The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
October 17, 2001

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at UCSF-Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Bustamante, Connerly, Davies, T. Davis, O. Johnson, S. Johnson, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, and Sayles; Advisory members Ligot-Gordon, Sainick, and Terrazas

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, Lee, Moores, Morrison, Pattiz, Preuss, and Seymour, Faculty Representatives Binion and Viswanathan, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Gómez, Gurtner, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Vice Chancellor Brase representing Chancellor Cicerone, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 9:50 a.m. with Committee Chair Montoya presiding.

1. **ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MANAGEMENT SCHOOL, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, effective immediately, Section 14(a) of The Regents' provisions as covered under Standing Order 110.1–Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University, be amended as follows:

additions shown by underlining

* * *

14. Professional Schools

(a) There are established the following schools, with curricula based on two or more years of undergraduate work:

* * *

<u>Management School, at San Diego, with curricula leading to the degrees of Master of Business Administration and Doctor of Philosophy</u>.

* * *

The Committee was informed that the San Diego campus proposes to establish a Management School that will become a global leader in management training and research. The school will respond to the growing need of California industry for personnel with strong

management skills in the high technology and biotechnology sectors. This includes firms that both make and sell the technology and those whose businesses depend critically on intensive use of advanced technology in creating more traditional goods and services. It will also provide valuable educational opportunities for highly qualified applicants who cannot be accommodated by the existing management schools in California.

The UCSD Management School will provide distinguished research and education in the theory and practice of management. This program will give special attention to the impact of creating and managing innovation, the greater importance of new entrants in large markets, and the rapid expansion of even smaller and newer firms into global markets. Technological innovation and rapid globalization also underscore the need for appreciation of the role of government and law in markets. They also suggest the need for training that understands the new challenges that may confront managers, including the incorporation of emerging environmental and social policies into the agendas of senior management.

In response, the Management School will emphasize a combination of disciplinary and industry-specific research, innovative teaching, and an emphasis on joint degree programs to provide specialized training attuned to technology and global markets. The Management School will strengthen UCSD as a teaching and research institution while contributing to the economic growth of the San Diego region and the state of California.

Educational Programs

- Degree programs – The Management School will develop full-time, part-time, and executive programs leading to the Master of Business Administration degree. In addition, the school will build a small Ph.D. program linked to the research emphases of the faculty that will complement the MBA program.

- Programs leading to joint degrees – The Management School will cooperate with other schools and divisions on joint programs that will lead to the awarding of double degrees including a joint program with the Jacobs School of Engineering leading to both the MBA and the Master of Engineering degrees, a joint program with the School of Medicine leading to both the MBA and the Master of Advanced Studies in Leadership of Healthcare Organizations, and a joint program with the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies leading to both the MBA and the Master of Pacific International Affairs.

- Executive education – The Management School will offer a full complement of executive education programs. In addition to the Executive MBA program, the School will offer both an array of short and customized courses on topics of interest to individual companies or industry groups. In delivering its executive education programs, the school will cooperate with UCSD Extension, which already has a strong administrative and enrollment base in the technology community.

- Undergraduate education – Although the Management School will not offer an undergraduate business major, its faculty will participate in undergraduate education. Management School faculty will teach some courses that are part of the Economics Department's existing Management Science major and minor. The school will also work with Economics to develop specialized minors in management geared to the particular needs of engineering and biology.

The campus envisions enrolling in fall 2003 the first cohort of 100 full-time students in the State-funded MBA program and 50 part-time students in the self-supporting MBA program. At steady state, targeted for 2011-12, the school will enroll 600 students in the State-funded MBA program, 510 students in self-supporting MBA programs, and 50 students in the State-supported Ph.D. program. Self-supporting non-degree executive education programs will enroll 150 students in 2003-04 and plan to grow to 1,500 enrollments per year in steady state.

Research Programs

The core curricular areas of the Management School will include accounting, finance, marketing, economics, operations research, and organizational behavior. The core research activities will be expected to encompass these areas, but with emphasis on modern topics and theoretical studies in keeping with UCSD's tradition of building new programs on cutting-edge basic and applied research. Although the exact programs will be determined by the faculty hired, core research activities will including the following: strategic management and responses to public policy in the technology-driven firm; computational finance in the modern financial marketplace; marketing in knowledge-based firms; and specialized joint research centers with other academic units that will focus on key technology industries.

