

**The Bridge Project:
Strengthening K-16 Transition Policies**

California Case Report

Stanford University

January 5, 2001

CALIFORNIA PHASE I -- TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM..... | 1 |
| PURPOSE OF THE REPORT | 2 |
| CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK..... | 3 |
| GENERAL CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT..... | 4 |
| Public Higher Education | 4 |
| Structure and Governance | 4 |
| Intersegmental Bodies and Collaborative Efforts | 5 |
| K-12 State Standards and Frameworks..... | 7 |
| Assessments in California..... | 9 |
| Secondary School Assessments | 10 |
| Higher Education Assessments..... | 11 |
| Alignment and Coordination of Assessments..... | 13 |
| Recent Policies, Legislation, and Legal Action Affecting Higher Education | 14 |
| SECTION 2: RESEARCH DESIGN | 17 |
| GENERAL DESIGN | 17 |
| DATA COLLECTION | 17 |
| Phase I..... | 17 |
| Phase II | 19 |
| DATA ANALYSIS | 20 |
| Phase I..... | 20 |
| Phase II | 20 |
| Dependent Variables | 21 |
| Independent Variables..... | 23 |
| Crosstabular Analyses..... | 24 |
| SECTION 3: CASE STUDY OF THE UC SYSTEM AND UC DAVIS | 25 |
| THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM | 25 |
| UC Governance and Policymaking..... | 25 |
| The UC Board of Regents..... | 25 |
| UC Office of the President..... | 25 |
| Academic Senate and Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) | 25 |
| Current Undergraduate Admission Policies for the UC | 26 |
| UC System-wide Minimum Eligibility Requirements..... | 26 |
| Basic UC Application Procedures..... | 28 |
| Tensions between Central System and Campuses | 29 |
| THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS | 30 |
| Institutional Background on UCD | 30 |
| UCD's Undergraduate Selection Policies..... | 31 |
| Selection Criteria..... | 31 |
| Selection Procedure..... | 33 |
| Admission Policy Tensions at UCD | 38 |
| UC Davis' Undergraduate Placement Policies | 38 |
| Expectations of Incoming Freshmen..... | 38 |
| Undergraduate Placement Policies at UCD | 39 |
| CONTINUING POLICY CONCERNS AT THE UC..... | 44 |
| Changing Admission and Section Criteria..... | 45 |
| Eliminating the SAT | 45 |
| Increasing the weights of the SAT-I and SAT-II..... | 45 |
| The Top 4 Percent Rule | 46 |
| De-valuing the Extra Credit Awarded for Honors and AP Coursework..... | 47 |
| Increased Emphasis on Outreach | 47 |

SECTION 4: CASE STUDY OF THE CSU SYSTEM AND CSU SACRAMENTO

| | |
|--|-----------|
| | 51 |
| THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM..... | 51 |
| CSU Governance and Policymaking | 51 |
| Board of Trustees..... | 52 |
| Current Undergraduate Admission Policies for the CSU System | 53 |
| System-wide Subject Requirements..... | 53 |
| System-Wide Eligibility Index..... | 54 |
| Selection Criteria..... | 54 |
| Special Admissions Policies | 55 |
| Basic Application Procedures..... | 56 |
| Campus-level Admissions Policies..... | 57 |
| Undergraduate Placement in the CSU | 57 |
| CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO | 60 |
| Current Undergraduate Admission Policies at CSUS..... | 60 |
| Current Undergraduate Placement Policies at CSUS | 61 |
| Basic Placement Procedures | 62 |
| CSU Placement Exams: Content and Scoring | 63 |
| Remediation Levels: Student ELM and EPT Data | 66 |
| Time Frame for Assessment and Placement..... | 68 |
| Administration of Exams | 68 |
| ELM and EPT Data Collection and Reporting | 69 |
| Tensions between CSU System and Individual Campuses..... | 69 |
| CONTINUING POLICY CONCERNS AT THE CSU | 70 |
| Admissions..... | 70 |
| Placement and Remediation..... | 71 |
| Reducing Remediation in the CSU | 71 |
| Strengthening Articulation: Communication Procedures and Outreach Efforts..... | 72 |
| Outreach Innovations at CSUS | 73 |
| SECTION 5: CONCLUSIONS TO PHASE I..... | 76 |
| GENERAL CONCLUSIONS..... | 76 |
| Lack of Policy Alignment..... | 76 |
| Forces Preserving Misalignment Within Higher Education | 77 |
| UC's Struggle for Diversity in the Post-209 Era..... | 77 |
| Reducing Remediation Rates in the CSU | 78 |
| Promising Developments in Alignment and Coordination..... | 78 |
| A Memorandum of Understanding between CSUS and Regional School Districts | 78 |
| Alignment of CSU and UC Course Requirements..... | 79 |
| APPENDICIES..... | 80 |
| APPENDIX A1: UCD STUDENT DATA SHEET | 81 |
| APPENDIX A2: SUBJECT A STATISTICS, UC DAVIS (PART I)..... | 82 |
| APPENDIX A3: SUBJECT A STATISTICS, UC DAVIS (PART II)..... | 83 |
| APPENDIX A4: STATISTICS ON REQUIRED REMEDIATION/DEVELOPMENT AT UCD..... | 84 |
| APPENDIX B1: CSU SACRAMENTO STUDENT DATA, FALL 1997..... | 85 |
| APPENDIX B2: CSU SACRAMENTO 1995-96 STUDENT DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION | 86 |
| REFERENCES | 87 |

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Educational reform continues to sweep the nation in various forms – continuing standards movements, accountability and assessment of teacher and student performance, class size reduction, shifting college admissions policies, and the curbing of “social promotion” are just a few of the many areas of reform activity. Though the intent of nearly all educational reform is to improve educational outcomes for students, very little effort has ever been made to coordinate reform across educational sectors to ensure academic success throughout the entire educational trajectory of students. Educational reform and change historically has been isolated within either the K-12 or higher education sectors. Standards for defining college-level coursework and remedial courses, for example, are determined solely by the higher education sector, while local and state level agencies define the curricula for “college prep” courses in high schools. The lack of coordination between public K-12 and post-secondary sectors may aggravate successful transitions between the systems and diminish educational opportunity for many students.

Several problems surfacing in higher education seem to be a direct consequence of the lack of coordination, misalignment of standards and expectations, and the confusing signals that those conditions must certainly be sending to students and educators alike. For example, many students are not taking the appropriate course sequences necessary to prepare properly for higher education. A June 2000 ACT national survey reported that 20 percent of students bound for four-year institutions, and nearly 40 percent headed for two-year schools, indicated that they would not take all the courses ACT deemed necessary for college-level work.¹ ACT stressed that students from low-income families are more likely than their more affluent peers to have high educational goals, but often do not understand what it takes to achieve them. Two other problems are particularly noteworthy in the context of educational success in the larger public K-16 system. First, retention and completion rates in many of our public colleges and universities are very low. Graduation rates at the least selective public colleges in many states range between 30 percent and 50 percent, and in some states, the least successful institutions have rates below 20 percent (The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1999). Second, the extent of enrollment in remedial or developmental education courses is high, particularly in public colleges and universities. In 1995, all public two-year institutions and over 80 percent of public four-year institutions offered at least one remedial course. And in the fall of 1995, 29 percent of all first-time freshmen enrolled in at least one remedial reading, writing, or mathematics course (Lewis and Ferris, 1996).

These educational realities in the higher education sector call us to question whether coordinated reform efforts throughout the broader K-16 system can improve student outcomes across the board. For example, many states have mandated assessments of educational progress for students in their K-12 sector, which reflect a particular set of

¹ *Education Week*, June 21, 2000, Page 5.

standards for student learning and performance. The standard assessments for college readiness across the country are the SAT and ACT exams, neither of which are aligned in content with K-12 standards in many states (Kirst, 1999). Can common standards and assessment tools across sectors result in better high school performance and college readiness, especially among students who aspire to, but do not make it to college? Can the coordination of college admission policies and high school curricula simplify the qualification, application, and admission process for students and institutions? Can K-12 achievement standards be established and met while simultaneously reducing the costly proliferation of remediation in higher education?

A major goal of the Bridge Project is to examine the policies that govern transitions from secondary to higher education in the public sector. We are interested in understanding how these policies are communicated to, and interpreted by, secondary school-level educators, parents, and students. Furthermore, we seek to understand how the current policies and practices regarding admission and academic placement in higher education align with the secondary education standards and assessments.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This case report focuses on issues of policy alignment and understanding for K-16 transitions in California. California provides an informative context for these issues in light of three aspects of K-16 education in the state. First, California has a rather unique, explicitly tiered and coordinated state college and university system that structures access to higher education (CPEC, 1993). The state also has at least one body attempting to address educational reform across sectors, the Intersegmental Coordinating Council of the California Education Round Table. Second, public higher education, particularly the University of California, has had to respond to the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996. The statute prohibits the use of race-based affirmative action in university admissions, and just prior to and since its enforcement, the nine campuses of the University of California have altered their admission policies to remain in compliance. In many cases, policies have been altered more than once. Finally, K-12 education continues to experience waves of accountability-oriented reform, resulting in a barrage of assessments administered to students including the Golden State Examination, the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program, and the High School Exit Exam.

The report contains an analysis of the general education policy context in California, and the admissions and placement policies influencing successful transitions from secondary to postsecondary education. Through a regional study of the Sacramento metro region, the report examines many K-16 issues of concern to California policymakers.²

² See Policy Analysis for California Education, Crucial Issues in California Education Policy (UC Berkeley: PACE 2000), pp. 173-205.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

We propose to link streams of work on policy coherence and motivation noted above into conceptions of policy signaling and incentives. Within our research agenda, we view admissions/placement standards and institutional arrangements as policies that communicate signals, meaning, and expected behavior to students and secondary schools. By understanding admissions and placement policies as signals, it is our intention to examine both existing policy structures and proposed reforms within the same analytical framework—specifically, the interaction that occurs within a state. In each state, our concern is with how admissions standards and policies promulgated by states and higher education institutions are understood, acted upon, and interpreted by parents, students, and secondary school personnel. An underlying belief embedded in this project is that clear, consistent, and reinforced signals will enhance the “college knowledge” of prospective students in secondary schools. If the signals are embedded within incentives that provide extrinsic motivation to students, they will be more effective. We focus upon incentives that will help students be better prepared for college-level work, admitted to universities, and complete their desired degrees (or community college competencies).

Examples of incentives could be admissions priority for students who complete numerous college preparatory courses or teacher development that helps increase the probability of students passing a placement test. We do not explore intrinsic motivations, but realize that they are an important component of motivating prospective college student behavior.

Signaling theory suggests that streamlined messages have a positive effect on students’ learning and achievement, and that mixed signals—the current state of affairs—have the opposite effect. Crucial aspects of signals and incentives are clarity and consistency. Consistency occurs when signals, incentives, and institutional policies are aligned—for example, how the format and content of state and local student assessments are aligned with the ACT or SAT. We posit that if incoherent and vague signals and incentives are sent by universities to students, then there will be less adequate student preparation for higher education. Though there is little current research on policy signaling, this work builds upon related work by higher education scholars (Flint 1992; McDonough 1994; Rosenbaum et al. 1996). We should note that our use of the term “signaling” is slightly different than that of John Bishop and other economists who have explored this topic.³ As Bishop uses the term, signaling refers to the attributes—achievement, education level, and ability—that students consciously attempt to transmit to employees and colleges. Our use of the term focuses on the signals that *policies* send to students and schools (Mow and Nettles, 1990). Improved signals to students will help foster improved “college knowledge” among secondary students.

³ For a similar definition of signaling to ours, see Fuhrman (1996).

GENERAL CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT

Public Higher Education

Structure and Governance

California has a strongly delineated, three-tiered public higher education system, whose functions were established by the Master Plan for Higher Education in 1960. According to state enrollment projections made in 1960, enrollment was expected to increase almost 350 percent between 1958 and 1975, and California's public officials believed that the state's future revenues could not sustain its level of public service. The Master Plan for Higher Education, as legislated by the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960, was enacted to achieve two main objectives: (1) to guard the State and state funds against unwarranted expansion and unhealthy competition among the segments of public higher education, and (2) to provide collegiate opportunities for qualified young people and give the segments and institutions enough freedom to furnish the diverse higher educational services needed by the state.

The Master Plan wed two very important aspects of the K-16 transition process -- mission and admission -- by linking the differentiation of function to a differentiation of access (CA Legislature, 1989, p. 16). First, the Plan placed regulations on the State's higher education institutions' selectivity (CPEC, 1993). The University of California (UC) was charged to restrict admission to the upper 12.5 percent of high school graduates, and the State College system (later renamed the California State University or CSU) was to restrict admission to the upper 33.3 percent. The Master Plan also limited lower-division enrollment to 40 percent of the CSU undergraduate enrollment, thus diverting substantial numbers of lower-division students to the community colleges (Gerth, 1971, p. 16). The Junior Colleges (now known as the California Community Colleges or CCC), which cost the State the least amount of tuition per student among the state-supported segments, were to maintain open enrollment. The mission and relative size of each system was likewise delineated. Their current missions are defined below:

- The University of California has eight general campuses and one health science campus (UC San Francisco). Its mission is to provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, including teacher education; to have the primary responsibility for state-supported research; to maintain the exclusive jurisdiction over professional education in such fields as dentistry, law, and medicine; and, with the exception of a few joint-degree programs with the CSU, to have the sole authority to award the doctoral degree. The UC system currently serves roughly 130,000 undergraduates and 40,000 graduate students. Each year, UC confers approximately 42,000 degrees, including 10 percent of the nation's Ph.D.s.⁴
- The California State University has 23 campuses. Its mission is to provide: instruction through the master's degree in the liberal arts and sciences, teacher

⁴ UCOP, Profile of the university. Retrieved October 5, 1999, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/commserv/profile/>.

education, and in professions and applied fields that require more than two years of collegiate study; and faculty research that is consistent with these primary instructional functions. As the largest university system in United States, the CSU serves roughly 350,000 students. The CSU system confers approximately 65,000 baccalaureate and masters degrees annually, more than half of the bachelor's degrees and 30 percent of the master's degrees granted in California.⁵

- The California Community College system has 71 locally governed districts that operate 107 colleges. This system provides (1) standard collegiate courses for transfer, (2) vocational/technical training, and (3) general or liberal education leading to the associate in arts or science degree. The system also provides remedial or developmental education, English as a Second Language, and basic skills and other basic education for adults. These colleges enroll over 1 million full- or part-time students.

The governance structures for each segment are similarly distinct. Community colleges are characterized by a larger degree of local control relative to the CSU and UC. The community colleges were separated from the local school districts in the late 1980s, and new local community college districts were created. These new districts contain their own governing boards that participate in a "shared governance" with the system-wide Board of Governors. The CSU is governed by its Board of Trustees, which establishes system-wide minimum criteria for admission, procedures for course placement, and various other policies for its 22 campuses and six off-campus centers across the state. Because the state legislature sets and approves the CSU budget, the state colleges have been subject to some direct control by several state agencies to the extent that many functions that are normally given to a governing board have been in the hands of officers in other departments of government. In contrast, the University of California has had substantial autonomy from direct state controls and has centralized administrative authority on the state-wide rather than on local campus levels. The UC is the only higher education system in the state that has constitutional status. Article IX, Section 9 of the California Constitution, specifies that its controlling board, the Board of Regents, has "full powers of organization and governance" subject only to very specific areas of legislative control. The UC Regents have ultimate authority over all policies within the University, including admission policies and procedures.

Intersegmental Bodies and Collaborative Efforts

Though the three segments maintain distinct and separate missions and governance structures, there are bodies that attempt to coordinate the functioning of the three institutions and influence policymaking toward that end. The most prominent of these is the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). CPEC is an independent agency that represents the public by serving as the state's planning and coordinating body. The Commission has 16 Board Members: nine representatives of the general public (with three each appointed by the Governor, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Speaker of the Assembly); five representatives of the major postsecondary education

⁵ CSU Office of Public Affairs. About the CSU. Retrieved November 28, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.calstate.edu/tier3/pubaffairs/Info/system.html>.

segments in California (i.e., Trustees of the CSU, the UC Regents, the State Board of Education, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities); and two student representatives. CPEC serves as a clearinghouse for information, planning, evaluation, and coordination. It maintains a statewide data base; coordinates efforts among the educational segments; and -- most relevant to this study -- conducts Eligibility Studies to estimate the proportion of public high school graduates who are eligible for freshman admission to California public universities. These data are then used to ensure that higher education admission policies adhere to the state's Master Plan. CPEC has legal and statutory authority to conduct intersegmental activities, but with a limited budget through which to carry out such activities. Further, it has no authority to "require" activities or participation and it is relatively understaffed to perform an appropriate intersegmental role.

In addition to CPEC, there are two other primary statewide, cross-institutional or cross-segmental bodies that concern themselves with improving K-16 articulation and setting standards in language arts and mathematics: (1) the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates and (2) the California Education Round Table's Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC). These entities are described below. The efforts of these groups have resulted primarily in recommendations, some of which have been supported by high-level endorsements. Their recommendations may result in policy change, but some overlap and duplication in cross-sector work to identify standards, assessments, and benchmarks are also evident.

The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) is comprised of representatives of the UC, CSU, and CCC academic senates. This committee published a document attempting articulation in the area of mathematics, entitled, "Statement on Competencies in Mathematics Expected of Entering College Students." Committee members who prepared this report represented the following organizations: CSU campuses (3 representatives), community colleges (3 representatives), UC campuses (3 representatives), the California Department of Education (1 representative), and high schools (2 representatives). Their statement is intended for K-12 teachers, so that they are aware of expectations for students who seek enrollment in public institutions. A corollary document was published for Language Arts.

The California Education Round Table, a voluntary association of the chiefs of the systems (or segments) of education in California, includes the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President of the UC, the Chancellors of the CSU and CCC, the President of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, and the Executive Director of CPEC. The Round Table considers issues affecting all segments of California education. The Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC) is the programmatic arm of the California Education Round Table. Composed of staff, faculty and student representatives from all segments of education, the ICC oversees working subcommittees and task groups which carry out Round Table priorities. The ICC is the primary and most influential intersegmental body in the state. ICC is addressing the following issues: (1) alignment of the newly adopted State Board of Education Standards and the Expectations of Freshmen in Higher Education with appropriate instruments, (2) mobilization of the resources of all educational sectors to enrich the capacity of the teaching profession in order that students will reach high standards, (3) expansion of the collaborative

administrative applications of technology and accessibility to technology for all students, (4) intensification of the delivery of services designed to prepare students academically and inform them about college, and (5) strengthening of the transfer process among and within higher education.

In December 1996, the ICC's Committee on K-18 Curricular Issues issued a report containing a set of policy recommendations. The report built on a previous document prepared by the Committee entitled, "K-12 School Reform: Implications and Responsibilities for Higher Education," and addresses the following three questions:

- How do current and emerging standards, admissions policies, and assessment practices of the four public education segments impinge upon students in their senior year? Particular attention was paid to the ways in which current practices do, or could, conflict to the students' detriment.
- How do current admissions policies affect the academic value of the high school senior year?
- How do the restructuring of high schools, redesign and integration of the high school curricula, the redefinition of graduation requirements, and changing admissions standards resolve or exacerbate the practices discussed above?

The policy recommendations were intended to provide the starting point for local, regional, and statewide discussions about the underlying issues surrounding the high school senior year. The expectation was that these recommendations would prompt critical and insightful discussions about the issues, leading to specific, student- and policy-oriented change. The report concludes by stating that continuous intersegmental efforts are critical, and that a primary focus on activities should be on the senior year of high school as a key lever for reform.

The ICC has also produced a set of articulation documents called the "Standards for California High School Graduates in Mathematics and English." In developing both math and English standards for California, the ICC attempted to clarify the relationship between graduation standards and expected competencies for entering college freshmen. But unlike the ICAS document mentioned above, which sets forth expectations in mathematics for college-bound students, the math portion of the ICC document is intended to convey mathematics expectations for all students who intend to graduate from high school. The ICC-developed English standards, however, are intended to directly align with the recommendations of postsecondary institutions for entrance into freshmen English programs (ICC, 1997, p. 48). In October 1997, the California Education Round Table published its "Standards for California High School Graduates" jointly with the ICAS mathematics standards.

K-12 State Standards and Frameworks

The State Board of Education has the primary authority to make K-12 policy. A major obstacle to achieving the goal of aligning standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments, however, is California's fragmented, convoluted, and poorly defined system of governance in the K-12 sector; there is no "master plan," or road map that can guide

policy toward a systemic end (CA Legislative Analyst's Office, 1999, p.5). Nevertheless, California's K-12 system has made great strides.

There are a number of state-wide standards-setting efforts underway in California. AB 265 charges the Commission for the Establishment of Academic Content and Performance Standards "with developing standards to recommend to the State Board of Education" as soon as 1998 (ICC, 1996, p. 13). In addition, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin's proposed (and politically popular) Challenge School District program calls for "standards to be set by grade level K-8 and for 'leaving' standards for high school as demonstrated on 'leaving' examinations" 1998 (ICC, 1996, p. 14).

There are three basic groups in the state that are involved in standards setting initiatives in language arts and mathematics: (1) the Education Round Table's ICC; (2) the Standards Commission, which reports to the governor; and (3) the State Board of Education. Each group has published two sets of competency and content standards documents (one set each for math and language arts).

Both the ICAS and ICC standards were developed to advise classroom teachers, school districts, the State Board of Education, and the Standards Commission on the level of knowledge and skills that the state's education community believe that high school graduates will need. The Standards Commission made recommendations to the State Board of Education in Fall 1997. ICC's next and related project is to develop an assessment to accompany the standards (ICC, 1996). However, the standards are voluntary by district, likely lack "teeth" for either local or state acceptance, and only apply to high school students about to graduate.

The California State Board of Education has been the primary dissenting group in the multiple standards-setting, intersegmental activities underway in California. In general, the board has disagreed with the math standards presented by the ICC; further, it has created its own standards commission for developing and adopting content standards in both math and language arts. The Board has been focused on factual, rote, routine-based basic skills. In contrast, the ICC and the ICAS have proposed relatively more rigorous standards (particularly in math), and have emphasized critical thinking.

California's reform efforts began with the development of content standards, then content frameworks, and finally the STAR assessment program. Assembly Bill 265, signed into law in October 1995, provided for the development of new statewide content and performance standards in the core curricular areas of language arts, mathematics, history/social science, and science. As outlined below, content standards have been implemented, and frameworks have been published. Performance standards, however, have yet to be implemented, which underscores some of the challenges the State faces in articulating what it considers to be adequate.

- *State Content Standards.* The State Board of Education has approved content standards for all grade levels in English, math, science, and social studies. Of particular interest to this study are the *Mathematics Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve*, and the *English-Language Arts Content Standards for California Public Schools, Kindergarten through Grade Twelve*, which were both published in December 1997. While the use of the State Board-adopted content standards is voluntary and still under the

control of local school boards, districts have been asked to demonstrate the ways in which their standards meet or exceed State standards. Moreover, all districts will be held accountable, through state assessment results, for their students' achievement toward the standards. Hence, the State standards form the basis of curriculum development at every grade level and a statewide assessment and accountability system.

- *State Frameworks.* The *Language Arts and Mathematics Framework*, published in 1999, offer blueprints for implementation of the content standards adopted by the California State Board of Education in 1997. While the content standards describe the content students should master by the end of each grade level, frameworks elaborate on those standards and describe the curriculum, assessment, instruction, organization, and professional development necessary to help students achieve the levels of mastery.

- *State Performance Standards.* With the exception of high school graduation standards, the State has not yet implemented performance standards indicating the level of achievement expected of students in each subject area for each grade. The State Board of Education plans for these performance standards to be aligned with state content standards and assessments.

Although California does strive to align standards with assessments within the K-12 policy arena, the efforts reported above indicate only a small effort toward improving compatibility and coherence between K-12 and higher education. The lack of compatibility between K-12 and higher education policies and practices in California is evident in two ways: (1) policymaking bodies in the two education sectors have minimal interaction and opportunity for collaboration and coherence, and (2) education assessments are not aligned. The latter point is discussed in the next section.

Assessments in California⁶

The lack of standardization among the different assessment exams in California has resulted in an array of variations in form and content. K-12 policymakers continue to strive to align textbooks, curricula, and student assessment tools. An even bigger challenge is to achieve policy coherence in content and assessment standards between K-12 and higher education. Some have proposed that unless the curriculum, standards, and assessments are carefully aligned, there will be serious ramifications for the effectiveness of the proposed system (Ed Source, 1998, p.4). The following presents the secondary and postsecondary assessments that California administers or plans to administer, followed by an analysis of the challenges California faces in aligning these assessments.

⁶ Assessment information is applicable to the 1997-1998 school year, the time at which the study was conducted.

Secondary School Assessments

California has two existing assessment programs for its secondary schools: the Golden State Examination (GSE) and the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program. In addition, two new assessments – the California Assessment of Applied Academic Skills (Matrix Sample) and the California High School Exit Examination – have been recently legislated. Of these two new assessments, only the exit examination program has received funding.

Golden State Exam

The California State Department of Education administers the Golden State Exam, a test that is based on the state's curricular frameworks. The GSE program offers end-of-course examinations in key academic subjects to students in grades seven through twelve. The Golden State examinations assess students' knowledge of the subjects and their ability to apply that knowledge. All of the examinations, except written composition, include a balance of multiple-choice items and questions or problems that require written responses. The science examinations include laboratory tasks.

The GSE recognizes students for demonstrating outstanding levels of achievement on each examination. Participation is voluntary for districts, and students who take the exams must be currently enrolled in courses covered by the GSE. The program provides students with an opportunity to build a cumulative record of their GSE achievements as they progress toward high school graduation. Success on six of the Golden State examinations can qualify students for the Golden State Seal Merit Diploma, established by AB 3488, that is designed to recognize students for their academic achievement across the curriculum. This achievement is recorded on their high school transcripts and recognized by a special insignia on their diplomas.

California's Standardized Testing and Reporting Program

The STAR program was authorized by Senate Bill 376 in October 1997. As required by statute, the California State Board of Education designated a statewide assessment test, the Stanford 9, in November 1997. First administered statewide in Spring of 1998, the Stanford 9 is a multiple-choice test that allows comparisons to be made to a national sample of students. School districts in California are required to test all students in grades 2 through 11. High school-level testing includes reading, writing, mathematics, science, and history/social science.

In 1999, two sets of items were administered to supplement the Stanford 9 in order to address California's State Board of Education adopted content standards in language arts and mathematics. These included 35 language arts items and 35 math items, which were designed to assess progress toward the standards. Hence, a combination of selected items from the original Stanford 9 math and language arts exams and the 35 augmented questions was used to comprise the California Standards Test. In addition to the STAR augmentation, the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, 2nd Edition (SABE/2) was added for Spanish speaking and limited English proficient students.⁷

⁷ California Department of Education. Standardized Testing and Reporting Program. Retrieved August 19, 1999, from the World Wide Web: <http://star.cde.ca.gov/star99/index.html>.

California Assessment of Applied Academic Skills (Matrix Sample)⁸

The CAAAS was enacted in 1995 and is scheduled to be implemented in Spring of 2001. The criterion-referenced matrix sample would assess a much broader array of content items and is proposed as a measure of progress toward state standards. The tests will include multiple choice and open-ended items. Students will be tested at the end of grades 4, 5, 8, and 10. High School sophomores will be tested in reading, writing, math, history-social science, and science.

Though legislated, this assessment program is losing ground in California's policy circles. Funds have yet to be appropriated for the tests' development and many legislators are doubtful of its ever receiving funding.

High School Exit Exams

Like the CAAAS, the California High School Exit Exam is still under development. The legislation for this exam, enacted in 1999 as Senate Bill 2X, appropriated \$2 million to the State Department of Education for developing this exam and also required the State Board of Education to adopt state performance standards on the exam by July 2000. The first administration of this exam is targeted for Spring 2001. Students will be required to pass this exam, which will be aligned to state standards, in order to earn a high school diploma. Students will be tested throughout grades 10-12 in language arts and mathematics.

Higher Education Assessments

The high stakes assessment exams for higher education present another maze for California students to navigate. We outline four major exams that college applicants and newly-matriculated college students in California take: (1) the SAT-I and ACT for university admissions; (2) the SAT-II (required by UC); (3) Advanced Placement; and (4) Entrance/Placement Exams for public and private California colleges and universities.

Scholastic Assessment Test I (SAT-I) and ACT Assessment (ACT)

The SAT-I is a norm-referenced, multiple choice test of verbal and math reasoning. California's state standards and assessments are not aligned with the SAT-I; SAT-I results are not indicators of students' overall academic performance in school. In 1998, 49 percent of the state's 334,852 seniors took the SAT-I compared to 43 percent nationally (Schevitz, 1999). The UC requires all applicants to submit SAT-I scores (or the ACT), and the CSU requires SAT-I scores only for those students with a high school grade point average below 3.0. SAT-I covers algebra and geometry, but also includes ratios and data interpretation that are not stressed on CSU placement tests. An SAT-I score above 550, however, exempts CSU entrants from taking the CSU placement tests.

The ACT is a three-hour, multiple-choice exam that assesses achievement in several academic subjects. Like the SAT-I, the ACT is used primarily for college admission. The ACT, a test made in Iowa City, is more popularly used by Midwestern colleges and universities. For the most part, California is an SAT-driven state and very few students take the ACT.

⁸ At this writing, CAAAS has not been implemented

Scholastic Assessment Test II (SAT-II)

The SAT-II tests (formerly called “Achievement Tests”) are norm-referenced, multiple choice and open-ended tests. The UC requires three SAT-II subject tests: (1) writing; (2) mathematics; and (3) a subject in an area appropriate to the chosen discipline of college study. Studies have shown that the SAT-II predicts freshman grades as successfully as SAT-I, and some UC departments, such as the College of Engineering at UCLA, believe that the SAT-II is a better predictor of success in their program.⁹ At the UC, the tests are growing in significance, as plans to increase the weight of the SAT-II, relative to the SAT-I, are being implemented (Galligani, 1999).

Advanced Placement (AP)

Advanced Placement is a program sponsored by the College Board that provides secondary teachers with curriculum guides for 32 college-level courses in 19 subjects. College and secondary school educators oversee the courses, develop and grade the annual exams, and lead workshops every year. AP Exams are graded on a scale from 1 to 5 (the top score). Grades of 3, 4 or 5 qualify students for academic credit and/or placement into advanced courses at virtually all of the nation's colleges and universities.¹⁰ In addition to earning college credit, high AP scores on the English and Math AP exams also exempt matriculated students from placement exams at the UC and CSU. Furthermore, the University of California allows extra weighting of grades earned in AP courses completed in the sophomore and junior year.

College Placement Exams

The CSU and UC systems administer criterion-referenced, multiple choice and open-ended English and mathematics entry-level placement exams for new students. These tests are designed to determine college readiness and course placement. The CSU and UC administer different placement exams. The CSU administers two placement exams for admitted and entering first-year students: the Entry Level Mathematics examination (ELM) and the English Placement Test (EPT). At CSU Long Beach, the Director of Testing prepared a document that simulates the use of the SAT-I (and ACT) on predicting EPT and ELM scores; these data suggest that the SAT-I can be used to accurately predict performance on the EPT and, less closely, the ELM. The study found a 0.79 correlation between the SAT-verbal score and the EPT and a 0.70 correlation between the SAT-math score and the ELM, suggesting that the SAT-I could be a reliable proxy for current CSU placement exams.

The UC system administers the Subject A English Examination, and while all UC campuses use the Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Program (MDTP) on a departmental basis, there is no official UC policy concerning math placement. These placement exams are not fully aligned with the K-12 content standards, since they were developed prior to the establishment of these standards.

⁹ As stated by Rae Lin Siporin, UCLA's Director of Admission in her address at the UC Counselors' Conference, Sept., 1999 at UC Berkeley.

¹⁰ College Board Web Page, <http://www.collegeboard.org/press/html9900/html/991026.html>, Oct. 31, 1999).

Alignment and Coordination of Assessments

Michael W. Kirst (1999) has noted the vast array of educational assessments in California and questions the degree of coherence among them across systems in K-16 public education. He observes that the tests have different purposes such as assessing preparation for college, placing entering college students in appropriate levels of coursework, predicting university performance, determining trends in statewide K-12 standards, and comparing state test results to national norms. The varied purposes of the tests, he argues, are indicative of the poor alignment of the assessments.

Kirst (1998) cites a number of examples of poor alignment. First, the placement tests given by the UC and CSU appear to assess different skills for ostensibly the same purpose, determining readiness for "college-level work." To determine freshmen English placement, the UC uses a student writing component that involves interpretation and analysis. In contrast, at the CSU the freshman placement writing exam emphasizes grammar and sentence structure. Misalignment between sectors is also evident. The entry-level mathematics test given by the CSU covers Algebra, Geometry, and Algebra II. This test, which is devised by a committee of CSU professors, is a mismatch with the State Board of Education math standards that contain more math problem solving. The Golden State Exam relies much less upon multiple choice than the CSU placement exams or the SAT-I, and the Golden State Exam stresses probability theory in addition to Algebra and Geometry. The SAT-I does not follow specific course sequences like Algebra I, II, and Geometry, but both the UC and CSU placement exams do. The SAT-II does follow course sequences, but CSU does not require this exam for its applicants, though it is arguable that CSU and USC have different standards for "college-level work." This results in numerous and different assessments of college readiness in students.

Kirst concludes that there is no clear linkage for teachers between K-12 content and performance standards and the various university entrance and placement exams. The UC and CSU placement tests are not designed to diagnose student weaknesses and high school teachers are not advised of their students' results on these placement exams. Furthermore, neither the Stanford 9 nor the upcoming high school exit exam is designed to measure university preparation. Hence, these consequential exams may not be aligned well with the tests high school teachers devise for major review phases in their courses and high school teachers have little opportunity to revamp their courses to better prepare their students for the university placement exams. Using the language of signaling, Kirst (1998) asserts that universities send so many different priority content signals to secondary schools that it is difficult for teachers to effectively coordinate course content with the universities' curricular expectations.

In a recent study commissioned for this project, Le, Hamilton, and Robyn (2000) of the RAND Corporation conducted a content and form analysis of three types of tests: K-12 accountability and monitoring tests, college admissions tests, and college placement tests. For their analysis, Le and her colleagues first mapped the framework of specifications for math and English. They then conducted an alignment exercise on several key dimensions. For math they analyzed the technical features, content, and cognitive process involved in negotiating the assessments. For English, they analyzed three types of items: reading, objective writing (mainly multiple choice items), and essay

writing. The researchers found variations in the content and difficulty level and concluded that these variations may send mixed messages to students and schools about what kinds of skills are valued. However, the researchers also argue that lack of alignment may not necessarily be problematic, as the tests serve different purposes and that creating one all-encompassing test is virtually impossible. The study's format and content analyses reveal what appears to be a lack of coordination among those who design and administer K-16 standards and assessments in California.

As the above summary describes, there continue to be vast disparities in content across all tests required of high school students matriculating to various California higher education institutions. Each system, and moreover each campus, has its own admission selection and placement criteria. And furthermore, the level of knowledge that students and parents have about the differing content among these assessments is unknown.

Recent Policies, Legislation, and Legal Action Affecting Higher Education

Throughout the US, there has been a broad rethinking of race-based affirmative action in admissions in higher education. In California, three recent policies (or actions with policy implications) relating to affirmative action significantly impact admission, selection, and placement: (1) Former California Governor Wilson's Executive Order on Affirmative Action (1995); (2) UC's SP-1 and SP-2 (1995); and (3) Proposition 209 (1997). These policy changes came at the wake of the *Hopwood v. State of Texas* decision, a 1996 5th District court ruling that struck down the University of Texas Law School's affirmative action admissions policy.

In 1995, California Governor Pete Wilson issued an Executive Order repealing affirmative action requirements not required by state law or federal mandate. This executive order was a precursor for what would eventually become Proposition 209 in 1996. Also in 1995, the UC Regents passed the UC Policy Ensuring Equal-Treatment Admissions and Employment (SP-1 and SP-2). SP-1 eliminated the consideration of race, gender, religion, color, national origin, and/or ethnicity in admission decisions to the university; SP-2 was a corollary that eliminated the hiring of faculty or staff based on these same criteria. These policies went into effect during the 1997-98 admission/selection cycle. Further discussion of these policies can be found in the description of the UC case study later in this report.

In 1996, Californians approved Proposition 209, a voter initiative which prohibits discrimination or the granting of preferences in education, employment, or contracting based on race/ethnicity, gender, or national origin. Following the initiative's passage, the American Civil Liberties Union filed a lawsuit in federal court on behalf of a number of groups opposed to Proposition 209. The suit sought to bar its implementation, challenge its constitutionality, and define what is meant by "preference." The district court initially issued an injunction prohibiting implementation of Proposition 209, but in April 1997, a federal appeals court struck down the injunction. Recently, the US Supreme Court refused to hear the case, thus securing the Proposition into law.

The UC Regents' passage of SP-1 and SP-2 also triggered a set of debates regarding university and campus governance. The university-wide Academic Senate of the UC rallied against the passage of SP-1, believing that the Regents had over-stepped its legal

grounds and had violated a long tradition of shared governance. The academic community strongly suspected “that the Regents’ action was not simply a statement of principle, but part of a coordinated campaign to bolster a ballot initiative to ban affirmative action, and to support the political ambitions of the Governor” (Douglass, 1997, Section IV, paragraph 4)¹¹. In the fall of 1995, all UC campus Academic Senates chapters joined forces to file a formal request that SP-1 and SP-2 be rescinded.

SP-1 and SP-2 still stand today. Legal review of the Regents’ action suggests that they are legal and within the purview of the Regents’ authority. However, this legal review determined that SP-1 does not affect outreach efforts to individuals. This review and the adoption of SP-1 has caused a ripple of activity at the UC regarding both changes in selection criteria and increased focus on targeted outreach to underrepresented students.

