

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

May 14, 1998

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at Covell Commons, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Chandler, Connerly, Hotchkis, Khachigian, Lee, Levin, McClymond, Montoya, and Soderquist; Advisory members Espinoza, Miura, and Willmon

In attendance: Regents Clark, Davies, Johnson, Leach, Nakashima, Ochoa, and Sayles, Faculty Representatives Dorr and Weiss, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Small, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gomes, Hershman, and Hopper, Chancellors Berdahl, Carnesale, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Vanderhoef, Wilkening, and Yang, Vice Chancellor Bainton representing Chancellor Debas, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 9:35 a.m. with Committee Chair Connerly presiding.

1. STATUS REPORT ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS FOR FALL 1998

Provost King stated that his presentation would focus on the final fall 1998 freshman admissions results and the ethnic distribution of those admitted. There has been a substantial increase in the number of applications for admission over the years, leading to the current situation where several campuses are highly oversubscribed with applications and where the ratio of admissions to applications varies greatly from campus to campus. Some campuses can essentially admit all UC-eligible applicants, while others must make a selection from a large pool of UC-eligible applicants.

The application process allows students to apply to as many campuses of the University as they wish, and students are encouraged to apply to multiple campuses. All eight general campuses provide outstanding undergraduate educational experiences. For fall 1998 there was an increased effort to deliver this message, especially to disadvantaged students. President Atkinson personally wrote to 13,000 prospective applicants from low-income, underrepresented minority, and rural backgrounds, inviting them to apply to UC and to consider several campuses as possible choices. On the average, applicants applied to 2.98 campuses for fall 1998, compared to 2.84 for fall 1997, an increase of five percent. In addition, there is some indication that students who responded to the President's letter applied, on average, to 3.8 campuses.

Provost King reported that the average number of campuses to which students applied increased in all cases from fall 1997 to fall 1998. Despite the University's success in getting students to apply to more than one campus, there were still some UC-eligible applicants who had not been admitted as of the first round of admissions, which took place during the month

of March. A second stage of the admissions process occurred in April. In this second stage, all remaining UC-eligible applicants who were California residents were admitted to one of the campuses of the University. Six campuses--Davis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz--participated in this second stage. Berkeley and Los Angeles admitted extra students during the first stage of the admissions process. In this second stage, attention was given to matching applicants with campuses in which they had expressed interest or that were geographically close to their residence. Early admissions results did not include the admissions made in this second stage.

Provost King continued that, in addition to the second stage of the admissions process, the University uses other methods to maximize enrollment opportunities for UC-eligible applicants. Berkeley and UCLA admit additional eligible fall applicants as of the spring and winter terms. This year, Berkeley offered admission for spring 1999 to 2,476 applicants, and UCLA offered admission for winter 1999 to 681 applicants. Through the second stage of the admissions process, the University was able to admit 3,179 additional UC eligible students--1,571 for fall 1998 and the remainder for winter and spring 1999. By virtue of this second stage, the overall admit rate for the system increased from 72.8 percent to 75.4 percent. The remaining applicants either were not California residents, were determined not to be UC-eligible, or both.

Provost King turned to a discussion of the ethnic distribution of those students who were admitted. The percentage of underrepresented minority students among those admitted is 15.6 percent for the University as a whole. This percentage includes Native American, African-American, Chicano, and Latino students. This compares with 17.5 percent for fall 1997. The percentage varies across the campuses, ranging from a high of 21 percent for the Riverside campus to lows of 10 percent for the Berkeley and San Diego campuses, with other campuses ranging from 12.5 to 16 percent. Admissions numbers for all ethnic groups dropped from 1997 to 1998, accompanied by a substantial increase in the decline-to-state category.

The campuses recently have completed intensive efforts to encourage admitted students to accept the offer of admission. The results of these efforts will be known on May 20, at which time responses from admitted students will have been tallied. The responses are known as Statements of Intent to Register, or SIRs. It is hoped that the University's efforts will yield a freshman class that, in addition to being well qualified academically, will bring to the campuses the rich variety of experiences, backgrounds, and cultures reflecting California's diversity.

Regent Connerly observed that each campus is going through a process of adapting to the elimination of affirmative action in admissions. He believed that the people of California were well served by the way in which the campuses are adjusting in a relatively short period of time. Turning to the admissions data presented by Provost King, Regent Connerly pointed out that on several campuses there appears to be an underrepresentation of white students due to an overrepresentation of Asian students.

Associate Vice President Galligani responded that the University has defined underrepresented groups as those who are underrepresented in the eligibility pool and therefore are targeted for outreach, including rural students. At present the African-American eligibility rate is less than three percent, while Asian-American students achieve a thirty percent eligibility rate. If the occasion arose when each ethnic group failed to make eligible more than ten percent of its students, then each group could be considered "underrepresented."

Regent Leach suggested that it would be interesting to have data on the ethnic make up of the high school graduating class of a particular year and how those data compare with the ethnicity of the students who apply to and those who are admitted to the University of California.

Regent McClymond referred to the interval between the submission of a Statement of Intent to Register and actual enrollment. She believed that it would be helpful for the Regents to have a picture that would trace enrollment from the eligibility population through the application process, admissions, Statement of Intent to Register, and actual enrollment. The data should be across the system and campus by campus and should include ethnic distribution.

President Atkinson expressed confidence that the SIR data would reflect accurately the enrollment data; the issue is how the admissions data will be reflected in the Statements of Intent to Register. The number of underrepresented minority students in the pool of admitted students is comparable to 1997 for the institution overall, decreasing from 17.5 percent to 15.3 percent.

In response to a question from Regent Davies regarding those students who decline to state their ethnicity, Provost King explained that, as shown in the table *Ethnic Distribution of Admitted Freshmen, Fall 1998 and Fall 1997* which was distributed to all Regents, when decline-to-state students are not included in the calculations, the percentage of underrepresented minorities rises to 18.2 percent for fall 1997 and 18.1 percent for fall 1998. Regent Leach pointed out that the number of decline-to-state students rose from somewhat over 1,000 in fall 1997 to over 6,000 in fall 1998, which tends to skew the statistics.

Regent Montoya referred to a news article which alleged that the University had analyzed SAT test information in order to determine the ethnicity of decline-to-state students and had determined that four-fifths of these students were white or Asian-American. Provost King noted that four-fifths of the University's applicants are also white or Asian-American. He did not believe that enough information was available to come to a sound conclusion regarding the ethnicity of decline-to-state students. Chairman Khachigian stated that she would consider any attempt to identify the race of these students as an invasion of their privacy.

Associate Vice President Galligani responded to the comments by Regents McClymond and Leach first by noting that the difference between the SIRs and the final data is usually between three and five percent. With respect to the high school graduating class, he reported that

Asian-American students comprised 11.2 percent, while their eligibility rate is approximately thirty percent. Latino students, on the other hand, made up thirty percent of public high school graduates and attained an eligibility rate of about four percent.

Regent Connerly commented that the courts have consistently ruled that racial classifications are suspect. The voters passed Proposition 209 because they do not want race to be considered in admissions decisions. There has been a profound increase in the number of students who decline to reveal their ethnicity. Mr. Connerly reported that he had received letters from anthropologists who contend that the use of race as a tool for public policy-making is a 19th century concept being applied to 21st century policies. He suggested that the University should consider how it uses race in the application process and whether the question of an applicant's race should appear on the application at all.

Regent Johnson stressed that the number of admitted underrepresented minorities for fall 1998 was only 1.9 percent lower than for fall 1997. President Atkinson added that the chancellors had put a great effort into encouraging these students to enroll.

Regent Khachigian stated that she joined with Regent Connerly in looking forward to the elimination of any reference to race on the University's application.

Regent Levin observed that The Regents remain committed to diversity in order for the University's campuses to reflect the population of the state. While the overall numbers are comforting, the Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses are a cause for concern because they will suffer from a lack of diversity in the fall 1998 entering class. She stressed that outreach programs must continue to grow in order to address this situation and in order to help students to understand that their ability to compete for a place at Berkeley or UCLA is important to the institution if it is to retain its excellence into the future.

Regent Connerly recalled that *SP-1, Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment--Admissions*, contains a statement that The Regents support diversity but that it cannot be achieved by artificial means. He reported that the day previously he had met with the Academic Senate and had discussed the defects of the K-12 system. He stressed the need to bring to the attention of the people of the State of California the inequities that exist which result in varying eligibility rates.

In response to a question from Regent Connerly regarding an article which had appeared in **The New York Times**, Chancellor Berdahl reported that the Recruitment and Retention Center on the Berkeley campus engages minority students in working with their communities to recruit students. Ms. Grace Massey, who was quoted in the article as discouraging minority students to come to Berkeley, was not employed by the Center, but she does work with minority students on the campus. Chancellor Berdahl found the article to be one-sided in its presentation, noting that students who expressed a different point of view from that which predominated in the article were not widely quoted. He informed the Committee that he had spoken with staff members and with students in the Center about their comments.

Regent Clark reiterated The Regents' commitment to diversity as represented by the final paragraph of SP-1, suggesting that the University should emphasize this aspect of the resolution.

Regent Montoya commended the admissions officers for the new efforts which are being put into the admissions process. It was her belief that the University should have been engaging in a more detailed selection process all along.

In response to a question from Regent Leach, Chancellor Berdahl stated that he had not responded to **The New York Times** article but that several faculty members had.

Provost King then invited Chancellor Wilkening to report on admissions at the Irvine campus. Chancellor Wilkening observed that the University has always been a leader of societal change, and its mission reflects that role. Through research, the faculty seek greater understanding and knowledge which, through teaching, they pass on to the students who represent a new generation of intellectual and societal leaders and, through publication, to the world at large. The University does this in partnership with its many communities and constituencies, sharing this work and ensuring its continued relevance. The Chancellor noted that this relationship with the public is fragile and often tense. The University consists of individuals who are part of the broader society; thus, it is impossible to insulate the University from the tumult and conflict outside its walls. Sometimes these external pressures threaten the University's ability to continue its work even as it seeks answers to society's problems. The ivory tower isolation of a public university is a myth.

With respect to admissions, the campus finds itself between two necessary but not easily reconcilable goals: achievement and access. Protecting both of these goals remains a fundamental priority for the University as a public land grant university. The Chancellor emphasized that the present situation represents an opportunity for the University to once again take a position of societal leadership as it works to balance achievement and access in the fairest way possible. The work that the campus has accomplished over the past two years to expand its outreach programs and redefine its admissions criteria will ultimately lead to a place of balance. Developing stronger alliances with schools and community colleges, reinvesting the public in this work, and extending the campus' reach into all communities are beginning this process of change.

Chancellor Wilkening recalled that when she traveled recently to Washington, D.C. with her fellow chancellors, she met with several congressional representatives who expressed great concern about UC's admissions policies and outreach work. She believed that the University's campuses maintain their role as public servants by not only educating a well-qualified, representative cadre of students but also by educating the public about the broader need systematically to improve K-12 education.

Vice Chancellor Gómez reiterated Chancellor Wilkening's belief that the University must work harder to create opportunities for students from all backgrounds to compete for a UC education. In addition to expanded outreach efforts, UCI has established several specific

goals for 1998-99 which have yielded positive results. The campus' first goal was to increase the number of high-achieving students in the class of 2002. In addition to recruitment of Regents Scholars and honors students, the campus engaged current UCI undergraduates in the yield efforts. A number of students in the California Alliance for Minority Participation (CAMP) program participated in a telephone campaign, contacting high-achieving minority students who had been admitted and encouraging them to come to Irvine. Now in its seventh year, the CAMP program is highly effective in attracting talented students to the University. The purpose of this campaign was to sustain diversity without compromising academic excellence.

In addition to this work, members of ASUCI, the undergraduate student government organization, held a conference for all admitted students, sharing their own experiences and offering themselves as peer mentors for incoming freshman. This personalized approach has been very effective, as reflected in the experience of Karen Fleming, who was offered admission to UCI, Cornell, and Vassar. After visiting these campuses, she chose UCI, largely due to the strength of the CAMP program. Ms. Fleming was unable to attend today's meeting, but Vice Chancellor Gómez transmitted the following message from her mother:

“The presence of a distinguished faculty panel representing the various research disciplines within the sciences provided parents and students with an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the educational culture at UCI. The faculty representatives shared their vision of UCI--past, present, and future. The emphasis on individual interaction with the faculty in a campus environment big enough to serve you but small enough to know you was a recurring theme which hit home with the students and their families.”

Mr. Gómez observed that the importance of scientific fields to an increasingly global economy is undeniable. In support of a growing demand in the state, the campus increased its enrollment targets of incoming students in engineering and computer science. To accomplish this goal, the Schools of Engineering and Information and Computer Science held receptions for admitted students, giving them the opportunity to meet faculty, students, and staff. The attendant increase in enrollment is reflective of increased interest in UCI in all academic fields. This year “Celebrate UCI” drew a record number of students who spent the day on campus, talking with faculty and students representing many different majors, interests, and campus organizations.

Vice Chancellor Gómez explained that one of the greatest challenges during this enrollment cycle was to overcome the perception that the University of California is hostile to diversity. By reaching out more directly to students, the campus hopes to have increased substantially the number of high-achieving students from diverse backgrounds who will enter UCI in the fall. The campus realizes, however, that this is the beginning of expanded outreach and recruitment to improve educational opportunities for able students. This past year, for example, UCI expanded its outreach efforts past the local geographical area to the San Joaquin Valley and the Coachella Valley, regions which have been underrepresented at the University of California.

