

## **CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS RELATED TO FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS CRITERIA AND PROCESSES**

- 1868** Organic Act directs The Regents to set the “moral and intellectual qualifications for admission.”
- 1869-81** Students admitted based upon oral examinations administered by the faculty.
- 1881-84** Students admitted based on written examinations.
- 1885** Regents formally transfer responsibility for admissions to the faculty, subject to final approval by The Regents.
- 1885-1931** Recommendation from the high school principal (of UC-accredited high schools) allowed to exempt student from requirement for some or all written examinations. After 1919, principal recommendation sufficient in itself for admission.
- 1931-33** Original “a-f” course pattern established. Students required to complete ten units of college preparatory coursework and achieve A or B grades for courses taken in grades 10-12.
- 1934-60** Curricular and scholarship requirements essentially unchanged. Additional “alternative” paths established in 1934; these include placing in the top ten percent of one’s high school class and various exemptions to the requirements (e.g., earning six A or B grades in the last two years, regardless of earlier performance).
- 1960** All alternative paths except eligibility by examination alone are eliminated to reduce the number of students considered qualified, in keeping with the restrictions of the newly established Master Plan for Higher Education.
- 1968** Academic Senate recommends changing UC eligibility criteria to require all freshman applicants to submit scores from the SAT and three achievement tests (now called SAT II: Subject Tests): one in English composition, one in math, and one in social studies or foreign language.
- 1970** UC President’s Office establishes November filing period for priority consideration of applications and common procedures for redirecting applications to “campuses of alternate choice.” During this period, most UC campuses remain open for applications until full and then redirect applications to other campuses. Most campuses also accept freshman applications for the fall, winter, or spring quarter. Applications of students

who cannot be accommodated on the campus of first choice and indicate they are not interested in redirection are returned and the appropriate application fee refunded.

**1971** UC Office of the President issues guidelines to campuses confirming previous instructions regarding application deadlines, enrollment targets, and redirection priorities. In addition, the guidelines specify that for campuses that receive more applications than they can accommodate during the priority filing period, “all applications...will be carefully reviewed” and fifty percent of those admitted “shall be the most highly qualified based upon scholastic criteria.” The remaining fifty percent are to be selected based on a “careful review of all remaining applications” that “shall involve the exercise of judgment with respect to each application and...based upon such criteria as academic interest, campus programs, hardship factors,...selective recruitment efforts, special achievements and awards, and similar considerations.” (*See Item IV-9 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.*)

The intent of this policy is to distribute highly qualified students to all campuses by ensuring that no one campus is allowed to select more than its share of the academically most well qualified applicants to the system. “Selective recruitment” programs during this period are largely those targeted toward minority and disadvantaged applicants. The 1971 guidelines also establish preferences for state residents and require campuses to reserve ten percent of the second group of spaces (the precursor to “Tier 2”) for appeals from redirected applicants.

**1971-86** Eligibility requirements gradually tightened to include more coursework. Admission requirements remain stable, but UC Berkeley and UCLA redirect students to other campuses. UC Santa Cruz also redirects students in its early years, but campus growth is sufficient by 1980s to accommodate all eligible applicants. Campuses vary in the degree to which they enforce application deadlines versus continue to admit students after the priority filing period. All campuses work with individual applicants at the margin of eligibility to complete all tests and courses so as to be eligible at the time of enrollment.

**1974** With the endorsement of the Academic Senate, Regents approve the principle that “Undergraduate admissions of the University should reflect the general ethnic, sexual and economic composition of California high school graduates,” recognizing the goal of wide representation of Californians within the undergraduate population of the University.

**1986** As larger numbers of students are redirected, UC changes application process to the “multiple filing” system, to better accommodate student choice in terms of campuses. Under multiple filing, applicants continue to

submit a single application, but it is sent to as many campuses as they wish and considered independently at each. In the first year of implementation, applications to each individual campus increase dramatically. Both UC Berkeley and UCLA now receive significantly more applications than they can accommodate. All other campuses are able to accommodate all UC-eligible applicants, but most are no longer able to counsel marginally eligible applicants so as to make them eligible and therefore admissible.

## 1988

In May, The Regents adopt a new UC policy on undergraduate admission that formally articulates UC's "historic commitment to provide places within the University to all eligible applicants who are residents of California." It says that UC seeks to enroll a student body that "demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economics back grounds characteristic of California." Policy directs each campus to develop procedures for selection from eligible applicants that are consistent with these principles. (*See Item IV-10 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.*)

In July, OP publishes selection guidelines specifying 40-60 percent of admitted students should be selected on the basis of "academic" criteria ("Tier 1") and remaining freshmen at each campus selected on the basis of a combination of "academic" and "supplemental" criteria ("Tier 2"). Supplemental criteria include "special talents, interests, or experiences that demonstrate unusual promise for leadership, achievement, and service..."; "special circumstances adversely affecting applicants' life experiences"; and "ethnic identity, gender, and location of residence." (*See Item IV-11 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.*)

By the late 1980s, both UC Berkeley and UCLA are denying substantial numbers of applicants. As it becomes necessary to draw distinctions among highly qualified applicants, both campuses develop processes for assessing non-academic criteria that rely on comprehensive reading of files. At both campuses, readers assign overall rankings for the Tier 2 review that do not rely on fixed weights for specific factors. Additionally, for determining admission in Tier 1, UCLA begins assessing academic criteria qualitatively, while UC Berkeley continues to use a formula. By the early 1990s, both campuses develop a "matrix" approach to making final selection decisions for Tier 2—that is, for students not admitted in Tier 1, academic and "personal" scores are balanced so that a very high ranking on one scale substitutes for lower rankings on the other.

Through the early 1990s other campuses continue to be able to accommodate all UC-eligible applicants.

**1995** Regents adopt Resolution SP-1, eliminating the consideration of race, ethnicity, and gender in the admission process, and increasing the proportion of the admitted class to be selected based on “academic criteria alone” (Tier 1) from 40-60 percent to 50-75 percent. SP-1 also directs the President and Academic Senate to develop new supplemental admissions criteria that give consideration to UC-eligible students who “despite having suffered disadvantage economically or in terms of their social environment...have nonetheless demonstrated sufficient character and determination in overcoming obstacles to warrant confidence that the applicant can pursue a course of study to successful completion.” (*See Item IV-12 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.*)

In response, a joint administrative-faculty Task Force is formed to recommend new admission criteria and selection guidelines. The Task Force recommends expansion of both “academic” and “supplemental” criteria and development of selection processes that include “a more comprehensive approach to reviewing students’ academic accomplishments and personal backgrounds.” (*See Item IV-13 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.*)

**1996** New policy on undergraduate admission adopted to conform with SP-1. “Academic” admissions criteria to be used to admit 50-75 percent of each class (Tier 1) and “supplemental” admissions criteria to be used in conjunction with the academic criteria to admit the remaining 25-50 percent (Tier 2) of each entering class. Supplemental criteria altered to eliminate race and ethnicity. (*See Appendix F to Item IV-13 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.*)

Following adoption of the new guidelines, faculty on each selective campus develop new policies and processes to be implemented for Fall 1998. (By this time, six campuses are selective or anticipate being so by 1998.) New campus policies expand academic criteria and pay increased attention to low-income and first-generation college students and to those in low performing schools. New processes expand qualitative review processes to a larger number of students. Berkeley and Irvine both develop non-fixed weight evaluation processes (already in place at UCLA) for academic as well as “supplemental” criteria. Davis, San Diego, and Santa Barbara continue to select Tier 1 students using a formula approach. BOARS formally reviews and comments on proposed campus policies. Campuses develop or expand training programs for staff and monitoring processes to ensure reliability and consistency of qualitative review processes.

**1998** Regents Resolution SP-1 and Proposition 209 take effect for freshman admission.

- 2000** Academic Senate recommends revisions to Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions to add ELC status as an academic criterion. *(See Item IV-14 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.)*
- 2001** In February, UC President Richard Atkinson writes to the Academic Senate, requesting that they consider a policy under which “campuses move away from admission processes focused on quantitative formulas and instead adopt evaluative procedures that look at applicants in a comprehensive...way.”
- In May, Regents adopt Resolution RE-28, rescinding Resolution SP-1, and reaffirm “that the Academic Senate shall determine the conditions for admission to the University, subject to the approval of The Regents, as provided in Standing Order 105.2. Pending any changes which The Regents might approve, the provisions for admission shall be those outlined in the Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions, which were adopted in July 1996 and revised in May 2000.” *(See Item IV-15 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.)*
- In October, Academic Senate endorses BOARS proposal for comprehensive review policy. BOARS presents policy to The Regents for discussion in October and action in November. In November, Regents, upon recommendation of the faculty and the President, adopt “comprehensive review.” Regents ask BOARS to report back annually on implementation progress and outcomes.
- 2002** Comprehensive review implemented for students entering in Fall 2002 term. In November, BOARS reports to The Regents on first year of implementation. *(See Item V-21 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.)*
- 2003** In September, BOARS reports to The Regents on second year of comprehensive review. *(See Item V-22 in Study Group Materials for December 16 meeting.)*