



ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE OFFICE  
LOS ANGELES DIVISION  
3125 MURPHY HALL  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90095-1408

PHONE: (310) 825-3851  
FAX: (310) 206-5273

November 26, 2007

Michael Brown  
Chair of the Academic Assembly  
UC Academic Senate

**In Re: UCLA Response to the Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy**

Dear Michael,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy. Upon receipt, I specifically requested that the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS), the Undergraduate Council (UgC), and the Executive Board to opine. All other Senate committees were welcome to opine, though none elected to. I am pleased to report that the UCLA Division of the Academic Senate supports this proposal.

Still, we believe there is room to improve the proposal as it will no doubt evoke strong responses from the public, both for and against. The Executive Board, which speaks for the division, believes that the document would be greatly enhanced if it would be slightly modified to contain a Goal Section, immediately prior to the Summary, in which it the stated reason: "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 change is to invite applications from a larger number of qualified applicants, and then to use full information from the application itself to decide which applicants are truly in the top one-eighth."

This section would bring to the fore the rationale for the changes, and help to assuage the concerns of those who will realize that the larger pool will reduce their student's chances of gaining admission to the UC of their choice. Moreover, it will help the general public to understand that this is not an effort to bypass Proposition 209, which some will no doubt believe it to be.

I am enclosing the responses from the Undergraduate Council and CUARS, for your information.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Elizabeth L. Bjork". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "E".

Elizabeth Ligon Bjork  
UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Maria Bertero-Barceló, Executive Director and Chief of Staff, Systemwide Senate  
Jaime Balboa, UCLA Senate CAO  
Sylvia Hurtado, CUARS Chair  
Stuart Brown, Undergraduate Council Chair

**Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS)  
Response to BOARS Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy  
November 13, 2007**

CUARS has been asked to opine and vote upon the BOARS Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy.

Professor Mark Rashid (BOARS Chair) presented the proposal and answered questions at the CUARS meeting on May 18, 2007. CUARS Chair Sylvia Hurtado and members Jeannie Oakes and Duncan Lindsey have attended BOARS meetings over the last year when the proposal was developed and are well versed. Professor Hurtado is the BOARS Vice Chair. CUARS discussed the proposal at their meetings on October 12, 2007 and October 26, 2007. It was noted that the proposal was entirely faculty driven.

CUARS voted on October 26, 2007 to approve the BOARS Proposal to Revise UC Eligibility Criteria. The faculty vote was 5 in favor, 1 opposed, no abstentions. The student vote was 1 in favor, 1 opposed, and no abstentions. Several faculty opined that the revision would benefit more California students, leaves authority to each campus to decide the "top" applicants, and could result in more diversity in their classrooms. The faculty member who voted against the proposal expressed a desire for more objectivity in the admissions process. The Director of UCLA Admissions felt that the SAT IIs were not necessary for effective review of applications and was not opposed to the revision of eligibility policy, though he conveyed a concern expressed by administrators that the proposal may increase applications to UCLA which will mean more letters of rejection sent to applicants and increased time pressure to review the applications. Both issues were addressed during the second meeting before the vote. The change in revising eligibility does not affect the use of the SAT reasoning test in our processes currently in place for admissions—as we use many objective academic indicators, information about the high school, and personal achievement information in the comprehensive review process. The second concern of administrators is not related to the merits of the educational policy but concerns with implementation (their role). Nevertheless, it was pointed out that there is considerable pressure at the systemwide level to employ a shared read process (which will reduce the number of files any single campus reads). UCLA is considering piloting a shared read process with Berkeley this spring to calibrate readers and determine the feasibility of ranking candidates that overlap in the application process.

**Undergraduate Council**  
**Response to BOARS Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy**  
**November 13, 2007**

UGC has been asked to opine and vote upon the BOARS Proposal to Reform UC's Freshman Eligibility Policy.

Professor Sylvia Hurtado (CUARS Chair and BOARS Vice Chair) presented the proposal and answered questions at the UGC meeting on November 2, 2007.

The Council faculty members voted unanimously in favor of the proposal. [Twelve in favor, zero abstentions, zero opposed]. The student vote was two in favor, one abstention, and one opposed. A member noted that the Board of Regents/California State Legislature may be difficult to convince that the proposal is viable politically as it takes away the guarantee of UC admission for the top 12.5% of high school graduates. Another member noted that the State Legislature maybe inclined to fund UC at a proportionate level to allow the top 12.5% of high school students to attend UC as the state's population grows.

A UGC member made the following suggestions.

"Here are my suggestions, none of which deal with any section but Section B. *Guidance to Prospective Applicants*, in the BOARS Proposal.

- (1) First sentence, first paragraph b) instead of "...signaling to students..." insert **"...providing to ..."**
- (2) On the next unnumbered page, beginning with the paragraph "Admission to University of California campuses..." delete from the second sentence of that paragraph "...possess a level of maturity that will allow them to..." so that that sentence reads **"UC is also looking for evidence that applicants will benefit from..."**
- (3) In the last sentence of that same paragraph, delete " rise to ...:" and insert **"...meet..."** so the last clause reads **"...an ability to meet those challenges."**
- (4) Under "All aspects of your academic record..." should be added to the fifth point "- any special academic project or **activities...**"
- (5) In that same section, as the required SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing are part of the aspects taken into account, they should be included in that list **"-your scores on the required SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing."** That same language should then be deleted from the last full paragraph right below that list so that "These include your scored on the required SAT Reasoning test or ACT with Writing..." is gone, and the second sentence of that paragraph should begin with **"Your scores on any additional standardized tests you may elect [I would highlight this word] to take..."**
- (7) In the current third sentence of that same paragraph beginning "UC uses test scores only to enhance our understanding..." I would delete "enhance" and insert **..."help..."**

(6) On the next page the first full paragraph following the itemized list beginning with "In these circumstance, scores..." change the last sentence of that paragraph to read "...exams, if any of the above **described circumstances** apply to you."

(7) The last sentence of the last paragraph of the B. section should be deleted as I consider it very dangerous and changed to: "**You are encouraged, always, to use your best efforts to obtain the optimum results concerning admission.**"

As I said above, I have limited my changes to just section B. which will be a guide to prospective applicants, because the desired result is clarity. I do have many other changes but I think the internal document is less important than one going outside the University systems. And I do not want to have to rewrite more than is absolutely necessary, and I think it very disrespectful to those who have labored over it for me to presume to rewrite."