The campus has also learned that one of the keys to success is sustained and consistent support from all levels of University leadership in order to educate accomplished and able students who represent the intellectual, geographic, and cultural diversity of the state. Attainment of this goal depends largely on coordination across campuses and across the system, with a clear understanding that access and achievement are not mutually exclusive goals. To some degree, UCI's expected enrollment increase may be credited to better communication between the University and the public. At the same time, however, the campus is cautious about the continued need for outreach to schools and community colleges.

As the University tries to negotiate the difficult dilemmas posed over the last few years about the efficacy of public education, the deep ambivalence on the part of many Californians has not been resolved. Mr. Gómez believed that this would be accomplished only if there is a renewed commitment to work with students, teachers, and staff at all academic levels to create opportunity for effective learning for all of California's students.

Regent Sayles reported allegations that private universities are using the perception of hostility towards minority students at the University of California to recruit those students to their campuses and asked whether the Irvine campus had encountered that situation. Vice Chancellor Gómez confirmed that other institutions had capitalized upon the perception of hostility on the part of students and even some counselors. The University held a major counselor conference at the beginning of the fall term at which time it attempted to correct these impressions, but it was possible that not all counselors were contacted. Chancellor Wilkening added that the Irvine campus' efforts are based on building and expanding relationships through programs such as CAMP which are aimed at underrepresented minority students. Regent Sayles stressed the need for UC to find ways to attract the most competitive minority students away from private colleges and universities.

Regent Ochoa observed that legislators with whom he had spoken about UC admissions tended to view the decrease in minority enrollment with panic, not taking into account the long-term outreach efforts of the campuses. He stressed the need to get the current outreach efforts into high gear. Regent Connerly concurred, noting that the State of California must provide more preparation for higher education in its K-12 schools.

Regent Johnson reported that Chancellor Orbach and the President of the Riverside Community College had taken outreach one step further by signing a contract with a group of sixth-grade students and their parents. These contracts, which were underwritten by local businesses, promise that full college tuition will be paid for those students who pass the University's (a)-(f) courses.

President Atkinson observed that over the long term the University of California had led the nation in its outreach efforts. Students who come through these programs have always been ripe for recruiting by other institutions. As a result of the passage of Proposition 209, the University has intensified its outreach programs to reach into early grades in a more powerful way than in the past. The President stressed, however, that the University of California, through its outreach efforts, cannot turn the situation around in K-12. It was his hope that UC would play an active role as a partner in bringing about the changes that must be made.

The people of the state must understand that they must attend to the quality of K-12 education.

Regent Connerly believed that it would be helpful for the Regents to have specific information on the problems that face K-12 schools. He specifically requested that a summary be prepared of the remarks made by Professor Widaman at the previous day's meeting of the Academic Council.

In response to a comment from Regent Chandler regarding the affordability of a UC education, President Atkinson noted that 52 percent of its undergraduates receive an average of \$5,200 annually in scholarships. This amount is augmented by loans and work study programs. He believed that no public university in the country could match this level of financial aid. One of the benefits of the fee increases during the early 1990s was increased support of financial aid.

In opening his presentation on undergraduate admissions at UC Berkeley, Chancellor Berdahl reported that the competition for admission for fall 1998 was extraordinarily intense, with admission offered to a lower percentage of applicants than at any other public university in the United States and to a lower percentage of applicants than all but a handful of selective private universities. The University of California, Berkeley actively recruits highly sought-after students and goes to great lengths to encourage them to enroll. This year, because of the downturn in minority enrollment at Berkeley, the campus has intensified its effort to increase the applicant yield. The campus' activities fall into four categories. First, the campus engaged in an effort to make personal contact between campus personnel and the 1,212 students in the targeted calling pool. Of those students, 84 percent were contacted. The targeted pool consisted of first-generation students, low-income students, and underrepresented minority students. Mailings were sent to all admitted students. Many individual departments contacted potential students; for example, the Biology Scholars Program called two hundred students who had indicated an interest in biology. In addition, a special video entitled "Messages from Berkeley" was commissioned, and copies were sent to 1,175 admitted students in the targeted pool. This video was distributed to all public high schools in California with at least one student admitted to Berkeley for the fall.

Secondly, the campus referred students to the appropriate offices when they had questions, and follow-up calls were made by staff in response to these questions. Thirdly, campus officials, faculty, and students visited high schools in the Bay Area and the Los Angeles area. Finally, alumni clubs hosted twenty receptions that were attended by 3,600 admitted students. Students were also invited to visit the campus and sample college life, including Cal Day on April 18.

Vice Chancellor Padilla observed that all admitted students are needed at Berkeley if the campus is to engage in the level of intellectual work to which it is committed. All applicants go through a rigorous selection process; those students who are selected in turn pose questions about the quality of the various academic departments as well as the quality of life in the campus and the community. The campus works hard to compete with elite private

institutions for the students it has selected. It interviews nearly 1,000 admitted students for Regents and Chancellors Scholarships. These interviews serve as a recruiting tool because the campus sees them as an opportunity to describe to students how strong the Berkeley academic programs are and why these students should choose Berkeley. The campus recognized that the cohort of Latino, Chicano, and African-American students who were admitted for fall 1998 was highly competitive, and it decided to work hard to contact all of these students to ensure that their questions about Berkeley had been answered. The campus demonstrated its commitment to providing the best intellectual environment for these students. Mr. Padilla described as an example of this commitment the case of a Latino student with a full scholarship to M.I.T. as well as admission to the Berkeley campus. In order to persuade this highly talented student to enroll at Berkeley, Mr. Padilla reported that he had arranged a demonstration for him by faculty in his areas of interest. The campus works on a case-by-case basis with all admitted students to bring them to Berkeley in the fall.

Regent Montoya noted that her experience with private universities was that full scholarships were awarded to students only for the first year. Vice Chancellor Padilla responded that he advises families to look carefully at the packages that are offered by other universities.

Regent Connerly raised the question of the legality of recruiting students based upon their race under Proposition 209. He reported that one student had felt uncomfortable being singled out as a result of his race and asked for an explanation of the rationale behind this type of recruiting. Regent Connerly also requested that Chancellor Berdahl address an article which had appeared in **The Wall Street Journal** concerning drop-out rates.

Chancellor Berdahl stressed that while the target pool included underrepresented minority students, it also included first-generation and rural students. Only half of the students were targeted due to their underrepresented minority status. The campus was contacting those students for whom the competition is very keen because the pool is relatively limited both nationally and in California. The campus also believed it was imperative to counteract the bad publicity which contends that Berkeley is not welcoming to minority students.

With respect to **The Wall Street Journal** article, Chancellor Berdahl reported that the conclusions in the article were based upon erroneous data. He recalled that its underlying assumption was that there is a direct relationship between performance on the SAT and drop-out rates. In reality, there is virtually no correlation between the SAT and the drop-out rate. For example, students scoring 700 to 800 on the SAT graduate at a sixty percent rate, while minority students who score above 1200 graduate at a 61 percent rate.

