The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
March 12, 2002

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

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bustamante, Connerly, T. Davis, Johnson, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Moores, and Sayles; Advisory members Ligot-Gordon and Terrazas

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, Lee, Morrison, Preuss, and Seymour, Faculty Representatives Binion and Viswanathan, Associate Secretary Shaw, Deputy General Counsel Morrison, Provost King, Senior Vice President Darling, Vice President Doby, Chancellors Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Tomlinson-Keasey, and Vanderhoef, Acting Chancellor Warren, Vice Chancellor Bainton representing Chancellor Bishop, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 1:15 p.m. with Committee Chair Montoya presiding.

UC ADMISSIONS TESTING PROPOSAL

Provost King recalled that a year ago President Atkinson had indicated that the Academic Senate had begun to examine the University's policies on the selection and use of standardized tests in the admissions process. On January 30, 2002, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) presented a discussion paper on admissions testing policy to the Academic Council. This paper was also sent to the Regents. The Academic Council is circulating it widely among the faculty and the broader University community, and town hall meetings to consider the issue will take place on each campus.

The purpose of today's session is to inform the Regents as fully as possible as to the thinking underlying BOARS' position on admissions testing and to solicit views on the issues raised by the discussion paper. At the May meeting, time will be devoted to providing responses to issues raised by the Regents and in the faculty discussions of the proposed policy. In addition, representatives of the major testing agencies will be available to present specific proposals regarding tests they could develop to meet the requirements laid out by BOARS.

Faculty Representative Viswanathan noted that, if the Academic Senate approves the BOARS recommendation, it will be forwarded to the Regents, who will be asked to approve a policy pertaining to the principles and properties of admissions tests to be used by the University. He then called upon Professor Dorothy Perry, the chair of BOARS, to present the proposal. She was joined by Professor Calvin Moore, chair of BOARS' subcommittee on testing.

Professor Perry recalled that BOARS had begun to re-examine aspects of the University's admissions testing requirements in the mid-1990s. Over the past thirteen months, BOARS has

devoted substantial time to analyzing the educational policy issues related to admissions tests. In addition, in October 2001 the Office of the President released the findings of a statistical study by Saul Geiser and Roger Studley on the relative value of the SAT I and the SAT II in predicting undergraduate student success at the University of California. In November 2001, the Divisional Academic Senate at Santa Barbara hosted a three-day conference on the role of the SAT I and other admissions tests in determining eligibility for admission to the University and in selecting students to be admitted to specific campuses.

BOARS' conclusions, and the reasoning upon which they are founded, are detailed in the January 30 discussion paper, the essential points of which are as follows:

- Based on the statistical evidence provided in the study by the Office of the President, BOARS concluded that there is no evidence that the SAT I is preferable, on statistical grounds, to more subject-related tests such as the SAT II.

- Given the lack of a clear-cut statistical reason to prefer one type of test over another, BOARS then considered the use of admissions tests in terms of educational policy. In reviewing the history of the University's adoption of standardized admissions tests, BOARS concluded that the original decision to adopt the current test battery was not based on clearly thought-out and articulated principles, but rather on a pragmatic need to sort large numbers of applicants for the purposes of determining both eligibility and selection at specific campuses.

BOARS believes that the University is in a unique position to analyze the value of different kinds of tests because of its database that includes SAT I and SAT II scores for all applicants. Many of BOARS' deliberations were based on the Geiser/Studley study. This analysis satisfied the committee that there are no substantial differences between the types of tests in terms of their ability to predict success at UC. High school grades are the best predictor as to how well students perform in college, but standardized tests do add to that prediction. These findings were limited to UC students and cannot necessarily be generalized to other institutions. The predictive power of the SAT II at UC is consistent across academic disciplines, racial and ethnic groups, and students who attend either low-performing or high-performing high schools. Data also show substantial redundancy in UC's current test battery. SAT I scores add little or no new information. Overall, differences between the various tests, including the ACT and the SAT I and SAT II, are relatively small. This finding has had important implications for BOARS' discussions of testing policy, as it led to the philosophy of making admissions decisions based on grounds other than purely statistical or predictive ones.

BOARS recognized the need to articulate a set of purposes and properties beyond the prediction of success in college to guide the use of admissions tests. Professor Perry emphasized that the main point to be drawn from the data is that all of the purposes that are desired of a test can be realized without any loss in the capacity to predict student success at UC. Nevertheless, BOARS is basing its recommendation on educational policy considerations.

BOARS has articulated the following set of desired purposes for admissions tests used by the University of California:

- to assess the academic preparation and achievement of UC applicants;
- to predict success at UC beyond that predicted by high school GPA;
- to aid in establishing UC eligibility; and
- to aid in selecting students for admission at individual UC campuses.

BOARS also recommends a set of desired properties that admissions tests used by the University of California should incorporate:

- An admissions test should be a reliable measurement that provides uniform assessment and should be fair across demographic groups.

- An admissions test should measure levels of mastery of content in UC-approved high school preparatory course work and should provide information to students, parents, and educators enabling them to identify academic strengths and weaknesses.

- An admissions test should be demonstrably useful in predicting student success at UC and provide information beyond that which is contained in other parts of the application.

- An admissions test should be useful in a way that justifies its social and monetary costs.

BOARS then considered the current admissions test battery in light of these principles and desired properties and concluded that none of the tests in use fully meets the needs of the University. Therefore, BOARS recommends that the University adopt a new test battery which would provide greater breadth, depth, and rigor than the current test pattern. The link back to the high school curriculum will send a powerful message to students, their parents, and educators.

Professor Moore provided more details about the proposed new battery of tests, which would consist of a core examination plus two subject tests. The core examination would cover the fundamental disciplines of language arts and mathematics, which are essential for college-level work. The core test would include reading comprehension and a writing sample. In addition, there would be two one-hour, curriculum-based achievement tests. Students would be able to select the topics of these two tests in order to demonstrate their academic strengths. BOARS deliberated at length about the number of additional tests and came to the conclusion that two would be optimal.

The test array should be transportable so that other institutions would accept them in lieu of other admissions tests. After examining current tests, BOARS has concluded that no array meeting these characteristics exists. As BOARS developed its recommendations, its members met on several occasions with representatives of ACT, Inc. and the College Board. Both organizations have assured BOARS that they are interested in working with the faculty to develop new tests that would meet the University's requirements, would have predictive validity equal to or greater than that of current tests, and whose scores could be made transportable to other institutions and to ranking services.

The testing agencies have indicated preliminarily that it is feasible to complete this work in time to implement this recommendation for students applying for admission in Fall 2006. This time line will give advance notice to schools and to students. The new tests will have to be field tested before they become operational. Other tests such as the Golden State exam may emerge in the more distant future as options that could meet the University's needs.

Professor Moore outlined some of the remaining issues that BOARS will need to resolve. The first is the incorporation of a higher-level examination which would cover four years of high school mathematics, especially for students who are preparing to major in science or engineering. Second, BOARS has yet to determine what choices students would have for the two additional examinations. Third, the role of the SAT II language test remains an issue that BOARS will continue to explore. Finally, BOARS will need to decide what options out-of-state students will have for the core examination as initially it will be administered only in California.

As a next step, deliberations will continue between BOARS and the Academic Senate on these remaining issues. The faculty will work with ACT and the College Board on test development over the next two years. Until such tests have been developed and are in place, the University will continue to require the existing admissions tests. Professor Moore concluded his remarks by observing that the BOARS proposal should lead to a better array of tests than is currently available. These curriculum-based tests will be in line with the national standards-based reform movement. In addition, the proposal sends a resounding message to students that the best way to prepare for UC is to take rigorous courses in high school, do well in them, and master the material.

Regent Connerly observed that the public would need to be educated about the importance of predictability in admissions decisions, noting that citizens tend to believe that college admissions are based on performance in high school. He asked for further comment from BOARS. Professor Moore noted that admissions decisions are based both on a student's achievements in high school and on predictions of how well the student will do at the University. Admissions tests add to the power of prediction.

Regent Lozano pointed out that the data presented for the years 1996-99 did not show a significant difference among low- and high-ranking schools with respect to the predictability of the SAT I and the SAT II. She was concerned that, as tests are aligned to content-based standards, a disparity would emerge. Professor Perry expressed the view that initiatives to improve instruction in lower-performing schools could lessen the effect. Regent Lozano asked how BOARS would address the issue of transportability if a new test is designed. Professor Moore anticipated that the testing agencies would work with UC faculty and with experts in other states in order to design a test that would reflect their standards as well.

Mr. Wayne Camara, Vice President of Research and Development for the College Board, believed that other institutions would determine whether or not they would accept a new test. The College Board will need to demonstrate that the new test is statistically similar in a meaningful way to the SAT I and the ACT and that it reflects national standards. In response to a question from Regent

Sayles, Mr. Camara stated his willingness to work with the California State University and the community colleges to gain their acceptance of the new test.

Ms. Cyndie Schmeiser, Vice President of ACT, recalled that the ACT had had a different philosophical origin than the SAT. The ACT, which has been in use since 1959, is designed to measure educational achievement. Her firm conducts national curriculum studies every three years to accomplish this goal. The core of ACT's proposal to the University of California is based upon tests that will meet its requirements.

In response to a question from Regent Lee, Professor Moore stated that the University would offer the option of taking the SAT I or the ACT to students who were not in a location where the new test was given. Professor Perry noted BOARS' concern about this issue and assured Regent Lee that such individuals would not be disadvantaged.

Regent Lee raised the issue of graduation rates. Provost King stated that the University of California's graduation rates are at the top among public universities. President Atkinson observed that increasing graduation rates comes under UC's partnership with the Governor; data on time to degree and graduation rates are included in the University's annual report to the Governor. He stated that a copy of the report would be provided to Regent Lee.

Regent-designate Terrazas asked about using SAT II test scores and high school grade point averages in making admissions decisions while the development of a new test is under way. He pointed out that President Atkinson had provided information to the Regents which had indicated that the third SAT II test was the next best predictor of student success after the SAT II writing test and suggested that it be substituted for the SAT I.

Professor Perry observed that one issue is the fairness to students who would still be required by many institutions to take the SAT I. It is not BOARS' intention to change the University's test requirements in the immediate future. Professor Moore added that there is no SAT II test for reading comprehension.

Regent-designate Terrazas suggested that the institutions that no longer require the SAT I might be able to supply information on how their applicants had been affected by the elimination of this requirement.

Regent T. Davis commented that she had approached the issue by thinking about what would be in the best interest of students and of the University. She noted that students are already required to take a wide battery of tests and expressed concern that the new test would represent an additional burden. She suggested that the transportability of the new test would be an important issue to address.

Regent Marcus asked how the SAT I and II tests are weighted under the comprehensive review policy. He suggested that, if the SAT I is worth less than 10 percent of the weight in admissions decisions, it may not be necessary to develop a new test as its replacement.

Provost King explained that the eligibility index has a sliding scale that takes into consideration combinations of GPAs and test scores, with the GPA serving as the dominant factor. Each SAT II carries twice the weight of an SAT I. President Atkinson stated that he would send an explanation of the eligibility index to the Regents.

Faculty Representative Viswanathan introduced the panel of testing experts: Ms. Eva L. Baker, Professor of Education at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Co-Director of the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing; Ms. Rebecca Zwick, Professor of Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara; Mr. Matthew Malkan, Associate Professor of Physics and Astronomy, UCLA; Mr. Keith F. Widaman, Professor of Psychology at UC Davis; and Mr. Gerald C. Hayward, Co-Director of Policy Analysis for California Education and a former chancellor of the California Community Colleges.

Professor Baker's presentation addressed the potential consequences that would result from a change in admissions-test requirements, assuming such a change adheres to the principles articulated by Professor Perry. Traditionally tests have been used for a single purpose, such as selection, placement, or diagnosis. Over recent years, however, educators have begun to use tests for multiple purposes, and thus the BOARS proposal is consistent with national trends in testing. Professor Baker explained that the criteria to be used in assessing the new test will be validity, fairness, and credibility. Assuming that the test will be focused on academic curriculum, one should expect improved academic preparation of UC students and improved quality of the secondary-school coursework required of UC candidates. The new test should also result in improved subject-matter preparation of secondary-school teachers as they help students to become better prepared. A final consequence might be improved rates of retention, progress, and graduation on the part of better-prepared students. Professor Baker recommended that, in anticipation of the proposed change, the faculty should begin now to collect data to establish a baseline. It will be necessary to determine who and what should be studied, such as students and faculty, majors, academic offerings in secondary schools, changes in UC course enrollments and content, and public opinion. The design should assess the impact of the change in light of other state policy changes.

Professor Zwick's presentation focused on points to consider when evaluating the BOARS' proposal. First, curriculum-based tests reduce certain fairness challenges, but they also invite new ones. At present, the public views the SAT I as an IQ test that assesses esoteric material unrelated to classroom learning. While moving to a curriculum-based test may minimize this type of criticism, a future issue could relate to whether or not there are equal opportunities for all students to learn the material on the test. This issue has been at the heart of several lawsuits, including *Debra P. v. Turlington*, which asked whether all Florida students had an equal opportunity to master the skills included on Florida's high school graduation test. It is recognized that schools vary in their coverage of material and in instructional quality, a fact that was recently reinforced by a study by the Public Policy Institute of California. Curriculum-based tests show ethnic and economic achievement gaps that are similar to those for the SAT I and similar aptitude tests.

Professor Zwick turned to the issue of transportability, raising the question of whether or not the University's core test could yield SAT-equivalent scores that non-UC schools would accept. Test

equating works well for two alternate forms of the same test. The process does not work well when the tests differ substantially in content or if one test depends heavily on curriculum and the other does not. Professor Zwick suggested that one conclusion to be reached is that producing valid SAT I-equivalent scores requires the new test to be similar to the SAT I. With respect to the link between the ACT and the SAT I, the College Board has suggested that, because the two tests have different content, concordant scores should not be viewed as interchangeable measures of the same combination of skills. Additionally, there is no evidence that other schools will be willing to use California-equivalent scores instead of actual SAT I or ACT scores. Finally, Professor Zwick emphasized that the process of developing a new test will be labor intensive. It can take many years to accumulate a body of research on the test and gain a feel for score interpretation.

Professor Malkan observed that BOARS had concluded that the University uses standardized tests to assess the academic preparation of applicants and to predict their success at UC. By that criterion, the SAT I performs a useful function. He believed that the Geiser/Studley report was compromised by admissions decisions which used the SAT I as a compensating factor for lower high school grades. For example, students in the study with weaker high school grades tended to have higher scores on the SAT I, which was the reason they qualified for admission. The study did not take into account the fact that students who enter UC with higher SAT I scores tend to self-select heavier course loads and more difficult courses, which may result in lower grades. If each student took the same course load, SAT I test scores would be even more predictive of student success. Professor Malkan pointed out that BOARS had identified only minor differences between the predictive value of the SAT I versus the SAT II. He believed that the SAT I was the most universal of the University's measures of academic preparation and the only method of comparing the preparation of UC students with the rest of the country. Other universities will continue to measure student qualifications in part with the SAT I, a process which has served UC well. Once the University drops the use of the SAT I, it faces the long-term danger of eroding academic standards because the comparability with other institutions will be lost.

Professor Malkan suggested that some of the arguments that proponents had put forth for eliminating the SAT I were not convincing. For example, objective studies have shown no significant gains resulting from test preparation courses. He saw no evidence that test-taking presented a burden, as most students take more than the minimum. He stressed his belief that no other large university, including CSU, is planning to drop the SAT I. Even if a replacement test is developed, its statistical properties will probably be similar to those of the SAT I. Professor Malkan's conclusion was that the current admissions system is not sufficiently broken that any more major changes are urgently required. Prudence dictates that the University assess the consequences of moving to comprehensive review before making another change.

Professor Widaman recalled that in the 1998-99 academic year BOARS had considered recommending that the SAT I be dropped from the eligibility index. At that time, studies had shown that the SAT I contributes essentially nothing beyond high-school grade point average and the SAT II. There is an extremely strong correlation between the verbal portion of the SAT I and the SAT II writing test, as well as between the SAT I quantitative section and the SAT II mathematics test. The SAT I is widely viewed as the standard bearer among tests used for selection of students for

higher education and thus is a major way by which universities rank their student bodies relative to other institutions. In 1999, a proposal to eliminate the SAT I might have drawn attention away from BOARS' major issues, which were eligibility in the local context and a reformulation of the eligibility index.

Professor Widaman discussed the potential elements of a new test battery, noting that experience has shown that in general achievement tests predict student success better than aptitude-type tests do. It is also clear that achievement tests relate less to socioeconomic status than the SAT I. The new test battery might consist of four to five areas that would be consistent with the University's course requirements. It would be possible to weight components of the test differentially based upon their representation in the (a)-(g) course pattern. Professor Widaman offered the possibility that in the future standardized test scores may become more important than the high school GPA as grade inflation continues. While concern has been expressed about certain biases in standardized tests, biases in assigning grades may be even greater than those found in tests. With too much grade inflation, it will become difficult to distinguish the top four percent of students in a high school. In concluding his remarks, Professor Widaman recommended that the University ensure that new tests are developed to its specifications and take the lead in framing the debate about the form that the tests should take.

Mr. Hayward commended the faculty for bringing forward a thoughtful, research-based discussion that had included widespread consultation and that took into consideration the needs of the various education segments. He observed that the K-12 accountability system that has been adopted by the State requires a clear message from the University if it is to be effective. Accountability shifts the focus to student outcomes, and all of the various elements within K-12 schools must be in alignment for such a system to work. The importance of the college connection is often overlooked at the K-12 level. The proposal sends the message to high school students that if they study hard and take a rigorous curriculum, they will improve their chances of being accepted and doing well at the University. Mr. Hayward contrasted this message with the one that is sometimes associated with the SAT I. The change to achievement-based testing has potential implications for the K-12 curriculum because it will test what students learn in school rather than innate abilities that may be beyond the students' control. The pressure will increase to ensure that opportunities to learn exist in a broader array of California schools. Achievement-based tests will also enable teachers to receive feedback about the effectiveness of their teaching and will provide important diagnostic information to the high schools. Mr. Hayward urged that any new tests be designed with multiple purposes in mind, including high school graduation, placement, and entrance to the University.

Regent Connerly asked whether others shared the opinions expressed by Professor Malkan. Mr. Malkan recalled that the various admissions committees on which he had served at UCLA did not see the SAT I as an egregious problem.

Professor Widaman believed that it was clear that the SAT II is better able to predict student success than is the SAT I. Professor Zwick emphasized that the development of a new test requires a large investment in terms of time and dollars. She suggested that consideration be given to a combination of existing tests.

Regent Connerly recalled that, according to information that had been provided to the Regents by President Atkinson, the quality of the student body continues to rise. He asked for further justification for the BOARS' proposal.

President Atkinson emphasized the fact that the proposal is intended to send the message to teachers, students, and parents that doing well in the required (a)-(g) courses will pay off in the admissions process. The new test is intended to measure what students actually learn in school rather than how well they have prepared to take the SAT I. The President stressed the importance of students' learning how to write, mastery of which is not tested on the SAT I. He acknowledged that many aspects of the ACT and the SAT I would need to be included in the new test. One goal of the new achievement-based test would be to improve the quality of K-12 education in the state.

Regent Lee asked whether it was anticipated that the California State University and the community colleges would adopt the new test. Professor Widaman noted that all of the segments of higher education in the state work closely together on these types of issues. He anticipated that CSU would be willing to use the test in its admissions.

Regent Bustamante expressed his appreciation to President Atkinson for having raised questions about the SAT. He noted the intention to ensure that the rigors that are found in the University translate into the K-12 system so that more talented children will be able to meet the entrance requirements. He believed that an achievement test was the best way to reach this goal as it shows mastery of the subjects. Regent Bustamante's experience was that test preparation classes can increase a student's test scores significantly. He believed that it was the role of the University of California to tackle the whole issue of curriculum-based academics. He asked whether the top universities against which the University competes had raised similar concerns about the SAT.

President Atkinson observed that many institutions accept the ACT, which is correlated more closely with the curriculum. At present, the University of California stands alone with respect to challenging the SAT.

In response to Regent Bustamante's comment regarding test preparation, Professor Widaman reported that recent studies had found that simply taking the test again increased students' scores by 70 points.

Professor Malkan observed that the SAT I serves as a useful tool to monitor the quality of the incoming class over time, particularly in light of the implementation of comprehensive review.

Regent Lozano agreed that an achievement-type test would be more fair to students because it is aligned to the curriculum that is taught in the schools, and she asked Professor Zwick to comment.

Professor Zwick pointed out that, even if the curriculum is intended to be the same in all of the state's K-12 schools, many levels of instruction exist. For example, the California Institute of Public Policy has found that the percentage of teachers who are fully credentialed and the average years of teacher experience vary considerably based upon the socioeconomic status and ethnic

composition of the school. A consequence is widespread differences in the results on standardized tests.

President Atkinson commented that one message of the eligibility in the local context program is that schools should offer the University's (a)-(g) courses in order to prepare their students for higher education. He recalled that when these course requirements were originally implemented, there was a fear that they would have a negative impact on underrepresented minority students. He stressed the positive effect of these requirements on education in the state.

Regent-designate Terrazas recalled a statement by Mr. Hayward regarding the development of a test that would serve multiple functions. He urged the faculty to consider designing a test that would provide useful feedback to the K-12 educational system in order to identify significant areas of weakness. The test should also be designed to minimize the disparity of socioeconomic impacts.

In response to a question from Regent Moores, Professor Moore confirmed that the mathematics section of the SAT I covers material that students should have learned through grade 8. Regent Moores suggested that the pervasive view was that the test covered more difficult material. Professor Moore explained that the new core test would cover geometry, Algebra II, and some trigonometry in addition to Algebra I.

Regent Marcus suggested that the University was about to embark on a costly and disruptive process without being certain of the outcome. He believed that the greater weighting of the SAT II tests in the admissions process was already sending a message about the need to study hard and take rigorous courses. He asked that, unless the need for a new test could be clearly demonstrated, it not be supported by the Regents.

President Atkinson pointed out that the cost to develop a new test would be borne by the testing agencies. He emphasized that the goal would be to assess what students have learned.

Professor Malkan believed that the eligibility in the local context program was sending a clear message to high school students, noting its significant effect even in the first year of implementation. He suggested that the testing agencies were being asked to design a test that is both substantially different from the present test and yet in some sense equivalent to the SAT I in order to permit its substitution for the SAT I.

Professor Widaman spoke in support of developing more rigorous versions of the various SAT II tests.

Professor Moore noted that the ultimate goal would be a concordance between the new test and the ACT in the same way that there is a concordance between the ACT and the SAT I. It is hoped that other institutions would accept this new concordance.

Professor Zwick commented that her research had led her to the conclusion that the SAT II has an overall predictive advantage over the SAT I. She found that for Latino students at all campuses, however, the SAT I was more predictive of first-year college grades, while the opposite was true for Asian-American and white students. The results were split for African-American students.

In response to a question from Regent-designate Ligot-Gordon, Mr. Camara noted that the SAT I is a reasoning test; the more difficult items involve advanced problem-solving that require higher thinking skills. The verbal test includes analogies, reading comprehension, and sentence completion. The SAT II's are best described as end-of-course tests rather than achievement tests.

Regent Connerly cautioned against being drawn into debates regarding race and ethnicity when considering the development of a new test. He stressed that the issue of fairness relates to the varying quality of the state's K-12 schools. Regent Connerly resonated with the opinions expressed by Regent Marcus and suggested that some direction should be given to BOARS, particularly if the desired consequences can be accomplished without the development of a new test battery.

President Atkinson commented that the Regents would have a further opportunity to discuss the issues raised by BOARS at the May meeting. In the interim, each campus will hold town meetings to discuss the issues and report back to the Academic Council. If the faculty approve the BOARS proposal, the general principles will be presented to The Regents for action in July.

Regent Marcus reiterated his belief that, in lieu of adopting a new test battery, lesser weight be given to the SAT I while more rigorous SAT II tests are developed. President Atkinson stated that he would ask representatives of BOARS to meet with Regent Marcus to discuss the proposal in greater detail.

Regent Seymour observed that if the proposal is adopted, the University would need to alert students to the change. Faculty Representative Viswanathan recalled that the BOARS proposal addresses the principles and properties that a new test should have. The development of the actual test will occur only after these principles have been approved by the faculty and adopted by The Regents.

Professor Perry stressed that BOARS had attempted to define what test would best serve the University's admissions process. She noted that the faculty had raised questions similar to those raised by the Regents as to why a new test was needed. BOARS is working closely with the testing agencies in order to be able to present a viable alternative to the SAT I.

Regent Lee stated that he could not support the proposal until the California State University and the community college system have indicated that they would accept the new test. President Atkinson did not believe that the faculty at all of the institutions could agree simultaneously to such a proposal.

Faculty Representative Viswanathan encouraged the Regents to address their questions and concerns to the President and the Academic Council.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary