

## **VI. Reports of Special Committees (none)**

## **VII. Reports of Standing Committees**

### **A. Academic Council**

#### **Chand Viswanathan, Chair**

- Report on new degree titles approved by the Academic Council (information)

Senate Bylaw 125.B.6 specifies that “The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs shall submit to the Academic Council for final action on behalf of the Assembly proposals for the establishment of new graduate degrees submitted in accordance with Bylaw 180.B.5 when such proposals cannot be included in the agenda of a regular Assembly meeting to be held within sixty calendar days after Committee action.”

“New graduate degrees” means degrees whose titles are new to a given campus. The Academic Council approved two such degrees in July and one in August. Degrees approved in July were the DPTSc at UC San Francisco for a joint doctoral program in Physical Therapy Sciences between UCSF and California State University San Francisco; and the M.Ed. at UC San Diego for Program in Teacher Education. The degree approved in August was the M.Ed. at UC Riverside for a Master’s of Education Program. Because the Council was acting on behalf of the Assembly, it is reporting its actions to the Assembly now.

### **B. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)**

#### **Dorothy Perry, Chair**

- **Approval of Comprehensive Admissions Policy (action)**

The Assembly is being asked to approve BOARS’ recommendation to institute a system of comprehensive review of applicants for undergraduate admission.

#### **Justification from BOARS Chair Perry:**

BOARS is submitting to the Assembly today a proposal to adopt a system of comprehensive review of applicants for undergraduate admission. This system is intended to replace UC’s current system of tiered admissions review. This latter system is a requirement of the 1995 Regental Policy SP-1, under which campuses are required to admit 50 to 75 percent of their freshman classes solely on the basis of academic criteria, including high school grades and test scores. This proportion of each admitted class constitutes one tier in the current admissions system. The other tier is composed of students admitted on the basis of both academic and supplemental criteria. BOARS is proposing to have all students

considered on the basis of a single, comprehensive set of criteria. These criteria are defined in 14 bullet points listed in a set of comprehensive review guidelines that follow this justification in the *Notice of Meeting*. It is important to note that these are the same criteria currently used in a tiered fashion, the last four being the supplemental criteria. BOARS is not proposing changing the criteria; it is proposing applying them in an expanded way.

At the outset, it might be helpful to define what is meant by comprehensive review. BOARS has agreed upon the following definition:

Comprehensive review is the process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise, while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated accomplishment.

The proposed comprehensive review strategy based on this definition would continue to emphasize academic achievement as the most important element for consideration, but it would broaden the definition to include achievement in the context of each applicant's opportunities.

The possibility of adopting a comprehensive review process arose at the Regents' meeting of May 2001, when they voted to rescind Regental orders SP-1 and SP-2, which forbade the use of race and ethnicity in both admissions and hiring practices. Although SP-1 and SP-2 were rescinded by the Regents in May — and replaced by a new Regents order, RE-28 — the tiered admissions system instituted under SP-1 remains in place per RE-28 until such time as an acceptable alternative is proposed by the Senate and approved by the Regents. That alternative is what you have before you today.

In considering what changes to propose in undergraduate admissions, BOARS embarked on a deliberative process involving several days of meetings that resulted in an alternative admissions proposal and the enclosed draft guidelines for implementation. There has been strong interest among the public and the Regents to evaluate possible alternatives in an expedited manner so that, if accepted, new procedures could be effective for students entering the University in fall 2002. Due to this heightened interest, BOARS sent its proposal to the Academic Council in July; further, the proposal was forwarded to the campuses for review over the summer months. Campus administrations made resources available for faculty to engage in this unusual summer process, and BOARS received the campus responses by September 1, 2001. In addition to the faculty review processes on the campuses, admissions staff both on the campuses and systemwide engaged in planning processes so that, should the Assembly approve the proposal today, and should the Regents approve the proposal in

November, applicants can be reviewed under the new system for the upcoming admissions cycle.

The rationale for the proposed change to a comprehensive review of applicants' files is a basic one. UC faculty recognize that all high school students do not have the same academic opportunities – in fact there are major differences among high school course offerings, educational preparation of teachers, school resources, family income, and support for educational endeavors both in the communities and at home. Comprehensive review provides for trained admissions staff and faculty to employ a more inclusive definition of merit that is based on our existing guidelines, and still geared strongly toward measures of academic achievement. This broadened definition would continue to recognize and reward high academic achievement as measured by GPA and test scores, but would permit the evaluation of obstacles overcome by students in their educational advancement. The proposed definition, principles, guidelines, and accountability measures are presented for your consideration in the enclosed documents.

BOARS also recognizes that some campuses are poised to adopt a comprehensive review structure, while others will require more time to develop the mature processes. In reviewing preliminary plans from the campuses, it became clear that each would have to individualize the processes, and that development of comprehensive review will be iterative and evaluative in nature. It will also require faculty and admissions staff time and energy spent in new ways.

During the course of faculty discussion, several important considerations continually emerged. They centered around maintaining the high academic quality of our student bodies, identification of a system of accountability permitting the comprehensive review policies to be used fairly and not distorted to look like racial preferences of any kind, and identification of resources sufficient to administer the processes on the campuses in a fair and complete way. BOARS has proposed guidelines that continue to emphasize the significance of high academic achievement – grades and test scores will continue to provide the basis for admission. In addition, a system of accountability, requiring each campus to audit its practices and evaluate them annually, both locally on campus and in conjunction with systemwide faculty and staff is required. The proposed definition of the accountability structure is included in this *Notice of Meeting*.

Resources have become a significant issue among faculty, staff, and administrators at all levels. This is so because comprehensive review is more expensive than review based solely on grades and test scores. This concern has

been underscored in the light of the downturn in the state's economy. However, the Office of the President is committed to implementing this change, if approved by the Assembly and the Regents. President Atkinson has pledged sufficient funding for the admissions offices on the campuses to embark on the process, and maintain it. President Atkinson will be remarking on this situation at the Assembly meeting.

Close timing of the necessary approval steps for the comprehensive review proposal means that BOARS documents are presented to you in the *Notice of Meeting*, even though the Academic Council has not made a recommendation regarding the proposal. The Council has been involved in this process since it began, and has been instrumental in arranging the unusual summer faculty review process. It anticipates arriving at a recommendation about comprehensive review at its October meeting. That recommendation will be delivered to you at this meeting.

BOARS wishes to acknowledge and thank the UC faculty and staff who participated in this activity over the summer. That deliberative work permits BOARS to present this proposal to you for approval at the fall meeting of the Assembly.

## **PROPOSED GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVERSITY POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

### **I. OVERVIEW**

On May 20, 1988, The Regents of the University of California adopted a University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. The Policy states in part that:

Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University's eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California.

In December 1995, following passage the previous July of Regents Resolution SP-1, a task force convened by the President of the University reviewed existing *Guidelines for the Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions* and recommended substantive changes. The revised *Guidelines* were issued in July 1996 and revised in May 2000 to reflect the University's newly adopted Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) policy.

In May 2001, The Regents adopted Resolution RE-28, which rescinded Resolution SP-1 and reaffirmed the goals of the 1988 Policy as follows:

the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.

Following the passage of RE-28, the President asked the Academic Senate to consider the adoption of evaluation procedures that would look at applicants in a comprehensive manner and would utilize a variety of measures of achievement.

The present revision of the *Guidelines* follows extensive deliberation on the part of the Academic Senate, its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), and its individual campus divisions and faculty admissions committees undertaken during the summer of 2001. The work of the Academic Senate built on themes already developed by the 1995 Task Force. For example, the report of the Task Force commented on the "need for a comprehensive review of the methods used for assessing academic performance, beyond

utilizing criteria such as GPA and standardized test scores” and suggested that “the selection process could be altered in the future to include a more comprehensive approach to reviewing students’ academic accomplishments and personal backgrounds.” The work of the Academic Senate should be considered as yet another step in the continuing evolution of undergraduate admissions practices and policies.

Effective with applicants seeking admission for the fall 2002 term and thereafter, the following revised guidelines and procedures shall be followed for implementation of the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and RE-28, adopted in May 2001.

These selection guidelines apply to campuses that have to select from a pool of eligible applicants, and to students who have met the established UC eligibility requirements for admission<sup>1</sup>. These eligibility requirements are established by the University in conformance with the specifications outlined in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which specifies that the top one-eighth of the State’s public high school graduates, as well as those community college transfer students who have successfully completed specified college work, be eligible for admission to the University of California.

These guidelines provide the framework within which campuses shall establish specific criteria and procedures for the selection of undergraduate applicants to be admitted when the number of eligible applicants exceeds the places available.

## **II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

As part of its work on behalf of the Academic Senate, BOARS has adopted the following definition and principles to guide the formulation of individual admissions policies for campuses selecting among UC eligible applicants. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications. BOARS defines comprehensive review as:

The process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment.

---

<sup>1</sup> These guidelines apply to those students eligible for admission. Up to 6 percent of new enrolled freshmen and 6 percent of new enrolled advanced standing students can be admitted by exception, as authorized by The Regents. Refer also to the Policy on Undergraduate Admissions by Exception.

In designing campus procedures, campus admissions committees should adhere to the following guiding principles:

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant's academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.
2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.
3. No fixed proportion of applicants should be admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.
4. Campus policies should reflect continued commitment to the goal of enrolling classes that exhibit academic excellence as well as diversity of talents and abilities, personal experience, and backgrounds.
5. Faculty on individual campuses should be given flexibility to create admission policies and practices that, while consistent with Universitywide criteria and policies, are also sensitive to local campus values and academic priorities.
6. The admission process should select students of whom the campus will be proud, and who give evidence that they will use their education to make contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the State and the Nation.
7. The admissions process should select those students who demonstrate a strong likelihood that they will persist to graduation.
8. Campus selection policies should ensure that no applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review of his or her file.

Faculty takes their responsibilities for admission and selection very seriously. BOARS anticipates that campuses will act autonomously in designing campus-specific policies and processes that are consistent with Universitywide policies and guidelines. BOARS will continue to monitor campus policies and work with faculty to continuously improve the processes and outcomes.

### **III. SELECTION CRITERIA**

Campuses receiving applications in excess of the number required to achieve their enrollment target for a specific term shall select students for admission as follows:

#### **A. Freshman Applicants**

The following criteria provide a comprehensive list of factors campuses may use to select their admitted class. Based on campus-specific institutional goals and needs, admissions decisions will be based on a broad variety of factors to ensure attainment of the goals set forth in the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and RE-28.

1. Academic Grade Point Average (GPA) calculated on all academic courses completed in the subject areas specified by the University's eligibility requirements (the a-f subjects), including additional points for completion of University certified honors courses (see 4, below). It is recommended that the maximum value allowed for the GPA shall be 4.0.
2. Scores on the following tests: the Scholastic Assessment Test I or the American College Test, and the College Board Scholastic Assessment Test II: Subject Tests.
3. The number, content of, and performance in courses completed in academic subjects beyond the minimum specified by the University's eligibility requirements.
4. The number of and performance in University approved honors courses, College Board Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, and transferable college courses completed. It is recommended that caution be exercised in order not to assign excessive weight to these courses, especially if considerable weight already has been given in the context of 1, above. Additionally, in recognition of existing differences in availability of these courses among high schools, it is recommended that reviewers assess completion of this coursework against the availability of these courses at the candidate's secondary school.
5. Being identified as eligible in the local context, by being ranked in the top 4% of the class at the end of the junior year, as determined by academic criteria established by the University of California.



6. The quality of the senior year program, as measured by type and number of academic courses (see 3 and 4, above) in progress or planned.
7. The quality of academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school.
8. Outstanding performance in one or more specific academic subject areas.
9. Outstanding work in one or more special projects in any academic field of study.
10. Recent, marked improvement in academic performance, as demonstrated by academic grade point average and quality of coursework (see 3 and 4, above) completed and in progress, with particular attention being given to the last two years of high school.
11. Special talents, achievements, and awards in a particular field, such as in the visual and performing arts, in communication, or in athletic endeavors; special skills, such as demonstrated written and oral proficiency in other languages; special interests, such as intensive study and exploration of other cultures; or experiences that demonstrate unusual promise for leadership, such as significant community service or significant participation in student government; or other significant experiences or achievements that demonstrate the applicant's promise for contributing to the intellectual vitality of a campus.
12. Completion of special projects undertaken either in the context of the high school curriculum or in conjunction with special school events, projects or programs co-sponsored by the school, community organizations, postsecondary educational institutions, other agencies, or private firms, that offer significant evidence of an applicant's special effort and determination or that may indicate special suitability to an academic program on a specific campus.
13. Academic accomplishments in light of the applicant's life experiences and special circumstances. These experiences and circumstances may include, but are not limited to, disabilities, low family income, first generation to attend college, need to work, disadvantaged social or educational environment, difficult personal and family situations or circumstances, refugee status, or veteran status.
14. Location of the applicant's secondary school and residence. These factors shall be considered in order to provide for geographic diversity in the

student population and also to account for the wide variety of educational environments existing in California.

**B. Advanced Standing Applicants**

Advanced standing applicants shall be selected by each campus using the criteria listed below as well as criteria 11-14 listed above. Priority consideration for admission of advanced standing applicants shall be given to upper division junior transfers from California Community Colleges.

**Criteria to Select Advanced Standing Applicants**

1. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that meet breadth or general education requirements.
2. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that provide continuity with upper division courses in the major.
3. Grade point average in all transferable courses, and, in particular, grade point average in lower division courses required for the applicant's intended major.
4. Participation in academically selective honors courses or programs.

(Refer to items 2 through 6 in Section A above for additional criteria to consider.)

**IV. APPLICATION PROCEDURES**

A common filing period for submission of applications shall be established by the Office of the President in consultation with the campuses. These dates shall be observed by all campuses and may be extended only if a campus determines that additional applications are required to meet enrollment targets. All applications submitted during the prescribed dates shall receive equal consideration for admission.

Applicants shall file one application on which they shall indicate all the campuses where they wish to be considered for admission.

Campuses shall observe and publish a common notification period for notifying applicants of their admission status.

## **V. ACCOMMODATION OF UC ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS**

UC eligible resident applicants, who have not been admitted at any of the campuses of their choice shall be offered a space at other UC campuses where space is available. This process, called referral, reaffirms the long-standing University commitment to provide a place for every eligible California applicant who wishes to enroll.

In addition to the referral process, campuses may choose to offer other enrollment alternatives to UC eligible applicants. Examples of such alternatives may include:

1. Fall term admission to a different major,
2. Deferred admission to another term; or,
3. Enrollment at a community college with provision for admission at a later time, if a stated level of academic achievement is maintained (for freshman applicants only).

**BOARS Statement on Accountability  
for Comprehensive Review of Eligible Applicants**

1. Each campus should articulate its admissions goals based on the following definition of comprehensive review of applicants:

Comprehensive review is the process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise, while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated accomplishment.

2. Each campus should define its campus admissions criteria.
3. Campuses should ensure that the faculty and supporting staff who evaluate applicants are well-qualified to select from among eligible applicants for the campus.
4. Campus practices should be tailored to specific goals but also reflect the best practices available.
5. Campus practices should be regularly evaluated and monitored both by the Divisional Senates and by BOARS during the admissions process.
6. Annual admissions and enrollment reports should be submitted both to the campus senates and to BOARS. These reports would define campus goals for admission and evaluate the extent to which the goals are being met.
7. BOARS would disseminate to the campuses systemwide information that permits sharing of best practices and refinement of campus procedures.