General Counsel Holst commented on the legality of Berkeley's program, noting that it targets students who have been admitted. He stated that, under Proposition 209, there are limits as to what could appropriately be done in the yield-effort process, but to date the activities have been legal. He confirmed for Regent Connerly that no special benefits were being offered to the targeted students but rather that they were part of the larger informational outreach effort.

Chancellor Berdahl referred to the legal analysis which took place at the University of Texas following the *Hopwood* decision. The interpretation of the ruling was that the University could not offer a benefit based upon race or impose a burden based upon race. He suggested that this would be a good test for the University of California to apply.

Regent Connerly observed that approximately 1,000 Black students qualified to enroll at the University of California, which means that they are in great demand. Because the University of California believes in a diverse student body, it is doing all that it can to persuade these students to come to the University, without giving them any type of preference. He reported that in 1989, 2,191 African-American students applied to the University of California; in 1997 there were 2,141 applicants. In 1989, the number of Asian-American students who applied was 8,165; in 1997, the number was 12,367. For transfers, the situation is practically identical.

Chancellor Berdahl suggested that the pool of qualified African-American students could be increased only through the University's intensified outreach efforts. He noted that Regent Connerly had identified the profound problem which faces the State and the nation.

In response to a question from Regent-designate Espinoza, Vice Chancellor Padilla reported that hundreds of students had volunteered throughout the year to carry the campus' message to the high schools. During April over one hundred students hosted admitted students and also traveled to southern California to attend receptions. He stressed that students have questions which only other students can answer. In response to a comment from Regent Connerly, Mr. Padilla stated that these outreach efforts are organized along multiracial lines.

Regent Sayles commended Vice Chancellor Padilla for his report but cautioned that in the future he would be posing questions about the recruitment of Black athletes. He stressed that the same amount of attention needs to be paid to high-achieving Black students. The success of the campus' efforts will be reflected in the number of targeted students who actually enroll.

Regent-designate Willmon referred to the report on transfer admissions that was presented at the March meeting. He believed that, in order for the Board to have a clear picture of overall representation, it would be necessary to have transfer-rate statistics in addition to those for freshman admissions.

In response to a question from Regent Ochoa, Mr. Padilla reported that the administration coordinates student outreach efforts, providing training to formal student organizations. Any contact with the high schools must be made by University officials.

Chancellor Berdahl introduced the speakers for the Berkeley campus' report on its admissions process: Associate Vice Chancellor Hayashi; Director of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools Laird; and Professor Franchot, Chair of the Faculty Admissions Committee. He highlighted the fact that two important changes in the admissions process had characterized the outcome this year: high selectivity and the composition of the freshman class. He underscored the fact that the admissions process resulted from a careful analysis

by the faculty committee. The process will be reviewed to see whether improvements can be made. The campus views admission to the Berkeley campus as a public trust and believes that the applicants deserve a thorough evaluation.

Associate Vice Chancellor Hayashi reported that over the past six years the number of students applying to Berkeley has increased by over fifty percent, with over 30,000 students applying for admission for fall 1998. The campus could accept about 8,200 applicants, amounting to a 27 percent admission rate. Mr. Hayashi reported that the applicant pool was very strong. In accordance with the new policies developed by the Faculty Admissions Committee, every application was read individually at least twice. The new policies required admissions officers to review patterns of course taking to see how students challenged themselves. Test scores were evaluated in tandem with grades that students earned in particular subject areas. The campus also looked at each applicant's achievements in terms of the educational opportunities he or she had been offered in high school. Most importantly, admissions officers looked at each applicant's achievements in terms of his or her own personal context, including socio-economic status and any challenges which the student had faced. The campus was confident that this approach would allow for better-informed decisions while fulfilling the goal to select a strong and diverse class. The campus knew, however, that the competitiveness of the applicant pool would make the goal of achieving racial and ethnic diversity difficult. Mr. Hayashi presented the following data illustrating how competitive the application pool has become. Berkeley received 13,696 applications from students with a 4.0 grade point average (GPA) or better. The campus denied over 7,000 applications from students with a 4.0 GPA or better, including 800 African-American, Hispanic, and Native American students. Berkeley received applications from 19,293 students who scored 1200 or above on the SAT. The campus knew that underrepresented minority students were not likely to fare well under the new admissions process. In 1998 the campus received 5,200 applications from students with annual family incomes of less than \$30,000. Only 29 percent of these applicants were African-American, Hispanic, or Native American students.

Director Laird outlined how the freshman class was selected from among this highly qualified applicant pool. He recalled that the Faculty Admissions Committee had worked to revise the campus' admission policies not only in response to the passage of SP-1 but also in response to questions having been raised about the Academic Index, which the campus had used successfully for the past twelve years. Because the Academic Index formula capped the GPA at 4.0, test scores had become the primary distinguishing characteristic among applicants. The faculty committee recognized that this was not the intended purpose of these tests and developed a new admissions policy for fall 1998. An applicant was given an academic score by each reader, using a scale of one to seven, with one the high score, and a comprehensive score on a scale of one to five. In the reading process, the second reader does not know the scores assigned by the first reader. If the two scores are more than one point apart, the file is read by a senior reader.

Mr. Laird explained that the process for fall 1998 was different from that used in previous years in three important ways. First, the Academic Index formula was not used to measure

academic achievement. Second, the GPA was uncapped. Third, to the extent possible, applicants were reviewed by high school, with consideration given to the applicant's academic achievement in light of the number of (a)-(f), honors, and advanced placement courses offered within the particular high school. The academic score had the following six criteria:

- Uncapped GPA, including the pattern of achievement reflected in grades over time. The campus was careful that no student be penalized because he or she attended a high school that offered few or no honors courses.
- Scores on the SAT I (or ACT) and the three required SAT II tests.
- College preparatory courses completed and the level of achievement in those courses.
- Scores on Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Higher-Level (IBHL) exams.
- Other evidence of intellectual or creative achievement.
- Levels of achievement in academic enrichment programs such as the Early Academic Outreach Program.

Mr. Laird continued that approximately 75 percent of the academic score was based on grades, test scores, and courses taken. Academic achievement was considered within the student's personal and school context. The comprehensive score includes the academic information plus three additional criteria: non-academic achievement, including accomplishments in the performing arts or athletics, employment, community service, and leadership in school and community organizations; the personal qualities of the applicant, including leadership ability, character, motivation, tenacity, initiative, and demonstrated concern for others and for the community; and likely contributions to the intellectual and cultural vitality of the campus. Once the reading and scoring were completed, in accordance with Regental policy the first fifty percent were admitted on the basis of the highest academic scores. The second half were admitted on the basis of the highest comprehensive scores, including about two percent who were admitted by exception.

The reading group consisted of 31 admission and outreach officers from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, plus unit supervisors and management team members. Eighty-seven percent of these readers have at least five years' experience reading applications, and 67 percent have at least ten years' experience. In addition, there were ten part-time readers, five Bay Area high school counselors, and six campus staff volunteers. The composition of the reader group was as follows: 10 males, 42 females, 12 African-Americans, 8 Asian-Americans, 7 Hispanics, 1 Native American, and 24 whites.