Need for the School

The Management School will serve global, California, and San Diego markets. Like most leading management schools, its largest single market for placement will be in the immediate region, but the majority of its students will be placed in state, national, and global markets. Extensive consultation with industry has led UCSD to conclude that it should recruit students that have, on balance, more technical backgrounds and less work experience than other major schools. There is a strong demand for younger managers who are skilled in technology but have acquired an MBA. This emphasis will complement the more conventional student mixes of Berkeley and UCLA. This innovation follows in the tradition of UC supporting the growth of technology intensive enterprises by providing specialized training based on sound research to meet new needs in the workplace.

While the UCSD Management School will serve a global market, the San Diego business community has strongly emphasized the importance of a new management school for the region. Strong growth of technology-based industry has boosted San Diego into its position as California's second largest, and the nation's sixth largest, city. San Diego is the only

large regional metropolitan economy in the country that does not have a management school ranked in *Business Week's* top fifty.

UCSD's planning for a management school also benefited from the large-scale study of the San Diego technology community during the past year by the Harvard Business School and the Council on Competitiveness, a Washington, D.C.-based association of 200 high-tech firms, research universities, and labor unions. As noted in the Council's report, "the absence of a 'first-rate' management school is broadly perceived to be an obstacle to sustaining San Diego's innovation capability." Executives particularly cite the loss of promising young executives when they have to depart the region for two years to get an MBA from a leading program elsewhere in the country. The proposed Management School will contribute substantially to retaining this talent and deepening the human capital pool of the region.

Industry demand for MBA graduates is strong. In 1999, Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, and Los Angeles placed their MBA graduates very quickly; within three months after graduation, placement ranged from 95 percent to 99 percent. Ph.D.s in management are also in high demand. In 1998-99, over 1,400 academic positions went unfilled, and an additional 740 positions were needed in 1999-2000.

Academic and Long-Range Development Plan

Establishment of the Management School is consistent with the campus academic plan and long-range development plan. The planned enrollment growth for the Management School is a crucial component of UCSD's plan for growth in graduate enrollments.

Reviews and Approvals

The proposal to establish a UCSD Management School has been endorsed by the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate and by the University of California Academic Council. The California Postsecondary Education Commission review is in progress.

Resources

Appropriate funding will be provided consistent with standard University budgetary practice. There are six sources of funding: State funding, professional school fees for MBA students, educational/registration/application fees, fully-employed MBA student fees, executive education program fees, and gifts/endowment. The $50 million cost of the Management School Building will be provided from gift funds. Construction of this building is expected to begin in fall 2002, with occupancy occurring in fall 2004. The school is a cornerstone in the campus' projected growth from 20,000 to 30,000 students.

Regent O. Johnson raised the issue of the pending review by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. Provost King explained that the University and CPEC had not reached total agreement on the proposal to date. In the unexpected eventuality that

convergence were not reached, the administration would return to The Regents with a new proposal.

Regent Preuss underscored the support of the community for the establishment of a strong interdepartmental Management School at the San Diego campus.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

2. **REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

It was recalled that two background papers on comprehensive review in undergraduate admissions, as shown in Attachments 1 and 2, were provided to the Regents in advance of the meeting.

Provost King noted that the responsibility to recommend changes in admissions policy to The Regents rests with the Academic Senate. Representatives of the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) will provide a status report on the proposal for comprehensive review in undergraduate admissions.

Faculty Representative Viswanathan recalled that The Regents, in rescinding its ban on affirmative action in admissions, had called upon the Academic Council to review undergraduate admissions procedures and report back to the Board. The Academic Senate's discussion involved all of the campuses as well as the Universitywide Senate. BOARS, which is composed of faculty members from admissions committees on each campus, was the primary Senate committee to develop the comprehensive review proposal. The proposal was recently endorsed by the Academic Council, with the proviso that the comprehensive review process be evaluated by BOARS after five years, using a methodology to be developed by BOARS. Throughout the review of the proposal, the most important concern of the faculty has been the academic quality of UC students. Professor Viswanathan noted that the proposal was not in its final form. Should the final proposal be approved by the Academic Assembly, the President will present it to The Regents at its November 2001 meeting.

Professor Dorothy Perry, the chair of BOARS, introduced the members of her panel: Professor Barbara Sawrey, the vice chair of BOARS, and BOARS member Professor Calvin Moore, chair of the Admissions, Enrollment, and Preparatory Education Committee at Berkeley. Professor Perry began her remarks by stressing that academic quality is the foremost concern of the faculty as well as the foundation of the proposed admissions process. She explained that at this stage of its deliberations, BOARS defines "comprehensive review" as the process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment. "Multiple measures of achievement and promise" refers to the continuing use of the 14

academic and related criteria approved by the Academic Senate. Professor Perry noted that, under the proposal for comprehensive review, statewide eligibility would remain unchanged. Comprehensive review will not change the qualification or identities of any eligible students who perform in the top 12.5 percent of California's high schools. The difficulty which BOARS wishes to address is the fact that not all eligible students who apply to highly selective campuses can be admitted. BOARS is not proposing to change the selection criteria, but rather to select among eligible students in a different way. The present tiered selection process, which admits 50 to 75 percent of applicants on academic criteria alone, would be replaced by a comprehensive review. Professor Perry explained that as campuses have become more selective, they have developed a form of comprehensive review for students who fall under the second tier of applicants. BOARS has become convinced that merit is best judged within the context of achievement; it believes that comprehensive review will result in better admissions decisions at the selective campuses. The change to a review process without tiers would give the campuses the added flexibility to determine the totality of each applicant's personal record of accomplishment in the context of the opportunities that were available to the applicant.

.

A number of key questions were raised during the course of BOARS' deliberations. The first concerns any erosion of high academic standards. Additional questions involve ensuring the integrity of the process as well as ensuring that checks and balances are in place. Who would benefit from the process and who would be disadvantaged are important issues to consider. The questions of how this proposal will relate to other admissions initiatives that have been adopted by The Regents and what resources will be required to initiate this change were also raised. Professor Perry reported that the focus would remain on academic achievement as measured by traditional criteria, including grades, test scores, and the breath of the curriculum. These criteria will now be looked at in the context of the student's environment in order to provide a sense of achievement and potential. To ensure the integrity and accountability of the process, BOARS has requested that each campus develop specific policies. BOARS feels that it is essential that faculty involvement in the admissions process increase as the new policy is implemented. The evaluators would have to be carefully selected and trained, as they are in the two-tier process. The admissions outcomes will be monitored not only by campus faculty but also by BOARS.

BOARS is confident that students who take full advantage of the opportunities that are available to them will benefit from the comprehensive review process. Professor Perry recalled that previous BOARS proposals to The Regents – Eligibility in the Local Context and the Dual Admissions Program – had related to eligibility rather than selection. The current proposal relates entirely to the campus selection process, but there are consistent themes throughout the three proposals, including high academic achievement. BOARS believes that the evaluation of the individual within the school, the community, and the society is an important part of each process.

Professor Perry reported that other highly selective institutions tend to use systems of comprehensive review for their applicants. BOARS does acknowledge that, as a public

institution, the University of California has a special responsibility to ensure that admissions policies are conducted in an open manner. A system of checks and balances will demonstrate the integrity of the process to the University's constituents.

Should The Regents approve the adoption of the comprehensive review process, it will begin with the 2001-02 admission cycles. The campuses are poised to move in this direction for the coming academic year. BOARS believes the proposed change is important as it will allow the campuses to choose the best students in a growing and changing state.

Regent Montoya reported that she had received a communication from a tenured faculty member at the Los Angeles campus which indicated a lack of consultation with the faculty regarding the proposal. This faculty member intended to provide the Academic Council and the President with a study which found that academic performance was correlated with the academic index currently used by the campuses.

Professor Perry responded that all of the campuses have faculty committees that are involved in admissions through Senate processes. Systemwide, BOARS has worked to engage not only the faculty admissions committees but all of the faculty Senate members in the process.

Regent Davies asked whether, under the comprehensive review process, BOARS believes that any current tier-one students would be denied admission. If so, BOARS should provide examples of the type of tier-one student who would not be admitted. He asked that BOARS provide information to the Regents about the people who will be making the actual admissions decisions.

Regent Bagley referred to the fact that admissions personnel are trained to read applicants' files through "norming sessions" and requested a definition of norming.

