest in working with UC faculty to develop curriculum-based tests that address the principles BOARS outlined in its discussion paper (referenced in the background to Recommendation 1) and providing broader and more rigorous coverage of the curriculum encompassed in UC's A-G requirements. ACT, Inc. plans to expand its existing achievement test by adding a writing sample. The College Board has indicated it will restructure its current national examination, the SAT I, to be consistent with BOARS' recommendations. The features of these proposed tests are displayed in the matrix below. Until new tests are approved and implemented, UC's current test requirements would remain in place.

Any new tests to be adopted by the UC faculty will require several years of development and field testing. Because of the national interest and significance of these changes for college students, the process involving the testing agencies is proceeding very quickly. As the faculty body charged with developing admissions policy on behalf of the Academic Senate, BOARS proposes to work with the testing agencies over the coming months and years to ensure that the tests they develop conform as closely as possible to the principles and needs of UC's faculty and students. BOARS will continue to bring policy recommendations to the Divisions, the Academic Council, and the Assembly for review. No new tests will be adopted at the University of California without review and approval by these Senate agencies. In the meantime, this motion confirms for the testing agencies the University's affirmation of their test development efforts and BOARS' responsibilities as the primary faculty body responsible for working with them in these efforts.

BOARS Recommendations and Testing Agency Proposals

BOARS Recommendation	ACT Proposal: Enhanced ACT	College Board Proposal: New National Test
<i>Curriculum-based tests of academic preparation and achievement</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current test is curriculum-based Comprehensive test-development process includes national and state curriculum surveys, high school and college teachers as item writers, and extensive content and technical reviews by ACT staff Tests measure higher-order thinking skills necessary for college study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will revise test-development process using national and state curriculum surveys Will review all test items for curriculum relevance Tests will continue to measure higher-order reasoning skills required for college
<i>Predictive validity</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same or better predictive power as current ACT/SAT I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same or better predictive power as current SAT I/ACT
<i>Transportable nationally</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully transportable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully transportable
<i>Uniform, fair assessment across demographic groups</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All test items reviewed for fairness No greater adverse impact than current tests 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All test items reviewed for fairness No greater adverse impact than current tests
<i>Diagnostic feedback to students, schools</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current test includes an extensive feedback system Test is complemented by curriculum-based tests in 8th grade (EXPLORE) and 10th grade (PLAN) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will develop feedback system for new test Current PSAT provides feedback on individual skills proficiencies to students and schools
<i>Testing time/burden</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall testing time no greater than current UC test battery 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall testing time no greater than current UC test battery
<i>Core Mathematics test</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current ACT math test covers first 3 years of college-preparatory math 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise SAT math test to cover first 3 years of college-preparatory math; incrementally increase number of advanced items
<i>Core Reading test</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current ACT reading test reflects curriculum emphasis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise SAT to reflect curriculum emphasis; expand critical reading
<i>Core Writing test</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add new ACT writing test in California 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adapt SAT II writing test, with writing sample, for use in new national test
<i>Timetable</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test development and field testing during 2002-04 Ready for use in 2004 for entering class of 2006 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Test development and field testing during 2002-04 Ready for use in 2004 for entering class of 2006

- **BOARS' Report on Eligibility in a Local Context**

Follow-Up Report on the Eligibility in the Local Context Program

The Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) policy was approved by the Senate and adopted by the Board of Regents in 1998. It went into effect for students applying for freshman admission for Fall 2001. ELC complements the statewide and examination-only eligibility paths by making eligible the top four percent of students in each California high school who have completed specified academic coursework by the end of their junior year. In order to be considered for admission and to enroll at UC, ELC students must apply for admission and complete UC required courses and standardized testing requirements by the end of the senior year. ELC designation guarantees applicants admission to the University, though not necessarily in the program or at the campus of their choice.

The University implemented the ELC program to advance several long-held goals:

- To increase the pool of eligible students to the top 12.5% of public high schools specified by the California Master Plan for Higher Education.
- To increase UC's presence in each California high school, particularly those that typically do not send many graduates to the University.
- To reward individual academic accomplishments in the context of the student's high school and the opportunities available to the student.

Students graduating from public comprehensive high schools or private high schools that are accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) are eligible to participate in the ELC program. Although participation in ELC is voluntary, 82% of public schools participated fully in the first year. Additional schools participated in a modified process that brought the total percent of public schools included to 97%. Participation rates increased dramatically for public high schools in the second year, where 98% fully participated. A total of 11,254 students were identified as ELC eligible in the first year and 13,496 were identified in the second year. In both years, about 81% of the ELC students applied. All were admitted in the first year and all are expected to be admitted in the second year, the current admissions cycle.

Because students identified as ELC in their junior year go on to complete the coursework and testing requirements for statewide eligibility, they cannot be distinguished from other eligible UC applicants. Thus it is not possible to identify which of the ELC applications represent new applicants stimulated by the ELC programs. However, analysis of differing rates of application growth for different high schools indicates that applications are growing at targeted schools, including

rural schools and those with particularly low application rates. A full report on the ELC program, including tables displaying participation rates and stimulated applications, is posted on the Office of the President website.

