



**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**

**Bill Jacob, Chair**

jacob@math.ucsb.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 20, 2011

DANIEL SIMMONS, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Re: Clarification of Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment**

Dear Dan,

Recently some ambiguity has arisen in the interpretation of one of the Non-Resident Enrollment Principles<sup>1</sup> authored by BOARS and endorsed by the Academic Council in 2009. As you know, UC eligibility policy changes are taking effect for fall 2012 admissions. BOARS believes it is necessary to clarify Principle #6 in light of those changes and this ambiguity. Principle #6 currently reads:

*6. Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident students by generally being in the “upper half of those ordinarily eligible” as stated in the Master Plan.*

Since the California Master Plan for Higher Education<sup>2</sup> asked UC to “select from” the top 12.5% or 1/8 of California high school graduates, UC has applied its interpretation of “eligibility” to this group of graduates. At the time the Master Plan was written, however, eligibility was essentially synonymous with admission for applicants who met basic eligibility criteria, unlike today, when the most selective UC campuses admit one quarter or fewer of their applicants. As such, it does not make sense to interpret Principle 6 to mean a campus that admits residents only from the upper quarter of their applicant pool should admit non-residents from the upper half of the pool.

The situation becomes even more ambiguous with the changes taking effect in 2012, because the new policy broadens eligibility to include the “entitled to review” group, while restructuring the pool of “guaranteed” applicants to include a population less than 12.5%. Rather than debating the interpretation of the Master Plan’s use of “eligible,” **BOARS recommends the following revision of Principle 6. We ask Council to endorse the change and forward it to the President.**

*6. Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus.*

<sup>1</sup> [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/committees/boars/MC2Yudof\\_BOARSNon-ResidentPrinciples\\_082109.pdf](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/files/committees/boars/MC2Yudof_BOARSNon-ResidentPrinciples_082109.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/mp.htm>

The purpose of the revision is to help prevent a resident applicant from claiming that her/his admission slot was taken by a non-resident with weaker credentials but a willingness to pay non-resident tuition. In revising the principle, BOARS is aware that the lack of a grade point bump or local context information for non-residents can make apples-to-apples comparisons of resident and non-resident applicants difficult. BOARS believes, however, that campus admissions professionals are fully capable of making appropriate judgment calls, and leaves the term “compare favorably” to their interpretation.

In addition, BOARS wants to make sure these clarifications are at the forefront of Council’s mind as it considers options for managing the budget gap, enrollment, and cost per undergraduate student, and moves forward with the project to “re-bench” the formulas for distributing state funds to campuses.

In these difficult financial times, BOARS also believes it is important to re-emphasize Principle 3, which states that “*non-resident enrollment should not be used exclusively as a revenue-producing strategy to the detriment of resident access,*” and Principle 5, which urges that “*fiscal considerations should not be a primary factor guiding the review of files or admissions decisions.*”

As campuses embark on programs to recruit more non-residents, they should take care to match any special considerations with equivalent considerations for comparable resident applicants. More generally, campus admissions committees and leaders should keep these principles in mind as they launch new non-resident recruitment efforts.

Sincerely,

Bill Jacob  
BOARS Chair

cc: BOARS  
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director