November 7, 2007

TO: Members, Riverside Division
    Academic Senate

FM: Advisory Committee

RE: BOARS “UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal”

After considering the responses from the Committee on Educational Policy, the Committee on Preparatory Education and the Undergraduate Council, the Advisory Committee had a lengthy discussion of the BOARS “UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal,” and in the end, it resolved on the following.

The Advisory Committee heartily agreed with BOARS on the urgent necessity of a fundamental reconsideration of the current admission criterion and it congratulated BOARS for its innovative approach of suggesting an entirely new system rather than tinkering with the existing one. The plan, as the Undergraduate Council rightly noted, attempted to “move the identification of the top 12.5% of high-school graduates from the blunt instruments of eligibility to the more discriminating tools of selection.”

Towards that end, the Advisory Committee endorsed BOARS’ position that the mere taking of SAT II (regardless of performance) is an inappropriate, not to say absurd, criterion for admission; indeed several members were stunned to learn that it is currently used in the eligibility process. Thus to BOARS’ proposal to eliminate this requirement, the Advisory Committee can only echo Voltaire – écrasez l’infame!

For their boldness and their willingness to think outside of the standard bureaucratic box, the members of BOARS deserved a vote of thanks. Nevertheless the members of the Advisory Committee also echoed the concerns of the other Riverside committees and concluded, with considerable regret, that they could not endorse the current proposal. At the same time, the Advisory Committee members wish to encourage BOARS to rethink its plan in light of the attached reports. In particular, they would like BOARS to consider the following issues.

While the proposal does an excellent job in detailing the many problems with the status quo, it is markedly less persuasive in arguing how the new proposal would correct them. The anxieties that individuals inevitably feel over leaping into the dark are only compounded when a venerable institution ponders such a radical move. Consequently, the revised proposal should address this matter with as much precision as possible, sketching out in particular how the new proposal would result in a different freshmen class.
Furthermore the Advisory Committee was baffled by the need to abandon the traditional guarantee on admission to the top 1/8th of a graduating class. Admittedly, this does not guarantee admission to the UC campus of a student’s choice, but it remains a valuable public relations tool for a system whose PR toolbox can at times seems rather empty. While everyone expressed a willingness to consider an alternate admissions process, all became uneasy when the new plan appeared to include a unilateral repudiation of the 1960 Master Plan. While this document may have its flaws, it certainly has served the citizens of the state – and the university itself – exceedingly well. In the circumstances, the revision should avoid the slightest hint of altering the Master Plan. Perhaps the way out of this difficulty might be for the revision to stress its alignment with the Master Plan and to argue that the new scheme will simply alter the definition of the top 1/8th. The Advisory Committee also suggests that while the proposal is undergoing revision, BOARS should immediately implement a major change to the existing system. On any UC campus, up to 6% of the first year class can be admitted by exception even though they are not formally eligible for admission. This entry way into the university needs to be highlighted in all admissions materials, which should carefully rehearse the various criteria that students could mention in their application for admission by exception. In short, let us cast a floodlight in this accession point, which is currently somewhat shrouded in bureaucratic shadows.

Again, the Advisory Committee congratulates the members of BOARS for their diligence and encourages them to revise this potentially invaluable proposal.

T. Cogswell, Chair (Department of History)
W. P. Beyermann, Vice Chair (Department of Physics and Astronomy)
J. E. Allison, (Department of Political Science)
W. A. Ashmore, (Department of Anthropology)
C. Chase-Dunn, (Department of Sociology)
J. M. Ganim, (Department of English)
P. E. Green, (Department of Ethnic Studies)
J. Halebian, (Department of Management and Marketing)
A. S. Jacobs, (Department of Religious Studies)
D. Jeske, (Department of Statistics)
P. Keller, (Department of Philosophy)
M. L. Molle, (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
A. W. Norman, (Department of Biochemistry)
L. P. Nunney, (Department of Biology)
T. C. Patterson, (Department of Anthropology)
R. A. Redak, (Department of Entomology)
P. M. Sadler, (Department of Earth Sciences)
T. Shapiro, (Department of Comparative Literature & Foreign Languages)
K. Vafai, (Department of Mechanical Engineering)
F. M. Vahid, (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
October 31, 2007

TO:  THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
      RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:  PIERRE KELLER, CHAIR
      COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE:  PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC’S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) discussed at length the BOARS proposal to reform UC’s freshman eligibility policy during two of its recent meetings (10/17 and 10/24). The committee feels that the language of the proposal is insufficiently clear for implementation. The proposal argues that comprehensive review should determine admission to a UC campus, but dispenses with comprehensive review for those students defined as belonging to the top 4% of their class. A guarantee of UC admission is thus defined not just independently of UC eligibility, but also of the outcome of comprehensive review. The result is at best a confusing, and arguably a confused set of admission criteria lacking a coherent rationale (see below for more on this). Finally, we have concerns about the timeline under consideration for adoption of the proposal. The suggestion that the ETR policy ought to apply to freshmen first enrolling in the fall of 2009 is precipitous if students now in secondary school are not to be “adversely affected” by the proposed changes.

Under the proposal, some students are offered a guarantee of admission independently of and prior to any comprehensive review of their merits; according to “the BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal: Q and A,” the proposal would guarantee admission to those students whose honor weighted GPA in the UC approved college-preparatory curriculum (“a-g” courses) place them in the top 4% of their class. The offer of guaranteed admission to these students undercuts the rationale behind a comprehensive review of a student’s file. The proposal notes that “the continued reliance on a simple index for eligibility” with rigid minimums is “educationally unjustifiable”. This line of thought leads the proposal to recommend a comprehensive review of students by each campus to determine their eligibility for admission. But given the reservations about a “simple index of eligibility” expressed in the proposal, it is hard to see why a simple index guaranteeing admission would be appropriate.

The comparison with private institutions that engage in comprehensive review suggests that comprehensive review must include the whole applicant pool. Dividing the applicant pool into those who are guaranteed admission to UC and those who are eligible for comprehensive review by individual UC campuses leads to a confusing distinction between two different kinds of eligibility criteria. As such, it could easily be misconstrued as an effort by the UC system to move away from its guarantee to admit the top 12.5% of California students towards a more restrictive guarantee of admission only for the top 4% of students. If all students are subject to comprehensive review, this perceptual problem disappears, since those students admitted in the comprehensive review process define the top 12.5% of students, as UC understands that notion.

The Committee on Educational Policy will be happy to revisit the proposal if and when it is suitably modified and revised. Please let us know if you have any questions for us concerning our response to the proposal.
Dear Tom:

Here is a brief summary of points made by Committee on Preparatory Education members about the BOARS eligibility proposal after your visit. Members present at the meeting generally agreed with the proposal's claim that the current method of determining UC eligibility is problematic, especially in its use of SAT II exams. Current eligibility standards do warrant revision. However, members also expressed concern about the apparent ambiguity of the policy BOARS is proposing as an alternative. By switching from a guarantee of admission if certain criteria are met to a guarantee only of "consideration for admission through comprehensive review," UC would be making the admissions process less transparent and hence more likely to arouse the public's suspicions of bias. Some might see it as a sneaky way to get around the ban on race-based admissions; others as a way for UC to be even more elitist than before. Given a public already anxious about UC's now-notorious lack of transparency in administrative salaries, this move toward lack of transparency in another area would seem to be particularly ill-timed. Members were not persuaded by the proposal's claim that this new approach would bring "much-needed clarity to the public message conveyed by UC admissions" promised in Section 5B (paragraph 2), fearing instead that the reverse would occur. One member expressed fear that the proposal would be interpreted by the public as "repudiating the compact"; another called the proposal "disingenuous" and "naive."

In addition, one committee member recommended that BOARS consider having students apply to UC as a whole, rather than to individual campuses. Any of the nine campuses could then admit the student and make a bid to recruit him/her. This might be especially helpful to campuses (such as UCR) that currently get fewer applications than Berkeley and UCLA. Other members of the committee liked this idea. We encourage the Advisory Committee to consider recommending it to BOARS.

Another area of concern for our committee was the possibly negative consequences for math preparation if applicants only have to complete 11 out of 15 a-g courses by the end of 11th grade. Would more students take only the minimum requirement for math (i.e., through Algebra II) rather than the recommended (but not required) four courses (i.e., through pre-calculus)? UCR cannot afford to have even more underprepared math students than we are already getting.

After the meeting ended, one member wrote in to expand upon his concerns about the potential for unfairness in the revised policy advocated by BOARS:

My general response to the BOARS recommendation is that it transforms the admissions system in a way that threatens the very existence of comprehensive review. In our current system the UC campuses can use comprehensive review so extensively because they are fortified by UC's guarantee of UC admission to students who meet clear and definite requirements. Those requirements provide what is generally accepted, though not in all quarters, as a fair frame within which the comprehensive reviews do their work. The requirements of that framework are accepted as fair largely because they are accessible and comprehensible to persons other than insiders, and because they depend upon clearly-defined academic goals toward which students, their schools, and their advisors can work.
The BOARS recommendations spend their energy on identifying what it considers to be unfairness in the results of UC's admissions policies. The report does not make a case for the fairness of the specific principles and requirements upon which it would base the new admissions policy. Fairness is much more than a perceived equality of results, and in fact an enrollment policy cannot be credible or fair according to California law if it is based fundamentally upon outcomes. Students and their schools need to know what they should work toward. Such and expectation is just. It in fact helps the UC system work with prospective students and their schools to improve their prospects of admission.

The state of California and all Californians have a right to expect a clear explanation of why some students are admitted and others are not. Confidence in the general process allows for measured exceptions, of which there are many (and many good ones, I think) in the current system. With our current system, some of those exceptions might conceivably be enlarged. The new admissions policy set forward by BOARS would universalize Berkeley's "black box" admissions system to the point that the future of comprehensive review would itself be jeopardized. BOARS has not shown that its new system is based on principles of fairness.

Thank you for your illuminating visit to our committee. We hope you will come again soon!

Best,
Deborah

Deborah Willis
Chair, Committee on Preparatory Education
and Associate Professor
Dept. of English
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

office phone: 951-827-1939
email: deborah.willis@ucr.edu
November 1, 2007

TO: THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: PETE SADLER, CHAIR
      UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: BOARS PROPOSED REFORM OF FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY

Undergraduate Council respectfully submits its review of BOARS proposal to reform freshman eligibility for admission to the University of California.

Council Members:
   P. M. Sadler, (Department of Earth Sciences) [Chair]
   C. Allgor   (Department of History) [On leave Fall quarter]
   C. Amrhein (Department of Environmental Sciences)
   P. Chatterjee (Department of Women's Studies)
   M. Faloutsos (Department of Computer Science & Engineering)
   J. M. Heraty (Department of Entomology)
   P. M. Johnson (Department of Political Science)

Ex-Officio and Guest Members:
   L. Lundgren  AVC Enrolment Management
   M. Campos   Undergraduate Admissions Director
BOARS PROPOSED REFORM OF FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY

SUMMARY
The changes proposed by BOARS move the identification of the top 12.5% of high-school graduates from the blunt instruments of eligibility to the more discriminating tools of selection.

Currently, the University of California determines which freshman applicants are eligible for admission by a convenient formulaic consideration of quantifiable achievement without regard to the applicant’s circumstances. In the second phase of the admission process, each campus may select from this eligible pool by re-evaluating achievement in the context of the opportunities available to each applicant as revealed by a comprehensive analysis of the whole application. The initial eligibility threshold is adjusted to meet our mandate to draw from the top 12.5% of high school graduates. The comprehensive review allows us to meet our mandate to represent all portions of the State. In essence, the proposed new framework simply moves the identification of the top 12.5% (which task is also mandated to the University) to the comprehensive review of the entire application at the campus level. To enable this selection process, the current pool of eligible applicants is replaced by a somewhat broader pool that is “entitled to review” at the campus level. The enlargement is achieved in part by relaxing the GPA threshold and not requiring SAT II test-taking, while allowing UC campuses to the select markers of excellence they will consider in choosing students consistent with the current comprehensive review process. The mandated 12.5% would be maintained by setting enrolment limits for each campus.

The proposed change should be encouraged to the extent that it empowers the Academic Senate to devise criteria that more intelligently and fairly select applicants likely to succeed at UCR, while not jeopardizing our chances of reaching the enrolment targets needed to fund our programs. The best interests of the UCR faculty are served by admitting the most able students. Comprehensive evaluation of achievement in the context of opportunity and circumstance is the best route to this goal, especially for applicants close to the current eligibility barrier. It allows us to avoid two errors of admission for this group of applicants: admitting less able applicants and not considering more able applicants, based solely on their position relative to the formulaic eligibility limit. The proposed changes can allow UCR to better serve the Inland Empire, where educational opportunity and family circumstance too rarely confer any advantage. Because the proposed change could also alter the balance of the intercampus competition for the best applicants, UCR should be concerned about the implementation of the new policy. Of particular concern are the allotment and enforcement of campus enrolment ceilings and the mechanisms for prompt referral of applicants to campuses other than their initial preferences. Finally, any plan to raise admission standards ought to be coupled with plans to improve retention.
1. GOALS OF THE ADMISSIONS PROCESS
The interests of members of the Academic Senate are best served by admitting those applicants with the greatest likelihood of succeeding at U.C. Riverside and helping us add impressive cohorts of alumni that attract more and better applicants. This quest for the best must be undertaken through a process that honors two state mandates:

- The Organic Act of 1868 charges the University of California “according to population, to so apportion the representation of students, when necessary, that all portions of the State shall enjoy equal privileges therein.” (sec. 14).
- The 1960 Master Plan for higher education directed the University of California to draw from the top 12.5% of high-school graduates, leaving criteria for identifying the “top” to the University

Accordingly, Regents’ policy (RE-28, 2001) directs us to seek and enroll students “with high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompass the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.” The current admissions process, devised by Academic Senate committees and with the Regents’ approval, attempts to achieve these goals in two stages.

2. THE CURRENT TWO STAGE ADMISSION PROCESS
To appreciate the logical simplicity of the proposed changes, it is essential to distinguish between the two stages of the current admission process – “eligibility” and “selection.” Although the distinction is not everywhere well understood, the process is widely believed to have the virtue of “transparency” and to confer a “guarantee of admission.” As a prelude to our evaluation of the proposed changes, we offer a brief summary of these four concepts and their significance to UCR.

2.1 ELIGIBILITY is a system-wide determination designed to identify that top 12.5% of high-school graduates from which the campuses may select applicants for admission. Eligibility is determined by conveniently simple formulaic measures of raw achievement, but four pathways have been devised in an attempt to achieve some degree of equal representation.

- “Eligible in the Local Context” are students in the top 4%, by GPA, in every Californian high school. These applicants must take 11 courses in the UC “a-g” subject categories by the end of the junior year and plan to take SAT subject tests. (The proposal would not change this pathway, except to remove the requirement to take SAT subject tests.)

- “Eligible in the Statewide Context” are the majority of applicants. They exceed a minimum GPA- and SAT/ACT-based index of raw achievement that is adjusted to limit the sum of statewide and locally eligible applicants to approximately 12.5% of graduates. These applicants are also required to complete a set of “a-g” courses and take examinations. (The proposal would expand membership in this category but change its status to “entitled to review” reflecting the intent to identify the top 12.5% using the fairer and more insightful selective processes of comprehensive review.)
• "Eligible by Exam" are 200-300 applicants each year who achieve unusually high examination scores but are technically ineligible in the local and statewide contexts. This pathway can admit talented students who did not follow a traditional high-school curriculum. (No change is proposed.)

• "Ineligible but Admitted by Exception" (A-by-E) is a pathway that allows campuses to admit students with extraordinary talents who would be unreasonably disqualified from all other pathways. The thresholds for A-by-E to UCR% are determined by Undergraduate Council and reviewed annually. No more than 6% of admissions on any campus may use this escape clause. (No change is proposed.)

Eligibility sets a sharp limit in terms of raw achievement below which UCR may not effectively seek applicants with the ability to succeed on our campus. It invites us to make two kinds of error: admitting applicants whose above-the-limit achievements are actually unimpressive, given the rich opportunities available to them; and not admitting (perhaps not even seeing) applicants whose below-the-limit achievements indicate superior talent and perseverance, given their lack of opportunity. The ability to search intelligently for "good risks" among students near the current statewide eligibility limit is particularly critical for a campus like UCR. It matters less to flagship campuses that seek "best bets" by drawing primarily from applicants with the highest eligibility indices. For these campuses, eligibility is already hardly relevant.

2.2 SELECTION (also called "comprehensive review") encompasses all the local processes by which individual campuses select and de-select from their eligible applicants and make offers of admission. Selection is based on a potentially comprehensive evaluation of each applicant’s achievement in the context of their individual opportunities and circumstances. It offers the best opportunity to apply scholarly insight to predict ability and the likelihood of success.

Campuses choose mechanisms and criteria for selection that meet broad system-wide guidelines. Selection may be based on a subjective summary of the entire application file (e.g. at UCB and UCLA), on a weighted numerical formulation of achievement and opportunity (e.g. at UCD and UCR), or a hybrid of these two approaches.

Until recently, UCR was considered to be one of only 2-3 non-selecting UC campuses. This was surely a disadvantage to our reputation among potential applicants. We are now selective; that is, a selection process developed by Undergraduate Council is in place and leads to the de-selection of a small number of applicants each year. In order to become more effectively selective, we need to chose from a larger pool of applicants. The plan is to migrate from a formulaic process to a fully nuanced reading of applicant files in which the Academic Senate’s guidelines for selection gain greater influence on the quality of students that attend our classes. The proposed changes in eligibility will likely hasten this transition.

2.3 A GUARANTEE OF ADMISSION? Eligibility is widely perceived to bestow upon applicants a guarantee of admission to the U.C. System, though not necessarily to a campus of their choice. Fulfillment of the guarantee depends upon campuses that seek to enroll more students than can be attracted from those that apply to them directly. It is achieved by the
"referral pool." As a mechanism to keep good applicants within the U.C. system, the referral pool is not very effective. Only about 6% of eligible applicants who are not selected by campuses of their choosing then accept offers from other campuses. In other words, applicants seek admission to campuses of their choice not to the system as a whole.

For UCR's enrolment goals, the referral pool is a source of small but significant numbers of students whose academic achievements are higher on average than those of our direct applicant pool. It is likely that the referral process could be more effective for us, if referrals could be made sooner. It is not an admission pathway that we should lightly relinquish. Academic and staff representatives from UCR have ensured that the proposed eligibility changes retain some referral mechanism and seek to increase its efficiency.

2.4 THE VIRTUE OF TRANSPARENCY lies in the perceived simplicity of the eligibility formula. But is it selection, not eligibility, that determines whether or not applicants achieve the admission decisions they want. Transparency allows applicants to estimate their own eligibility – based on quantified achievement (test scores and raw GPA) alone. Transparency also carries the risk that able students may de-select themselves (decide not to apply) even though a proper analysis of achievement in context would have found them better able to succeed at a UC campus than some eligible applicants. These worries are most acute in the Inland Empire and near the lower limit of eligibility where UCR seeks to meet its enrolment targets.

3. ADVANTAGES OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES
Admission to the UC system is currently a complex process. Its various parts serve different constituencies and have different advocates. Of the many ways to summarize the proposed changes we take one that is simple and most relevant to UCR: the changes proposed by BOARS move the identification of the top 12.5% from the blunt instruments of eligibility to the more discriminating tools of selection. The proposal would encourage the best practices of comprehensive review to become the major pathway to admission throughout the UC system and eliminate some indefensibly arbitrary aspects of eligibility.

In order to allow selection of the top 12.5%, the statewide pool must be enlarged somewhat and accorded a different status – "entitled to review." The guarantee of admission is replaced by a guarantee of comprehensive evaluation that considers the opportunities afforded by the local school system and the circumstances of family and neighborhood. The pool would be enlarged by relaxing the GPA threshold to an unweighted GPA of 2.8 in all a-g courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades. This was the eligibility cut-off until the most recent adjustment to 3.0 was applied to limit the pool to 12.5%. To be entitled to review, students must complete 11 of the 15 required courses by the end of the 11th grade and the full 15 will be required before enrolment. They must also take the SAT reasoning test or the ACT with writing, but will not be required to take the SAT subject tests.

The enlargement of the pool will be balanced by campus enrolment targets that limit the system to 12.5% of the graduating seniors.
UCR should be able to search for talent more effectively in the new pool. We may still use mitigating criteria such as first-generation college attendance and low family wealth, but may apply these insights to applicants just below the current eligibility limits. This year UCR was permitted to consider students at the old GPA threshold of 2.8.

Eligibility in the local context includes some allowance for circumstance, it remains essentially unchanged. Eligibility by exam and admission by exception provide safety nets to catch those rare unconventional applicants whose achievements are considerable, but not conveniently captured by the eligibility formula; these safety nets remain unchanged.

4. CONCERNS ABOUT PERCEPTION

Although the proposed changes can benefit UCR, they will surely provoke criticism from various constituencies. While welcoming the changes, we should be prepared to manage our image with the public and in the press. Some of these criticisms will be unfair and might have been avoided had the proposal been worded or presented differently.

Proponents of the guarantee of admission may charge that it has been unfairly cut from 12.5% to 4%. In fact, the top 12.5% will still be offered admission, but the members of the top-12.5% pool will be selected with fairer and more logical consideration of the circumstances of their achievements. There might seem to be room for a middle way in which an upper portion of those currently eligible in the statewide context would retain this status and an enlarged lower portion would become entitled-to-review. This would, of course, increase the complexity of the pathways to admission and still leave one substantial pathway in which achievement is measured without regard to context.

Guardians of the Master Plan may charge that the University is opening its doors to more than the allotted top 12.5%. The faculty may worry that the changes will admit more poorly prepared students. In fact the proposal seeks fairer and better justified predictive measures of the ability to succeed. These measures should enable some campuses, like UCR, to enroll better prepared students without changing the number of admissions. As the statewide pool of potential applicants shrinks in coming years, our Inland Empire pool is predicted to grow. But relatively few school children in our school districts are advantaged by educational opportunity or family circumstance. As part of a strategy to serve this region more effectively, we can take advantage of the proposed replacement of the eligibility index by entitlement to comprehensive review.

Champions of standardized tests will likely be distressed by the proposal that SAT II subject tests no longer be required. Many studies show that these tests add very little to the predictive power of the GPA alone for identifying potential success in college. More significantly, the current eligibility threshold requires only that a prospective student take one of these tests and ignores their achievement on it. Mere test-taking was a simple means to limit the size of the eligible pool; it is not a logically justifiable measure of ability. A CPEC study from 2003 estimated that this test-taking requirement eliminated 10,000 students who completed the SAT and required a-g courses, graduated with GPAs of 3.5 or better, but did not take the subject tests. Estimates based on the California Basic Educational Data System indicate that only 35% of African American and 38% of Chicano/Latino students, for example, who complete the a-g
course requirements take the subject exams. Mere test-taking is hardly a measure of achievement but it appears to prevent the eligible pool from representing the State and capturing the top students.

5. CONCERNS ABOUT IMPLEMENTATION
Although the proposed changes have defensible goals and potential benefits to UCR, we should be vigilant about the details of implementation. Our campus calculation of the number of offers of admission needed to meet our enrolment targets have been developed through hard-won experience in a context of competition with other campuses, notably UCI. As all campuses adjust their practices in response to the proposed changes, our staff will be challenged to modify their calculations in response. We will need assurances that system-wide mechanisms can hold campuses to the admission limits that will be set to meet our 12.5% mandate. We must seek assurances that the new referral procedures will yield at least as many able students as at present. In short, the advantages of the “Power of Ten” need to be realized and enforced.

To implement comprehensive review we must train and pay for skilled readers. It may be true that the quality of our enrolled student body should not be compromised merely to reduce the cost of the admission process. It may be claimed that the Academic Senate should identify best policies without regard to cost. Nevertheless, we should ask whether other services will be compromised to pay for comprehensive review. This concern could be reduced by implementing some system-wide sharing of insights gained from the reading of applications – an idea that appears to have support at UCOP. Currently the vast majority of applicants’ files are read at UCLA and/or UCB. UCLA has shown recently that selection procedures can be swiftly and radically changed, with assistance from a sister campus (UCB). Cost estimates at UCB indicate that, once comprehensive review is well developed, the cost of reading a file is substantially less than the application fee.

If SAT II subject exams are no longer required, the practices of some committees, Honors and Scholarships for example, may need to be modified.

6. ADMISSION AND RETENTION
UCR’s admission targets include some allowance for students who leave prior to graduation. We should be able to reduce our admission targets and increase our selectivity by reducing attrition. There is surely an unfortunate cycle in which admission of more poorly prepared students leads to lower retention rates which, in turn, requires admitting more students. Consideration of freshman admission policy ought to be coupled with plans to improve our retention rate.
September 12, 2007

TO:  PIERRE KELLER, CHAIR
     EDUCATIONAL POLICY

     P.M. SADLER, CHAIR
     UNDERGRADUATE COUNCIL

     THEDA SHAPIRO, CHAIR
     PREPARATORY EDUCATION

FM:  THOMAS COGSWELL, CHAIR
     RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC’S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

On behalf of Chair Brown, the attached proposal to reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy is being sent out for your review. The proposal, which would substantially alter UC’s existing eligibility policy, was presented at the June 27, 2007, Academic Council meeting, where Council agreed to send out the proposal for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

Please forward your committee’s response to me by October 31, 2007.

Attachment (1)
Dear Colleagues:

The enclosed document is being forwarded for your review and comments. As background information, BOARS voted unanimously to endorse the BOARS Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy at its May 4, 2007 meeting. The proposal, which would substantially alter UC’s existing eligibility policy, was presented at the June 27, 2007, Academic Council meeting, where Council agreed to send out the proposal for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

The Council would very much appreciate receiving responses by December 5, 2007. Please be advised that the practice of the Academic Council for general reviews is to send the comments to all Systemwide Committees. Each committee may decide whether or not to opine. Please notify the Senate Office either directly, by emailing Executive Director María Bertero-Barceló (maria.bertero-barcelo@ucop.edu), or through your Committee Analyst, if your committee chooses not to participate in this review.

Sincerely yours,

John B. Oakley, Chair
Academic Council

Encl: 1
Copy: María Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director
Divisional Senate Directors
Academic Senate Committee Analysts
June 11, 2007

JOHN B. OAKLEY, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: BOARS’ UC Freshman Eligibility Reform Proposal

Dear John,

I am pleased to report that BOARS, at its May 4, 2007 meeting, unanimously endorsed the enclosed UC Freshman Eligibility Reform proposal. As you know, this year the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) has undertaken a comprehensive examination of UC’s freshman eligibility policy. Presentation of BOARS’ UC Freshman Eligibility Reform proposal to the Academic Council this month is an exciting threshold for BOARS, which looks forward to continued work to see this proposal to its fruition with the Board of Regents next year.

On behalf of BOARS, I respectfully request that the Academic Council approve BOARS’ UC Freshman Eligibility proposal to be distributed for systemwide Senate review.

I look forward to Council’s action at the June 27 meeting.

Best wishes,

Mark M. Rashid, Chair
BOARS

Encl: 1
cc: BOARS
    Maria Bertero-Barcelo, Executive Director, Academic Senate

MMR/mr
A PROPOSAL TO REFORM UC'S FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY POLICY

Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
16 May, 2007

I. SUMMARY

At present, UC determines who, among California's graduating high-school seniors, is in the top one-eighth based on an Eligibility Index involving GPA and standardized test scores. California's Master Plan for Higher Education instructs that UC should "draw from" this portion of the graduating class for its freshman entrants. UC has long construed this Master Plan provision to imply a guarantee of admission, somewhere in the system, to all students who meet the GPA/test score Eligibility Index.

In recent decades, space limitations have obliged most campuses to select from among their UC-eligible applicants, with a few campuses becoming extremely selective. Selection for freshman admission to a particular UC campus is made on the basis of a comprehensive review of the entire application file, which contains much information about academic and non-academic achievements, as well as the circumstances and context in which those achievements were made. Admission to the UC system (i.e. UC eligibility), on the other hand, is based simply on course-taking and GPA in those courses, and test-taking and scores on the required tests. UC eligibility engenders rigidly-enforced criteria which are, individually, arbitrary and difficult to justify educationally. Further, recent data suggests that eligibility depends heavily on merely taking UC's required pattern of standardized tests, which itself is not an educationally valid metric of academic achievement.

In short, UC's values and goals in freshman admissions, with respect to both academic quality and equity in access to the University, would be better served by establishing eligibility for UC on the basis of a complete review of each UC aspirant's qualifications. Accordingly, a replacement for the existing eligibility policy is proposed. The main purpose of the proposed change is to invite applications from a larger number of qualified applicants, and then use full information from the application itself to decide which applicants are truly in the top one-eighth.

II. BACKGROUND

Freshman admission to the University of California is defined by two main concepts: eligibility and selection. Eligibility identifies students who are invited to apply, and simultaneously guarantees them admission to the UC system, though not necessarily to a campus to which they apply. Selection is the process by which campuses choose from among applicants. Since 2001, selection has employed "comprehensive review" of each entire application. The eligibility concept originated in 1960, and since 1968 has relied only on the grade-point average across all UC-approved courses, and test scores.

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education instructs UC to "draw from the
top one-eighth” of the State’s graduating high school seniors. This stipulation has, since 1988, been interpreted as a guarantee that UC will admit, to some campus in the system, all California high school graduates in the top one-eighth who apply. Eligible status does not, however, guarantee admission to a campus of the applicant’s choosing. Applicants who wish to enroll at a campus with more eligible applicants than space permits must be selected by that campus. At present, seven of the nine general campuses are obliged to select from among their eligible applicants. The Riverside and Merced campuses currently admit all eligible applicants who apply to them. To fulfill UC’s guarantee of admission, UC-eligible applicants who are not admitted to any campus to which they apply are referred to Riverside and Merced for admission. These referral-pool admission offers are declined by the vast majority of their recipients: in 2006, only 6% of referral-pool admits submitted a Statement of Intent to Register.

The main route to UC eligibility – called “eligibility in the statewide context” – requires:

a) successfully completing a set of college-preparatory courses, described in UC policy as “a through g courses,” each of which has to be approved by UC at the student’s high school in order to count toward eligibility; b) taking UC’s full pattern of standardized tests, consisting of the SAT Reasoning exam or ACT with Writing, plus two SAT Subject exams in different a-g subject areas; and c) achieving test scores and an honors-course-weighted GPA in the a-g subjects that together exceed the threshold established by UC’s Eligibility Index. This Index specifies the minimum test scores required for a given GPA. At present, the minimum GPA required for eligibility is 3.0. The required test scores decrease as GPA increases above this minimum.

The California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) conducts a study every few years to estimate the number of the state’s graduating seniors who are UC-eligible. Based on these periodic studies, the Eligibility Index is adjusted to maintain the proportion of UC-eligible students at one-eighth the number of graduating high school seniors.

Beginning in 2000, an additional route to establishing UC eligibility was added: Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). Students whose honors-weighted GPA in a-g subjects places them in the top 4% of their junior class, as determined by transcript evaluations performed by UC, are deemed eligible, provided they complete their remaining a-g subject requirements and take all the tests required for eligibility in the statewide context. These students are therefore guaranteed admission somewhere in the system, as are statewide-eligible students. Although ELC students must still complete the full test pattern, the scores themselves do not affect their ELC status in any way. Near-total overlap exists in the two main eligibility pathways: over 95% of ELC students are also eligible in the statewide context. However, there is some evidence to suggest that UC’s congratulatory notification of ELC status stimulates some students who would not have done so otherwise to complete their a-g course requirements and then apply to UC.

A third, minor pathway exists, in which UC eligibility is established solely on the basis of very high scores on the required standardized tests. This pathway is maintained for the purpose of affording access by students who, for various reasons, cannot present the traditional evidence of academic achievement in the form of grades in approved a-g courses. The number of students who are eligible by this pathway alone is only a few
hundred each year.

Whereas admission to the system – i.e. eligibility – is determined solely on the basis of course-taking, GPA, test-taking, and test scores, selection by a particular campus is based on a comprehensive review (CR) of the applicant’s file. CR ideally uses all the information in the application, as well as information about the high school from which the applicant graduated. CR is governed by a single, overarching set of principles and criteria, but campuses have considerable latitude in the formulation of their specific processes and procedures. It is through CR that all facets of an applicant’s academic preparation and other accomplishments can be carefully considered, in the context of the opportunities and challenges inherent in their school and family circumstances. Campus-based CR processes range in character from numerical formulas to more holistic judgments. In all cases, CR processes are subject to extensive guidelines, rigorous norming, and continuous monitoring of the results to ensure objectivity and consistency. In conformance with California state law, race, ethnicity, gender, and national origin do not enter into the decisions made under CR in any way.

Eight of the nine general campuses currently conduct CR processes. The newest campus, UC Merced, will likely develop its own CR process in due course. Campuses vary considerably in their levels of selectivity. Two campuses, Berkeley and Los Angeles, could be called hyper-selective: they are able to admit only about one-quarter of their UC-eligible applicants. In recent years, the Santa Cruz campus has found it necessary to select from among its eligible applicants, and currently admits about three-quarters of its eligible applicants. UC Riverside has in recent years come very close to the selectivity threshold, and consequently has conducted a CR process in anticipation of becoming fully selective. UC Merced is currently able to admit all UC-eligible applicants that apply. The other four general campuses (San Diego, Irvine, Santa Barbara, and Davis) generally select for admission between 40% and 60% of their eligible applicants.

III. RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSED POLICY CHANGES

Regents’ policy directs UC to “… seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.” UC seeks to identify and admit freshman entrants who have prepared well by challenging themselves academically, and who have successfully met these challenges. Admissions criteria should directly relate to, and accurately measure, the applicant’s potential for success in college and beyond. These criteria should be applied in ways that fairly evaluate each applicant’s potential to benefit from, and contribute to, the university experience. Fixed, minimum measures on any particular criterion are inherently arbitrary, are difficult to justify educationally, and should be avoided. Admissions decisions should always be made with due regard for the challenges and opportunities inherent in each applicant’s circumstances.

UC’s present collection of admissions policies falls short of these aspirations in a number of important ways:

1) The current procedure for determining UC eligibility fails to use all the available
information about applicants. By relying entirely on the grade point average and test scores, current eligibility procedures ignore everything else in a student's application, which includes pages of information about special academic attainments, leadership and other non-academic accomplishments, and a personal statement that allows applicants to explain their achievements in the context of their school and family circumstances. In addition, an applicant's achievements can and should be compared with those of other UC applicants who have similar profiles of opportunity and disadvantage. Quantitative studies show that using additional information, including information comparing a student to others from the same school, produces a more accurate prediction of who will succeed at UC. All selective private colleges and universities use some form of comprehensive review rather than a simple index of grades and test scores. Individual UC campuses have in place procedures for whole-file review. Continued reliance on a simple index for eligibility therefore seems educationally unjustifiable.

2) Eligibility, as presently constructed, contains rigid minimums that lack sound educational justification. The current eligibility requirements consist of a set of minimums, none of which by itself can be justified on educational grounds as a requirement for UC admission. For example, failure to complete a single required course on the a-g list renders a student ineligible, even if the school does not offer enough sections of that course to permit all students to take it, or no one told the student that the course was required for UC, or the student actually did take the course but the school failed to submit the required paperwork to UC for course certification. A 2004 CPEC report1 estimated that about 1.9% of California school graduates – 6500 students – took all the required exams, and achieved a GPA and test scores that met the eligibility index, but failed eligibility because of a single a-g course deficiency. Other studies have found that only 45% of California's public high schools offer enough sections of a-g courses to permit all students to satisfy UC requirements2. The course minimums therefore exclude many students who failed to satisfy the requirement through no fault of their own. Similarly, the statewide Eligibility Index requires unvalidated minimum test scores, a practice contrary to best practices in admissions testing (see the National Academies Press' 1999 "Myths and Tradeoffs: The role of Tests in Undergraduate Admissions," the recommendations of test producers including ACT Inc. and the College Board, and the 1999 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing (AERA, APA, NCME)). Finally, in light of the highly varied grading practices and access to GPA-enhancing honors courses, both between and within schools, the GPA minimum for eligibility is itself suspect. Taken together, these realities indicate that many graduating high school seniors who are academically strong and would perform well at UC are denied eligibility because they fail to meet just one of the minimum requirements.

3) For all its apparent simplicity in concept, the actual determination of an individual student's eligibility can be quite complicated. Aside from the a-g course-taking

1California Postsecondary Education Commission, “Factors Limiting Eligibility for the University of California” (OP/04-03), December 2004.
requirement, the testing requirement, and the Eligibility Index, the policy contains extensive provisions relating to grade levels in which some of the required courses must be taken, mechanisms for “validating” missing courses either by subsequent courses in an area of “sequential knowledge,” relevant standardized-test performance, or by other means; determination of grade points for repeated courses, etc. Some high schools do not maintain up-to-date lists of UC-approved courses on the “Doorways” web site, and students in those schools therefore may not get credit for some courses that should satisfy a-g requirements. Students from advantaged backgrounds who attend well-resourced schools with strong college-going cultures are likely to have access to the guidance needed to negotiate the bureaucratic complexities of UC eligibility. For example, such students are likely to receive strong advice to take UC-certified English courses beginning in the 9th grade, and thereby remain on track to complete the required four years of English by the end of the 12th grade. On the other hand, students from schools that send few students to UC, and/or whose parents and teachers cannot provide ready UC guidance, are placed at a disadvantage. It bears mention that the requirements of eligibility must be, and are, strictly enforced, because eligibility confers a valuable commodity – a freshman admission slot at UC.

4) In practice, the impact of the testing requirement for eligibility depends almost entirely on whether or not a student takes the tests, not on the performance on the tests. Test-taking by itself is not an educationally justifiable criterion for admission. In its 2003 eligibility study, CPEC found that 14.4% of the state’s graduating seniors were fully UC-eligible. However, that is only slightly less than the 14.8% who completed the a-g curriculum as well as the full UC test pattern. Less than half a percent of the state’s graduating seniors are taking all required courses and tests, but failing to achieve eligibility due to inadequate performance. And, virtually all of these 0.4% missed the Eligibility Index by a very narrow margin. CPEC further found that the single most prevalent reason for ineligibility was simple failure to take the required SAT Subject exams. CPEC also reported that, among those who completed the a-g curriculum and took the SAT Reasoning exam but not the required SAT Subject exams, fully three-quarters would have become DC eligible if they had taken the SAT Subject tests and received scores at least equal to their SAT Reasoning-exam average. The state’s UC eligibility rate would thereby have jumped from 14.4% to 20.7%. Taken together, these facts indicate that eligible status is much more a matter of mere willingness to submit to test-taking or knowledge of UC’s testing requirement, than it is a rational assessment of academic achievement. Students who successfully complete the a-g curriculum and merely take the required battery of tests are very likely to be eligible.

5) The two SAT Subject tests required by UC are taken in subjects elected by the student. In quantitative studies, BOARS has repeatedly found that, while the predictive power of all standardized admissions tests is quite modest, scores on these elective subject tests make a negligible contribution to predictions of initial academic performance at the University. In 2006, UC’s required test pattern changed in response to changes introduced in the SAT Reasoning exam. These Reasoning-test changes, in turn, were compelled by then-president Atkinson’s call on the College Board to more closely align the SAT with the curricula that college-bound students are actually expected to learn before enrolling in postsecondary institutions. The College Board’s response
consisted mainly of incorporating the old SAT Subject test in Writing into the core Reasoning exam, along with some elements of the old SAT Subject Math level IC exam. Additionally, analogies were dropped from the old Verbal section of the core exam, as were quantitative comparisons from the old Math section. The ACT Assessment, on the other hand, did not change in response to President Atkinson's call, but an optional writing component (required for UC applicants) was introduced in order to provide a comparable alternative to the SAT Reasoning test for UC applicants. The extent to which these changes bring the SAT and the ACT into conformance with BOARS' 2001 testing principles remains under study. However, these new test configurations have, in the meantime, compelled a change in UC's required test pattern: prior to 2006, three SAT Subject tests were required along with the core exam, but two of the three were mandated to be the Writing and Math tests, with the third one in an elective subject area. With the inclusion of the Writing test and aspects of the Math Subject test in the core exam, the test pattern was changed to specify two SAT Subject tests, both in elective (but different) subject areas. Under the old test pattern, the Writing and Math Subject tests, but not the third (elective) test, showed reasonable predictive validity for freshman GPA. Thus, the only predictive elements of the old SAT Subject test requirement have been incorporated into the core exam, leaving a Subject test requirement that contributes very little to UC's ability to predict which applicants will perform well initially at UC.

6) **The SAT Subject test requirement, in particular, contributes to underrepresentation of certain groups.** From an analysis of 2004 CBEDS and College Board data, it is estimated that 54% of all a-g completers also took the eligibility-enabling SAT Subject exams required by UC. However, among African American students, only 35% of those completing the a-g curriculum also took the required SAT Subject exams. Among Chicano/Latino students the number was 38%. These gaps in SAT Subject test-taking behavior have a major negative impact on the size of the pool of high-achieving ethnic-minority students who are visible to UC.

7) **UC's eligibility construct denies certain UC campuses the benefits of selecting their admitted classes on the basis of a comprehensive review of each applicant.** For two campuses, eligibility serves as a *de facto* admissions process, with a third campus in nearly the same circumstances. For these campuses, the ideals of comprehensive review, whereby individual applicants are judged within the context of their own opportunities and circumstances and assessed against the campus's own goals in constructing classes, simply do not apply. Further, the admit pools for these campuses are artificially constrained by rather arbitrary requirements that bear little relation to actual academic achievement, as explained above.

8) **The prominence of existing eligibility requirements in official UC publications and**

---

3 These figures are only estimates. CBEDS (California Basic Educational Data System) contains estimates of a-g completion rates at California high schools, whereas the College Board maintains data on the number of California students who complete SAT Subject tests. CBEDS does not contain a-g data records for individual students, so it is not possible to match students between the CBEDS and College Board datasets. Accordingly, it is assumed that SAT Subject-test takers are also a-g completers. While this is an assumption, it is thought to be quite accurate, in light of the fact that any student who completes UC's distinctive required pattern of tests very likely intends to apply to UC.
presentations deters non-eligible students from applying, and therefore renders invisible to UC many graduating high school seniors who could potentially excel as UC students. The vast majority of California high school seniors who apply to UC do satisfy the formal requirements for eligibility. However, many other California seniors who have strong academic records in high school do not meet all the technical requirements for UC eligibility. Some of these currently non-eligible students would be more likely to succeed at UC than some of the students who are currently deemed eligible. But under existing procedures many of these academically talented students are not applying to UC.

IV. PROPOSAL FOR A NEW ELIGIBILITY POLICY

Following extensive study and deliberation, BOARS has concluded that UC’s current eligibility construct hampers and will prevent, if unaltered, the University from achieving its admissions objectives over the long term. Accordingly, BOARS proposes that the University change its admissions policies to better honor the values inherent in its status as an elite, publicly-funded land-grant institution of higher education.

The various elements of the existing eligibility policy are defined by UC Systemwide Senate Regulations 418, 420, 424, 428, 440, 450, and 476, and also by two Regents' policies. The policy changes recommended by BOARS will require substantial amendments to the above-listed Senate Regulations. The specific changes to Senate Regulations are not detailed here; instead, the recommended policy itself is described in full detail. In order for the proposed policy to take effect, The Regents would also need to make conforming amendments to the existing Regents' policies on undergraduate admissions and admission requirements. Accordingly, the present document should be understood as: 1) a recommendation to the Academic Senate to seek, through the President, regental approval of the proposed policy; and 2) pending regental approval of the proposed policy, a request to authorize BOARS and UCRJ to work together to draft the specific amendments to Senate Regulations required to effectuate the new policy. The draft SR amendments would then be subject to Senatewide review for clarity and conformance with the previously-approved policy.

Entitled to Review: Description of the Proposed Policy

BOARS recommends that the present practice of providing a guarantee of admission to all students who meet a narrow set of criteria based on course-taking, GPA, test taking, and test scores be replaced. The new policy would guarantee not admission, but consideration for admission through a comprehensive review at each campus of application, to all students who meet certain basic criteria of academic achievement. Guaranteed admission to the UC system, albeit not necessarily to the campus of a student’s choice, would continue to be extended to California-resident applicants who are found by UC to be in the top 4% of their high school graduating class, as is presently the case under the ELC program.

The details of the proposed “entitled to review” (ETR) policy are as follows:
1. All California-resident applicants who:

- complete a prescribed 11 of the 15 required a-g courses by the end of the 11th grade,

- achieve an unweighted GPA of 2.8 or higher in all a-g courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades, and

- take the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing,

would be entitled to a review (ETR) at each campus to which they apply. Submitted test scores do not affect ETR status, but may be used in comprehensive review. Students who are entitled to a review by this pathway are expected to complete the full set of 15 required a-g courses prior to enrolling. Failure to do so is grounds for cancellation of admission, although this is not automatic. The provisions of this paragraph are similar to the current "eligibility in the statewide context" policy, except that no SAT Subject tests are required, and test scores are immaterial in the determination of ETR.

2. The ELC program continues in essentially its present form: California-resident applicants with ETR status as described in paragraph 1 above, and who are found, by a UC transcript analysis, to be in the top 4% of their high school class at the end of the 11th grade, would be offered admission to at least one campus in the system, provided they complete the required 15 a-g courses prior to enrolling. The ranking used to determine the top 4% is to be based on uncapped, honors-weighted GPA in all a-g courses completed. No guarantee is made of admission to any campus to which the applicant actually applied. Applicants who are not admitted to any campus to which they applied would be referred for admission to campus(es) that are open for referral admission. It is noted that this "ELC only" referral pool would be much smaller than the referral pool under the present policy, which usually consists of several thousand applicants. This can be inferred from the fact that under the current policy, typically only about 100 ELC applicants end up in the referral pool. In contrast to the current policy, under the proposed policy ELC status would no longer require the taking of SAT Subject tests.

3. All applicants who achieve very high scores on a prescribed battery of standardized tests are accorded ETR status, irrespective of their high school records. The battery consists of the SAT Reasoning test or the ACT with its optional Writing component, and two SAT Subject tests in different subject areas. This test pattern is identical to the one required under the current eligibility policy. This testing-only provision in the ETR policy is similar to the existing Eligibility by Exam Alone pathway, the intent of which is to provide a route into UC for those applicants whose circumstances prevent them from presenting conventional academic credentials (e.g. home-schooled students). At present, the number of students eligible by this pathway alone is very small – typically 200-300.

4. Nonresident applicants who achieve an unweighted GPA above a prescribed
threshold in all a-g subjects taken in the 10\textsuperscript{th} and 11\textsuperscript{th} grades are accorded ETR status. The exact GPA threshold will be determined to maintain a similar proportionality between resident and nonresident ETR students as now exists among resident/nonresident UC-eligible students.

5. Students who miss ETR status under paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 above, but who nonetheless can demonstrate substantially equivalent academic preparation as determined by campus-based comprehensive review of their applications, are still invited to apply. Though not strictly entitled to a review, such students will generally receive a comprehensive review at each campus to which application is made. This provision is intended to avoid exclusion of students who, for example, have course records that reflect minor variances from the a-g curriculum, but whose overall academic records are clearly consistent with an ETR level of preparation and achievement. Students in this category whom a campus wishes to admit will be offered admission on a “by-exception” basis, entirely consistent with the existing Admission by Exception (A by E) policy. The A by E policy is a long-standing, regentally-approved mechanism by which applicants who are not strictly UC-eligible can be admitted to a campus. It is limited to a maximum of 6% of the enrolled freshman class, although in practice the A by E mechanism is used far less extensively even than this.

The intent of paragraph 5 is to allow some flexibility in the policy, so that no student is unduly penalized for circumstances that may be beyond the student’s control, or for minor variances from the a-g requirements in an otherwise strong record of achievement. This flexibility is compelled, among other factors, by the realities of K-12 education in California: many students attend poorly-resourced schools whose administrative capacities may not allow for diligent upkeep of UC-approved a-g course lists. Some students at these schools may pursue the most rigorous college-preparatory course of study available to them, but nonetheless fall victim to the administrative failings of their school in the matter of actually achieving a-g completion. Other reasons exist that can prevent high-achieving and high-potential students from attaining the technical requirements of ETR status. In light of the fact that ETR status guarantees only a review — for which the applicant pays a $65 fee for each campus to which application is made — and not admission, it would seem inappropriate to deny this benefit on the basis of a set of criteria that only tends to suggest promise, but does not precisely partition students into those with promise and those without.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

If the ETR proposal, as defined in the above section, is approved, conforming amendments to Senate Regulations will be drafted to enact its provisions. However, in order for this substantial change in UC admissions policy to reach its full potential, or indeed even to become fully effective, other changes in the admissions-policy landscape should be made. BOARS has identified two areas where concurrent changes would be beneficial: the comprehensive review guidelines, and admissions-process management. With respect to the former, recommendations to amend are within the purview of BOARS and the Senate. Admissions-process management, on the other hand, is an administrative function, and while Senate consultation is desirable from the standpoint of
achieving the best outcome, decisions about implementation are ultimately in the hands of the administration.

The following two sections outline BOARS' current thinking with respect to desirable future policy evolution in both the CR-guidelines and admissions-process management. BOARS believes that the plans described below represent a possible way forward that could maximize the benefit of the ETR policy. These plans are tentative at this stage, and subject to ongoing and broad consultation and input. BOARS' intention in describing these plans here is simply to illustrate the nature of the changes that would be desirable or required in the event that the ETR policy is enacted.

It is noted that no concrete implementation timeline is included here, because the required discussions between the Senate and the responsible administrative units have not yet occurred. A policy change of this magnitude obviously would need to be widely and publicly disseminated. UC's past practice has been to provide sufficient advance notice of changes to eligibility policy so that students now in high school are not adversely impacted. Therefore, BOARS expects that the ETR policy, if approved, would apply to freshman entrants who first enroll in Fall 2009 or after.

A. Revision of the Comprehensive Review Guidelines

The main policy document that governs campus-based comprehensive-review practices is entitled "Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions" (the "Guidelines"). Dating from 2001, the Guidelines have governed all CR practices beginning with the Fall 2002 entering class. The main provisions of the Guidelines include a statement of eight guiding principles, and an enumeration of 14 selection criteria that may be used by campuses in formulating their CR processes. Among the eight guiding principles of Comprehensive Review, the first two merit explicit mention here:

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant's academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.

2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.

Among the 14 selection criteria are the academic GPA, scores on UC's required pattern of standardized tests, the volume of and performance in a-g courses beyond the minimum required for eligibility, the "quality of academic performance relative to the academic opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school," and special talents. Also explicitly included is personal hardship or challenges that may have diminished the applicant's ability to demonstrate their full academic potential. The Guidelines do not address the relative weights assigned to the various criteria, nor do they require that specific criteria actually be used in a campus's CR process (beyond the stipulation that a broad variety of criteria should be used).
BOARS believes that the present Guidelines are conceptually sound and consistent with UC’s values. However, in light of the proposed ETR policy, BOARS also believes that an addition to the Guidelines is desirable in order to effectively guide the future evolution of campus-based CR processes. Specifically, BOARS proposes that a ninth principle be added:

The full course-work record, including courses taken in relation to what was available to the applicant, performance in them, and standing among the applicant’s peers along both of these dimensions, is the primary basis on which to assess academic achievement. Scores on standardized tests can be useful for enhancing subject-specific understanding of an applicant’s level of preparation, but should not be construed as providing an indispensable and independent measure of overall college readiness.

The intent of this additional CR principle is to make clear that a thorough analysis of the academic record, in all its various context-dependent aspects, is the critical element in any sound CR process. Test scores can and should be used for purposes of enhancing and confirming readers’ assessments of subject mastery, but are not to be considered indispensable measures of “overall college readiness.” Through this ninth CR principle, BOARS aims to discourage the rigid weighting of test scores in campus-based CR processes.

Also, because the proposed ETR policy does not include the SAT Subject test requirement of the existing eligibility policy, some adjustments to the language of Selection Criterion 2, which deals with test scores, is desirable. The following replacement language is proposed:

Scores on the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with its optional Writing component. Scores on other widely-administered standardized tests, such as SAT Subject tests or Advanced Placement exams, although not required, can be considered if submitted.

B. Guidance to Prospective Applicants

UC’s admissions policies serve the dual purposes of: a) determining the procedures by which applicants are admitted to the University, and b) signaling to students and their parents, and to schools, what UC considers appropriate preparation for freshman enrollment at the University. The supposed simplicity of the existing eligibility construct is often cited as supporting the signaling function, and is therefore promoted as a major strength of the existing policy. However, as explained in section III above, the determination of eligibility for an individual applicant can actually be quite complicated. UC’s admissions policies and practices have always been the subject of confusion and anxiety on the part of prospective students, their parents, and their teachers and counselors. This anxiety is due in part to the existence of two separate policy concepts – eligibility and selection. Public understanding of eligibility, selection, and the difference between them is extremely limited, and is highly heterogeneous across demographic groups.
BOARS believes that the changes proposed here offer an opportunity to bring some much-needed clarity to the public message conveyed by UC admissions. This clarity can be effected through direct, narrative communication explaining the values, goals, and criteria attending UC's admissions policy. This narrative statement should be fairly short, accurate with respect to all CR processes across the system, and meaningful to students seeking specific guidance on how best to prepare themselves for UC. BOARS recognizes that the public articulation of admissions policy, including any related guidance offered to students and their parents and counselors, is within the domain of the University's administration. However, as originator of the ETR proposal, BOARS believes that a collaborative effort between the administration and the Senate is likely to result in the most effective articulation of the policy to the public. It is in this spirit that the following is offered as a candidate narrative-guidance statement.

Admission to University of California campuses is competitive. UC seeks to admit students whose records demonstrate strong academic preparation, within the context of each student's educational opportunities. UC is also looking for evidence that applicants possess a level of maturity that will allow them to benefit from, and contribute to, the educational experience offered by the University. UC accords admission priority to applicants whose records indicate a willingness to challenge themselves academically, and an ability to rise to those challenges.

All aspects of your academic record will be taken into account, including:

- the courses you took and are now taking in high school,

- the courses available at your school,

- your course grades,

- how you did in comparison to other applicants from your school and from other schools,

- any special academic projects you undertook while in high school, and

- any improvement in your grades over your high-school years.

All standardized test scores that you submit will also be considered. These include your scores on the required SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing, as well as your scores on any additional standardized tests you may elect to take, such as SAT Subject tests or AP exams. UC uses test scores only to enhance our understanding of your mastery of specific subjects, and not as overall indicators of college readiness. Merely taking many tests does not, by itself, enhance your standing in UC's admissions process. In most cases, test scores are consistent with the coursework record. In these cases, the scores have neither a positive nor a negative effect on the admissions decision. In some circumstances, however, test scores can
provide important information not otherwise available to UC. Examples of these circumstances include:

- Your school does not assign conventional grades.
- You did not have access to a UC-approved a-g curriculum.
- You are missing one or more of the 15 required a-g courses.
- You feel that your grades in one or more subject areas do not reflect your true level of mastery of the subject.

In these circumstances, scores on standardized tests in the appropriate subject areas can help UC gain the understanding of your qualifications needed to make the correct admission decision. So, take the required SAT Reasoning test (or ACT with Writing), and in addition, strongly consider taking SAT Subject tests or AP exams if any of the above apply to you.

UC is also very interested in your experiences and achievements outside the classroom. The University views all your achievements in the context of the educational opportunities available to you through your school and otherwise, as well as in the context of particular challenges you may face in your life circumstances. Extracurricular achievements of all kinds can be important factors in admissions decisions, particularly if they are substantial and sustained, demonstrate leadership qualities, or make real contributions to the school, community, or society at large.

It is of the utmost importance to recognize that there is no single qualification or attribute that means certain admission or certain denial at any UC campus. Each year, each UC campus admits many students with very high grades but few if any extracurricular achievements. And, each year, each campus admits many students with more modest coursework performance, but exceptional records of leadership outside the classroom and/or of overcoming obstacles and challenges. The great majority of successful UC applicants fall somewhere between these extremes. Only you can decide how to spend your time as you prepare for college, but make academics a priority. Above all, if you apply your best effort to all that you do, it will show in your application, and you will have the best chance of being admitted to the UC campus of your choice.

C. Admissions-Process Management: Admission and Enrollment Targets

In order to effectively manage undergraduate enrollment, any UC freshman admission system must serve two essential functions: 1) It must provide for admission, somewhere in the UC system, of approximately one-eighth of California’s graduating seniors, as called for in the Master Plan; and 2) it should facilitate achievement of an enrolled freshman class on each campus that closely matches the numeric enrollment target on
that campus. Under the present admissions system, each of these functions is effectuated by a separate policy instrument: eligibility enforces the Master Plan, and campus-based selection serves to modulate freshman enrollment levels to match campus capacity. No consideration is given to the Master Plan at the level of campus-based selection. Likewise, periodic adjustments to the Eligibility Index are made only on the basis of CPEC eligibility studies, generally without consideration for matching enrollments with projected capacity.

Ultimately, capacity should grow with the enrollment demand dictated by the Master Plan's one-eighth provision and California's population of graduating high-school seniors. The participation rate, i.e. the proportion of California's graduating seniors who enroll at UC as freshmen, has remained fairly stable at between 7.5 and 8%. In light of this observation, UC's compliance with the Master Plan can alternatively be stated in terms of freshman enrollment, as compared to the population of graduating seniors. Under the proposed policy, although the number of students entitled to review is not directly regulated, the number of admits - and therefore the size of the enrolled freshman class - of course would continue to be regulated on each campus. Accordingly, the admission and enrollment data following each annual admission cycle could be analyzed to help determine how enrollment targets should be adjusted for the next cycle, in order to meet UC's Master-Plan obligations as well as its other institutional objectives.

It is clearly the case that the volume of applications would increase under the proposed policy. In fact, a major goal of the policy is to make better admissions decisions by reviewing more applications comprehensively. The associated fiscal burden would be partially if not fully offset by the additional revenue from the application fee, which at present stands at $60 for each campus to which an application is submitted ($70 for international applicants). In an effort to understand the possible magnitude of the application-processing increase, BOARS has studied estimates of the ETR pool based on the 2003 CPEC dataset. Those analyses suggest that the ETR pool would be perhaps 50% larger than the UC-eligible pool. Specifically, the 2003 CPEC study estimated a 14.4% UC eligibility rate, while BOARS' analysis based on the same data indicates a rate of 21.6% for the ETR pool. However, not all ETR students would apply to UC. A rough idea of potential application volume can be gained by considering the number of ETR students in 2003 who enrolled at any four-year college in the Fall. This is estimated at 15.4% of California graduating seniors. The proportion of ETR students who enrolled at any postsecondary institution, including two-year colleges, was 19.5%.

It is noted that opportunities presently exist to achieve economies in the read process, through sharing of application-read information between campuses. Any increase in application volume is likely to draw further attention to this fact. BOARS believes that much might be gained, both in terms of CR process improvement as well as efficiency, through collaborative sharing of application-read information among campuses with common applicants. BOARS further believes that these gains can be achieved while simultaneously respecting campus autonomy in the freshman selection process.

D. Admissions-Process Management: Application Referral

UC's current practice is to refer eligible applicants who are denied admission at all
campuses to which they apply, to one or more referral campuses for admission. In recent years, only the Riverside and Merced campuses have remained open for referral admissions. It is through this referral-pool mechanism that UC honors its commitment to admit all UC-eligible applicants. Although the yield rate for referral admission offers is very low (6% for Fall 2006 enrollment, or in the neighborhood of 1% of the systemwide entering freshman class), the referral pool does yield a not insignificant number of enrollees for the Riverside and Merced campuses. Further, the referral pool serves the important function of conferring a systemwide character to UC admissions.

BOARS believes that the proposed ETR policy offers an opportunity to strengthen the referral-pool mechanism, making it a more robust and attractive route into the University. In broad outline, one way to accomplish this might be as follows. In the course of comprehensively reviewing applicants, campuses could refer some applications to a central “recommended pool.” Campuses could elect to do this in cases where the applicant's credentials would seem to merit admission somewhere in the UC system, but where space limitations preclude an admission offer from the reviewing campus itself. An applicant in the recommended pool would be removed from the pool if any campus to which the applicant applied makes an admission offer. The remaining recommended pool would consist of applications that one or more campuses considered sufficiently strong to merit admission somewhere in the system, but which did not receive a favorable admission decision from any campus. All campuses would then be invited to consider applications in the recommended pool using their comprehensive review processes, and to extend admission offers as appropriate. A process of this sort, particularly if executed in a timely manner, might help to distribute the enrollment demand more uniformly across the UC system. It would also tend to preserve the systemwide character of UC freshman admission.
The BOARS Eligibility-Reform Proposal: Q and A

What changes is BOARS proposing?
BOARS is proposing two main changes. First, UC would invite a larger number of graduating seniors from California public high schools to apply for freshman admission. Students who have completed the UC-approved college-preparatory curriculum (the “a-g” courses), have achieved sufficiently high grades in those courses, and have taken the SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing would be entitled to review of their applications, and would be invited to apply. This “entitled to review” (ETR) pool would be somewhat larger than the current UC-eligible pool mainly because it does not involve a requirement that SAT Subject (previously called “SAT II”) tests be taken. Campuses would continue to select freshmen as they do now, using comprehensive review to consider all the information in the application, and to evaluate students’ achievements in the context of their school and personal circumstances.

Second, BOARS is proposing to substantially strengthen its commitment to identify and select from the top one eighth of California high school graduates, as mandated by the Master Plan for Higher Education. Currently, the “top one eighth” is identified via UC’s eligibility construct, which hinges primarily not on actual academic achievement, but instead on merely taking each one of the required high school courses and standardized tests. The BOARS proposal would replace this practice with a simpler and fairer system in which all students who meet specified criteria of college readiness would be guaranteed a comprehensive review of their applications. Alongside this statewide guarantee of a review, the top four percent of the class in each high school would be identified by grades in a-g courses, as is currently done to determine who is “Eligible in the Local Context.” These students, if otherwise entitled to a review, would be guaranteed admission somewhere in the UC system, just as they are now. If not accepted at any of the campuses to which they apply, they would be offered admission at another UC campus. This definition of who is eligible for guaranteed admission would be more transparent and fairer than the current definition, which relies heavily on participation in UC’s unique and extensive required test pattern. The remainder of the ETR pool beyond the top 4% would not be guaranteed admission, but would be guaranteed a comprehensive review of their entire application at each campus to which they apply.

Why is BOARS proposing these changes?
BOARS’ overarching goal is to better honor its Master-Plan obligations, and to strengthen UC’s commitment to the social contract they imply. If the proposal is enacted, two main benefits are expected to result. First, enriching the applicant pool should enable campuses to select a group of students who are better prepared academically. UC’s current requirements for guaranteed admission to the system, which are presented in UC publications and web sites, deter applications from some students who are academically strong, but whose records have some technical deficiency. For example, the 2003 CPEC study estimated that about 10,000 seniors completed the required a-g courses, took the SAT I, and graduated with GPAs of 3.5 or better, but were ineligible for UC because they did not take the required SAT II exams. If campuses could receive and review
applications from such students, they would likely find students who are better qualified overall than some students who are currently deemed eligible by the present version of the eligibility construct.

While eligibility, and therefore guaranteed admission to the system, involves meeting a GPA/test-score performance index, this index is set at such a modest level that nearly all students who take all required a-g courses and complete UC's test pattern are, in fact, UC eligible. At present, guaranteed admission to UC hinges primarily on students' course- and test-taking behaviors, and, to a much lesser extent, on the grades and scores they earn. Campuses can make better and more accurate decisions by reviewing all the information in the application, and by considering applicants' accomplishments in the context of their particular schools and personal circumstances. Not surprisingly, BOARS has found that considering other information from the application, in addition to average grades and composite test scores, does result in more accurate prediction of students' performance at UC.

The second expected benefit is better representation of California's various communities. Under current procedures, nearly half of UC's admitted freshmen come from high schools that account for only one-fifth of the state's public high school graduates, and the trend is toward more stratification, not less. UC's admitted freshmen come from households that have higher incomes and education levels than the general population of California. And the percentage of California high school graduates who are Chicano, Latino, African American or Native American is about two times bigger, and growing faster, than the percentage of UC freshmen from these groups.

The admission guarantee to the UC system, with its attendant rigidly-applied eligibility rules, has failed to attract high-achieving students from less-advantaged backgrounds. The current requirements for guaranteed admission instead favor students from high schools where curricula, counseling, and administrative procedures are geared toward maximizing the number of students who meet UC's requirements. These high schools tend to be affluent, enrolling relatively large proportions of white and Asian students. Enacting the BOARS proposal should increase the number of applications from the rest of the high schools. As the applicant pool draws from more high schools, it should also become more representative in terms of income, education, race, and ethnicity. A more representative pool should result in a more representative group of admitted freshmen. From this larger and more inclusive pool of applicants, campuses should be able to select students who are more qualified academically and who better represent California.

Why propose these reforms now?
During the past five years, all UC campuses have developed procedures for comprehensive review of freshman applications. These procedures take account of the whole array of information in the application, including various measures of academic achievement as well as leadership and other non-academic accomplishments, while considering, to varying degrees, each applicant's achievements in context.
Actual offers of admission have always been made by individual campuses. Most UC campuses now have more applicants than they can admit. The requirements for guaranteed admission to the UC system were developed in a previous era, before most campuses became selective, and before all the campuses had developed procedures for comprehensive review. Those earlier requirements, using only high school grades and test scores, no longer reflect the way UC campuses select students. But they are still publicized by UC as criteria for “eligibility,” and they deter some highly qualified students from applying. No other elite university, including those against which UC competes for students, guarantees admission to its admits based on such narrow criteria.

In short, the systemwide eligibility requirements have become obsolete. They now hinder UC’s effort to recruit and select the most qualified students.

What about the Master Plan? Doesn't it require a 12.5% eligibility rate for UC? California's 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education calls for UC to “draw from the top one-eighth” of the state's high school graduates for its freshman classes. Subsequent revisions clarify that UC should in fact guarantee admission to all California applicants in the top 12.5% of their graduating class. The Master Plan and its amendments explicitly leave it to the University to decide how to determine the top one-eighth. Accordingly, UC developed the present eligibility construct, which requires periodic recalibration so that about one out of eight graduating seniors are deemed eligible.

The BOARS proposal would continue this adherence to the Master Plan by limiting the total number of freshman admission offers to about one out of eight graduating seniors. It would also strengthen UC's commitment to the principles underlying the Master Plan by basing the determination of the top one eighth not on mere coursework and test participation, but on a thorough and complete review of each college-ready applicant's qualifications.

Does the BOARS proposal remove the guarantee of admission to UC for some students?

Students who are in the top four percent of their high school class would continue to hold an admissions guarantee, as is presently the case. However, those students who are not in the top four percent of their high school class, even if eligible under the current policy, would no longer be guaranteed admission to the UC system. Instead, they would be guaranteed an admission review at every campus to which they apply.

The existing guarantee does not seem to be highly valued by most of its intended beneficiaries. The guarantee means that students who are not admitted by any of the campuses to which they apply are placed in a referral pool, which gives them the option of attending a UC campus where spaces are available — in recent years, Riverside and Merced. For Fall 2006, fewer than six percent of the students who were given this option accepted it. Those who accepted these referral offers amounted to less than one percent of new UC freshmen that year.
Admission to a particular campus seems to matter more to students than admission to the UC system. The BOARS proposal would guarantee admission via the referral pool to fewer students, but would guarantee more students that their applications are thoroughly reviewed by the campuses to which they apply.

**Does the BOARS proposal mean that campus-based selection procedures will have to change?**

No, except possibly at Merced. Other campuses have already been using comprehensive review to select freshmen. Some campuses rely more on numerical formulas, others rely more on the judgment of trained readers. The BOARS proposal would not change these existing procedures. It would only increase the numbers of applicants subject to them. Campuses, via their divisional senates and ultimately their faculty admissions committees, would remain free to use the methods they think best to admit students, consistent with BOARS' systemwide comprehensive review guidelines.

**The BOARS proposal would not require applicants to take SAT Subject examinations. Does that mean UC would be lowering its academic standards?**

No, because the SAT Reasoning examination – the successor to the old “SAT I” exam – now includes a writing component. In fact the SAT Reasoning test incorporates the content of the old SAT II Writing test essentially in its entirety. The previous SAT I examination did not include writing. Statistical studies found that the previous SAT II Writing examination had a strong correlation with the academic performance of students at UC. However, among UC freshmen entering in fall 2006 — the first class that took the new SAT Reasoning test — statistical studies now find that the new SAT Subject examinations, which are taken in subjects elected by the student, do not add significantly to the accuracy of predictions of academic performance at UC, once scores on the Reasoning test are taken into account. It is also worth noting that the SAT Reasoning exam now includes substantial material from the old SAT II Math 1C exam, which was previously required of all UC applicants. Under UC's old test pattern, SAT I and SAT II math scores were highly correlated, and given the inclusion of much of the SAT II math material in the new SAT Reasoning test, it seems likely that this correlation will only increase. Taken together, these facts indicate that there is no longer a good reason for UC to keep requiring the Subject exams.

However, there may be circumstances under which specific SAT Subject exams, as well as other tests, may be useful to a campus in arriving at an admission decision. For example, although no campus or major can require specific SAT Subject exams as a condition of admission, many UC engineering programs recommend that their applicants submit a score on the SAT Math 2C Subject test. The BOARS proposal would in no way alter how campuses use scores on non-required examinations, such as SAT Subject and Advanced Placement tests. Campus-based majors are free to recommend particular exams, students are free to take the exams and submit the scores, and campuses are free to take them into account in making decisions. But students would be entitled to have
their applications reviewed if they meet the basic conditions — a-g courses, grades, and taking the SAT Reasoning or ACT with Writing — and do not take SAT Subject examinations.

Finally — and importantly — it is noted that very few students are currently rendered ineligible because of low SAT Subject test scores. In effect, what matters in the current eligibility construct is whether students simply take the tests, not how well they score. This is not an effective way to maintain high standards.

What will happen to Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC)?
The BOARS proposal provides for continuation of the ELC program in essentially its present form, except that taking SAT Subject exams will no longer be required to retain ELC status. Test scores have never played a role in determining eligibility under the program, by design.

Aren't there other ways of achieving the same goals without restructuring eligibility? What about Admission by Exception?
"Admission by Exception" (A by E) is a longstanding policy construct whereby campuses are permitted to admit ineligible applicants, not to exceed six percent of the enrolled freshman class. The original purposes of A by E were to allow campuses and the system to experiment with alternative admissions processes, to admit academically promising students whose profiles of disadvantage prevented them from achieving UC eligibility, and to attract students with extraordinary talent who failed eligibility for one reason or another. Some campuses use A by E primarily to admit sponsored athletes for intercollegiate sports, while others use the policy more broadly.

In the last decade or so, no campus has come close to the six percent limit — most have only one or two percent A by E enrollees. A main reason is that A by E admits must, by definition, be ineligible, but the great majority of applicants do meet eligibility requirements, because UC publications present these as minimum requirements for even applying to UC. The A by E pathway is an unadvertised pathway that is underutilized because of broad misperceptions that "eligibility" defines the pool of meritorious students. Advertising A by E more aggressively would be confusing, given the current eligibility policy.

With more applicants, won't the costs of admissions processing increase?
Yes, but applicants pay a $60 fee for each campus to which they apply. The marginal cost of reading a single application is considerably less than this, even in the most elaborate and intensive campus-based processes.

Will the BOARS proposal impact the University's general-fund appropriation from the state?
Each year, the University negotiates with the state's Department of Finance to arrive at an enrollment target for both freshman and transfer students, as well as a marginal funding rate ("per head" allocation). This negotiation process is driven by a variety of factors, including demographic projections, state and UC educational policy aims, and the fiscal circumstances of the state. While it is true that budgetary scenarios that prevent admission of all applicants guaranteed admission under the current eligibility policy – which occurred in 2004 – are politically painful, it is highly unlikely that the current guarantee structure represents a significant element in the negotiation process. After all, it is widely known that, the eligibility index notwithstanding, UC routinely admits considerably more than 12.5% of California's high school graduates. Yet, neither the legislature nor the Department of Finance has put pressure on UC to adjust the eligibility index. This implies that other considerations, and not simply the number of students declared eligible by the eligibility index in force at any given time, drive the budget negotiations with the state.

Where can I go to get more information and supporting data?

The full BOARS proposal is available at:
www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.eligibility.reform.0807.pdf

CPEC report which synopsizes the main reasons why students fail to be UC eligible: “Factors limiting eligibility for the University of California” (CPEC report OP/04-03, December 2004), available at:
www.cpec.ca.gov/completereports/2004reports/OP04-03.pdf

Information relating to the stratification of access to UC: “BOARS Inclusiveness Indicators,” available at:
www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/boars.indicators.pdf

Study of the relevance of various factors known at the time of application in predicting freshman GPA at UC: “A comparison of measures included in the UC eligibility construct in the prediction of first year UC GPA – focus on the predictive value of SAT II,” available at:
(URL pending Senate approval for posting)

Study to estimate the size and composition of the ETR pool: available at:
(URL pending Senate approval for posting)
A Comparison of Measures Included in the UC Eligibility Construct
in the Prediction of First Year UC GPA – Focus on the Predictive Value of SAT II

Prepared by Sam Agronow, Tongshan Chang, and Kyra Caspary
Admissions Research and Evaluation
University of California, Office of the President, and
Mark Rashid, BOARS Chair UC Davis

Purpose:
The analyses in this report, requested by Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), are part of an effort to determine which factors available to UC admission offices, beyond those currently used in determining eligibility, improve the prediction of student success at the University of California. This report examines the contribution of a number of variables of different types, but also focuses on the relative value of the new SAT test pattern (as simulated from old SAT I and SAT II measures), most especially the value of the new SAT Subject test requirement, in the prediction.

Data Set:
Data from the cohort of freshman entrants to the University of California, 2004, were used in the analyses in this report. In addition to the grades and test scores used in determining UC eligibility, percentile ranks within high school (statistics akin to “class ranks”) were calculated for SAT scores, high school GPA, and number of college preparatory and honors courses taken. The percentile ranks were calculated based on three years of applicants to UC from the same school. Percentile ranks within school were not calculated for schools with fewer than 20 applicants to UC over the three-year period. Instead, the percentile ranks for three years of UC applicants ("pool" percentile ranks) were used in the cases where the school percentile ranks were not available. A dummy variable was included in the analyses to represent this replacement of pool percentile rank for school percentile rank. Additionally, a series of variables captured by the on-line application system, “Pathways,” was employed in the analyses. These variables include change in GPA from 9th to 10th grade and from 10th to 11th grade, number of academic and non-academic awards, number of AP exams taken or planned, percent of scores of 3 or 4 or 5 on the AP exams, total hours spent in activities outside of high school, and the percent of time spent in volunteer activities, employment, or academic preparation programs sponsored by the University of California or others. Finally, a school’s Academic Performance Index (API) was obtained from the California Department of Education. Schools with no API score, such as private and out-of-state schools, were assigned an API score equivalent to the mean score of schools in the 9th decile for that year, and a dummy variable indicating this replacement was included.

In order to simulate the effect of the new SAT composite scores on UC GPA, the older SAT I and SAT II measures available for the class of 2004 freshman entrants needed to be recombined. The new SAT reasoning exam, effective for the freshman class entering in 2006, includes three components: SAT Math, SAT Critical Reading, and SAT Writing. The complete battery of SATs in 2006 consist of these three SAT Reasoning exams plus two SAT Subject exams of the student's choice (the highest two SAT Subject scores are used). The simulation of this new SAT pattern was accomplished by combining the older SAT I and SAT II measures as follows:

1) Approximation of composite of new “SAT Reasoning” exam plus two SAT Subject exams = average(SAT I Math, SAT II Math) + SAT II Writing +SAT I Verbal + 2(SAT II Other)

2) Approximation of new “SAT Reasoning”exam only = average(SAT I Math, SAT II Math) + SAT II Writing +SAT I Verbal
The outcome variable analyzed was UC GPA after one year of matriculation.

**Models/Analyses:**
Linear multiple regression was employed to predict the first-year GPA. The predictor variables described above are identified as follows:

1. Weighted, capped high school GPA
2. New simulated SAT Composite (simulated SAT Reasoning + simulated new SAT Subject) as defined above
3. New simulated SAT Reasoning (as defined above)
4. Rank: capped GPA (i.e., an approximation of the percentile rank of variable 1)
5. Rank SAT Composite (i.e., an approximation of the percentile rank of variable 2)
6. Rank: SAT Reasoning (i.e., an approximation of the percentile rank of variable 3)
7. Ranks: Percentile ranks on A-G courses, junior and sophomore honors, senior honors, plus a dummy variable identifying number missing one or more rank variables
8. Number of semesters of A-G courses, reported individually, plus total semesters of honors courses taken
9. “Pathways” variables described above
10. Academic Performance Index (API), as described above

The Models tested combine the variables or sets of variables numbered above as follows:

Model 1: $1$ (i.e., Weighted, capped high school GPA only)
Model 2: $1 + 2$ (i.e., Weighted, capped high school GPA + new simulated SAT Composite)
Model 3: $1 + 3$ (i.e., Weighted capped high school GPA + new simulated SAT Reasoning)
Model 4: $1 + 2 + 5$
Model 5: $1 + 3 + 4 + 6$
Model 6: $1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7$
Model 7: $1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8$
Model 8: $1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9$
Model 9: $1 + 3 + 4 + 6 + 7 + 8 + 9 + 10$

**Results:**
The nine tables that follow show the results of these regression analyses, first for the UC system and then broken down by the eight undergraduate campuses that accepted freshmen in 2004 (UC Merced was not yet enrolling students).

The multiple-R-squares shown in the top rows of each table allow the comparison of the nine Models in terms of the amount of variance explained in UC GPA.

Predictive Value of “Simulated” SAT Subject scores:
The comparison of Model 1 (Weighted-capped GPA only) with Model 2 (Weighted-capped GPA + simulated SAT Composite) and Model 3 (Weighted-capped GPA + simulated SAT Reasoning) in the systemwide data (first table) shows that the SATs add approximately 0.06 – 0.07 to the prediction of UC GPA. However, a comparison of Model 2 vs. Model 3 shows that the prediction of the simulated SAT Reasoning exam actually contributes slightly more variance (0.2542) to the prediction of UC GPA than the simulated SAT Composite which contains the SAT Subject scores (0.2413). This finding appears in the separate campus analyses, shown on subsequent pages, that compare Models 2 and 3 for all campuses except Berkeley. For Berkeley, see second table, the model including SAT Subject tests (Model 2) is only slightly higher (0.1775) than the model without the simulated SAT Subject scores (Model 3, 0.1766).

A comparison of Model 4 and Model 5 shows a similar pattern of results. Model 5 which contains no SAT Subject variables has slightly more explained variance than Model 4 which contains the SAT Subject variables.¹

Models 6 through 9 build on Model 5 by adding the additional variable groups. Each of these models exclude the SAT Subject variables. The systemwide results show that there are only small gains in predictive validity, beyond Model 5 (weighted-capped GPA, simulated SAT Reasoning, plus percentile ranks on GPA and SAT Reasoning) when these additional variable groups are included. I.e., the gain in predictive validity between Model 5 (0.2806) and Model 9 (0.2958) is about 0.015. However, the gains between Model 5 and Model 9 in some of the campus models is a little larger, e.g., about 0.036 at UCLA and 0.025 at UC Davis.

¹ The variance explained by Model 5 may also be higher than Model 4 because of the inclusion of the percentile rank on weighted capped GPA in Model 5 but not Model 4.
### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Raq</th>
<th>AdjRaq</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1827</td>
<td>0.2414</td>
<td>0.2543</td>
<td>0.2682</td>
<td>0.2667</td>
<td>0.2680</td>
<td>0.2807</td>
<td>0.2820</td>
<td>0.2856</td>
<td>0.2865</td>
<td>0.2995</td>
<td>0.2958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Outcome: First-year GPA

- **28375 cases used**

#### Measures from the UC Application

- **University of California, Office of the President**

#### High School

- **SAT composite**
  - 0.01  0.449  0.000  0.01  0.450  0.000  0.01  0.450  0.000  0.01  0.450  0.000  0.01  0.450  0.000

#### Other Awards

- **College Preparatory Elective**
  - 0.00  0.31  0.000  0.00  0.32  0.000  0.00  0.32  0.000  0.00  0.32  0.000  0.00  0.32  0.000

#### Outreach

- **Overall volunteer work**
  - 0.00  0.23  0.000  0.00  0.22  0.000  0.00  0.22  0.000  0.00  0.22  0.000  0.00  0.22  0.000

#### Total Honors

- **Total activity hours**
  - 0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.31  0.000  0.00  0.31  0.000  0.00  0.31  0.000  0.00  0.31  0.000

#### Total hours

- **Total AP courses**
  - 0.00  0.32  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000

#### Missing Data

- **MISSing data**
  - 0.00  0.31  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000  0.00  0.30  0.000

#### Source

- UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

---

*Reported by applicants on the UC online application.*

1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, UC, 04-10-07
### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

#### 2004 Fall Freshman Entrants

- **University of California, Office of the President**
- **Outcome: First-year GPA**

#### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.145</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.152</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted, capped GPA</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT math</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.904</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 other</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: A-G courses</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: junior &amp; soph. honors</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: senior honors</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.261</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade at least 1 rank variable</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.737</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes

1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + (SAT2 Other)
2. Approximation of SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

---

**Source:** UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

**Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, 8-10-07**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raq</td>
<td>0.1761</td>
<td>0.2597</td>
<td>0.2618</td>
<td>0.2822</td>
<td>0.2917</td>
<td>0.2958</td>
<td>0.2978</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
<td>0.3213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjRaq</td>
<td>0.1759</td>
<td>0.2594</td>
<td>0.2615</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
<td>0.2906</td>
<td>0.2939</td>
<td>0.3165</td>
<td>0.3164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model Summary

#### Model 9

- Rsq: 0.3213
- Adj Rsq: 0.3164

### Variables

- **SAT Composite**
  - Reading: 0.632
  - Writing: 0.669
  - Math: 0.601
- **High School GPA**
  - Electives: 0.423
  - AP Exams: 0.625
  - Activities: 0.199
- **College Preparatory Elective**
  - Math: 0.141
  - Science: 0.214
  - English: 0.270
- **Pathways Data**
  - College Prep: 0.008
  - AP: 0.008
  - Outreach: 0.008
- **Minorities**
  - PAPI: 0.008

### Notes

1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal
3. Reported by applicants on the UC online application.

Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (UAR) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data.

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, UC 04-10-07
A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

3626 cases used
Outcome: First-year GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Rsq</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
<th>PChange In GPA: 9th to 10th</th>
<th>PChange In GPA: 10th to 11th</th>
<th>Academic Awards</th>
<th>Other Awards</th>
<th># of AP exams planned</th>
<th># of APs exams taken</th>
<th>% taken scored 3</th>
<th>% taken scored 4 or 5</th>
<th>Total activity hours</th>
<th>% Volunteer work</th>
<th>% Employment</th>
<th>% Outreach (non-UC)</th>
<th>% UC Outreach</th>
<th>Missing Pathways data</th>
<th>API (2003) with replacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1538</td>
<td>0.1536</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>-0.210</td>
<td>0.1538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2076</td>
<td>0.2074</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.205</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>0.2112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2464</td>
<td>0.2460</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>0.2106</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2696</td>
<td>0.2681</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.2186</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>-0.216</td>
<td>0.2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2745</td>
<td>0.2723</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.2236</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>-0.221</td>
<td>0.2745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2845</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>0.2316</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>-0.229</td>
<td>0.2845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3064</td>
<td>0.3031</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.2426</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>0.3064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3110</td>
<td>0.3042</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.2526</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>-0.243</td>
<td>0.3110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC undergraduate admissions file (UADS) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data.

1 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal
2 Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT 1 Verbal
### A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

**Outcome**: First-year GPA

**2004 fall freshman entrants**

**3211 cases used**

**Source**: UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

#### Table 1: Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Req</td>
<td>0.0999</td>
<td>0.1265</td>
<td>0.1666</td>
<td>0.1827</td>
<td>0.1794</td>
<td>0.1823</td>
<td>0.1873</td>
<td>0.2012</td>
<td>0.2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdjReq</td>
<td>0.0878</td>
<td>0.1290</td>
<td>0.1562</td>
<td>0.1808</td>
<td>0.1776</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>0.1825</td>
<td>0.1929</td>
<td>0.1927</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
<th>Model 8</th>
<th>Model 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.404</td>
<td>-0.433</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>-0.500</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td>-0.501</td>
<td>-0.501</td>
<td>-0.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Additional Information:

- **SAT composite**: Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)
- **GPA**: Reported by applicants on the online application.
- **Change in GPA**: Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)
# A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

## UC San Diego: No exclusions

### 2004 fall freshman entrants

### 3802 cases used

**Outcome:** First-year GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.1922</td>
<td>0.2641</td>
<td>0.2174</td>
<td>0.2662</td>
<td>0.2467</td>
<td>0.2517</td>
<td>0.2849</td>
<td>0.2692</td>
<td>0.2267</td>
<td>0.2517</td>
<td>0.2849</td>
<td>0.2692</td>
<td>0.2267</td>
<td>0.2517</td>
<td>0.2849</td>
<td>0.2692</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rsq and AdjRsq values

- Rsq: Variance explained by the model
- AdjRsq: Adjusted R-square, which takes into account the number of predictors

### Intercept

- B: Unstandardized coefficient
- Beta: Standardized coefficient
- p: Probability level

### SAT composite

- Weighted, capped GPA

### Hightschool

- Rank: capped GPA
- Rank: SAT1 verbal
- Rank: SAT2 writing
- Rank: SAT2 math
- Rank: SAT2 other
- Rank: A-G courses
- Rank: junior & soph. honors
- Rank: senior honors

### Background

- # of AP exams planned
- # of APs exams taken
- % taken scored 3
- % taken scored 4 or 5

### Pathways

- Change in GPA: 9th to 10th
- Change in GPA: 10th to 11th
- Academic Awards
- Other Awards
- # of AP exams planned
- # of APs exams taken
- % taken scored 3
- % taken scored 4 or 5
- Total activity hours
- % Volunteer work
- % Employment
- % Outreach (non-UC)
- % UC Outreach
- Missing Pathways data

### API (2003) with replacement

- API (2003)
- API (2003) with replacement

### Notes

1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal * 2
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

**Source:** UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, Aug 10, 2004

---

* Reported by applicants on the UC online application.
A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1006</td>
<td>0.1033</td>
<td>0.1492</td>
<td>0.1467</td>
<td>0.1677</td>
<td>0.1678</td>
<td>0.1726</td>
<td>0.1605</td>
<td>0.1042</td>
<td>0.1997</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>0.1373</td>
<td>0.1657</td>
<td>0.1697</td>
<td>0.1658</td>
<td>0.1750</td>
<td>0.1848</td>
<td>0.1899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1866</td>
<td>0.1897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome: First-year GPA

2866 cases used

- **Model 1**
  - Rsq: 0.049
  - AdjRsq: 0.047
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 2**
  - Rsq: 0.049
  - AdjRsq: 0.047
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 3**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 4**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 5**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 6**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 7**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 8**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

- **Model 9**
  - Rsq: 0.050
  - AdjRsq: 0.048
  - B: 0.000
  - Beta: 0.000
  - p: 0.842

---

**Table Notes**

- **Rsq** refers to the coefficient of determination, indicating the proportion of variance explained by the model.
- **AdjRsq** adjusts Rsq for degrees of freedom, providing a more accurate measure of model fit.
- **B** represents the unstandardized regression coefficient.
- **Beta** represents the standardized regression coefficient.
- **p** is the significance level, indicating the probability of finding a relationship as large as the observed one if it were not present in the population.

---

**Table Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Rsq</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: capped GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: A-G courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: junior &amp; soph. honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: senior honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Elective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total honors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 9th to 10th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 10th to 11th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP exams planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of APs exams taken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 4 or 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total activity hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Outreach (non-UC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UC Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pathways data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API (2003)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Source**

UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, UC 2004-10-07
## A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

### 2004 fall freshman entrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Rsq</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>Weighted, capped GPA</th>
<th>SAT composite</th>
<th>SAT reasoning</th>
<th>Rank, capped GPA</th>
<th>Rank: SAT1 verbal</th>
<th>Rank: SAT1 math</th>
<th>Rank: SAT1 other</th>
<th>Rank: SAT2 writing</th>
<th>Rank: SAT2 math</th>
<th>Rank: SAT2 other</th>
<th>Rank: A-G courses</th>
<th>Rank: senior honors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1854</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.75</td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.188</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2658</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2961</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2995</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3203</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3211</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3258</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3468</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.3492</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.522</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

### Source:
UC undergraduate admissions data (UAGP and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data)

Prepared by Admissions Research & Evaluation, 04-10-07
## A Comparison of Measures from the UC Application in Predicting UC GPA

### 2004 Fall Freshman Entrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>3575 cases used</th>
<th>Outcome: First-year GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Missing at least 1 rank variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>AdjRsq</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric GPA</td>
<td>-4.79</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT composite</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT reasoning</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: GPA</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 verbal</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT1 math</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 writing</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 math</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: SAT2 other</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: A-G courses</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: junior &amp; soph. honors</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank: senior honors</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Social Science</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language other than English</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Preparatory Elective</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total honors</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 9th to 10th</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in GPA: 10th to 11th</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Awards</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Awards</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP exams planned</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP exams taken</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 3</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% taken scored 4 or 5</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total activity hours</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Volunteer work</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Employment</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Outreach (non-UC)</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% UC Outreach</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Pathways data</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>API (2003)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal + 2(SAT2 Other)
2. Approximation of new SAT composite: average(SAT1 Math, SAT2 Math) + SAT2 Writing + SAT1 Verbal

### Source

UC undergraduate admissions file (UAD) and longitudinal file (ULONG) merged with Pathways data
MEMORANDUM

April 4, 2007

TO: Mark Rashid, Chair, BOARS Subcommittee, UC Academic Senate
FROM: Roger Studley, Assistant Director, Admissions Research & Evaluation, UCOP
SUBJECT: Entitled to Review – Third set of data simulations

Data Requested

The attached data (4pp.) contain follow-up analyses related to “Tasks 1 & 2” of your December memo requesting analyses related to BOARS’ development of the concept of “Entitled to Review” (ETR). These data update the data presented at the March BOARS meeting by (i) adding matriculation data to the ETR scenarios and (ii) adding a scenario, described in your March 29 email, that reflects BOARS’ current thinking on an ETR proposal.

Description of Data Provided

Each page of the attached data corresponds to one of the following scenarios:

- **Page 1**: Students who, at the end of their junior year, had (i) completed, with a grade of C or better, the 11 a-g courses required for ELC eligibility, (ii) achieved a 2.8 minimum unweighted a-g GPA, and (iii) taken the SAT I or ACT examination. (Note that students were not required to take a writing examination because it was not part of the SAT I or ACT examinations for the cohort of students graduating high school in 2003, the year from which the data sample was drawn.) This scenario reflects BOARS’ current thinking on an ETR proposal.

- **Page 2**: Students who, at the end of their junior year, had completed, with a grade of C or better, the 11 a-g courses required for ELC eligibility. In contrast to the previous scenario, no minimum GPA or test-taking requirements are imposed in this scenario.

- **Page 3**: Students who, by the end of their senior year, fulfilled the 15 unit a-g course requirement with a grade of C or better in each course. No minimum GPA or test-taking requirements are imposed.

- **Page 4**: Students meeting CSU’s 2003 eligibility requirements.

Each page/table has 9 columns of data:

- **Column 1**: Contains estimated characteristics for the entire cohort of California public high school graduates in 2003 (the year from which the sample was drawn).
Entitled to Review – Third set of data simulations

Note that these characteristics are not the actual characteristics of the 2003 cohort. They are the characteristics of the 54-school sample on which the simulations (and the 2003 CPEC Eligibility Study) were based. As such, they provide a consistent basis of comparison for the scenarios. Sample stratification was based on four strata, created by dividing public high schools into (i) those with and without a large proportion of African American students and (ii) those with API scores above or below the median. On these dimensions, therefore, the weighted sample estimates are likely to closely reflect the underlying population; on other dimensions, the correspondence between the sample and the population will be weaker. For example, while the population estimate for API deciles 1-5 is 48% (which is close to the expected 50%), the estimate for deciles 1-3 is only 20% (relatively far from the expected 30%).

- **Column 2**: Contains the ETR estimate for the given scenario. The “College Aspirations” rows at the bottom of the page have been added to suggest likely number of applicants from the ETR population. The “Stimulated Applicants (Projected)” row uses a rough estimate of the stimulation effect of the ELC program (12% additional applicants) to produce an estimate of the number of students who might apply to UC under an ETR policy.

- **Columns 3-5**: These columns partition the simulated ETR populations into three (mutually exclusive and exhaustive) groups:
  - Students currently eligible for UC either in the Local Context or by Examination Alone. (These students might retain their guarantee of admission to the UC system if an ETR-type admissions/eligibility model were adopted.)
  - Students currently eligible for UC but only in the Statewide Context. (These students would no longer have guarantee of admission to the UC system, but they would remain eligible for review if and ETR-type model were adopted.)
  - Students not previously eligible for UC but who meet the ETR definition under consideration in the present scenario.

- **Columns 6-9**: These columns attempt to suggest the number of ETR students who might apply to UC. Column 6, a “lower bound” estimate, comprises ETR-designated students who did apply to UC in 2003. Column 7 comprises the subset of these students who ultimately enrolled at UC. Column 8 comprises ETR-designated students who show up in the National Student Clearinghouse as having matriculated at any 4-year college (not just at UC). Column 9, which might be considered an “upper bound” estimate, adds students who matriculated at any 2-year college to the column 8 total.
### Simulations of "Entitled to Review"

Scenario: (i) "ELC 11" A-G Requirement, (ii) 2.8 Minimum Unweighted GPA, and (iii) Must Take ACT or SAT Reasoning Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates (Estimated from Sample)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: without Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at a 4-Yr College (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,701</td>
<td>2,778</td>
<td>1,467</td>
<td>3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>72,404</td>
<td>15,217</td>
<td>26,501</td>
<td>28,680</td>
<td>41,707</td>
<td>21,879</td>
<td>51,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grad</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>52%</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>48%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>31%</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High School GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students Completing A-G</th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>33%</th>
<th>3.33</th>
<th>3.45</th>
<th>2.63</th>
<th>2.88</th>
<th>55%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.80 (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80 - 3.19</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 - 3.59</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60 - 3.99</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 and above</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom)</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 4 and 5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 6 and 7</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### College Aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied to UC</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>16%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Applicants (Projected)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at UC</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 4-Year College</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Simulations of "Entitled to Review"
### Scenario: "ELC 11" A-G Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates (Estimated from Sample)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students w/out Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at a 4-Yr College (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>5,785</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>1,978</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>2,958</td>
<td>1,511</td>
<td>3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>91,228</td>
<td>15,731</td>
<td>29,744</td>
<td>45,701</td>
<td>43,966</td>
<td>22,435</td>
<td>50,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grads</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Completing A-G</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (unweighted)</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean GPA (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 2.80 (weighted, capped)</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80 - 3.19</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20 - 3.59</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.60 - 3.99</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 and above</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 4 and 5</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 6 and 7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Aspirations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied to UC</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Applicants (Projected)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at UC</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 4-Year College</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simulations of "Entitled to Review"
Scenario: "Freshman 15" A-G Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Graduates (Estimated from Sample)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students w/o Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled Anywhere (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>5,198</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,716</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>3,485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Estimate (weighted)</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>82,991</td>
<td>14,064</td>
<td>32,131</td>
<td>36,706</td>
<td>40,820</td>
<td>20,772</td>
<td>54,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of High School Grads</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender
- Female: 52%
- Male: 48%

Ethnicity
- African American: 10%
- Latino: 31%
- Native American: 1%
- Asian American: 17%
- White: 40%
- Unknown: 1%

High School GPA
- Students Completing A-G: 27%
  - Mean GPA (unweighted): 3.33
  - Mean GPA (weighted, capped): 3.46
- All Students
  - Mean GPA (unweighted): 3.68
  - Mean GPA (weighted, capped): 2.63
- Below 2.60 (weighted, capped)
  - 55%
- 2.60 - 3.19
  - 17%
- 3.20 - 3.59
  - 14%
- 3.60 - 3.99
  - 9%
- 4.00 and above
  - 4%

Academic Performance
- Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom)
  - 20%
- Deciles 4 and 5
  - 28%
- Deciles 6 and 7
  - 27%
- Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top)
  - 24%

College Aspirations
- Applied to UC
  - 16%
- Stimulated Applicants (Projected)
  - 18%
- Enrolled at UC
  - 8%
- Enrolled at Any 4-Year College
  - 25%
- Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College
  - 69%
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### Simulations of "Entitled to Review"

**Scenario: CSU Eligible**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>Number in Sample (of 18,660)</th>
<th>Population Estimate (weighted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,510</td>
<td>2,086</td>
<td>2,997</td>
<td>3,514</td>
<td>6,057</td>
<td>18,660</td>
<td>335,658</td>
<td>98,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>15,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,388</td>
<td>44,469</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>8,5%</td>
<td>40,342</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>31,843</td>
<td>16,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61,817</td>
<td>85,225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>46,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### High School GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Academic Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deciles</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 1, 2, and 3 (bottom)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 4 and 5</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 6 and 7</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciles 8, 9, and 10 (top)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### College Aspirations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College Aspirations</th>
<th>EFR Students: All</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ELC or EEA)</th>
<th>EFR Students: EFR Students with Guarantee (ESC Only)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Previously Ineligible</th>
<th>EFR Students: Applied to UC (Historical)</th>
<th>EFR Students: Enrolled at UC (Historical)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied to UC</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulated Applicants (Projected)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at UC</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 4-Year College</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled at Any 2- or 4-Year College</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---