At this point the meeting was disrupted, and the Committee adjourned for lunch.

.....

The meeting reconvened at 1:35 p.m. with Committee Chair Connerly presiding.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Chandler, Connerly, Khachigian, Lee, Levin, McClymond, Montoya, and Soderquist; Advisory members Espinoza, Miura, and Willmon

In attendance: Regents Clark, Davies, Johnson, Leach, Nakashima, Ochoa, Parsky, and Sayles, Faculty Representatives Dorr and Weiss, Secretary Trivette, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Small, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gomes, Hershman, and Hopper, Chancellors Berdahl, Carnesale, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Vanderhoef, Wilkening, and Yang, Vice Chancellor Bainton representing Chancellor Debas, Laboratory Directors Browne and Tarter, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

Chancellor Berdahl explained that Director Laird had had to leave to attend a meeting, and he called upon Professor Franchot for her remarks.

Professor Franchot reported that the Berkeley faculty, as represented by its standing committees in the Academic Senate and in its Divisional Council, generally feel that the University has encountered a momentous change of direction which does not represent a catastrophe. The Faculty Admissions Committee has designed, in close cooperation with the administration, a new policy for undergraduate admissions; the mission before the faculty is to practice that new policy as carefully, as innovatively, and as responsibly as is possible.

In order to proceed, however, the University of California needs to pull together as an institution and speak to the public in a more encouraging and forward-looking manner. Because there is enormous dismay among California's various populations about the direction the University is taking, it is important to encourage minority students to apply to the University of California. Secondly, it will be necessary to back up the new admissions policy with continued and sustained conversation among the Regents, the various campus administrations, and the Academic Senates. The University has entered an era when it cannot depend on easy numerical formulations or on racial designations to determine who should be admitted into the University. This new process depends on a shared sense of what a Berkeley student should look like, who that student should be, and what that student should bring to the campus.

Second, Professor Franchot suggested that the University would need to back up the new policy with sustained outreach. While current efforts have been commendable, and while the faculty stand solidly behind administrative efforts in outreach, she would welcome further administrative initiatives to consult faculty about outreach in order to connect faculty and various professionals who work in outreach.

Professor Franchot reported that the faculty support the continued use of the Scholastic Aptitude Test, in spite of pressure to remove the examination requirement. She pointed out that California high schools today couple poor education with extraordinary grade inflation.

She further suggested that University resources be invested in high school counselors because the new admissions policy is labor intensive for students. They need to think about how they are going to present themselves for admission consideration to UC Berkeley and other campuses. High school counseling is critical, because otherwise this policy runs the risk of unintentionally benefitting those students who have excellent tutorial help and excellent counseling help. The University should also consider early admissions programs in order to compete against the private universities that are recruiting the outstanding students.

Professor Franchot pointed to the need to revise the University of California application such that it gives the faculty and the readers the kind of information they are looking for. Currently the application is set up to provide certain kinds of electronically friendly data. Such a revision would support the University's claims that it is trying to remain accessible.

Finally, Professor Franchot noted that support for the new admissions policy depends critically upon support for the principle of the individual as the University moves with great difficulty from an era of group preference into an era of individual assessment. She believed that it would be critical to decide whether or not to modify individual assessment and reincorporate some forms of group preferential thinking in order to maintain the University's charter to the State. This is the great divide that currently is raging in the Berkeley faculty and among administrators and faculty. Professor Franchot reported that, as chair of the Faculty Admissions Committee, she had stood firm on the principle of individual assessment rather than trying to mix and match individual assessment with institutional needs, whether they are defined as needs for a greater racial diversity or a greater financial diversity. She believed that the University would need to be philosophically coherent for the public. She pointed out that, while politics are everywhere, they do not belong in undergraduate admissions. She expressed her appreciation for the support of the campus administration and the support of the Regents in this very difficult time.

Regent Connerly saw no weakening in the resolve of the Regents to continue the course that was set at the meeting of July 20, 1995. Moreover, he noted that the voters of California, by a very decisive margin, supported the pursuit of this endeavor. Regent Davies agreed, and he asked that Professor Franchot convey to the faculty who believe that there is still hope that group preferences can be resurrected the resolve on the part of the Regents to do away with these preferences. He asked whether under the new policy SAT scores might become a more significant factor in determining admissions.

Professor Franchot believed that the answer to Regent Davies' question depended upon the application. For example, the reader will need to evaluate the reasons why an A student has very low SATs in making an admissions decision. Tests scores need to be looked at in relation to the student's GPA and his or her family and educational situation. Elimination of the test requirement would place the University's admissions process at the mercy of the high school context, which can also be subject to factors of racial or gender bias.

Regent-designate Willmon requested that Professor Franchot comment further on ways to improve the University's application for admission. She suggested, first, that the application

should be easier to understand and more visually friendly. Secondly, she believed that either the application should provide additional opportunities for a student to demonstrate his or her writing skills, or there should be a proctored essay separate from the application itself. In response to a question from Regent-designate Willmon regarding the weighting of such an essay, Professor Franchot believed that it would be possible for a student to request that his or her writing skills be emphasized in the evaluation process. The essays that are written in connection with the SAT II examination are currently available to the University.

Regent Connerly asked whether there was any requirement that a student be asked to identify his or her race as a part of the admissions process. Professor Franchot reported that the Berkeley Faculty Admissions Committee was in favor of removing the ethnicity identification box from the application. If this information is required for federal reporting purposes, then the faculty would prefer that it be removed before the application is read.

General Counsel Holst explained that there are requirements for reporting in terms of enrolled students, but it is not necessary under any federal requirement that that information be obtained on the application form or prior to enrollment.

Regent Khachigian observed that it was important for the Board to hear Professor Franchot's comments and offered the assistance of the Regents in addressing this highly charged issue. She noted that the University is changing a culture that has been in place for a long time, which can be difficult to achieve.

President Atkinson stated his intention to establish a task force of people who had been involved in the admissions process throughout the system to examine relevant issues such as the application form, with the involvement of representatives from BOARS. He stressed that the system as a whole needs to understand what each campus is doing and to gain from that knowledge.

In response to a question from Regent Johnson, Professor Franchot stated that while she was in full support of Berkeley's new admissions policy, it had resulted in dismaying first-year results. She recalled that Berkeley's incoming class will be 10.4 percent underrepresented minority students. She pointed out that there are two ways to look at this number. One is that it is a catastrophe. Another way is that it is the beginning of building. It was her hope that the University as an institution would now present an innovative and optimistic vision for the future.

Regent Connerly recalled that earlier in the meeting he had stated that 1,000 Black students who were UC eligible graduated from high school in 1996. He was later informed by a representative of CPEC that the number was actually 544.