- **BOARS' Report on Comprehensive Review in Admissions**

Follow-up Report on Implementation of Comprehensive Review

The comprehensive review policy was approved by The Regents in November 2001, after having been approved by the Academic Assembly on a 42-0 vote. The policy calls on those campuses that cannot accommodate all UC-eligible applicants to select students "using multiple measures of achievement and promise, while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment." Comprehensive review eliminated the "tiered" approach to admission selection that divided students into groups admitted on "academic" factors alone and on "academic and other" criteria. The actual criteria selective campuses may employ in choosing among applicants were not changed.

Comprehensive review was implemented on all campuses except Riverside and Santa Cruz, which are still able to accept all eligible applicants, for students applying for admission to the fall 2002 term. Prior to the beginning of the admission cycle, each campus admissions office reported to BOARS on its plans for implementing the new policy. Applications were reviewed during the first three months of 2002. All campuses were successful in implementing the new policy and completing their decision-making processes in March.

During the discussion process that led to the adoption of the comprehensive review policy, BOARS and other groups expressed the importance of evaluating the process to ensure that it is conducted with integrity and in conformance with the faculty's principles and criteria. In December 2001, BOARS adopted a set of accountability principles, reproduced below, to serve as an overall framework for this evaluation process. BOARS has repeatedly expressed its belief that accountability for the implementation of comprehensive review must remain the purview of faculty admissions committees on the individual campuses. In addition, BOARS has outlined the following components of an annual evaluation process.

- Each year, BOARS will review each campus's admission policy documents and other materials that document how the campus's freshman selection policy operates.
- Each year, each campus will compile data, displayed in a consistent format to be developed by the Office of the President, that allows for the analysis of trends and comparisons among campuses. The format for this data has been developed and is being reviewed currently by the campuses.

- Each year, BOARS will meet with all campus admissions directors to discuss in detail the process the campuses used, any issues or concerns that either BOARS or the campuses have with those processes, and the outcomes of each campus process. For fall 2002, this meeting has been scheduled for late July.
- Staff in the Office of the President will conduct independent quantitative analyses of the outcomes of the admissions process Universitywide and by campus.
- Both campus and OP analyses will address the question of the relationship between campus admissions evaluation criteria and processes and the success of admitted students. This analysis will consider both academic success and more qualitative factors including the level of students' engagement with and contribution to their campuses.
- Office of the President staff will develop a program to independently verify the accuracy of student-provided data for a sample of freshmen admitted to UC. This verification process is currently under development and will be piloted for a small sample of students admitted to fall 2002.

In addition, a joint faculty-administration committee has been established to identify ways of streamlining and making more efficient the comprehensive review process. Among the options this group is addressing are technological advances that will facilitate the gathering and review of detailed information that is contained in the application but not currently collected electronically, and the sharing of aspects of the application reading process among campuses. This group has already identified a number of specific enhancements and will pilot several for the fall 2003 admission cycle.

BOARS is also aware that the existing application is not necessarily well suited to providing all information needed for evaluation in a comprehensive review system. The application will be evaluated and revised to be more compatible with the needs of the campuses.

BOARS ACCOUNTABILITY PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

1. Each campus should articulate its admissions goals, based on Universitywide policies and guidelines and campus-specific educational values and philosophy.
2. Each campus should define its campus admissions selection criteria and the selection process it will use in the context of the campus admissions and enrollment goals. Campus practices should be tailored to campus-articulated goals and policies and conform with Universitywide policies and guidelines.

3. Campuses should ensure that the faculty members are engaged in the selection processes and that professional staff are well qualified and well trained to conduct admissions evaluations.
4. Campus practices should ensure that no systematic bias is present.
5. Campus practices should include processes to monitor accuracy and reliability of data used in the decision-making process.
6. BOARS should disseminate to the campuses information regarding effective admissions selection practices.
7. Campus practices should be refined over time to reflect the most effective practices and to ensure continued compliance with Universitywide guidelines and policies and changing circumstances.
8. Campus practices should be routinely evaluated and monitored both by appropriate committees of the campus Academic Senate Divisions and by BOARS at scheduled intervals. Processes should be reviewed in terms of conformance to Universitywide and campus-specific policies and guidelines, and state and federal regulations.
9. Admission outcomes—defined in terms of qualifications at entrance (e.g., high school GPA, other academic indicators, and other evidence of achievement), as well as demographic characteristics (e.g., ethnic makeup, socio-economic status, geographic distribution, etc.)—should be systematically studied. Campuses should maintain these data in accordance with standards set by BOARS to support systemwide evaluation.
10. Campuses should have mechanisms in place to evaluate long-term outcomes in terms of student performance as measured by first-year GPA, persistence and graduation rates, and other indicators of student success that may be identified.

VIII. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (none)

IX. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (none)

**X. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT
Renee Binder, Chair, University Committee
On Faculty Welfare (oral report)**

XI. NEW BUSINESS