Regent Lee stressed that faculty should be involved in admissions decisions and suggested that retired professors could be recruited to participate in the process.

Regent Morrison stated that it would be helpful to him to gain an understanding of the governance structure of the faculty at both the campus and systemwide levels. The information provided should include how the decision makers are selected by their peers in order for the Regents to be confident that the process is open and democratic. Faculty Representative Viswanathan stated his intention to provide a written narrative with information on each campus, on how the Universitywide Senate committees operate, and on how their decisions percolate to the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the President, and The Regents.

Regent Hopkinson was interested in what aspects of the current comprehensive review process would be applicable to the new proposal. She asked what a comprehensive review on all of the campuses would cost.

Regent Connerly began his remarks by noting that at the present time he was not inclined to support the proposal, although he was subject to change if the facts presented by the faculty are persuasive. He expressed concern about the fiscal effects of the proposal, given the fact that the University is not able to fund the Dual Admissions Program. He asked how the University could ensure the public that it matters that students work hard and earn good grades. He believed the fact that the faculty are minimally involved in the selection of students should be addressed. He recalled that the reason the two-tiered admissions process had been adopted was to send the message that the University of California placed a premium on quality and asked how quality could be preserved if the system were changed.

Regent Moores asked for commentary on the role of the faculty and the readers in the admissions process. Professor Moore of the Berkeley campus reported that he concentrated his efforts on working with the lead readers to communicate the faculty perspective and to ensure that the policies that have been drafted by the admissions committee and the Academic Senate are followed. While the faculty have significant input into the process, the actual admissions decisions are made by the director of admissions. Professor Moore expressed his complete confidence in the expertise of the readers, who undergo considerable professional training.

Regent Moores recalled that the statement had been made that BOARS would monitor the outcome of the comprehensive review process and asked how that would take place. He noted that under the eligibility guidelines all applicants are required to take both the SAT I and the SAT II and asked whether there was a minimum score that must be attained. President Atkinson reported that the University has a formula for eligibility that combines the grade point average and test scores. The University asserts that every eligible California student will be admitted to a UC campus. The comprehensive review process is important for highly selective campuses that are not able to admit all eligible students.

Regent Lansing stated her support for the evaluation of the whole student as opposed to making evaluations based on quantitative factors alone. She believed that if the faculty were to answer major concerns on the part of the Regents, they might be convinced to adopt the proposal for a comprehensive review process. The students who are admitted under a comprehensive review process must not be less qualified than those who are selected using the tiered admissions system. Equally, students who work hard should not be denied admission. She reiterated Regent Davies' concern that students who are presently qualified may not be admitted. The faculty should provide more information on how a holistic approach to admissions would actually work.

The President stated his intention to circulate the questions that had been posed to the Regents for their comments and provide answers in writing prior to the November meeting.

Regent T. Davis stressed that, while she recognized the role of the faculty, the Regents should not diminish the role played by staff in the admissions process. The staff are involved with students at the high schools through outreach programs that are funded by the

University and thus are in the best position to make these decisions. She asked whether an effort would be made to standardize the admissions process across the campuses or whether each campus would be able to choose its process to implement the policy. Regent Davis supported an admissions process that would produce engaged and intelligent citizens who would contribute to both the academic strength of the campuses and the economic future of the State of California. She pointed out that there had been no consideration by the Regents of what the outcome of an admissions policy should be and felt that this was an issue that should be addressed.

Regent Montoya asked BOARS to provide information on which public universities continue to use a tiered approach in admissions.

Regent Hopkinson requested that, for the November meeting, a detailed description be provided of how the comprehensive review process works at the Berkeley campus. Professor Moore reported that, at Regent Hopkinson's request, a summary sheet on freshman admissions statistics at Berkeley from 1997 to 2000 had been prepared, and he distributed copies to the Regents. In 1997, prior to the implementation of comprehensive review, the average uncapped GPA was 4.12; in fall 2000, it had increased to 4.27. SAT scores have also increased, as did the number of honors courses taken or planned. The number of freshmen who return as sophomores increased from 96.1 percent to 97.6 percent.

Regent Morrison suggested that it would be helpful for the Regents to receive copies of the two booklets that the University publishes pertaining to admissions, including the application packet.

Faculty Representative Viswanathan introduced the faculty members of the panel who would provide different perspectives on comprehensive review in admissions: Professor David Palumbo-Liu of Stanford University, chair of its Undergraduate Admission and Financial Aid Committee; Professor Jack Citrin of UC Berkeley; and Professor Jeff Gibeling, chair of the Davis campus division of the Academic Senate.

Professor Citrin presented a report entitled "The Pitfalls of Comprehensive Assessment," copies of which had been distributed to the Regents. In beginning his presentation, Professor Citrin asserted that the admissions process at the University of California, given its highly selective nature, must be founded on the principles of excellence, fairness, and openness. Professor Citrin believed that the elimination of the academic tier system would by definition lower the overall quality of the student body. Comprehensive review would make the admissions process less fair because the standard by which applicants are judged would be based upon their social background. The inherent subjectivity of the process will leave students and their parents confused about the criteria used to make admissions decisions.

Professor Citrin reported that, although BOARS had modeled its proposals on the Berkeley system, no appropriate analyses of the Berkeley experience had been conducted. According

to Office of the President data, admissions policies that were implemented systemwide in 1997 have improved the academic quality of the student body at every campus without reducing the overall number of minority students admitted to UC. In addition, members of recent freshman classes are more similar in their academic ability than past classes.

Professor Citrin believed that the University administration was attempting to craft admissions policies which would bring about a different racial and socioeconomic distribution of students in the post-Proposition 209 era. A 1999 report of the UC Davis admissions committee states that "...the inescapable effect of a policy (of increasing the role of contextual, non-academic factors) is to reduce the quality of the admitted class."

BOARS has stated the following objectives of a comprehensive review policy:

- To refine and redefine the concept of merit to make it more inclusive
- To evaluate all achievements and performances in the context of the opportunities available to the applicant
- To identify applicants who can contribute to the life of the campus and emerge as State and national leaders

Professor Citrin suggested that such a procedure would privilege a disadvantaged applicant with low test scores over a middle-class student with a high grade point average. He believed that, if comprehensive review is adopted, the Regents should be prepared for lawsuits. While he believed that poverty should not be a handicap to attending the University, he did not believe that such a factor should be a positive advantage, outweighing factors more directly linked to academic success.

Professor Citrin noted that the implementation of comprehensive review is entrusted to readers who have no experience teaching those they admit. Over time, reliance on objective indicators of merit will be set aside in favor of achieving social targets and goals. While the desire to admit future leaders is admirable, there is no evidence that such individuals are absent from the top academic tier of applicants. There is no evidence that admissions officers have the skills and information to accurately identify people who will make important contributions to the campus.

Professor Citrin believed that comprehensive review enhances the role of subjectivity and unsubstantiated theories in selection decisions. This view has been supported by psychologists who reviewed decades of research comparing the validity of actuarial versus clinical methods of assessment, who stress this defect in explaining why the evidence consistently proves the superiority of objective, quantitative assessment. Professor Citrin suggested that the fact that elite private institutions employ a comprehensive review process is not relevant to a public university. These institutions choose from among a smaller group

of students concentrated at a higher overall level of academic achievement, and they devote more time and money to each applicant.

Professor Citrin referred to a letter to President Atkinson from Chancellor Berdahl and Professor Moore which offered to provide a review of the new process after five years of experience. He suggested the need for appropriate studies of the new system before it is put into place, rather than after it had been implemented.

In light of his comments, Professor Citrin offered the following recommendations. First, The Regents should maintain the policy requiring an academic tier of at least 50 percent for admissions. Second, The Regents should declare a moratorium on pending proposals to modify methods of assessment and academic merit measurement until the completion of a comprehensive study whose methodology and analysis is open to scientific scrutiny and criticism by faculty experts.

Professor Palumbo-Liu introduced Ms. Anna Marie Porras, Associate Dean of Admissions at Stanford, who would be available to answer Regents' questions. He believed that the guiding principles behind comprehensive review and the proposed selection criteria were consistent with much of Stanford's admissions process. The overarching role, as stated in Stanford's selection criteria, is to bring together of group of students that will "...benefit most from the University's resources, contribute to its community, finish well, and proceed to a lifetime of intellectual, personal, and social accomplishment." The primary criterion for admission to Stanford is academic excellence: a compound of exceptional capacity, scholastic performance in relation to available opportunities, and the promise of intellectual growth. Because so many applicants present exceptional achievement, Stanford looks carefully at nuances such as how the student has taken advantage of the opportunities available to him and how obstacles have been overcome. In making these determinations, Stanford relies on the entire application folder: the transcript, including grades, honors, and rigor of program; scores on standardized national tests; documented perseverance and attainment in activities outside the classroom; quality of conception and writing in the personal statement; and the strength of recommendations from the secondary-school counselor and teachers. An additional factor for many but not all admits is personal achievement outside the classroom. In particular, Stanford values a national or international level of performance in athletics and the creative and performing arts. No index or formula is used to evaluate applicants; Stanford feels that academic achievement cannot be measured solely by a test or grades alone. For the freshman class that entered in fall 2001, Stanford reviewed approximately 19,000 applications and admitted 2,400 students. Each admitted applicant file was read between two to six times over the course of three rounds of review. While faculty are not directly involved in reviewing applicant files at the undergraduate level, the Committee for Undergraduate Admission and Financial Aid serves as an oversight group and takes part in the application review process. Professor Palumbo-Liu noted that the improving quality of the student body at Stanford over the years has led to more students who pursue individual research, honors courses, and other university programs. The

admissions process is under continuous refinement and redefinition according to the changing admissions landscape.

Professor Gibeling reported that the faculty recognize the importance of enrolling students who are well prepared for university-level work. Faculty have concerns that the overall level of students at the University has declined in recent years in spite of rising GPAs and SAT scores. Because of this overriding concern regarding academic quality, the faculty have discussed all of the issues that were raised today by the Regents. In particular, the faculty are concerned that the comprehensive review process will result in the decline of academic quality and that it will be more difficult to be held accountable in a way that engenders trust that admissions decisions are fair and equitable. Professor Gibeling stressed that meeting a large number of supplemental criteria for admission will never overcome a poor academic record. Faculty have also expressed concern that changes are taking place too rapidly and that decisions are not fully informed. They also share some Regents' concerns that the cost of comprehensive review will be too high. Professor Gibeling reported that, in order to involve faculty in the process, at the beginning of the summer he sent an e-mail to each faculty member describing all of the changes in admissions that have either been adopted or are proposed. At a meeting of the Representative Assembly, the Davis faculty supported the BOARS proposal, which opens an opportunity for each campus to develop a unique set of selection procedures. As such, the Davis selection process is quite different from that of the Berkeley model. He stressed that the process would be driven by the faculty after thorough discussion and debate. The Davis admissions committee will recommend to the faculty that weight be assigned to the 14 academic and supplemental criteria in order to assess past academic achievement and the likelihood of future success. The admissions committee performed simulations on the fall entering class by applying the new factors that are proposed for fall 2002 and concluded that the quality and diversity of the class would be unchanged. There would be a small change in the actual students who were admitted. Professor Gibeling recalled that Professor Citrin had referred to a report by the Davis admissions committee in 1999; the BOARS proposal defines "quality" in a broader way that goes beyond quantitative measures. The reason the admissions committee concluded that the same class would have been admitted in fall 2001 under either set of procedures was because they had no rational basis for changing the weighting of the selection criteria, nor did they have the time to consider what outcomes might be desirable. The faculty may wish to assess outcomes such as first-year success, graduation rates, employment after graduation, and the like. The first step will be to put into place a broad, comprehensive procedure that does not make major changes in the outcomes. The comprehensive review proposal invites a broader participation of faculty, while eliminating the tiered approach, and it gives them an opportunity to consider what the admissions process is trying to achieve.

Regent Bagley supported allowing the professionals involved with admissions – the faculty and the administration – to formulate admissions policy. He recalled that in Professor Citrin's written remarks, referring to the principles of comprehensive review, he had stated that "[A]nother principle is that no single factor, not even perfect grades and test scores, is enough to guarantee admission." Regent Bagley noted that any student who falls within the

top 12.5 percent of California high school graduates is guaranteed admission somewhere within the system and asked Professor Citrin to comment on this apparent contradiction. Professor Citrin responded that he was making the distinction between eligibility and admission to the more selective campuses and that he should have made that more clear.

Regent Connerly asked the faculty to consider how the University can reassure the public that a comprehensive review process is fair to all applicants. He reiterated Regent Hopkinson's request for information on how the Berkeley campus had implemented a comprehensive review process and what the campus' experience with it had been.

Chancellor Berdahl noted that the norming sessions for readers provide a basis for confidence in the quality of the judgments that are being made. Professor Moore continued that last year the norming process involved 66 readers; management of such a process presents a concern because so many people are involved. Approximately half of these readers are career employees in the admissions office. The campus brings in temporary readers for a three-month period, many of whom are retired admissions professionals, retired high school teachers, and some active high school counselors. This method enables the campus to communicate with the high schools with respect to the ingredients for a successful application. Professional staff from the Student Learning Center are also recruited to participate. Professor Moore stated that he would be interested in recruiting emeritus faculty. In response to Regent Bagley's earlier question, Professor Moore defined "norming" as a process by which a group of professionals review and discuss student applications and agree on a score for each file. The readers must norm eighty files before they become professional readers. All readers are required to attend weekly norming sessions where difficult cases are discussed. The lead reader is responsible for quality control. Applications that cannot be normed by two readers are forwarded to a third, senior reader who resolves the situation. The percentage of files that went to a third reader in 2000 was 2.3 percent, which indicates the professionalism and expertise of the readers. Professor Moore noted that he takes seriously the issue raised by Regent Connerly with respect to public trust and transparency in the admissions process. The campus receives between 1,000 and 1,500 appeals of its admissions decisions. These files are carefully read, often by the director of admissions, and a decision is made. He stressed that the campus seeks to enroll students who will contribute to the intellectual vitality of the campus. Professor Moore recalled Regent Davies' question regarding the type of student who would be denied admission under the comprehensive review process who would have been accepted using the tiered formula. He imagined that such a student would be one who had not challenged himself in high school.

Regent Connerly noted that, as the Regents consider the BOARS proposal, it should be done in the context of the decline in the quality of public education in California, if such a decline is an accepted fact.

Regent Lansing suggested that part of the decline in students' preparation for college may result from the fact that their studies are directed towards success on the SATs. She believed

that the comprehensive review would identify those students who used their high school experience as preparation for higher education.

Regent Lozano asked for a detailed presentation on the how the readers are selected and prepared and how consistency in the process is assured.

Regent Lee observed that the selection process at Stanford must be expensive as it involves up to six readings of an application. Ms. Porres reported that Stanford has 13 full-time staff who review files; the University also hires part-time readers. Many files are read only once.

Regent Montoya suggested that the Davis campus model was moving toward a more objective form of comprehensive review. Professor Gibeling confirmed that the process would continue to involve quantitative measurements of a student's achievement.

President Atkinson stressed the fact that the selection process will have to be tailored to each individual campus. What BOARS is proposing is a general policy for admissions; considerable flexibility will be provided to the campuses to carry out the policy, with oversight by the faculty.

Chairman Johnson believed that, if the Board were to approve the BOARS' recommendation, such a step would be irreversible. She supported the need for careful review of the proposal by the Regents, and she raised a question regarding the timing of the Academic Senate's consideration.

Faculty Representative Viswanathan explained that BOARS had been on an accelerated time line in order to receive campus responses to the proposal by September 6. The faculty spent countless hours over the summer deliberating the issue. Chairman Johnson pointed out that such an accelerated schedule is not the University's normal approach to consideration of such important issues.

Chairman Johnson asked Professor Citrin to discuss the increase in test scores for tier-two applicants. Professor Citrin recalled that in 1998 the Berkeley campus implemented its comprehensive review process, while retaining the two-tier system. This was the same year that affirmative action was no longer used in admissions. While there were small changes in the tier-one scores between 1997 and 1998, scores of African American, Chicano/Latino, and Native American students admitted in the second tier increased in the post-Proposition 209 environment.

Chairman Johnson shared the concern that the University would be able to communicate the comprehensive review process to the public. Professor Citrin noted that simulations could be provided for the Berkeley experience over the past four years in order to provide answers to the types of questions the public might ask.

Professor Moore suggested that the norming sessions would provide the Regents with a sense of the integrity of the selection process. He reported that high school counselors had repeatedly informed admissions personnel that the campus was making better admissions decisions under the new procedure. The students appreciate the fact that the process involves more than a score generated by a computer.

Regent-designate Terrazas believed that the Regents would face challenges if a comprehensive review policy is adopted; he felt confident that, if the integrity of the process is upheld, it can be defended.

Regent Bustamante felt the fact that students' grades are increasing at the same time that the quality of their education seems to be decreasing indicated the need for more qualitative means of assessment. The fact that the most prestigious institutions of higher education use a qualitative approach suggests the need for a review by the Regents of the University's admissions process as the system strives to maintain excellence. Regent Bustamante believed that consideration should be given to the question of whether or not the process was moving forward too rapidly for the kind of examination that it should receive from the Regents. He believed that lessons could be learned from institutions such as Berkeley and Stanford that already use a qualitative approach. With respect to the point that the University could lose qualified students to private institutions, he pointed out that universities such as Princeton continuously recruit the state's highly-qualified minority students. Regent Bustamante referred to the issue of public perception; he believed that this perception would be influenced by the outcomes of the process. The University must have a methodology that continues to provide excellence, and he believed that a more qualitative approach would do so. He believed that the presentation in November would be a critical one, and he urged the President to address in writing the questions that had been raised.

In response to a question from Regent Marcus regarding the varying quality of high schools throughout the state, Professor Moore reported that the reader receives a calculation for each student's ranking within his or her high school. This provides the reader with the ability to evaluate how the student performed within the context of the school. The campus also has a ranking for each student in the applicant pool based on such factors as honors and Advanced Placement courses taken.

Ms. Porres reported that Stanford takes into account not only the applicant's GPA but also the highest GPA in the class. Consideration is also given to the percentage of students who are planning to attend a four-year institution as a measure of how many students in the class are focused on higher education.

Professor Gibeling continued that at Davis one factor is the number of (a) - (f) courses a student has completed beyond the minimum number required. A second factor involves the evaluation of achievement within the context of the high school.

Regent Pattiz suggested that consideration should be given to the question of what effect a comprehensive review process would have on the University's ability to attract and retain high-quality faculty.

Regent Sayles requested more information on how a student with high grades from a less competitive school would compare with a student with slightly lower grades from a highly competitive school. Professor Citrin believed that the process would disadvantage a student from a school such as Lowell who was not at the top of the graduating class.

Regent Sayles concurred with the idea that the Regents must give consideration to outcomes. If the Regents are concerned about broad social goals, that should be made clear. He suggested that the Regents had never reached a consensus about what the outcomes should be. Regent Sayles asked if there were data pertaining to the economic advantages of a degree from Berkeley versus a degree from Irvine. He challenged the assumption that any student has the right to attend a particular campus. The message to the public should be that qualified students will be admitted to a campus of the University of California.

Regent O. Johnson referred to Professor Citrin's three principles of excellence, fairness, and openness in the admissions process. She did not believe that the comprehensive approach would lower expectations for excellence. In terms of fairness, she believed that the process would be more fair because of its qualitative nature. Given the extremely competitive nature of the applicant pool to the Berkeley campus, difficult questions of selection arise. She believed that the qualitative approach enabled the campus to defend its decisions in an open fashion.

Regent-designate Ligot-Gordon raised the issue of whether any formulas would be used in the comprehensive process. Professor Perry noted that each campus had provided BOARS with its unique plan, which she would share in writing with the Regents.

Regent Moores observed that in the norming sessions readers tended to give more weight to an applicant's test score based on the high school attended. He expressed concern that the Berkeley process does not quantify any student data. Referring to the table of freshman admissions statistics prepared by the Berkeley campus, he asked that the Regents be provided with a more detailed chart which breaks the data down into tier one and tier two students. He also wanted to know whether the character of the undergraduate class at Berkeley was changing due to comprehensive review.

Regent Montoya recalled that she had supported Eligibility in the Local Context and the Dual Admissions Program because both provided more certainty to students who apply to the University of California. She felt that the proposed comprehensive review process would increase uncertainty for students and spoke in support of a system such as the one used at Davis.

Chancellor Berdahl asked that the Regents provide guidance to the campuses as to what outcomes they are seeking in the admissions process. He noted that the Board has stated that socioeconomic status could be taken into account and asked how this could be done without looking at context.

(For speakers' comments, see the minutes of the October 17, 2001 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary