

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE  
SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO • SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

## NOTICE OF MEETING

### REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Wednesday, May 29, 2002, 10 a.m.-4 p.m.  
Sunset Village, Covell Commons, 300 Deneve Drive  
University of California, Los Angeles

<b>I.</b>	<b>ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>MINUTES</b>	
	Minutes of the Meeting of October 31, 2001	2
	Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, October 31, 2001	12
<b>III.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT</b>	
	Richard C. Atkinson	13
<b>IV.</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</b>	
	Chand R. Viswanathan	13
<b>V.</b>	<b>SPECIAL ORDERS (none)</b>	

---

*Next meeting of the Assembly: Wednesday, October 30, 2002, UC Berkeley*

<b>VI.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES</b>	
	<b>Report of the Senate’s Task Force on UC Merced</b>	
	<b>Peter Berck, Chair</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES</b>	
	<b>A. Academic Council</b>	
	<b>Chand Viswanathan, Chair</b>	
	• Nomination and Election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2002-2003 (oral report, action)	13
	• Nomination and Election of at-large Membership, Universitywide Committee on Committees, 2002-2003 (action)	13
	• Assembly Meeting Schedule, 2002-2003 (information)	13
	• Apportionment of Representatives to the Assembly, 2002-2003 (information)	13
	• Approval of Senate Membership for Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment (action)	14
	• Report from the President’s Council On the National Laboratories	16
	• Announcement of the Academic Council’s Selection of the 2001-2002 Oliver Johnson Award Recipient (information)	16
	<b>B. University Committee on Committees (UCOC)</b>	
	<b>Concepcion Valadez, Chair</b>	
	• Appointments of Committee Chairs and Vice Chairs, 2002-2003 (information)	16
	<b>C. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)</b>	
	<b>Dorothy Perry, Chair</b>	
	• Approval of BOARS’ Recommendations on Admissions Testing (action/discussion):	
	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	16
	• Report on Eligibility in a Local Context	22
	• Report on Comprehensive Admissions	23
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>PETITIONS OF STUDENTS (none)</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>IX.</b>	<b>UNFINISHED BUSINESS (none)</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>X.</b>	<b>UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT</b>	
	<b>Renee Binder, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>XI.</b>	<b>NEW BUSINESS</b>	<b>25</b>

## **I. Roll Call**

### **2001-2002 Assembly Roll Call May 29, 2002**

#### **President of the University:**

Richard Atkinson

Joseph F. Dimento

Alexei A. Maradudin

William Sirignano

#### **Academic Council Members:**

C.R. Viswanathan, Chair

Gayle Binion, Vice Chair

David Dowall, Chair, UCB

Jeffery Gibeling, Chair, UCD

James Given, Chair, UCI

John Edmond, Chair, UCLA

Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR

Michael Bernstein, Chair, UCSD

Daniel Bikle, Chair, UCSF

Richard Watts, Chair, UCSB

George Blumenthal, Chair, UCSC

Barbara Doshier, Chair, UCAP

Charles Perrin, Chair, CCGA

David Dooley, Chair, UCEP

Dorothy Perry, Chair, BOARS

Renee Binder, Chair, UCFW

Alan Jackman, Chair, UCPB

#### **Los Angeles (9)**

Kathryn Atchison

Dalila Corry

Robert Ettenger

Lillian Gelberg

Seymour Levin

Vickie Mays

Jose Moya

Jane Valentine

Shi Zhang

#### **Riverside (2)**

Bajis Dodin

R. Erwin Taylor

#### **San Diego (4)**

Ellen T. Comisso

Jeanne Ferrante

Kim R. MacConnel

Donald F. Tuzin

#### **San Francisco (3)**

Mary Croughan-Minihane

Patricia Benner

Barry Massie

#### **Santa Barbara (3)**

Michael Gerber

Dan Little

Eileen Boris

#### **Santa Cruz (2)**

Alison Galloway

Susan Schwartz

#### **Berkeley (7)**

James Bartolome

Steven Beckendorf

Steven Botterill

John McWhorter

Daniel Melia

Jeffrey Riegel

Howard Shelanski

#### **Davis (6)**

Lester Ehler

Dallas Hyde

Jerry Powell

Evelyn Silvia

Jessica Utts

Philip Yager

#### **Irvine (4)**

James Danziger

#### **Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Peter Berck

## **II. Minutes**

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ACADEMIC SENATE**

### **REGULAR MEETING OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE Minutes of October 31, 2001**

#### **I. Call to Order/Roll Call of Members**

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met at 10:00 a.m. on Wednesday, October 31, 2001 in Covell Commons in Sunset Village at UC Los Angeles.

Following the call to order, Assembly Chair Chand Viswanathan asked members to join him in a moment of silence in memory of those who had lost their lives on September 11.

Senate Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló called the roll of the Assembly; the meeting attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

#### **II. Minutes of the May 23, 2001 Meeting**

The minutes of the May 23, 2001 meeting of the Assembly were approved as written.

#### **III. Announcements by the President Richard C. Atkinson**

President Atkinson briefed the Assembly on selected topics from his discussion outline\* that had been distributed prior to his arrival, and Provost King gave an update on the Educational Doctorate. Following the briefing, the President and Provost took questions from the floor. Highlights from that discussion follow.

**Budget:** The Governor has indicated that he plans to ask for mid-year cuts in this year's budget. It is expected that negotiations with the Governor's Office will result in some cuts for the University but not at the 15% level as originally mentioned. For next year, the University will request an 11.5% increase, which will fund the basic Partnership and compensate for the funds lost in this fiscal year. Given the economic conditions of the state, however, it is not likely that the University will receive all of the 11.5%. Over the next several months, the University will be considering ways to cope with any significant cuts. This will be a topic for discussion at the Regents' meeting in November.

**Commission on Graduate Education:** The recent report from the Commission on the Growth and Support of Graduate Education notes that UC will need an additional \$215

million annually to fund growth and increase the University's ability to compete for the best graduate students. Given the economic environment, this report will not be presented to the Regents in November, as originally planned.

**Faculty Salaries:** The University received significantly reduced State funding for the 2001-02 salary programs. To partially mitigate this reduction, a proposal will be presented to the Regents in November to give eligible employees additional funds through a special retirement account called a Capital Accumulation Provision (CAP) accrual account, which will be funded from UCRS monies.

**Outreach Activities:** To date, the University has enrolled a total of 73,000 K-12 teachers in professional development programs covering all disciplines. This exceeds the original goal of 70,000. While legislation makes it difficult to collect comparative data on participant and non-participant teachers, the University believes that these programs have had a substantial impact on the teaching of reading in the early grades. There is anecdotal evidence from the Los Angeles area that significant increases have occurred in reading performance, which can be attributed, in part, to this effort.

**SAT Proposal:** The proposal to eliminate the SAT I, as a requirement for admission to UC, is being vetted through the Academic Senate. A recent report on the predictive validity and differential impact of the SAT I and SAT II at UC, which was distributed with the discussion outline, is an interesting study, and the President offered to take questions about it at the end of his report.

**Faculty Hiring and Gender Equity:** The State Audit examined the rate of women faculty hired, salaries at hire, and the rate hired versus the number of women in the national Ph.D. pool. Although improvements are needed, the report concluded that when the estimates of available doctoral recipients were adjusted to reflect the pool from which UC actually hires, the availability of women in the pool (33%) was much closer to the rate at which the University hires women professors (29%). The report also concluded that factors other than gender appear to cause any salary disparities that exist between male and female hires. In response to the audit recommendations, campuses are implementing new and strengthening existing practices to ensure equal opportunity for women.

**Mexico:** Historically the Mexican government tended to send its students to East Coast universities, but with the Governor's focus on strengthening relationships between California and Mexico, more students are coming to the University of California. Under the guidance of UC MEXUS there are currently 91 Mexican Ph.D. students enrolled at UC and a faculty exchange program is in place. The University is also in the process of identifying a facility in Mexico City that would serve as the equivalent of the London House.

**Dual Admissions Program (DAP):** Although the Regents approved DAP for implementation in Fall 2003, it will be delayed by one year because there is no State funding available for the program.

**Eligibility in the Local Context Program (ELC):** Instituted for the first time this past fall, ELC has been highly successful. Ninety-eight percent of California high schools are participating in this program.

**Fee Waivers:** Although the President supports fee waivers for dependents of eligible faculty and staff, financial constraints will prevent this initiative from being implemented this academic year.

**Master Plan Review:** There is a move to change the University's funding formula in the Master Plan so that students coming to UC in the first two years would be funded at the community college rate and, at the junior and senior years, funded at the CSU rate. At the graduate level there would be a new formula. UC representatives have been working hard to make it clear why such a recommendation would be harmful to the University.

**Summer Instruction Expansion:** Full funding was received for summer instruction at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara this past summer, and all three campuses reported a dramatic increase in their enrollments. Although support for the program remains strong in Sacramento, full summer funding for all of the campuses will take longer than initially planned because of the budget.

**UC Merced:** Although there continues to be strong support from the Legislature and from the Governor for UC Merced, the environmental issues are so complicated that there is some uncertainty about whether it will open in 2004 as scheduled.

**Education Doctorate:** The Provost reported that in recent negotiations with the CSU on their proposal to be allowed to offer the doctorate in education (Ed.D.) independently, the following agreement was reached: 1) CSU's initiative at the State level will be dropped. 2) A California Institute for Educational Leadership will be created, co-chaired by the UC Provost and his CSU counterpart that will have Senate members from both institutions. The Institute will have a start-up budget of \$4 million (\$2 million from each institution) to fund the development of new joint Ed.D. programs. The students in the joint programs will be UC students. They will be funded by the State for the marginal cost of instruction for UC. On a credit unit basis, the funding will be apportioned between the two institutions. 3) A needs assessment will be made of all state regions and ways will be found to serve those regions. It is expected that the budget will continue to be funded by the State. The President added that having this joint program in place would meet his commitment to increase the number of doctoral degrees awarded in education by UC, and that there is no longer a need for campuses to develop their own Ed.D. programs.

**Comprehensive Review:** The President presented a detailed account of the background on the Comprehensive Review proposal, in an effort to address concerns about the proposal being fast tracked. There was a group of State Legislators who felt strongly that comprehensive review should be included as part of RE 28 [resolution to repeal SP 1 and 2], when it went before the Regents last May. In the spirit of shared governance, the President refused to support this view, even though he favored comprehensive admissions. In

discussions with the then-Academic Council Chair, Michael Cowan, it was decided that it would be possible for the Senate to vet a comprehensive review proposal in time for it to come before the Regents in November 2001, if the relevant Senate Committees worked over the summer months. This timeline would allow those campuses that wanted to implement comprehensive review for this year's round of admissions to do so.

The President invited questions from the floor. In response, he (or Provost King) made the following additional comments:

The Legislature set aside \$750,000 for the implementation of the comprehensive review program. If the university does not move forward with the program, it will lose this money.

The University currently has a funding scheme that takes into account the full mix of graduate and undergraduate student levels and that provides strong support for graduate education. Disaggregating UC's budget by level would be disastrous to the University.

UC's fees for professional students are low by comparison to those of other public institutions. Fee increases where the university would return 50% of the amount to financial aid to ensure that low-income students have access to the University is a powerful incentive. This is one of the reasons why the President will continue to advocate for fee increases.

Educational fee waivers would be an effective faculty recruitment and retention tool for the University, but waivers will not be part of the proposed budget for next year because the preservation of the Partnership has a higher priority. The University will continue to keep fee waivers on its agenda. Funding for the program will have to come from the State.

One of the proposals that the Governor will put forward at an economic summit that he has planned is to use the University's construction projects as an economic stimulus for the State.

BOARS is in the process of reviewing the SAT proposal. The Senate will have to determine the mix of tests that it will recommend for student applicants. A writing sample from students is absolutely critical and one of the best success predictors for the University of California.

The Provost reported that he had sent a memorandum to the Academic Council Chair addressing questions that were raised at the October Council meeting on current law and the release of student information. Under existing law, all requests for information about students, including government inquiries about foreign students, are subject to the provisions of the Federal Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). It prohibits the release of certain categories of student records without prior student permission except for reasons of public health and safety. In legislation just approved, if an agency wants access to records, it must now go to a judge and obtain a ruling that will grant it access. The

University will have to adhere to the judge's ruling. To date, the number of such requests has been small. [The Academic Council Chair will forward a copy of the Provost's memorandum to Academic Senate members.]

**IV. Announcements by the Chair**  
**Chand R. Viswanathan**

December 5 Assembly Meeting. Four Assembly meetings have been scheduled for this academic year in anticipation of an increased workload. If, by the end of this meeting, there is an indication that a December meeting is not necessary, the Chair will ask for permission from the Academic Council to cancel the December meeting and notify the Assembly members.

**V. Special Orders**  
**Consent Calendar**  
**Variance to Senate Regulations Requested by the Davis Division**

The Faculty of the School of Medicine proposed to modify the grading procedures from a letter grade based system to an honors/pass/fail system in order to bring the UC Davis School of Medicine into conformity with the other medical schools in the UC system. At its June 5, 2001 meeting, the Davis Representative Assembly approved the amendment. On behalf of the Assembly, the amendment was approved by the Academic Council at its July 2001 meeting.

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

**VII. Reports of Standing Committees**

**Academic Council**

**Chand Viswanathan, Chair**

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

On behalf of the Assembly, the Academic Council approved the following degree titles at its July and August meetings: DPTSc at UCSF for a joint doctoral program in Physical Therapy Sciences between UCSF and Cal State University, San Francisco; the M.Ed. at UC San Diego for a Program in Teacher Education; and the M.Ed. at UC Riverside for a Master's of Education Program.

**Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools**

**(BOARS) Dorothy Perry, Chair**

Approval of Comprehensive Admissions Policy (action)



At its October 10, 2001 meeting, the Academic Council unanimously approved (with one abstention) the Comprehensive Admissions Policy as proposed by BOARS. The approval included the provision that the Policy would be reviewed five years following its implementation by a methodology to be developed by BOARS. Chair Viswanathan noted that the BOARS Chair now brings before the Assembly a motion to approve the Comprehensive Admissions Policy, as amended in Distribution Item 1. He read the motion as follows:

**Resolved: that the Assembly approve BOARS' recommendation to institute a system of comprehensive review of applicants for undergraduate admission. Assembly approval is contingent upon the understanding that the process of comprehensive review be evaluated under a methodology to be developed by BOARS and that the results of the BOARS evaluation be reported to the Academic Council within five years of the implementation of comprehensive review.**

Chair Viswanathan invited BOARS Chair Perry to provide additional background on the proposal. Professor Perry stated that BOARS had met in a series of meetings over the summer so that there would be an opportunity for the university to initiate comprehensive review with the Fall 2001 admissions cycle, if approved. In drafting the final proposal, BOARS consulted widely with both Systemwide and Divisional Senate Committees as well as with representatives from campus admissions staffs because they are responsible for putting together the operational plans. Following the events of September 11, BOARS voted to make an additional change. That change is found in the wording of Principle #6 on page 88 in the Call. It now reads:

“The admissions 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 California, the United States, and the broader International community.”

In a brief slide presentation, Professor Perry stressed that if the Assembly were to approve the Comprehensive Admissions proposal, it would: 1) eliminate the tiered system of review, and 2) put faculty back in control of the University's admissions policy. The following would not change:

- eligibility in the local context
- the fourteen selection criteria
- the systemwide admit pool
- the primary focus on academic achievement and preparation
- the determination by the campuses on how the criteria are applied

Professor Perry noted that the most often repeated concern about the proposal is that by removing the tiered system, the academic quality of students would be compromised. BOARS believes that the academic quality of students would not only be maintained but enhanced by the elimination of the tiered system.

Following her presentation, Professor Perry moved that the Assembly adopt the motion, as contained in Distribution Item 1 of the meeting. The motion was seconded, and Chair Viswanathan called for a discussion on the motion. Comments offered during the discussion included:

Why is there such an urgency in putting through this proposal? If the University of California truly wants a good admissions policy, there should be a more deliberative and thoughtful process. A better way would have been for each campus to develop its own comprehensive review plan and then have those reviewed by BOARS.

The problem with comprehensive admissions policies is that they can be perceived as subjective and arbitrary. Comprehensive review may also be portrayed as a way for the University to circumvent Proposition 209. It should be stressed that adoption of this policy will not change UC eligibility rules.

The fourteen selection criteria should be reexamined because many are vague and because there are questions about how they are weighted and how they are applied. For example, "special projects" as a criterion is vague, and it is not clear that the recommended 4.0 cap on the GPA is preferable to an uncapped GPA.

Will the funding for the implementation of comprehensive review continue to be a separate budget item?

During the five-year review process, the University should ensure that it is continuing to admit a diversity of students.

**There being no further discussion, Chair Viswanathan called the question on the main motion by asking for a show of hands. The motion was approved by a vote of 42 yes, 0 no and 3 abstentions.**

Chair Viswanathan thanked all of the faculty members, BOARS, and the BOARS Chair for their diligence in getting the motion passed. The proposal will be sent to the Regents for consideration at their November 14, 2001 meeting.

**Professor Mays asked that the record reflect the Senate's quick response to the President's request for action on this proposal. Due largely to the hard work of the BOARS Chair and members, this proposal came before the Assembly in record time.**

**Committee on Privilege & Tenure (UCP&T)  
George Blumenthal, Immediate Past Chair, UCP&T  
Jodie Holt, Chair, UCP&T**

Approval of Revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 015 and new APM Section 016 (action)

The Assembly was asked to approve revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual's section 015, and to approve a new, related APM section, 016. With Regental approval, the

President will issue the revised APM-015 and APM-016 as University policy. Chair Viswanathan asked Professor George Blumenthal to present the proposal.

Currently APM-015 includes both the Code of Conduct and the disciplinary procedures. The proposal before the Assembly would separate these into two sections. One would encompass only the Code of Conduct (APM-015), and the other the disciplinary procedures (APM-016). These changes were presented to the Assembly on an informational basis last February. Since then, comments were received from the campuses, and many were incorporated into the document. It has gone through a formal review at the systemwide, divisional, and administrative levels.

The most important change in the proposed APM-016 is in the range of disciplinary procedures that are available for the discipline of faculty members. There are currently four potential disciplines for faculty misconduct: Dismissal from the University; Demotion; Suspension without Salary; and Written Censure. It is proposed that this list is increased by two additional sanctions:

Denial or Curtailment of Emeritus Status.

Rationale: None of the current disciplinary procedures apply to emeriti. To include this additional sanction would provide both a sanction that could be used against the emeriti and provide some protection for the emeriti.

Temporary Decrease in Salary (without demotion) for some specified period of time.

Rationale: Since most disciplinary proceedings, are not factors in deciding on promotion, there are only three possible disciplines available – being fired, suspended without salary, or censured. This sanction would provide an intermediate option.

For APM-015, there are a number of technical changes proposed. The main area of change is found in Part III of the Code. The updated version contains two lists of procedures for campuses -- a mandatory list and a recommended list. It is hoped that the campuses will reexamine their own procedures and make them consistent with the new Code of Conduct, should it pass the Assembly and Regents.

**Professor Blumenthal moved that the Assembly vote to endorse the proposed revisions to APM 015 and the new APM 016 as they appear on pages 115 to 154 of the Call. The motion was seconded and Chair Viswanathan called for a discussion of the proposal.**

During the discussion, Professor Blumenthal was asked for clarification on some of the proposed changes.

**Chair Viswanathan called the question on the motion to approve for adoption the proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 015 and the new APM Section 016 by asking for a show of hands. The motion was approved by a vote of 43 yes, 0 no, and 2 abstentions.**

**VIII. Petitions of Students**

Chair Viswanathan acknowledged the receipt of a Petition from UC Berkeley students and faculty. The Petition called for the immediate elimination of the SAT and to increase underrepresented minority student enrollment.

**A motion was made and seconded to forward the Petition to BOARS, as a point of information. Chair Viswanathan called the question on the motion by asking for a show of hands. The motion was approved by a vote of 38 yes, 2 no, and 4 abstentions.**

**IX. Unfinished Business (none)**

**X. University and Faculty Welfare Report**

**Renee Binder, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare**

Professor Binder reported on UCFW's agenda for this academic year. The items include: Parking, Faculty Housing, Rising Costs of Health Care for Faculty and Staff, Childcare, Benefits to Domestic Partners, Retirement with a special focus on the Health Sciences Faculty, and Educational Fee Waivers. An important part of UCFW's charge is to continue to advocate for the various initiatives, including Fee Waivers and Domestic Partners, until they are approved and funded. The Committee is also available to give UCFW's perspective on issues that might be under consideration by other Senate Committees. In response to questions taken from the floor, Professor Binder offered these additional comments.

UCFW developed a proposal last year for phased retirement so that faculty could cut back their service incrementally. Because of the increasing enrollment, the University's focus is on recruitment and retention, not retirement. That is why VERIP will not be made an option at this time.

The recent Task Force Report on Childcare is available from the Office of Human Resources & Benefits, Office of the President. Contact Lubbe Levin at [Lubbe.Levin@ucop.edu](mailto:Lubbe.Levin@ucop.edu) for a copy. Professor Binder encouraged campuses to take advantage of the President's offer to provide matching funds for campus childcare programs.

Issues regarding sabbatical leaves should be brought to the campus committee on Privilege and Tenure.

**XI. New Business**

There has been no assessment of the impact of asking students to submit five SAT II scores. A member requested that this issue be considered by BOARS. BOARS Chair Perry agreed to make is part of the Committee's discussion on the SAT.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Attest: Chand Viswanathan  
Chair, Assembly of the Senate

CV/BM

\*Distributed at the meeting:

- 1) President Atkinson's discussion outline for the October 31, 2001 meeting\*
- 2) October 29, 2001 Report – UC and the SAT: Predictive Validity and Differential Impact of the SAT I and SAT II at the University of California

Distribution Item I: Revised Motion before the Assembly: Approval of Comprehensive Admissions Policy

Distribution 2: BOARS modification to Principle #6 as passed at their October 12, 2001 meeting.

\*Meeting distributions are available at the  
Academic Senate's Office, 1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, California

## Appendix A

### 2001-2002 Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of October 31, 2001

#### **President of the University:**

Richard Atkinson

#### **Academic Council Members:**

C.R. Viswanathan, Chair  
Gayle Binion, Vice Chair  
David Dowall, Chair, UCB  
Jeffery Gibeling, Chair, UCD  
James Given, Chair, UCI  
John Edmond, Chair, UCLA  
Irwin Sherman, Chair, UCR  
Michael Bernstein, Chair, UCSD  
Daniel Bikle, Chair, UCSF  
Richard Watts, Chair, UCSB  
George Blumenthal, Chair, UCSC  
Barbara Doshier, Chair, UCAP (absent)  
Charles Perrin, Chair, CCGA  
David Dooley, Chair, UCEP  
Dorothy Perry, Chair, BOARS  
Renee Binder, Chair, UCFW  
Alan Jackman, Chair, UCPB

#### **Berkeley (7)**

James Bartolome  
Steven Beckendorf (absent)  
Steven Botterill  
John McWhorter (absent)  
Daniel Melia  
Jeffrey Riegel (absent)  
Howard Shelanski (absent)  
Lowell Dittmer (Alt.)  
Shmuel Oren (Alt.)

#### **Davis (6)**

Lester Ehler (absent)  
Dallas Hyde (absent)  
Jerry Powell  
Evelyn Silvia  
Jessica Utts (absent)  
Philip Yager  
Ryken Grattet (alt.)  
Sharon Hietala (alt.)  
Margaret Rucker (alt.)

#### **Irvine (4)**

James Danziger  
Joseph F. Dimento  
Alexei A. Maradudin  
William Sirignano

#### **Los Angeles (9)**

Kathryn Atchison  
Dalila Corry  
Robert Ettenger  
Lillian Gelberg  
Seymour Levin  
Vickie Mays  
Jose Moya  
Jane Valentine  
Shi Zhang

#### **Riverside (2)**

Bajis Dodin  
R. Erwin Taylor

#### **San Diego (4)**

Ellen T. Comisso (absent)  
Jeanne Ferrante  
Kim R. MacConnel  
Donald F. Tuzin (absent)  
Ben Williams (alt.)

#### **San Francisco (3)**

Mary Croughan-Minihane (absent)  
Patricia Benner  
Barry Massie (absent)

#### **Santa Barbara (3)**

Michael Gerber  
Dan Little (absent)  
(1 TBA)

#### **Santa Cruz (2)**

Alison Galloway  
Susan Schwartz

#### **Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Peter Berck

**III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT (oral report)**

**IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR (oral report)**

**V. SPECIAL ORDERS (none)**

**VI. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES**  
**Report of the Senate's Task Force on UC Merced**  
**Peter Berck, Task Force Chair (oral report)**

**VII. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

**A. Academic Council**

**Chand Viswanathan, Chair**

- **Nomination and Election of Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2002-2003 (oral report, action)**
- **Nomination and Election of the Universitywide Committee on Committees at-large Membership for 2002-2003 (oral report, action)**
- **Assembly Meeting Schedule, 2002-2003 (information)**

Proposed Dates and Locations

Wednesday, October 30, 2002, UC Berkeley

Wednesday, March 12, 2003, UC Berkeley

Wednesday, May 28, 2003, UC Los Angeles

Submission Receipt Dates\*

August 1, 2002

December 12, 2002

February 28, 2003

- **Apportionment of Representatives to the Assembly (information)**

On the basis of Divisional Academic Senate membership as of February 2002, the Webster Method of Calculation was used to determine the number of campus representatives to the Assembly for 2002-2003. At its meeting of March 20, the Academic Council approved the apportionment of the 40 Divisional Representatives as follows. A comparison with the last two years' apportionment is shown.

---

\* Final date on which the Secretary/Parliamentarian can receive reports and other submissions for inclusion in the *Notice of Meeting*.

<b>Campus</b>	<b>Representatives 2000-2001</b>	<b>Representatives 2001-2002</b>	<b>Representatives 2002-2003</b>
Berkeley	7	7	7
Davis	6	6	6
Irvine	3	4	4
Los Angeles	10	9	9
Riverside	2	2	2
San Diego	4	4	4
San Francisco	3	3	3
Santa Barbara	3	3	3
Santa Cruz	2	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>

- **Approval of Academic Senate Membership for full-time Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment and full-time Senior Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment (action)**

The Assembly is being asked to approve Senate membership for full-time faculty with the UC titles Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment and Senior Lecturers with Potential for Security of Employment.

**Justification from Chair Viswanathan:**

Membership in the Academic Senate is granted to specific faculty titles by the UC Regents, with Regental actions on this issue codified in Regents' Standing Order 105.1. The Office of the President has proposed that a small group of faculty with the title Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (Lecturer PSOE) and Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment (Sr. Lecturer PSOE) be granted Senate membership. At its meeting of June 2001, the Academic Council supported a motion calling for full-time faculty with these titles to be granted Senate membership. This change is likewise supported by the Senate's Universitywide Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP).

Full-time Lecturers PSOE constitute a very small group within the University. As of fall 2001, there were seven such faculty at UC — 1 at Irvine, 1 at Los Angeles, and 5 at Santa Barbara. There currently are no Senior Lecturers PSOE in the system. Lecturers PSOE teach and perform public service, but research is not a criterion for their appointment or advancement. They are hired to meet long-term instructional needs that cannot best be met by hiring faculty within the Professorial Series. A faculty FTE must be allocated for each Lecturer PSOE before recruitment can begin. Review procedures for these faculty parallel procedures in UC's Professorial Series. Depending on performance, Lecturers PSOE can be advanced to the Lecturer with Security of Employment title (Lecturer SOE).



At present, Lecturers SOE are members of the Academic Senate, but Lecturers PSOE are not. Instead, Lecturers PSOE are members of Unit 18. Those Lecturers PSOE who advance to Lecturer SOE are automatically granted Senate membership. The Office of the President proposes that Lecturers PSOE be given a status that parallels that of Assistant Professors: Senate membership without tenure (or security of employment). Granting Senate membership to Lecturers PSOE would make the University's academic personnel policies more internally consistent and would aid departments that seek to recruit these faculty. UCAP and the Academic Council both concur with these UCOP assessments. The Council thus requests of the Assembly that it approve the administration's proposal to grant Senate membership to full-time Lecturers PSOE and Senior Lecturers PSOE. The Assembly's views will be presented to the President for transmission to the Regents, who will take final action on this issue.

What follows is the revision to Regents Standing Order 105.1 that will be submitted to the Regents, should the Assembly approve Senate membership for full-time Lecturers PSOE and Senior Lecturers PSOE. Deletions to current language are shown by ~~strikeout~~, additions by underline.

Standing Order 105.  
ACADEMIC SENATE

105.1 Organization of the Academic Senate

- (a) The Academic Senate shall consist of the President, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Provosts, Directors of academic programs, the chief admissions officer on each campus and in the Office of the President, registrars, the University Librarian on each campus of the University, ~~each lecturer who has full-time teaching responsibilities in any curriculum under the control of the Academic Senate and whose academic title is Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment or Lecturer with Security of Employment,~~ and each person giving instruction in any curriculum under the control of the Academic Senate whose academic title is Instructor, Instructor in Residence; Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor in Residence, Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine); Associate Professor, Associate Professor in Residence, Associate Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Acting Associate Professor; Professor, Professor in Residence, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), ~~or~~ Acting Professor; full-time Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment, full-time Senior Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment, full-time Lecturer with Security of Employment, or full-time Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment; however, Instructors and Instructors in Residence of less than two (2) years' service shall not be entitled to vote. Members of the faculties of professional schools offering courses at the

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

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

- **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**