Chancellor Berdahl commented that he was very supportive of the new admissions policy. He recalled that, as President of the University of Texas, he had helped to institute an individualized assessment admissions policy which required that three essays be included in the application. He noted that he and Professor Franchot had differed in their interpretation

of the admissions results, in part because they talk to different constituencies. Many students had expressed to him their dismay with the results of the new policy. The Chancellor reiterated his commitment to its successful implementation.

In response to a question from Regent Lee regarding the proposal to make eligible the top four percent of students from each high school in the state, Professor Franchot stated that she was personally opposed to the idea because she opposed anything automatic in the admissions process. She understood the concerns of the faculty, however, with the admissions results which have come in the wake of SP-1. She suggested that there were two approaches to the problem: either make it easier for students to become eligible, or find a long-term solution. She noted that the four percent proposal will require students to take the required tests and courses. As an educator, Professor Franchot feared that the proposal would result in students who arrive on campus unprepared to do the work.

Regent Ochoa commented on the inconsistencies between the value of the SAT in the admissions process and the fact that test scores can be sensitive to income and ethnic identity. Professor Franchot noted the need to use the tests carefully in evaluating students but not as the sole basis for an admissions decision. She would be reluctant to see the tests eliminated because they represent one objective standard in a subjective admissions policy.

Professor Franchot suggested that a more important issue is the University's understanding of the state's high schools. She believed that the University of California has the resources to go out into the high schools and develop profiles to help people in admissions with questions such as the incidence of violence, the availability of (a)-(f) courses, and the presence of formal or informal tracking. This would greatly assist admissions officers in evaluating each student from his or her high school situation.

In response to a question from Regent Ochoa regarding the cost of the new admissions policy, Associate Vice Chancellor Hayashi reported that the budget for his department had been increased by \$150,000, which covered the increased effort.

Regent Nakashima recalled that the presentations had emphasized the importance of counselors in high schools and asked for a description of what role they play. He was also interested in the training that they receive and how well informed they are with respect to the entrance requirements of various colleges and universities. He wondered whether the low eligibility rate for Black students could be attributed in part to a lack of adequate counseling. He asked whether there was a program at the University of California to inform counselors of the University's requirements.

Associate Vice Chancellor Hayashi reported that Office of the President annually sponsors five or six counselors' conferences that are attended by up to 800 or 900 counselors at each conference. He continued that counselors play an important role in preparing students for college. In some large urban school districts, there is one counselor for every 1,000 to 2,000 students, which essentially means that there is no counselor. Some of the more elite schools have one counselor for every 200 students. Mr. Hayashi noted that a good counselor is able to see a young student with curiosity and drive and encourage the student to expand his or

her horizons.

In response to a question from Regent Connerly regarding the admissions procedures at private institutions, Professor Franchot observed that the process differs, first, because the University of California, as a public university, has obligations to the public that private universities do not have. Its admissions process needs to be clear and predictable. Secondly, private universities use many different kinds of preference, including preference for the children of their alumni. The University still gives preference to in-state students and has, from Regental policy, an obligation to strive for a diverse student body, but there is no preference at the heart of the admissions policy now.

2. **BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS' (BOARS) PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

Provost King recalled that the Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools has the major role with regard to consideration of the setting of eligibility criteria for UC. He called upon BOARS Chair Widaman for his comments regarding proposed changes in freshman eligibility requirements, noting that BOARS intends to make its recommendations at the July meeting

Professor Widaman recalled that since the founding of the University, the Board of Regents has delegated to the faculty all rights and responsibilities for setting the conditions of admission of students to the University, with admissions criteria subject to approval by the Board. The Academic Senate in turn invested these rights and responsibilities in the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. He observed that admitting students to the University is one of the most important tasks of the faculty, as the quality and diversity of the student body of the University have a tremendous impact on campus life and on the vitality of academic pursuits. Following the passage of SP-1, several committees, including BOARS, have worked to devise ways to ensure the continued diversity of the student body, consistent with the stipulations of SP-1. BOARS has been working during the last year to reformulate admissions criteria in order to provide equitable access for students throughout the State of California while maintaining the quality of the students identified. As a result, BOARS has felt the need to propose changes in admissions criteria to maintain or enhance the diversity of the student body of the University consistent with both SP-1 and historical principles guiding admission to the University.

Admission to the University of California involves two sequential components, eligibility and selection. Eligibility involves the determination that the applicant meets the criteria for admission to the University. There are two paths to achieve UC eligibility. The first involves completion of the subject, scholarship, and examination requirements. The subject requirement consists of the (a)-(f) courses, a pattern of 15 college preparatory courses, including two years of history/social science, four years of English, and three years of mathematics. The scholarship requirement is met by either achieving a grade point average of 3.3 or above in the (a)-(f) courses or, if the high school grade point average is between

2.82 and 3.29, achieving a corresponding score on the SAT I or ACT, according to the eligibility index. Students are required to take the SAT I or ACT plus three SAT II subject tests, which will include writing, mathematics, and a third test of the student's choice.

If the subject or scholarship requirements were not completed satisfactorily, an applicant may become eligible by achieving a combined score of 1400 on the SAT I and a combined score of 1760 on the three required SAT II tests, with a minimum of 530 points on each of the tests. Approximately 99.5 percent of students achieve eligibility by the first path, with over 91 percent of students eligible for admission achieving a grade point average of 3.3 or above and 8 percent via an acceptable combination of GPA and SAT I scores.

Professor Widaman recalled that the most recent CPEC eligibility study found that only 11.1 percent of the spring 1996 graduates from public high schools fully met UC eligibility criteria. BOARS is currently considering a number of alterations to UC eligibility criteria in order to approximate more closely the 12.5 percent stipulated by the Master Plan.

The second step in admissions is selection of students by individual campuses. The academic criteria used to select 50 to 75 percent of freshmen include the following:

- Grade point average in (a)-(f) courses
- Test scores
- Number, content of, and performance in (a)-(f) courses taken beyond the minimum
- Honors and advanced placement courses
- The quality of courses taken in the senior year
- The quality of performance relative to programs offered in the school
- Outstanding performance in one or more academic subject areas
- Outstanding work in one or more projects in any academic field of study
- Recent, marked improvement in academic performance

The remainder of the eligible candidates are reviewed on the bases of the academic criteria listed above plus the following factors:

- Special talents, achievement, and awards
- Completion of special projects
- Achievement in light of disadvantage or other special, personal circumstances
- Location of secondary school and residence

BOARS has the responsibility to oversee how each campus, using these guidelines, selects students from the pool of eligible students who apply to the campus. In making the choice to offer admission, admissions personnel evaluate this wide array of additional factors for each applicant.

Professor Widaman addressed the proposed changes in eligibility criteria. The primary proposed change is to present two new and different paths to eligibility. The first path would be based on superior academic performance in the local environment of the individual high

school. The second one would be based on superior academic performance in a statewide context. The first track is a completely new approach to establishing eligibility, with students eligible under this path identified as UC Merit Scholars or UC Scholars.

Before discussing the proposals, Professor Widaman outlined conditions that will apply to both of the proposed new tracks to eligibility.

Continuing Considerations for All Applicants

- Students will apply to UC campuses of their choice, but the location of an applicant's secondary school will not be linked geographically to a specific UC campus.
- All eligible students will be guaranteed admission to the UC system.
- Eligibility will be defined by academic performance through the end of the junior year.
- The GPA in (a)-(f) courses will be computed identically for all applicants.
- Guaranteed admission to UC would be contingent on meeting all further eligibility criteria, including completing an application form, completing the 15-unit (a)-(f) course pattern in a timely manner and at an appropriate level of performance, and taking the SAT I (or ACT) and SAT II tests.

New Considerations for All Applicants

- To indicate more accurately course performance during high school and to prevent too many ties in high school GPA, pluses and minuses should be used in the computation of the GPA.
- The policy regarding the extra grade points for honors and AP courses will likely be revised, with the extra grade points being either reduced substantially or eliminated. Analyses of current validity study data indicate that the full extra grade point provided for honors and AP courses does not improve prediction of UC performance. Instead, at most one-half of an additional grade point should be allowed for these courses. Other analyses indicate that an elimination of the extra grade points would not harm prediction to any appreciable degree. Given the ability to consider the pattern of honors and AP courses taken by a student as another aspect of eligibility and selection, eliminating the extra grade points is reasonable. Furthermore, this would equalize access considerably for students attending high school that offer few, if any, honors and AP courses.

New Path 1: Superior Academic Performance in Local Context

Professor Widaman reported that BOARS will propose for consideration that students become eligible for the UC system by demonstrating superior academic performance in the

context of their individual high schools. The rationale for this proposed avenue to eligibility is that outstanding academic achievement accomplished within a given socio-economic and academic environment demonstrates a commitment to success and a level of perseverance that should translate into success in the UC system. While continuing to provide access for all highly achieving students, the UC Merit Scholars Program expands the concept of eligibility so that equal opportunity is afforded high achieving students regardless of the high school they attend.

To become eligible in this way, a student must rank within the top of his or her high school class. Because the proposal is a pilot project that must be evaluated in the future, BOARS intends to propose that students be in the top four percent of the high school class to gain this recognition. Based on the success of the program and of student success at UC in the future, it may be advisable to alter the percentage of students at each high school who achieve eligibility in this fashion.

To implement this program, BOARS has proposed the following guidelines:

- High schools will be involved in the determination of their UC Merit Scholars using criteria approved by BOARS.
- Eleven of the 15 units of the (a)-(f) courses must be completed by the end of the junior year; the GPA in these courses will be used to identify the merit scholars.
- If ties in GPA occur when identifying the top four percent of students, they may be broken by using the nine academic criteria and perhaps the four supplemental criteria that have been approved for selection of students by individual campuses.
- BOARS strongly recommends the establishment of a tenth academic criterion that would be added to the nine academic criteria for selection described previously. This tenth criterion is identification of the student as a UC Merit Scholar.

Professor Widaman observed that because the proposal represents a radical departure from previous admissions procedures, it should be considered a pilot project. It is assumed that the program would require continual monitoring for at least five to six years, and perhaps ten years, to determine whether students admitted under this program progress within the UC system and obtain UC degrees at acceptable levels. If evaluations demonstrate that this is the case, then appropriate modifications to requirements may be made in the future.

New Path 2: Superior Academic Performance in Statewide Context

While the second new path to eligibility, identified as superior academic performance in a statewide context, is essentially the same as the current policy, BOARS is contemplating significant changes here as well. First, SAT II scores will be factored into a revised eligibility index, together with the SAT I and the GPA. At present, only SAT I scores are entered into the eligibility index, along with the GPA. However, analyses of validity study data indicate

that when SAT I and SAT II scores are included in the same equation, SAT II scores are more predictive of success at UC than are SAT I scores by an approximately two- to-one ratio. Therefore, BOARS supports combining SAT I and II scores into an overall index of performance on the SAT tests along with the GPA, perhaps weighting SAT II tests more strongly than the SAT I.

Second, the category of "Eligible by Index" should be broadened such that all students, not only those in the GPA range of 2.82 to 3.29, will have to meet an eligibility index to become eligible. Students with a 3.9 or 4.0 high school grade point average would have to achieve some minimum SAT composite score. As the student's high school GPA declined, a higher SAT composite score would be needed to gain eligibility for UC. Because BOARS is considering either reducing substantially or eliminating the extra grade points for honors and AP courses, it cannot be explicit at this time regarding the precise combinations of high school grade point average and SAT composite scores. After analyses of validity study data and subsequent re-analyses of CPEC eligibility study data, BOARS will be in a position to offer more concrete numbers.

In response to a question from Regent-designate Miura regarding the eligibility of private high school graduates, Associate Vice President Galligani commented that CPEC was not able to obtain this data. While combining private and public high schools graduates would likely raise the percentage of eligible students to 12.5 percent or above, the Master Plan specifically refers to "public high school graduates."

In response to a follow-up question from Regent Johnson, Professor Widaman explained that the potentially eligible pool, which represented 9.4 percent of the graduating seniors in the CPEC eligibility study, contains those students who would be fully eligible if they were to complete the required SAT examinations. The size of this potentially eligible pool is one of the reasons why BOARS is proposing a broadening of the index so that students throughout the GPA range would have to have some minimum corresponding SAT score.

Regent McClymond asked for a clarification of how the two paths to eligibility would relate to one another. Professor Widaman responded that, in order to make eligible 12.5 percent of the state's high school graduates, the University could choose either to lower its entrance standards somewhat, or it could reach out to students who currently are not eligible. Simulations done by the Office of the President indicate that about one-third of the state's high schools send very few students to the University. Under the four percent proposal, the University would make 1.3 or 1.4 percent of the students newly eligible. In June the schools would identify the top four percent of their students, who would then be identified as UC Merit Scholars. During a school assembly in the senior year, these students would be presented with a certificate which would indicate that they are eligible to attend UC, pending the completion of the entrance requirements. The students from the statewide pool would send in their applications in November of their senior year, as is currently the case.

Provost King pointed out that this new path that BOARS is proposing would produce additional eligible students. It would not displace currently eligible students.

Regent McClymond related that her experience teaching undergraduates is that many of them are not prepared for the educational environment that they find at UC. She was concerned that, by guaranteeing admission to a certain percentage of students coming out of every school, the University would actually provide a disincentive to the schools to provide more academically competitive curricula to their students.

Professor Widaman recalled that Senator Teresa Hughes had sponsored a constitutional amendment to revise the eligibility pool to 12.5 percent of each individual high school, which would provide no incentive at all for the schools to prepare their students. Under the BOARS proposal, the students newly identified as eligible will likely be students who currently reside in the potentially eligible pool. If the ranking is done on the grade point average in the (a)-(f) courses, the merit scholars will be the students with the highest grade point averages in their school. He believed that newly eligible students would be considerably better prepared than many of the students who are currently eligible.

President Atkinson asked whether the new paths to eligibility would provide less motivation for students to take honors courses in high school. Professor Widaman explained that the extra grade point for honors and advanced placement courses was instituted in order to encourage students to take the most difficult course of study possible. The concern on BOARS has been that many faculty members have asked students in their freshman courses whether or not they have taken honors or AP courses in a particular area of study. Those students indicate whether or not they have done so. There appears to be fairly good evidence that there is not a strong relationship between taking honors and AP courses and whether or not students can place out of lower-level courses, nor is there a strong relationship between taking honors and AP courses and the grades in the course.

President Atkinson expressed concern that the ability to predict performance should be taken into account in this way. Associate Vice President Galligani pointed out that the performance in honors and AP courses would still be considered in the selection process of a specific campus.

Professor Widaman stressed that he would encourage students to take the most difficult course of study possible. Analyses of validity study data that separated out the predictive power of the unweighted grade point average along with the extra grade points for honors and AP courses indicate that those extra grade points have about half the predictive power of the regular unweighted grade point average, so it may be reasonable to cut the weighting by half rather than eliminating it. Currently, admissions documents state that at most four courses of this kind may be included in the grade point average to establish eligibility. Routinely as many as 15 honors and AP courses are used, so that some students report 5.0 grade point averages. Thus the option exists of limiting the number of courses to four, in accordance with University policy.

Regent Lee raised concerns about the proposed policy, noting that many schools at present do not do a good job of preparing their students for higher education. In particular, he

believed that local school districts should be held accountable for these results, which should be published on an annual basis.

Professor Widaman believed that many areas in the state, such as the Central Valley, do not prepare as many students for the University system because UC is not a presence in that area. This does not necessarily mean that these students are receiving a poor education. In addition, if these students are not interested in attending a UC campus, they have no incentive to take the SAT II tests. The BOARS proposal is a way of reaching out to these students. Secondly, the proposal provides some motivation to the teachers and to the school district, and even to the school board, to try to make sure that more than just four percent of their students are eligible. Four percent will be eligible by this first plan, but an additional 8.5 percent will become eligible through performance within the statewide pool.

In response to a comment by Regent Lee as to where the blame for a school's failure should be placed, Professor Widaman observed that there are some schools that do not have the money to provide wonderful educational experiences for their students. He suggested that while SP-1 and Proposition 209 were interesting proposals, they presupposed that everyone has equal access to educational opportunity, which is not true. When students are identified under this program, the University will stipulate clearly what steps must be taken to attain eligibility. Under this proposal the University would require that 11 of the 15 (a)-(f) courses be completed by the end of the junior year. The grades in the (a)-(f) courses taken in the sophomore and junior years would be the basis for the ranking of the students.

In response to a question from Regent Sayles regarding the number of African-American students who might become eligible under this proposal, Professor Widaman replied that while information is not available by ethnic groups, it is clear that the top four percent would have somewhat greater ethnic diversity than the present 11.1 percent eligibility pool. The best simulation results show that underrepresented students would increase from 11 percent to 12 percent. Regent Connerly added that the Texas plan, which admits the top ten percent, has had very little effect on racial and ethnic make-up of the student body.

Regent Sayles expressed concern that the proposal may cause more problems that it solves. In particular, it could encourage parents to enroll their children in less competitive schools and have them take less demanding courses in order to qualify, leaving them unprepared to enter the University. Professor Widaman responded that, for this reason, BOARS is considering reducing the extra credit for honors and advanced placement courses, because they are much more widely available in suburban schools than they are in either large, urban schools or in rural schools.

Regent Sayles stressed that the University wants to make eligible students who succeed in the most demanding academic circumstances. Professor Widaman reiterated the fact that anyone currently eligible would remain eligible. The program is designed to reach out to those schools that do not send very many students to the University.

Regent Ochoa observed that a number of questions had been raised that go to the mark of the commitment of the entire Board of Regents and the UC family to maintain the academic excellence of the University of California. From his experience he had found some very competitive, well-prepared students at the top of the class in rural and urban areas. However, at schools in areas such as East Los Angeles, students tend to aspire to attend a community college or a campus of the California State University. He stated his support for maintaining the academic excellence of the University of California while working with K-12 and the community colleges to improve their preparation of students.

Professor Widaman noted that proposals made by Senator Hughes and others would lead to larger ethnic diversity than the four percent proposal; however, they would be accompanied by a decline in the quality of students. The four percent proposal could achieve a considerable increase in diversity with almost no noticeable change in the quality of the students.

In response to a question from Regent Davies, Professor Widaman explained that there would be no minimum SAT scores required of those students who were made eligible under the four percent proposal. Regent Davies believed that if that were the case, the proposal would produce more unprepared students. With respect to extra grade points being awarded for honors and AP courses, Regent Davies did not believe predictability was the most important issue. Rather, he believed that the University should offer an incentive to students to take those courses. Finally, he referred to the argument that the four percent proposal would not displace any students who would be eligible statewide. Because the University could attain its goal of making eligible the top 12.5 percent by choosing additional students from the statewide pool, he did not believe that it was true to say no one would be displaced.

In response to Regent Davies' comments, Professor Widaman noted that the SAT scores are not a factor for eligibility for ninety percent of the students who are made eligible for the University of California. Under this proposal, the proportion of students who would be made eligible regardless of their SAT scores would be reduced.

Regent Montoya suggested that BOARS consider the top two percent in order to address concerns of quality raised by the Regents. Professor Widaman pointed out that this would not result in the University's admitting the top 12.5 percent of students. Regent Montoya believed that this goal could be achieved by increasing the number of students admitted under Path No. 2. Professor Widaman commented that this approach would be possible. The four percent proposal, however, offers a way to bring the eligibility pool very quickly to 12.5 percent.

Provost King underscored the fact that simulations show that four percent is the point at which the quality of students has not suffered significantly by bringing in a certain percentage per high school.

President Atkinson supported Regent Lee's idea of publishing school results, and in particular he suggested that it would be valuable to know how productive schools are in terms of the

number of their students who meet the (a)-(f) requirements. He recognized that while remarks made by Regents during the discussion concerning quality were quite valid, it was his hope that the four percent proposal would send a message to the many schools that never send any students to the University of California.

Professor Widaman reported that BOARS is also looking at how to align the University's (a)-(f) requirements with the course requirements of the California State University. This would greatly simplify the process of getting through high school and taking the proper courses for college.

Regent Johnson stated that she still had concerns about the four percent proposal and urged Professor Widaman to make the Regents more comfortable with it when he presents BOARS' recommendations at the July meeting.

Regent-designate Miura observed that the term "UC Merit Scholar" implies a standard of achievement that should extend across all high schools rather than being limited to the top four percent of each high school.

Faculty Representative Weiss reported that the larger body of the faculty would be addressing the proposal over the coming months and that she would be able to communicate the results of those discussions at the July meeting.

(For speaker's comments, see the minutes of the May 14, 1998 Committee of the Whole.)

The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary