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DURING THE 2001-2002 ACADEMIC YEAR, The Committee on Scholarships and Honors met and accomplished the following:

1. The Committee met on November 28, 2001 and unanimously voted to approve the Conflict of Interest statement pertaining to the Committee on Scholarships and Honors. At the same meeting, the Committee discussed in some depth various aspects of the formulae to determine the Regents and Chancellors Scholarships, including SAT I v. SAT II and high school non honors gpa v. honors gpa. The formula used in previous years included only non honors gpa and SAT I (600 x HonorsGPA + SAT). It was decided to include the SAT II scores in the ranking. But in order to decide on which gpa to use, the Committee requested additional information from Leslie Nelson (Undergrad Admissions) concerning the number of schools offering honors courses and from Sheryl Hayes (Financial Aid Office) on how the previous year’s students would have been ranked had we used the honors gpa.

2. The Committee met on December 17, 2001 and decided to use an overall ratio of gpa to SAT scores of 1.5:1. The SAT component would include SAT I and the top 2 SAT II scores since many students often lack a score for the third SAT II test due to the Score Choice System. The Committee decided to compare the rankings of applicants based on 2 different formula – one in which the honors gpa was used, the other in which an average of the honors and non honors gpa was used. The reasoning behind the two rankings was to ensure that students were not disadvantaged for not having access to honors classes and yet at the same time to encourage students to continue to take honors classes when they are available to them.

The two ranking systems are:

System/Rank 1 = (1066 x Honors GPA) + SAT I + SAT II (Top2 scores)

Example: 1066 x 4.5 (assume the highest) + 1600 + 1600 = 8000
          4800 gpa v. 3200 SAT
          1.5 gpa v. 1.0 SAT

System/Rank 2 = (1130 (ave. of honors and non honors gpa)) + SAT I + SAT II (top 2)

Example: 1066 x 4.25 (assume the highest) + 1600 + 1600 = 8002.5
          4802.5 gpa v. 3200 SAT
          ~1.5 gpa v. 1.0 SAT
The number of honors points included would be capped at 8.

3. The Committee met on February 1, 2002 and compared the two different rankings systems of the students. It was noted that there were ~31 students with a System 1 ranking of less than 500 (a ranking of 1 being the highest) that were ranked at greater than 500 with System 2. Therefore, it was decided to offer Regent’s Scholarships to the top 500 in the System 2 system as well as to all students who ranked 500 or less in the System 1 system, for a total of ~531 offers. It was felt that in this way that the maximum number of outstanding students would be offered Regent’s Scholarships. A sporadic check of the schools that the top ranking students were from who had no honors points did not yield any clear pattern of schools from a certain area or of a certain type. It was noted that including only the top 2 of the SAT II scores was a good strategy, as many of the students on the list did not have a third score.

The Committee also unanimously approved to offer Chancellor’s Scholarships to the remainder of the applicants on the list (all those students with any gpa of 3.65 or above and a combined SAT I score of 1300 or any single score of 710 or better, criteria established in previous years).

Finally, the Committee examined the list of ELC students who did not make the Chancellors/Regents list but none of those students could be moved onto the Chancellors/Regents list due to a lack of additional information on those students. Furthermore, it was noted that since UCR had an excellent record in attracting a diverse student body, it needed to concentrate most on attracting the best, highest achieving students, not necessarily the students from the most diverse backgrounds.

4. The Committee will meet on May 23 to confirm the Carl Fuglie award, to make decisions on the Chancellor’s Award for Undergraduate Excellence and the UC President’s Undergraduate Fellowship and to decide whether to make any changes in the published criteria for the regent’s and Chancellor’s Scholarship selection.