

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

*Robert M. Anderson*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-9303*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*  
*Email: Robert.Anderson@ucop.edu*

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council*  
*Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents*  
*University of California*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor*  
*Oakland, California 94607-5200*

March 15, 2012

PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT LAWRENCE PITTS

**Re: BOARS Resolution on Oversight of Eligibility in the Local Context**

Dear Larry:

I am transmitting for your immediate attention a resolution adopted by BOARS that calls on the University to continue careful oversight of the determination which high school seniors are Eligible in the Local Context for guaranteed freshman admission to a University of California campus. At a minimum, the University's direct oversight must continue until BOARS and the administrators tasked with managing the admission process have been able to analyze the results of the revised admission process.

I intend to bring the BOARS resolution to the Academic Council for adoption but note that BOARS has plenary authority over admissions and is therefore entitled to address you directly. Please feel free to contact me or BOARS chair Bill Jacob if you have any questions or concerns about this resolution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Bob", written in a cursive style.

Robert M. Anderson

Encl (1)

Cc: President Yudof  
Vice President Sakaki  
Chief of Staff Robinson  
Executive Director Winnacker

# **BOARS Resolution on Maintaining the Integrity of the Eligibility in the Local Context Program**

**March 2012**

## ***Whereas***

1. The Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program extends the possibility and promise of a UC education to a broad segment of California high school students;
2. The 9% ELC guarantee is a central feature of current admissions policy;
3. The 5,500 students in the fall 2012 applicant pool who have an admission guarantee through ELC and do not have a guarantee through the statewide path are significantly more diverse than the overall applicant pool;
4. The value of ELC percentile information to campuses extends beyond the guarantee itself, due to its important role in the individualized review process;
5. UC recently streamlined the cost of the ELC program by evaluating transcripts from one-third of schools each year rather than all schools each year;
6. Percentile rankings supplied by high schools cannot be used to determine ELC status, because they are not based on UC criteria, and because these criteria will vary across schools. Moreover, because such rankings do not consider 'a-g' course-taking, they will depart furthest from UC criteria in low API schools where the ELC determination matters most;
7. Managing and verifying the ELC guarantee determination centrally at UC ensures its integrity and consistency;
8. The Regents approved the new admissions policy with the understanding that UC would maintain the integrity of the ELC guarantee;
9. BOARS is still monitoring outcomes from the new admissions policy, including the effect of the expanded ELC guarantee and the role of ELC data in selection.

## ***Be it Resolved that***

1. UC must continue to manage the ELC determination process rather than rely on data supplied by high schools;
2. No changes to ELC implementation should be made until BOARS has had a chance to fully evaluate outcomes from the first year of the new admissions policy.