

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS
ANNUAL REPORT 2001-2002**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met September 2001 through August 2002 for a total of nineteen meetings days. Additional business was conducted in subcommittee meetings and by email. Most of BOARS' meetings were convened as two-day working sessions, which allowed the committee to expedite a proposal on the use of standardized tests in admissions. BOARS also continued its work on the comprehensive review policy and other admissions changes.

DURING THE 2001-2002 ACADEMIC YEAR, BOARS CONSIDERED AND ACTED ON THE FOLLOWING MAJOR ISSUES:

COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW. In fall 2001, BOARS submitted a proposal to institute a system of comprehensive review of applicants for undergraduate admissions, replacing the system of tiered admissions. Under the two- tiered system, campuses admitted 50 to 75 percent of their freshman classes solely on the basis of academic criteria constituting one tier. The other tier was composed of students admitted on the basis of both academic and supplemental criteria. BOARS proposed to have all students considered on the basis of a comprehensive set of criteria.

In its proposal, BOARS defined comprehensive review as “the process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and process, while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated accomplishment.” The comprehensive review strategy would continue to emphasize academic achievement as the most important element for consideration in admissions, but would include other achievements in the context of each applicant’s opportunities. The proposal recognized that merit is demonstrated in multiple ways and supports UC’s message to students to challenge themselves.

BOARS presented the proposal after a deliberative process which involved meetings and campus review during the summer months. The Academic Assembly and the Regents subsequently approved the proposal in November 2001 to be immediately initiated for the Fall 2001 admissions cycle.

Upon the proposal’s approval, BOARS committed to monitoring and evaluating the comprehensive review process. The committee ensured faculty oversight by interacting with the Admissions Directors throughout the year. In September 2001, BOARS held a joint meeting with the Admissions Directors to allow each campus to present their plans for implementing comprehensive review. To address faculty accountability in the process, BOARS also adopted ten accountability principles to serve as a foundation for ongoing review and evaluation. After campuses completed the first admissions cycle using the comprehensive review process, UCOP facilitated a review of each campus’ experiences based on these accountability principles. Campus outcomes and data analyses were then presented to BOARS in July 2002 at another joint meeting with the Admissions Directors.

Preliminary findings indicated that each of the selective campuses successfully implemented the comprehensive review policy in conformance to BOARS' guidelines and principles.

Also at the joint meeting, BOARS and the Admissions Directors discussed the value of the process and areas that would need further study. One of these issues was the importance of accurate and valid applicant information. BOARS believed that a verification process would serve as an important warning and deterrent against falsification on the application. During the summer, UCOP and UCSD each successfully piloted processes to verify non-academic information provided by a student on his/her application. A systemwide verification plan is under development. Other ways to make the admissions process more efficient and streamlined are being discussed by the Admissions Process Task Force, a joint faculty-administration committee.

At the end of August 2002, BOARS had begun to prepare a report on comprehensive review's first year of implementation, which will be presented to the Academic Council and the Board of Regents in fall 2002. BOARS will continue to monitor comprehensive review as the processes evolve.

ADMISSIONS TESTS. BOARS also undertook an intensive study of the use admissions tests in response to President Atkinson's February 2001 request to consider eliminating the SAT I from UC admissions requirements. BOARS 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. In considering educational policy questions, BOARS concluded that there are many good reason to use achievement-type tests for admissions.

In January 2002, the committee issued a discussion paper on "The Use of Admissions Test by the University of California", in which BOARS endorsed the continued use of admissions tests but recommended that the UC faculty consider adopting a new array of tests. BOARS also proposed a set of principles that would enhance the depth, breadth, and rigor of the tests used in the UC admissions process.

After BOARS released its paper, townhall meetings were held at every campus to give the faculty a forum to discuss the proposal and recommendations. During this time, BOARS also had extensive interactions with the two national testing agencies, ACT Inc. and the College Board, to discuss the possibility of developing tests that would address BOARS' principles. After review by campuses and the Academic Council, BOARS' recommendations were presented to the Regents and the Academic Assembly of the Senate. In May 2002, the Academic Assembly unanimously passed resolutions in support of BOARS' continuing work with the two testing agencies to develop improved admissions tests.

After the Assembly vote, ACT announced its intention to enhance their existing exam by adding a writing sample for California test-takers. By June 2002, the trustees of the College Board approved changes to the SAT, including adding a writing section, new reading questions, and more-advanced mathematics. College Board officials said the new test would relate more closely to high-school curriculum and more accurately predict a student's performance in college, which would be consistent with BOARS' recommendations.

BOARS will continue its collaborative work with both the College Board and ACT on the development of admissions tests that reflect the specifications outlined by BOARS. That work will continue through the next academic year. BOARS had also begun working on additional recommendations regarding the use of supplemental subject matter tests, which will be presented to the Academic Council, the Senate Divisions, and the Assembly for review and approval.

A-G COURSES. BOARS approved new descriptions for the VPA “P” requirement and Lab Science “g” requirement. As high school courses become more non-traditional and unique, additional policy clarifications were needed to help staff assess new course submissions. The policy clarification for the VPA requirement, which takes effect for students entering the University in fall 2003, was drafted by a statewide VPA committee and presented for BOARS’ approval. The Lab Science policy clarification was drafted by a BOARS subcommittee, and approved by the whole committee. Both of these new descriptions will be posted on the a-g interactive guide website.

ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT (ELC). As ELC completed its first admissions cycle this year, BOARS was asked to consider uncapping the GPA to determine ELC eligibility. BOARS approved changing the GPA calculation used to identify ELC students by including all UC honors courses without capping at eight. This method will reward those students who have completed challenging work.

DUAL ADMISSIONS. In June 2002, the Legislative Conference Committee funded \$2.5 million for the Dual Admissions initiative recommended by BOARS last year. UCOP is in the process of identifying 30-40 community college campuses to pilot the program. BOARS will stay updated on the implementation of the program is rolled-out.

REVIEW OF OTHER ISSUES. During the course of the year, the committee also discussed and/or commented on the following proposals and issues:

- The Subject A Examination
- ICAS’ draft revision of the 1982 English Competency Statement
- The May 2002 draft Master Plan for Education in California
- Establishing guidelines to help assess alternative educational institutions, e.g. home schools

BOARS REPRESENTATION. Members represented BOARS in a number of other committees including the Admissions Processing Task Force, California Articulation Numbering, MOU Implementation Committee, UCCP Initiative, and UC Undergraduate Experience Survey. Several members also participated in the counselor conferences. Chair Perry represented BOARS on the UC Merced Task Force, UCEP, and UCOPE.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. BOARS would like to acknowledge following UCOP consultants for their contribution, work, and insight over the past year: Pat Hayashi, Associate President; Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President – Student Academic Services; Carla Ferri, Director – Admissions; Saul Geiser, Director – Research and Planning; Nina Robinson, Director – Policy and External Affairs; Judy Kowarsky, Associate Director – Admissions.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Perry, Chair (UCSF)

Barbara Sawrey, Vice Chair (UCSD)

Calvin Moore (UCB)

Patrick Farrell (UCD)

Linda Georgianna (UCI)

Philip Curtis (UCLA)

Dennis Focht (UCR)

Jane Stevens (UCSD)

Verna Gibbs (UCSF)

Michael Brown (UCSB)

Karen McNally (UCSC)

Kenneth Burch (Graduate student rep, UCSD)

Christopher Diaz (Undergraduate student rep, UCLA)

Committee Analyst:

Emily Hung