Lastly, on February 2, 1999, African American, Latino, Pilipino American students and related organizations filed a class action lawsuit in the U.S. District Court in San Francisco, charging that U.C. Berkeley's undergraduate admissions process violates federal civil rights laws. Plaintiffs include African American, Latino and Pilipino American freshmen college students currently attending college elsewhere who were denied admission to U.C. Berkeley, as well as three minority organizations that represent future applicants to Berkeley: the Imani Youth Council of the Oakland NAACP, the California League of United Latin American Citizens, and the Kababayan Alliance, a Pilipino high school student organization.

The case, known as *Jesus Rios v. the University of California*, was filed by a legal team that includes the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) of Northern California, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights (LCCR) of the San Francisco Bay Area, the Asian Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California, and the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. The suit alleges that UC Berkeley’s new admissions--now without provisions for race-based affirmative action--have a disparate impact on African American, Latino, and Pilipino American applicants and is therefore discriminatory under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. More specifically, the plaintiffs allege that the UC Berkeley admissions policy places too much weight on SAT scores and grades in Advanced Placement (AP) courses. SAT scores, the plaintiffs claim, represent a poor measure of an applicant’s promise, and many schools with high concentrations of African Americans, Latinos and Pilipino Americans do not offer any AP courses.¹²

The availability of college preparatory courses and the enrollment patterns of students in those courses have been of central concern in recent years as CSU and UC have decided to impose new course requirements for admissions. The outcome of the Rios case will have important policy implications for the UC, as the University continues to search for ways to maintain current levels of access to underrepresented racial minorities.

Collectively, these aggressive policy actions and the Rios suit set the stage for a post-affirmative era in the state. Of particular relevance to this study are the policies that

¹¹ Douglass Report. Retrieved from World Wide Web: <http://ishi.lib.berkeley.edu/cshe/jdouglass/pub/toc.html>.

¹² American Civil Liberties Union. (1999, February 2). Minority students sue U.C. Berkeley for discrimination saying admissions process violates federal civil rights laws. Retrieved February 1999, from World Wide Web: <http://www.aclu.org/news/1999/n020299b.html>.

affect admission, selection, and placement at California's two 4-year systems of higher education in the following ways:

- Heightened struggles to re-define admission/selection criteria that preserve campus diversity
 - Increased emphasis on socio-economic status as an admission criterion
 - Increased emphasis on defining non-academic admission criteria
 - Renewed questioning of the validity of using SAT-I scores for admission purposes
 - Increased emphasis on pre-college outreach
 - Heated debates about admission/selection policy realms (especially within the UC System)
 - Waning public confidence in admission policies and the K-12 sector, due to high levels of college-level remediation (especially within the CSU System)
-

SECTION 2

RESEARCH DESIGN

GENERAL DESIGN

Research for this study was conducted in two phases, each with a specific focus and methodology:

- **Phase I:** The focus of this phase is gaining an understanding of current preparation and exit policies in the K-12 sector, college entrance and placement policies, and disjunctures between college admissions-related policies and K-12 policy and practice. The following questions are explored: What are the formal and informal state and higher education institutional policies and practices in K-16 education? How compatible are the K-16 standards and assessments in terms of their content, objectives, and specifications? The method of inquiry was qualitative case study. This report outlines the findings from this phase of research.

- **Phase II:** The second phase seeks to understand how higher education admissions standards and placement policies are communicated to, and understood by, secondary school-level educators, parents, and students. The methods of inquiry for this phase are parent and student quantitative surveys, focus group interviews with students, and individual interviews with teachers and administrators. A forthcoming report outlines from this phase of research.

A third phase of this project was also completed but is not reported here. In Phase III, educational policies that bear upon K-16 transitions are proposed and analyzed in light of the results of Phases I and II.

To capture an understanding of K-16 policies across a broad sample of college-bound students, Phase I inquiry focused upon two public universities and Phase II research was conducted in school districts that historically send graduates to those institutions. The two universities were chosen for their relative proximity to each other and variance in selectivity of admission. The University of California, Davis (UCD), located in the Sacramento area, is one of the nine campuses of the very selective University of California. The other case study institution, California State University, Sacramento (CSUS), is moderately selective. Phase II research was conducted in six schools in three Northern California school districts.

DATA COLLECTION

Phase I

Data collection consisted of individual interviews and the collection of relevant documents at the two university sites and system offices. Interviews were conducted by the Principal Investigator and two graduate students during the 1997-1998 school year.

Table 2-1

Interviewees at the University of California, Office of the President (UCOP) and UCD

| Name | Position |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <u>UCD</u> | |
| Mary Jo Anderson ^a | Administrative Analyst, Planning and Budget |
| Cynthia Bates ^b | Coordinator of the Subject A Examination |
| Peter Dale ^a | Vice Provost, Undergraduate Studies |
| John Dixon ^c | Coordinator, Undergraduate Scholarships |
| Pat Kearney ^c | Director of Student Housing and Financial Aid |
| Yvonne Marsh ^c | Assistant Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Services |
| Brian Miller ^a | Chair, Academic Senate |
| Evelyn Silvia ^a | Past Chair, Academic Senate, Chair, Task Force on Admission and Enrollment |
| Gary Tudor ^{a,c} | Director of Admissions |
| Carol Wall ^a | Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs |
| <u>UCOP</u> | |
| Immouna Ephrem ^d | Director of Placement |
| Carla Ferri ^d | Director of Undergraduate Admissions |
| Bob Polkinghorn ^d | Director of Higher Education/Lower Education Relationships |

^aOct 17, 1997; Mike Kirst and Amy Hightower, interviewers

^bOct 28, 1997; Amy Hightower, interviewer (by telephone)

^cOct 31, 1997; Amy Hightower and Sam Bersola, interviewers

^dFeb 25, 1998; Mike Kirst and Amy Hightower, interviewers

Table 2-2

Interviewees at CSUS

| Name | Position |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Donald Gerth ^c | President |
| Larry Glasmire ^a | Director of Admissions |
| Eric Gravenberg ^a | Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management |
| Isabel Hernandez-Serna ^a | Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs |
| Marilyn Jensen ^d | Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of University Academic Programs, CSU Long Beach |
| Linda Joy ^a | Director of Financial Aid |
| Nancy Sprotte ^b | Senior Director, Enrollment Management Division |
| Shirley Uplinger ^a | Vice President for Student Affairs |

^aSep 2, 1997; Mike Kirst and Amy Hightower, interviewers

^bMar 25, 1998; Amy Hightower, interviewer (by telephone)

^cOct 29, 1997; personal letter to Mike Kirst

^dJan 26, 1998; Mike Kirst and Amy Hightower, interviewers

Therefore, description and analysis of policies in this report reflect those in effect at the time of data collection. Each interview was audiotaped and lasted from 40 to 90 minutes. The individuals interviewed at each site are listed in Tables 2-1 and 2-2.

In addition to interviews conducted during site visits to the two campuses, supplementary phone interviews were also completed on occasion for clarification of information. Major documents reviewed for the study are cited in the body of this report.

Phase II

The Sacramento Metropolitan Area and surrounding cities was chosen as the target population for Phase II. Within this geographic area, we chose two high schools within each of three school districts in which to carry out data collection. Our aim was to choose schools that are geographically proximal to the institutions studied in Phase I (UCD and CSUS) to insure that our sample of students would view the two universities as their local UC and CSU options and therefore would likely seek out information on those institutions' policies and practices. Schools and districts were selected with regard to the following criteria: racial diversity, UC eligibility rates, UC- and CSU-going rates, SAT-I scores, and STAR scores. In addition, we considered the percentage of students on free or reduced lunch as an indicator of school socioeconomic status. Within high schools and districts, we attempted to choose schools that would provide contrasts in socioeconomic status, racial composition, and academic performance, while also selecting schools that normally send a fair number of students to the two local public universities. The characteristics of the six sampled high schools are summarized in Table 2-3.

Table 2-3
Selection Characteristics of Sampled High Schools

| District | High School | % White | % Reduced/free lunch | % completed UC a-f reqs | % enrolled @ UCD (#) | % enrolled @ CSUS (#) | 11 th gr Stanf. 9 (% >49 th pct) |
|----------|-------------|---------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | 48 | 16 | 15 | 5 (na) | 5 (na) | 42V 46M |
| | 2 | 44 | 17 | 22 | 7 (58) | 6 (33) | 33V 50M |
| 2 | 1 | 29 | 49 | 44 | 6 (50) | 13 (79) | 32V 45M |
| | 2 | 51 | 14 | 36 | 7 (47) | 12 (94) | 50V 64M |
| 3 | 1 | 30 | 24 | 37 | 14(51) | 4 (72) | 44V 53M |
| | 2 | 35 | 56 | 37 | 3 (46) | 8 (83) | 28V 44M |

na: data not available

The six high schools represent a range of our selection characteristics. Sampled schools in Districts 2 and 3 each represented a low and high performing pair within the district. District 1 had only two comprehensive high schools, however, and these schools were average-performing within the Northern California context. Racial composition and socioeconomic status had the most variance in District 2.

Within each school, we selected a stratified sample of students and their parents for participation in our study. Our selection matrix was a 2x2 design (grade level x honors track¹³) in which we targeted students in 9th grade, 11th grade, honors track, and non-honors track. At each high school this selection matrix resulted in a target sample of students in four English classrooms: one 9th grade college prep class, one 9th grade honors class, one 11th grade college prep class, and one 11th grade honors class. English classrooms were chosen to delineate students by grade level and academic track because, unlike mathematics courses, the classrooms were homogeneous with respect to grade level.

We surveyed students and their parents in the spring quarter of the 1998-1999 academic year using a questionnaire specifically designed for the study. Parents were asked to complete a 15-minute survey and an attached consent form. The parent survey collected data on family socioeconomic status, their knowledge of local college admission requirements, and their specific behaviors associated with obtaining information about college. Students returning signed consent forms were given approximately 30 minutes during class to complete a 27-question survey. The student survey was designed specifically for this study and gathered data on student behaviors, aspirations, and beliefs related to going to college. Copies of both parent and student surveys are reproduced in the Appendix. The final sample consisted of 443 students and 453 parents. There were 418 cases in which both student and parent were surveyed.

Individual and focus group interviews were also conducted at each school. We conducted focus group sessions with a random sample of approximately 10 students in each junior class that we surveyed. We conducted individual interviews with the teacher of each surveyed class, the vice principal for instruction, and a counselor who had responsibility for post-secondary counseling. We also interviewed a district-level administrator in charge of curriculum and assessment at each of the three school districts. All interviews were audiotaped and transcribed.

DATA ANALYSIS

Phase I

Data analysis in Phase I consisted of a straightforward parsing of interview or document data into categories reflective of specific admissions and placement policies (e.g., minimum eligibility requirements, application procedures, etc.).

Phase II

Univariate and crosstabular analyses were conducted on the student and parent survey data. To ascertain how well students understand higher education admissions and

¹³ Each of the schools in the study had no formal academic tracking of students. However, we assumed that many students still maintained primarily honors or college-prep (non-honors) course-taking patterns that can be indicated by the academic level of their English class.

placement policies and procedures, distributions of various indicators of the possession of knowledge about postsecondary policy as well as postsecondary aspirations were analyzed across several key independent variables. The interview data was analyzed using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Emergent themes pertaining to the research questions were selected for further description of the ways in which the transmission of college knowledge occurs in school contexts.

Dependent Variables

Following the research questions of the study, the dependent variables were designed to measure levels of knowledge possessed by students in the areas of college admissions and academic placement. For each of the target postsecondary institutions, students were asked to identify the tuition for one year, the curricular requirements for admission, the relative importance of various admission criteria, and their knowledge of placement test requirements. Students' postsecondary aspirations were also analyzed to understand their relationship with school-level and individual characteristics. Parent data was analyzed with respect to their knowledge of tuition and curricular requirements. The dependent variables are summarized in Table 2-4.

Table 2-4
Dependent measures

| Variable | Description | Scoring |
|---|--|-------------|
| <i>Tuition-CCC</i> ^a | Estimate of tuition for one year | Continuous |
| <i>Tuition-UCD</i> ^a | at the California Community College, | |
| <i>Tuition-CSUS</i> ^a | UC Davis, and CSU Sacramento | |
| <i>Postsecondary Aspirations</i> | Choice of desired postsecondary destinations: -Local community college -UC Davis -Other UC campus -CSU Sacramento -Other CSU campus | Dichotomous |
| <i>Curriculum Requirements-UCD</i> ^a | Course completion requirements for UCD admission. # of courses in: -English -Mathematics -Social Studies -Laboratory Science -Foreign Language -Visual/performing Arts | Continuous |

^aDependent measure from both student and parent surveys

Table 2-4 (continued)

Dependent measures

| Variable | Description | Scoring |
|---|--|--|
| <i>Curriculum Requirements-CSUS^a</i> | Course completion requirements for CSUS admission. # of courses in: -English -Mathematics -Social Studies -Laboratory Science -Foreign Language -Visual/performing Arts | Continuous |
| <i>Admissions Criteria-UCD</i> | Importance of criterion in gaining admission to UC Davis -High school grades -SAT/ACT test scores -Senior year grades -Rank in class -Extracurricular activities -Ability to pay tuition -my race/ethnicity | 5 pt scale, "Not important" to "Single most important" |
| <i>Admissions Criteria-CSUS</i> | Importance of criterion in gaining admission to CSU Sacramento -High school grades -SAT/ACT test scores -Senior year grades -Rank in class -Extracurricular activities -Ability to pay tuition -my race/ethnicity | 5 pt scale, "Not important" to "Single most important" |
| <i>Placement Test Requirements-UCD^a</i> | Placement test requirements at UC Davis. Test required in: -English? -Mathematics? | Nominal: "Yes" "No" "Don't know" |
| <i>Placement Test Requirements-CSUS^a</i> | Placement test requirements at CSU Sacramento. Test required in: -English? -Mathematics? | Nominal: "Yes" "No" "Don't know" |

^aDependent measure from both student and parent surveys

Independent Variables

We focused our study on four independent variables: (1) school performance, (2) academic track, (3) race, and (4) key agent. Schools were classified as high, middle, or low performing, based on the state-measured Academic Performance Index (API) as well as the raw SAT-9 test averages for each school (see Table 2-5). The academic track for

Table 2-5
Classifications of school performance

| District | High School ^a | SAT-9 average verbal + math score | API Rank | School Performance |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Applewood | 88 | 5 | Middle |
| 1 | Haverhill | 83 | 5 | Middle |
| 2 | Bridgeport | 77 | 4 | Low |
| 2 | Three Palms | 114 | 10 | High |
| 3 | Bellview | 97 | 6 | High |
| 3 | Center City | 72 | 1 | Low |

^aNames are pseudonyms

Table 2-6
Primary Independent measures

| Variable | Description | Classifications |
|---------------------------|---|--|
| <i>School Performance</i> | Academic environment of the school as measured by relative standing on statewide SAT-9 assessment scores. | High, Middle, Low |
| <i>Academic Track</i> | Measure of curricular environment based upon enrollment in honors-level math and English courses | Double Honors Single Honors Non-Honors |
| <i>Race/Ethnicity</i> | Student race/ethnicity (self-report) | African American Chinese American Southeast Asian Other Asian Latino/a Native American White/Caucasian Mixed Race |
| <i>Key Agents</i> | Frequency of discussions about college admissions with: -Parents -Teacher -School Counselor -College representative | "Not at all" versus: "More than twice" "At least once" "At least once" "At least once" |

each student was based upon their current matriculation in math and English courses designated by their school as "honors" level. "Dual Honors" students were enrolled in honors-level math and English courses, "Single Honors" designated students enrolled in either honors-level math or honors-level English, and "Non-Honors" students were not enrolled in honors-level math or English courses. Race and ethnicity was coded over nine categories. Lastly, students were grouped based on their degree of interaction with four different "key agents" of college knowledge: parents, teachers, school counselors, and college representatives. Each of these independent variables are listed in Table 2-6.

Crosstabular Analyses

Univariate analyses of dependent variables were completed using the entire sample of students (9th and 11th graders in all schools). Crosstabulars displaying the distribution of each dependent variable across each independent variable were analyzed for patterns and statistically significant distributions (chi-square test). These bivariate analyses were completed for 11th grade students only in order to focus the study on a college-prep population that is ostensibly entering the college choice process.

SECTION 3

CASE STUDY OF THE UC SYSTEM AND UC DAVIS

In this section, we describe the admissions and placement policies and procedures at UCD. The section contains descriptions of both the policies as designated by the University of California system as well as the campus-level policies in place at UCD at the time of the research.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM

UC Governance and Policymaking

The UC Board of Regents

The Board of Regents consists of 26 members: Eighteen are appointed by the California Governor for 12-year terms; one is a student appointed by the Regents to a one-year term; and seven are ex-officio members (i.e., the governor, lieutenant governor, speaker of the Assembly, superintendent of public instruction, president and vice president of the Alumni Associations of UC and the UC president). In addition, two faculty members -- the chair and vice chair of the Academic Council -- sit on the board as non-voting members. Officially, the governor is the president of the Board of Regents, but in practice, the presiding officer of the Regents is the chairman, elected from among its body for a one-year term, as is the vice chairman. Legally, the UC Regents has ultimate management control over all actions within the university and its campuses, including both admission and selection policies and procedures.

UC Office of the President

The Regents appoint the UC President, and with the President's advice, appoint vice presidents, campus-wide chancellors, directors of the national laboratories, a general counsel, a treasurer, and a secretary. The UC Office of the President (UCOP) is headquartered in Oakland. Most relevant to our case, the UCOP bears the responsibility for establishing selection criteria for admission to the UC. To lead this effort, UCOP employs a University-wide Director of Admissions and a University-wide Director of Relations with Schools.

Academic Senate and Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

The Board of Regents delegates authority in academic matters to the system-wide Academic Senate, which consists of faculty and certain administrative officers. This senate has been described as "powerful," stating that it "dominates the process of selecting campus and university leaders and consults directly with the Regents on all policy decisions" (CHEPC, 1997, p. 26). The Academic Senate determines academic policy as a whole, sets conditions for admission and granting of degrees, authorizes and supervises courses and curricula, and advises administration on faculty appointments, promotions, and budgets. An important distinction to make in terms of who governs

admission and selection policy is that while the Academic Senate, through the Regents, has responsibility for eligibility requirements, the Office of the President and individual UC campus chancellors have responsibility over selection criteria.

In 1920, the Academic Senate established the Board of Admissions, which, in 1930, became the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). BOARS has wide authority to set admissions criteria and to oversee the activities of admissions officers (Douglass, 1997, Section I, p. 5). Enrollment demand and the geographic expansion of the University shifted the work of BOARS from a committee that reviewed individual applications to that of a policy committee.

Current Undergraduate Admission Policies for the UC

UC System-wide Minimum Eligibility Requirements

According to the UCOP Director of Undergraduate Admissions, the UC admission process is distinguished among most private universities' admission processes by the UC minimum eligibility requirements. All applicants must meet three criteria: (1) the 15-unit "a-f" subject requirements; (2) the Scholarship Requirement; and (3) the Examination Requirement. These criteria constitute the "UC Eligibility Requirements," and are described below.

System-wide "a-f" Subject Requirements

The subject areas and required pattern of courses known as the "a-f" subjects are specified by BOARS. The intent of the subject requirements is to ensure that students can participate fully in the first year program at the University in a broad variety of fields of study. The 15 "a-f" high school courses are as follows (Table 3-1):

Table 3-1

UC Course Subject Requirements

| Course | Years |
|------------------------|--|
| History/Social Science | 2 years required. 1 year of US history or .5 year of US history and .5 year of civics or American government; and 1 year of world history, cultures, and geography. |
| English | 4 years required. College preparatory English that includes frequent and regular writing, and reading of classic and modern literature. Not more than 2 semesters of 9th grade English can be used to meet this requirement. |
| Mathematics | 3 years required, 4 years recommended. College preparatory mathematics that includes the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and 2 and 3 dimensional geometry. Math courses taken in grades 7 and 8 may be used to fulfill part of this requirement if your high school accepts them as equivalent to its own courses. |

Table 3-1 (continued)
UC Course Subject Requirements

| Course | Years |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Laboratory Science | 2 years required, 3 years recommended. Laboratory science providing fundamental knowledge in at least 2 of these 3 areas: biology, chemistry, and physics. Lab courses in earth/space sciences are acceptable if they have as prerequisite or provide basic knowledge in biology, chemistry, or physics. Not more than 1 year of 9th grade laboratory science can be used to meet this requirement. |
| Language Other Than English | 2 years required, 3 recommended. Courses should emphasize speaking and understanding and include instruction in grammar, vocabulary, reading, and composition. |
| College Preparatory Electives | 2 years (4 semesters in addition to the requirements listed above) required. Electives chosen in the following areas: visual and performing arts, history, social science, English, advanced math, laboratory science, and language other than English. |

According to the *Quick Reference for Counselors*, a UC publication, “students must take 15 units of high school courses to fulfill the Subject Requirement, and at least 7 of the 15 units must be taken in the last two years of high school. (A unit is equal to an academic year, or two semesters, of study)” (p. C-2). The same document states that courses in math and languages taken in grades seven and eight may, with grades of C or above, be counted toward the Subject Requirement, provided the high school principal certifies that the courses are comparable in content to those offered at the high school. Furthermore, there are a host of “exceptions” (peripheral to our study, here) that the system makes in determining if the language other than English requirement has been met. Most of these entail proficiency in a non-English language, as demonstrated through a variety of methods¹⁴.

System-wide Scholarship Requirement

System-wide undergraduate admission policy includes a Scholarship Requirement, which specifies the minimum high school grade point average (GPA) that applicants must attain in the “a-f” courses described above. Grades in “a-f” subjects in grades 10-12 are used to calculate high school GPA. The *Quick Reference for Counselors* guide adds, “courses taken in the ninth grade can be used to meet the Subject Requirement if the student earns a grade of C or better, but they will not be used to calculate the GPA” (p. C-7). In calculating the GPA, extra weight is assigned to honors classes “to encourage students to undertake more challenging work at the advanced secondary level” (p. C-7); however, only certified honors level courses offered in grades 11 or 12 are of acceptable rigor to the UC system and, therefore, only these courses are allowed extra weight.

¹⁴ Recent policy changes have altered the "A-F" requirements. See Section 5 in this report.

According to the 1998-99 UC Application for Undergraduate Admission and Scholarships booklet¹⁵, “If your GPA is 3.3 or higher, you fulfill the minimum requirement for admission to the University. If your GPA is below 3.3 but above 2.81, you fulfill the minimum requirement if you achieve the college entrance test score indicated on the Eligibility Index...” (p. 6). Below is a sample of the Eligibility Index:

Table 3-2
UC Eligibility Index for CA Residents

| High School GPA in “a-f” courses | ACT Score | SAT-I Score |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| 3.30 and above qualifies with any score | | |
| 3.29 | 12 | 570/490 |
| 3.18 | 18 | 900/750 |
| 3.06 | 25 | 1150/1030 |
| 2.94 | 31 | 1400/1310 |
| 2.82 | 36 | 1600/1590 |
| Below 2.82 does not qualify for regular admission | | |

Notes:

This table is only a partial scale; the original runs continuously from GPAs of 3.29 to 2.82 and can be found in the UC Admissions and Scholarship Handbook.

The first SAT-I score is for those taking the test after April 1995; the second score is for those who took the SAT-I prior to April 1995.

System-wide Examination Requirement

The UC system requires applicants to submit two test scores: (1) SAT-I or ACT scores; and (2) SAT-II scores. Composite SAT-I or ACT scores are used in determining minimum eligibility; the SAT-I scores must be from the same sitting. Applicants must take three SAT-II subject tests, one each in writing, mathematics, and in a subject area appropriate to the chosen discipline of college study. Individual campuses may utilize these test results at their discretion. At UCD, SAT-II scores are a component of an academic index (see the following section).

Students scoring 1400 or higher on the SAT-I (or a 1300 if before April 1995) or 31 or higher on the ACT, and a total score of 1760 or higher on the three SAT-II subject tests (with a minimum score on each test of 530) automatically meet minimum UC eligibility requirements, regardless of high school courses taken or grades received.

Basic UC Application Procedures

Applicants may apply to as many campuses of the University as they wish, at a cost of \$40 per campus. UC applications are processed centrally, and copies are sent to the campus or campuses chosen by the applicant. Campuses make admission decisions independently and do not consider whether an applicant has been admitted to another campus.

At each campus, the administrative staff in the Office of Admissions is responsible for evaluating candidates' qualifications and background. For some programs, such as Engineering or Fine Arts, deans and faculty members are directly involved in the process. Meeting the minimum eligibility requirements is the first step in the regular admission

¹⁵ This is the document used for the 1997-98 application cycle.

process for each UC campus. Each campus considers applicants who meet these requirements, and if the number of eligible applicants exceeds the number of available spaces, the campus employs supplemental procedures and criteria.

According to the UC Director of Admissions, the new UC selection guidelines that were adopted post- SP-1 were developed to allow some campus autonomy. In general, the guidelines support the use of more qualitative factors for selecting students and campuses have responded in different ways to the flexibility within the guidelines. For example, Berkeley and UCLA have implemented complex criteria and procedures to select the majority of their students. Riverside and Santa Cruz, however, have not been in high demand; these campuses have applied only the minimum eligibility requirements in selecting applicants. In other words all UC-eligible applicants who meet the November 30 closing date traditionally have been admitted. Thus, despite system-wide minimum eligibility requirements that guide all campuses with numerous policies and various bodies that regulate admission procedures, there is significant variation across UC campuses driven by their latitude to define, and specify weights for, supplemental selection criteria.

Tensions between Central System and Campuses

As described above, the UC Regents only establish eligibility requirements for admission to the University, whereas the individual campuses, under the guidance of the UC Office of the President, are responsible for the specific selection criteria and procedures. Historically, the UC Regents have deferred campus-level matters to the Academic Senate of each campus. However, tensions currently exist between the UC Office of the President and individual campuses over the issue of eligibility versus selection criteria. These tensions are most prominent within the policy domains regarding affirmative action and student access to the UC.

According to a document prepared for the 1995 UC Committee on Educational Policy and Affirmative Action, applicant demand has recently far exceeded the supply of spaces available at the University. The high demand has made admissions policy, particularly at the most competitive UC campuses, a continuing problem to grapple with. As stated in the report:

This difficulty is the result of a variety of concomitant factors, such as increases in the overall number of applications, very uneven levels of enrollment demand at different campuses, extreme popularity of certain majors such as engineering and computer science, shifts in the ethnic composition of the applicant pool, and differing levels of candidate qualifications (UC, 1995b, p. 9).

Despite the latitude each campus enjoys in implementing system-wide policy, the Regents have approved major policies and, occasionally, sanctioned new policies without input from the Academic Senates. In the area of admissions, the most contentious example of this mode of policymaking was the passage of SP-1 and SP-2 (see Section 1).

In addition to a strongly-worded statement regarding equal treatment admissions, SP-1 directed each campus to revise its selection criteria so that no less than 50 percent and no more than 75 percent of the regularly admitted class will be selected solely on the basis of academic achievement. This reflects an increase from the prior range, which was

from 40 to 60 percent to be selected solely on academic criteria. Furthermore, the guidelines also specified the criteria (but not the specific weights) to select the remaining 25 to 50 percent of the UC-eligible class, “to meet the goals of excellence and diversity outlined in the 1988 undergraduate admissions policy and in SP-1” (UC, 1996a, Section I A.). Preliminary legal review has found that preferential outreach activities are not subject to elimination under SP-1.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, DAVIS

Admissions and placement policy within the University of California system is perhaps best understood from a campus-level perspective. This section offers a case summary of admission and placement at one particular campus, the University of California, Davis. We begin with a brief description of UCD, followed by the campus’ selection policies at the time of the study (1997-1998).

Institutional Background on UCD

The University of California, Davis was founded in 1908 as the University Farm for the University of California. Today, UCD is the largest of the nine UC campuses in terms of area (6000 acres in the Sacramento Valley) and third largest in enrollment (approximately 19,300 undergraduate and 5,200 graduate students).

By most accounts (e.g., *Peterson’s Guide to Colleges* and *Barron’s Guide to Colleges*), the Davis campus of the University of California is considered a highly selective research university. According to *US World & News Report’s College Rankings 2000*, UCD ranks 42nd among national universities. By comparison, UC Berkeley is ranked 25th, UCLA and the University of Michigan are tied for 20th, UC San Diego is ranked 32nd, and the University of Texas at Austin is ranked 44th. UCD received 25,500 undergraduate applications for the 1998-99 academic year, offered admission to 16,811 (66 percent admit rate), and enrolled 5,502 students (31 percent yield rate). The mean grade point average for new freshmen was 3.72 and the mean SAT-I scores were 556 Verbal and 593 Math. California residents comprise 97 percent of the undergraduate population, and 14 percent come from the Sacramento/Yolo area. Roughly 10 percent of the undergraduates at Davis come from the Sacramento county and 3.6 percent come from the neighboring county of Solano. These two counties are among the ten counties sending the most undergraduates to UCD. Less than half of the undergraduate student body (43 percent) self-identify as white/caucasian. Between 1994 and 1998, the number of American Indian, Asian, Black, Chicano, East Indian, Filipino and Latino students increased 21 percent, from 8,598 to 10,406¹⁶ (see Appendix A1 for more student demographics).

¹⁶ UCD Admissions web page, Undergraduate factbook, Student Affairs Research & Information, STANDARD REPORTS, Student Ethnic Census, Fall 1998. Retrieved from the World Wide Web, <http://www.sariweb.ucdavis.edu/downloads/ethcen98.pdf>

UCD's Undergraduate Selection Policies

As described in the previous section, the UC Regents define minimum eligibility for admission to UCD, but the campus, under the guidance of the UCOP, is responsible for its specific selection criteria and procedures. These criteria and procedures become significant when the campus cannot accommodate all UC eligible applicants. UCD officials determine not only the specific selection criteria to be used from a list provided by UCOP (see *Guidelines for Implementation of SP-1*, Appendix C) but also the weights assigned to these criteria. Since 1986 all colleges at UCD have employed various additional selection criteria, and the College of Engineering began using such criteria in 1984. Davis officials have stated that their selection criteria seeks to identify those students who have demonstrated the capacity for high academic achievement and who possess a variety of other qualities that can contribute to the strength and diversity of the campus community.

Selection Criteria

The following is an outline of the array of the admission and selection criteria UCD used for selecting new students for the 1997-98 academic year:

High School Graduation. Though not required, UC's *Quick Reference Guide for Counselors* states: "If a student does not have a high school diploma, the University will accept the Certificate of Proficiency (the State's legal equivalent to a high school diploma) awarded by the State Board of Education upon successful completion of the California High School Proficiency Examination. The University also will accept proficiency examinations from other states, and the GED Certificate, in place of a diploma. However, a student must still meet the Subject, Scholarship, and Examination Requirements" (UC, 1996b, p. C-9). As stated in the previous section, applicants may be admitted by examination alone.

Test Scores. The University requires submission of the SAT-I or ACT and three SAT-II subject tests (including math and writing). UC has required submission of SAT-II scores since about 1984, when demand became an issue. Each SAT-II portion and each SAT-I portion count the same weight in calculating the Academic Index at UCD (i.e., each section has a maximum possible score of 800). However, because there are three required SAT-II portions and only two SAT-I portions, the SAT-II factors more heavily for campuses like UCD that choose to use all three SAT-II exams in calculating their academic index.

High School GPA. Though extra weighting for UC-approved honors and AP courses typically boosts top students' grade point averages over 4.0 (A = 4), UC Davis allows a maximum value of 4.0.

Senior Year Grades. GPA is calculated on grades earned in years 10-12, but some exceptions apply (see Scholarship Requirement section above). As Gary Tudor explained "the senior year is a validating year. We'll look at courses in progress for the 35 percent [admitted through Step 3, described below]. But there's no way, the way we do business,

that we can even use the senior year.” On the other hand, he noted that in 1997, UCD rescinded offers to 200 admitted students largely because of “D” grades they received in AP courses or in a required “a-f” course.

High School Class Rank. Not currently considered (see later section on 4 percent Rule).

Required Coursework. See Table 3-1 above for a-f course requirements.

Personal Statements. An applicant’s personal statement appears to play a minimal role in admissions at UCD. One perspective on this role is illustrated by the *UC Davis Admission Advisor*, a newsletter for high school counselors and community college transfer advisers:

The applicant’s essay may play a role in evaluating applicants on the basis of supplemental criteria. For that reason, the essay should serve convincingly and eloquently as testimonial to the student’s abilities, budding ambitions, and analytical skills deserving of the developmental nurturing that higher education would impart. The essay should be taken seriously and composed insightfully (UC Davis, 1997a, p. 2).

Gary Tudor, the Director of Admissions, told us that his office reads the personal statements of *all* of the minimally-eligible applicants to UCD. Yet Tudor also stated that “for 99 percent of the cases, it doesn’t matter,” meaning that an applicant is generally admitted according to the formulae detailed below. Where the personal statements do carry some significance is in the third step of the selection process (see below). For example, in the initial review of an application, an applicant’s statement may be “flagged” for review at this third stage (i.e., it may indicate that a closer review is warranted due to the existence of criteria from the Persistence Determination Quotient).

Recommendation Letters. Letters of recommendation are seldom used in the selection process at UCD (at UCLA and UC Berkeley, this is not the case). The application says that letters are optional. In fact, little information regarding the appropriateness and potential use of providing recommendation letters is provided in any documents reviewed for this study¹⁷. Therefore, it is not surprising that few students submit them. Tudor mentioned that if the letters do factor into the admission decision, it is generally after a student has already been initially denied.

Appeals Process. Although not well-publicized (there is a short paragraph about appeals in the application), an appeals process exists for applicants who believe that a mistake was made regarding their applications. According to Tudor, about 600-700 appeals are reviewed each year. In about 50 such cases, the office finds that they had made an administrative error. In about 50 additional cases, information was missing from the file or was submitted late. In the remainder, there were “hardship reasons.” Davis saves some spots for appeals; last year, of the 13,500 students admitted, about 150 were

¹⁷ In the information we have reviewed, letters have been mentioned only in the application to the UC, and not in information provided to counselors or other university documents.

admitted through appeals. This process occurs only from March 1 to mid-March, with decisions/notifications being made by mid-April.

State Residency. Although state residency is not required, higher admission and selection standards apply to out-of-state residents. For example, nonresident applicants must earn a grade point average of at least 3.40 (B+) in the courses used to meet the subject requirements

Status of Sending High School. Applicants from “target schools” receive additional bonus points in Steps 2 and 3 of the UCD selection process (see below).

Selection Procedure

Prior to the selection process, the Planning and Budget Office, with assistance from the Admissions Office, generates a target number for the Division of Biological Sciences (an intercollege unit) and each of the three Colleges -- Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Engineering, and Letters and Science. Working backward from the yield rates of the year before, the Admissions Office generates a set number of students, per college/division, that may be admitted that year. These are the numbers that are used to guide the following selection procedures.

The UCD staff sorts all applicants into two groups: UC-eligible and not UC-eligible. Those who are UC-eligible proceed to the regular admission review process and are divided into four groups: the three Colleges and the Division of Biological Sciences. The following three-step selection procedure then begins for each college/division:

Selection on Academic Criteria Alone (Step 1)

Step 1: Academic Index (for the first 60 percent).

The UCD admissions office ranks incoming applicant files according to the UCD Academic Index (which includes GPA; SAT-I composite; and SAT-II composite scores of writing, math, and one other test of student preference). The point value for each of these criterion is listed in Table 3-3 below, and the maximum possible Academic Index is 10,000.

Table 3-3

UC Davis’ Academic Index for Regular Admission

| Criteria | Maximum Point Value |
|--|---------------------|
| Calculated GPA (including extra credit for up to eight honors courses, capped at 4.0) | 6,000 |
| Total SAT-I/ACT (ACT composite score is converted to an SAT-I score equivalent) | 1,600 |
| Total SAT-II (3 tests @ 800 points each) | 2,400 |
| Total Points: | 10,000 |

The first 60 percent of admitted students to each college (or each major within the Division of Biological Sciences and the College of Engineering) come from those applicants with the highest academic indices. As a consequence of SP-1, beginning with the 1997-98 application cycle, the UC system increased the maximum percentage for selecting applicants according to academic criteria alone from 60 percent to 75 percent. UCD, however, opted to remain at the 60 percent level.

Selection Using Supplementary Criteria (Steps 2 and 3)

Two steps that incorporate “supplemental criteria” are used to select the remaining 40 percent of UC Davis’ class. These two steps mark the greatest change in UCD policy post-209 and SP-1. Under “supplemental criteria” review, the university, in addition to considering the “academic criteria,” considers: (1) personal accomplishments, talents, experiences, or interests that contribute to the educational environment of the campus, and (2) special circumstances which may have affected the applicant’s life, including personal hardship, disabilities, economic disadvantage, and membership in groups historically underrepresented in the UC eligibility pool (UC, 1995c). In accordance with SP-1, these new policies eliminated ethnic identity and gender as explicit criteria considered for admission. Steps 2 and 3 are described below.

Step 2: Comprehensive Review (for the next 5 percent).

Those applicants who were not admitted in Step 1 are reviewed to see if they fit one (or more) of five specific criteria:

1. Completed a pre-collegiate motivational program. “This is for participation in motivational or recruitment programs that help students master basic academic skills and encourage them to pursue a university education. Programs to consider include EAOP, Upward Bound, Talent Search, Cal SOAP, Professional Development, MESA, etc.” (UC Davis, 1997e, p. 3)
2. Member of the Educational Opportunity Program (EOP). “Applicants can apply for membership in the EOP by reporting low income status or by demonstrating a history of educational disadvantage in the family.” (UC Davis, 1997e, p. 3)
3. First generation of university attendance.
4. Attend a target high school. Each UC campus compiles a list of target schools by using data generated by the California Department of Education and the UCOP. This list must meet final approval by UC’s General Council. These schools typically have low UC-going rates, a low SES population, and a low number of students taking college entrance exams. Gary Tudor explained that 179 high schools in the state (of about 830) are classified as “targeted” each year. In 1997-98, a high school was declared a “target school” by UCD if: (a) the UC “a-f” course enrollment rate was below 54.6 percent; (b) the UC admission rates were below 10 percent; and (c) fewer than 18 percent of students took the SAT-I.
5. Possess a special/exceptional talent. “A special talent or skill involves *substantial participation or exceptional performance* in the arts, sciences, languages, athletics, etc., that demonstrates hard work and accomplishment. The participation or skill level must have received distinguished recognition at the

school, regional, and/or national levels. This category can include contributions or achievement in an academic pursuit (debate team, science fair), community service, or a talent.” (UC Davis, 1997e, p.3, emphasis original).

Applicants who meet at least one of these criteria receive a “check-mark” or an “on-button” by their name. The admissions office staff then selects the next five percent of its class, from the “checked” students, who are still ordered by Academic Index. As in Step 1, five percent are admitted to each college/division.

Step 3: Academic Potential/Campus Contribution Index (for the remaining 35 percent).

The remaining 35 percent of the regular, first-time freshmen admits are chosen by first re-ranking all remaining eligible applicants according to an Academic Potential/Campus Contribution (AP/CC) Index. This index awards points for the Academic Index from the initial ranking in Step 1, a “Campus Enhancement Quotient,” and a “Persistence/Determination Quotient.” The top 35 percent (by each department) of this group is admitted.

Unlike the “on/off” procedure in Step 2 in which an applicant advances for meeting at least one criterion, in the Step 3 the more criteria met, the better the applicant’s chances of being selected. The Campus Enhancement Quotient is determined by achievement of the following criteria:

1. Completed one or more pre-collegiate motivational programs
2. Has one or more special/extraordinary talents (according to definitions defined under Step 2)
3. Has demonstrated leadership promise
4. Veteran/ROTC scholarship

Applicants are placed in categories 1 through 4 based upon the number of criteria met. For example, if an applicant meets any three criteria, s/he is placed in category 3, while meeting any two criteria places an applicant into category 2. The category in which an applicant is placed determines their score on the Campus Enhancement Quotient (see Table 3-4). Originally, there was a fifth category that gave bonus points to regional applicants from Yolo, Solano, or Sacramento counties. UC Davis’ Chancellor eliminated this criterion before 1997 because of public outcry.

Table 3-4
Campus Enhancement Quotient for Step 3

| Category | Point Value |
|----------|-------------|
| 1 | 1,000 |
| 2 | 1,750 |
| 3 | 2,500 |
| 4 | 3,250 |

The Persistence Determination Quotient is calculated similarly using the following criteria:

1. Having a significant disability
2. First generation of university attendance
3. From a target school (according to definitions defined under Step 2)
4. Marked improvement in 11th grade (C's or less to B, C's or less to A)
5. Demonstrated specific instance or instances of perseverance. "This is based on a reading of the personal statement and any other supporting information that is supplied by the applicant in order to document the applicant's ability to persist and rise above unusual difficulties or challenges. Factors considered are those over which the applicant has little or no control. Such difficulties or challenges might include, but are not limited to, high mobility during previous schooling, unusual family disruption, childhood poverty, unusual medical/emotional problems, lack of exposure to academic role models, inadequate primary and secondary education, a dysfunctional environment such as alcohol or drug abuse, adverse immigrant experience, English as a second language, etc." (UC Davis, 1997e, p. 3)
6. Nontraditional applicant: "A nontraditional applicant is one that comes from a segment of California's population that has had low UC going rates. This would include such things as being from a low income family (this must be reported as required for EOP status, [described in Step 2]), being a single parent or being a person who is applying to the University to start a new career because of being laid off (result of corporate downsizing), etc." (UC Davis, 1997e, p.3).

As with the Campus Enhancement Quotient, an applicant's category is determined by the number of criteria met and a corresponding score is given according to the schedule in Table 3-5. The Academic Potential/Campus Contribution (AP/CC) Index is the sum of these two quotients and the Academic Index and has a maximum of 17,250 points (Table 3-6).

Table 3-5
Persistence/Determination Quotient for Step 3

| Category | Point Value |
|----------|-------------|
| 1 | 1,000 |
| 2 | 1,600 |
| 3 | 2,200 |
| 4 | 2,800 |
| 5 | 3,400 |
| 6 | 4,000 |

Table 3-6

Academic Potential/Campus Contribution (AP/CC) Index for Step 3

| Factor | Maximum Point Value |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Academic Index from Step 1 | 10,000 |
| Campus Enhancement Quotient | 3,250 |
| Persistence/Determination Quotient | 4,000 |
| Total Points: | 17,250 |

While UCD’s selection process has three steps, campus officials divulged to us that they do not “publicize” Step 2, because they feel it becomes too complex for the general public to readily understand. The Director of Admissions commented about his office’s reluctance to talk about Step 2: “At college nights, we don’t really talk about Step 2 at all. It’s just too complicated, takes too much time...We talk in general terms, hit the highlights, don’t miss anything [major]” (Tudor, Oct. 31, 1997). Instead, he hints at Step 2 as a part of his discussion about Step 1, commenting that five percent of the students are admitted according to the Academic Index and some supplemental criteria.

The UC publication *Introducing the University* (1999), which supplements the Application for Admission, describes UCD’s three steps qualitatively, but not quantitatively. We include this direct quotation to demonstrate what UCD communicates to prospective students:

Criteria to Select 60 percent of Freshmen

Up to 60 percent of students will be selected on the basis of academic achievement, as assessed by review of the following: high school GPA, calculated on UC “a-f” courses completed, performance on college entrance test scores, number of courses completed beyond the minimum eligibility requirements, and the number of UC-approved honors or AP courses completed or in progress.

Criteria to Select Remaining Freshmen

The remaining percentage of freshmen will be selected on the bases of academic and personal achievement and experience, as assessed through a comprehensive review of all information provided on the application, including academic performance as described plus the following: demonstrated leadership, special talents, residency, presence of and responses to life challenges, honors, and awards, marked improvement in a challenging academic program, and participation in pre-collegiate programs that develop academic abilities. (University of California, *Introducing the University*, 1999, p. 39)

Admission by Exception

In accordance with UC policy, UCD may admit up to six percent of its incoming freshmen, and another six percent of transfer students, by exception. Prior to the passage of SP-1, the policy stated that within the six percent designation, up to four percent may

be used for admitting students from underrepresented minority, low-income, or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. Since SP-1 went into effect, the policy no longer considers minority group status.

Admission Policy Tensions at UCD

Who makes admissions policies is currently a point of contention across the UC system. Similar to the larger UC system-wide debate, UCD's campus-wide debate revolves around the distinctions of who has the authority to define admission policy and who has the authority to define selection policy. At UC Davis, the Admissions and Enrollment Committee -- which was commissioned by and reports to a campus faculty committee -- designed the new selection procedures that were implemented in 1997 (i.e., to select the class entering in Fall of 1998). This committee generated the criteria and weights for Steps 2 and 3. Discussions lasted a full year, from June 1995 to July 1996, and a final set of recommended criteria and accompanying weights were submitted to the UCD Chancellor in early fall 1996. The UCD faculty committee had input into, although not final approval over, the new selection criteria. Because the criteria were to govern selection procedures rather than admissions procedures, the UCD Chancellor had final approval, and the proposed criteria completely by-passed a vote by the Academic Senate. Inevitably, this procedure caused some anger among the UCD faculty.

SP-1 required all chancellors to submit a campus-specific admission selection plan to the Office of the President by November 1996, to allow time for review before the processes would be implemented in fall 1997. According to the UCOP Director of Undergraduate Admissions, there was "some give and take" regarding the approval of these plans (Ferri, Feb. 1998). In other words, the approval process was somewhere between symbolic and authoritarian.

UC Davis' Undergraduate Placement Policies

Expectations of Incoming Freshmen

As mentioned in Section 1 of this report, The Intersegmental Coordinating Council of the Academic Senate, along with the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, developed a joint statement of competencies expected of students matriculating to higher education. What follows are excerpts from the UC Davis 1997-98 Catalog on the expectations of students matriculating to the UCD campus:

Preparing for University Work -- Freshmen

You should take college preparatory courses that will challenge you to work hard and will prepare you beyond minimum levels of competence in reading, writing and mathematics. A student who is well prepared for university work will have taken four years of English in high school, four years of mathematics, two to three years of foreign language, two to three years of laboratory science, two or more years of history/social science, and one or more years of art or humanities.

Reading

You should become proficient in reading and understanding technical materials and scholarly works. Learn to read analytically and critically, actively questioning yourself about the author's intentions, viewpoint, arguments and conclusions. Become familiar, and comfortable, with the conventions of standard written English, and with various writing strategies and techniques. Your reading experience should include original works in their entirety, not just textbooks and anthologies, and should encompass a wide variety of forms and topics.

Writing

Effective critical thinking and proficiency with the written language are closely related, and both are skills that every university student must master. By university standards, a student who is proficient in English composition is able to understand the assigned topic; select and develop a theme by analysis and argument; choose words that aptly and precisely convey the intended meaning; construct effective sentences, i.e., sentences that economically and successfully convey the writer's ideas and display a variety of structures; and demonstrate an awareness of the conventions of standard written English.

Mathematics

Many undergraduate majors require preparation in mathematics beyond the three years required for admission to the university. All majors in the natural and life sciences, engineering and mathematics require calculus. Many majors in the social sciences require statistics or calculus, or both. Calculus is also required for undergraduates preparing for careers in the environmental sciences, dentistry, medicine, optometry, pharmacy and bio-statistics. If you select a major that requires either calculus or statistics, you should expect to take that course during your first year at the university (UC Davis, 1997b).

Whether these expectations are related to undergraduate placement exams and policies is unclear.

Undergraduate Placement Policies at UCD

Systemwide, the UC has an official policy regarding only oral/written expression placement. All UC campuses use the mathematics diagnostic testing program and the MDTP, but there is no official UC policy concerning math placement.¹⁸ Students are assessed in oral and written expression proficiency through the Subject A examination before they may enroll in the university. Students who have scored high marks on the SAT-II and/or the AP English Exam are exempt from taking the Subject A exam, if the

¹⁸ Each campus has a different cut-off score, which can vary by department and program. In addition, some campuses allow students to submit SAT math scores in lieu of taking these tests. Therefore, mathematics placement policies is beyond the scope of this study.

university has on record these scores by the April prior to enrollment. All other students must take the Subject A exam, which is given once a year in May.

Developmental History of the Subject A Examination

In its current form, the UC Subject A examination has been administered since 1986, when the recommendations of the Academic Senate's University Committee on Preparatory Education were implemented. The group's charge was to: determine what incoming students should know and be able to do; address remediation needs; and inform K-12 schools about UC-wide expectations and standards. Each year, this group (comprised of faculty representatives of each UC campus) decides on the scoring guide and conducts pre-tests of the Subject A examination; it also determines cut-offs and scoring, based on pre-test results. According to Immouna Ephrem, UCOP Director of Placement, the contents, dates, and expectations of the Subject A have remained constant since 1986 (Ephrem, Feb. 1998).

The following passage describes the exam's development and history; it comes directly from the University Subject A Examination Information Booklet, 1996: The University of California first defined the competence designated as Subject A in the list of admissions requirements in its 1897-98 Register. Subject A, "Oral and Written Expression," was there said to be the ability to use English "correctly, clearly, and pertinently on all the lines upon which...thought is exercised." This formulation makes clear that, from the beginning, competence in Subject A was understood to be the result of regular reading and writing assignments in all subjects, not just English. In 1919, satisfaction of the Subject A requirement was changed from an admission requirement to a prerequisite for enrollment in many courses that require substantial writing, including courses in freshman composition" (UC, 1996c, p. 1).

Satisfying the Subject A Requirement

All UC students¹⁹ must fulfill the Subject A requirement by the end of their third quarter at the university (i.e., within their first year). This means demonstrating proficiency in writing, which can be accomplished through several means.

The first way to satisfy the Subject A requirement is to earn a passing score (i.e., 8 out of a possible 12 points) on the University-wide Subject A examination. All students who will enter the UC directly from California high schools are required to take this exam, unless the university has on record that they are exempt (see below). At a cost of \$55 (paid by the student), the test is designed and scored by the UC faculty; it is intended to define the competence expected of students entering the university.

According to the UC Davis General Catalog, "This examination may be taken only once prior to enrollment. It is offered in the spring at local sites throughout California; a student admitted for fall quarter who has not already satisfied the Subject A requirement must take this examination." The UC Information Booklet for the Subject A Examination, 1996 states to prospective test-takers: "You've been preparing for the Subject A Examination throughout your high school career. All the reading and writing you've done -- in classes across the curriculum -- should help you succeed on the Subject

¹⁹ "All" students means those who have not been classified as ESL, based on initial Subject A scores, described below.

A examination” (p. 4). A student’s score on the Subject A exam does not affect admission to the UC.

Students who do not earn at least an 8 or above on the Subject A examination, and who are non-exempt, can satisfy the Subject A requirement through the successful completion of an approved course. Prior to enrolling at the University, students can satisfy the Subject A by completing, with a grade of C or better, a transferable college course in English composition worth four quarter or three semester units. Academic Senate Regulation 636 states that once a student has enrolled in the University of California, s/he may not satisfy the Subject A requirement via a composition course offered through a community or state college (UC Davis, 1997a). Once enrolled at the University, students can complete (with a C or better) an appropriate English course (described in the Subject A informational document as being a writing course designated by their campus for this purpose) at the university. At UCD, this course is English 57. The final examination in this course is the Subject A exam, on which they must earn a passing score.

According to Cynthia Bates, who coordinates UC Davis' Subject A, about 75-80 percent of those who take this course are able to earn passing scores on the Subject A examination by course completion.²⁰ Students who do not pass the Subject A final may take the exam again at the beginning of the following quarter. If they do not pass the test at this point, they repeat the class, take the Subject A exam again, and either pass it then or may submit a portfolio of their work for review.

An adequate portfolio may be accepted as qualifying the student for having met the Subject A requirement. According to the Report on Subject A University of California, Davis 1995-96 data overview, “A favorable [portfolio] review indicates that the student has demonstrated sufficient competence to undertake freshman composition and is therefore exempted from the Subject A requirement; an unfavorable review indicates the need for a third quarter of English 57 instruction” (p. 1). According to calculations of data provided by UCD’s Subject A coordinator, students submitting portfolios for review have a very high success rate (77 percent were accepted through portfolio review in 1996-97; 79 percent the year before; 80 percent the year before that; and 83 percent in 1993-94; see Appendix A2).

Students may also be exempted from taking the Subject A exam. High Advanced Placement, SAT-II, ACT, or International Baccalaureate test scores, or transferable college courses work will exempt some students from having to take the Subject A examination. They must earn either: (a) a 680 or higher on the SAT-II writing test (administered after May 1995); (b) a 3, 4, or 5 on either AP exam in English Language or Literature; (c) a 5 or higher on the International Baccalaureate Higher Level Examination in English (Language A only); or (d) a grade of C or better from a transferable college English Composition course. A final exemption from taking or passing the Subject A exam is by passing with credit the California State University and Colleges English Equivalency Examination. Interestingly, the CSU English Placement Test may not be used to satisfy the Subject A requirement. The University must have on record these exempting scores prior to the date that it mails notification about the testing time of the Subject A examination (i.e., prior to April 1). In other words, any student who receives this notification is required by the UC to take the test.

²⁰ Bates, C. (1997, October 28). Interview

Administration of exams

Administered by ETS, the test is given on the morning of the second Saturday in May. Faculty, lecturers, graduate students in composition, and ETS staff meet in Berkeley to read and score the exams on a UC-wide basis. Students are notified with their scores one month after taking the test. The actual exams are then sent to the UC campus where the student will attend. The Subject A exam also is offered during UC Davis' orientation, although that information is not widely publicized.²¹ However, students' taking the exam at this late date and who do not earn a passing score need to enroll in supplementary classes, and often these classes are already filled.

Subject A Exam Content

Students are given two hours to read a passage and complete an essay that responds to a set of questions posed at the end of the passage. Essays are evaluated on the basis of the student's ability to develop a central idea, to express himself/herself clearly, and to use the conventions of written English. The topic has no "correct" response, but students must respond fully to all parts of the topic.

Placement procedures

UC Davis offers the Subject A course (a.k.a., English 57 at UCD) through a contractual arrangement with a community college.²² At UCD, the Sacramento City Community College teaches English 57 on the Davis campus; the Subject A examination final is graded by faculty members of both the UCD English composition department and the Sacramento City Community College.

For students who have difficulty with the English language, additional, pre-English 57 courses may be required. Therefore, some students must take linguistic courses before they must take English 57. These courses are Linguistics 21, 22, and 23. Depending on the severity of the English language deficiency, a student might be required to enroll in one, two, or three of these courses before enrolling in (and passing) English 57 before enrolling in the standard freshman English sequence course. Prior to this year, there was some confusion as to whether a student needing linguistic courses had to complete the Subject A course requirement within the first three quarters at the university. According to Cynthia Bates, a new policy from the Associate Dean of the College of Letters and Science's office at UC Davis states that students who are limited-English proficient have three quarters to meet the Subject A requirement after they have completed all necessary/required linguistic courses.

Remediation/Developmental Levels at UCD

Of the approximately 17,000 students who took the Subject A examination in 1996-97, 47.5 percent passed it UC-wide.²³ This percentage has decreased slightly from years past, where normally those passing were between 50 and 57 percent, with half satisfying the requirement prior to entering UC. Appendices A2-A4 are a series of data tables from UCOP's Director of Placement, including Subject A take and pass rates by each UC

²¹ Ibid.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

campus from 1990-1996 and by each high school in Sacramento County (from which UCD selected 9.5 percent of its incoming class in 1996, the third-highest sending county) and in Yolo county (comprised 3.2 percent of UCD's 1996 entering class), from 1988, 1990, 1994, and 1997. In general, UCD has been slightly below the overall UC-wide average in terms of first-time entering fall students who have met the Subject A requirement (65.9 percent had met this in 1995, as compared to 68.5 percent UC-wide; and in 1996, 65.4 compared to 69 percent).

An accurate picture of the students who take the placement exam, their pass/fail rates, and their placement into developmental courses (i.e., English 57, Linguistics 21, 22, and 23) proves to be difficult to estimate. Double-counting and inconsistent accounting procedures from year to year do not allow for accurate tracking of all students. For example, in 1993-94, 1,125 (or 35 percent of) entering UCD freshmen and transfers were required to take English 57; in 1996-97, 1,396 UCD students (or 37 percent) were taking English 57. But the 1996-97 number includes students repeating the course; therefore, the percentage is inflated and data cannot be compared to the 1993-94 data. No other data are available from UC Davis. Appendices A2-A4 present UC Davis' placement data as clear as possible. Data from UCOP, which also includes figures for other UC campuses and a UC-wide average total, compares placement data across campuses. These data, however, are based on reports from the UCD placement office, which (as described above) has had difficult struggles in maintaining accurate records. Therefore, the data should be used with caution. The UCOP data can be found in Appendix G of this report.

The level of remediation at UCD and the UC system as a whole is certainly cause for public concern. The education policy question centers around the adequacy of high school preparation for university work: Why are so many students who are deemed admissible by UC eligibility and selection criteria unable to read and write at the college level? Moreover, who should pay for the necessary remediation? Nevertheless, it is important to note that despite the challenges raised by the Subject A requirement, UC Davis enjoys a high retention rate. Davis undergraduates persist at rates among the highest of all UC students. Among freshmen entering from 1991 to 1995, 91 percent returned for a fourth quarter and 86 percent returned for a seventh quarter (retrieved December 1999, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ucdavis.edu>).

Subject A Data Collection and Reporting

At UC Davis, Cynthia Bates collects some data specific to course-takers at UCD campus level, but receives most of her data from the Office of the President.²⁴ The data report which high school students from which counties have satisfied the Subject A exam. "We were given these sheets," said Bates, "and I suspect that they send them off to high schools. But oftentimes, these things aren't disseminated" (Bates, Oct. 1997). Bates mentioned that information regarding the Subject A examination passing rates, etc. is likely shared during counselors day at UCD, which is held in September.

Immouna Ephrem, principal analyst in Outreach, Admissions, and Student Affairs at UCOP, is responsible for sending out Subject A exam reports to high school principals, high school English department chairs, and chief college counselors.²⁵ The reports

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Ephrem, I. (1998, February 25). Interview

include the number and percentage of students from their school, county, and district who satisfied the Subject A requirement the previous year. These reports are sent out in April. In February of each year Ephrem sends county superintendents, district superintendents, high school principals, English department chairs, high school counselors, and community college representatives “heads-up” letters regarding the administration of the Subject A exam in the second week of May. This letter also provides other information regarding the contents of the exam (including a Subject A Examination Booklet). Carla Ferri, UC Director of Admission, said that in UC-sponsored conferences for high school counselors, “we make it very clear about our battery of tests. So students do know. And we make it clear about the timing.”²⁶

CONTINUING POLICY CONCERNS AT THE UC

According to a 1995 computer simulation to assess the impact of using SES rather than race/ethnicity in admission and selection criteria, the UC system as a whole would see the following results:

- A lower level of ethnic diversity than currently exists
- Differing effects by different minority groups
 - African American enrollment reduced by 40-50 percent
 - American Indian enrollment reduced by 40-50 percent
 - Latino enrollment reduced by 5-15 percent
 - Asian American enrollment increased by 15-25 percent
 - Limited, or no, effect on white student enrollment
- An increase in lower income students
- A decrease in average SAT-I scores and high school GPAs of incoming students (UCOP Student Academic Services, May 1995)

Almost everyone we interviewed expressed concern over how drastically SP-1 would affect campus diversity. In the immediate post-SP-1 and Proposition 209 era, three important UC discussions have emerged:

- Changing the weighted importance of certain admissions and selection criteria, such as the SAT and the extra weighting for honors and AP grades
- Increased emphasis on outreach and the legality of outreach to K-12 students of particular, targeted ethnic/racial groups
- Examination of legislation that recently passed in Texas, whereby the top 10 percent of graduates from all high schools in the state automatically are admitted to any state university and a counter plan, proposed by UC President Atkinson, to admit the top 4 percent of high school graduates in California to the UC

To conclude the UC section of this report, we offer summaries of these discussions.

²⁶ Ferri, C.(1998, February). Interview

Changing Admission and Section Criteria

Eliminating the SAT

Published in July 1997, the Latino Eligibility Task Force's Latino Student Eligibility and Participation in the University of California *YA BASTA!* Report suggests both long- and short-term recommendations for increasing Latino eligibility within the UC system (Latino Eligibility Task Force, 1997). The task force recommended eliminating the SAT for determining eligibility creating admissions alternatives. The task force questioned the reliability and validity of the SAT-I, suggesting that while the SAT predicts adequately freshman grades, it does not adequately predict either two-year persistence rates or five-year grades. They further show that if the UC system used a 3.3 GPA on the "a-f" requirements and dropped the SAT, that Latino UC eligibility would double.

The task force's proposal to drop the SAT has met much resistance. UC faculty generally support using the SAT. Keith Widaman, chairperson of BOARS, said that the SAT was not, in fact, a major hurdle for either Latinos or African-Americans, citing evidence that the test shows a close correlation between high school grades and SAT scores. He stated: "Dropping the SAT would be like discarding a thermometer if you're sick" (CrossTalk, Spring 1998, Volume 6, Number 2).

Increasing the weights of the SAT-I and SAT-II

Discussions on increasing the weighted importance of the SAT-I in the UC Eligibility Admission Index was proposed by the Academic Senate in February of 1998. These discussions lost momentum, as discussions to include the SAT-II in this Index surfaced.

In May of 1999, the UC Regents established a new Eligibility Index, that will affect students applying for admission on and after Fall 2001. Unlike the current Eligibility Index that combines high school GPA and SAT-I scores, the new Index will include SAT-II scores. The revised index weighs the SAT-II more heavily than the SAT-I. The test score formula is: [SAT-I composite] + [2 x (SAT-II writing + SAT-II mathematics + third required SAT-II)]. A comparison of current and new indices is shown below in Figure 3-1.

According to Dennis Galligani, Associate Vice President for Student Academic Services at the UCOP, the official rationale for the new Index are as follows:

- Research indicates that taken together, GPA and scores from the full battery of SAT tests are the best predictor of success at UC
- The Index provides a systematic way of balancing the student's grades and scores in eligibility determination
- All eligibility criteria, including all required tests, are included in this Index

Under the new index, the minimum GPA required for UC eligibility is reduced slightly to 2.80, and all students--even those with the highest GPAs--are required to meet minimum test score requirements. (UC, 1999a).

Figure 3-1
Current and 2001 UC Eligibility Indices

| Current UC Eligibility Index^a | | New UC Eligibility Index^a | |
|---|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Examples of Index Thresholds | | Examples of Index Thresholds | |
| <u>GPA</u> | <u>Test Scores^b</u> | <u>GPA</u> | <u>Test Scores^b</u> |
| 2.82 | 1600 | 2.80 to 2.84 | 4640 |
| 2.90 | 1490 | 2.90 to 2.94 | 4160 |
| 3.00 | 1270 | 3.00 to 3.04 | 3840 |
| 3.20 | 840 | 3.30 to 3.34 | 3248 |
| | | 3.5+ | 3120 |

^a required for GPAs between 2.82 and 3.29
^b Includes only SAT-I (or ACT)

^a required for all GPA ranges; effective Fall 2001
^b Includes SAT-I (or ACT) plus 3 SAT- II tests

The Top 4 Percent Rule

In 1998, the Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach, chaired by State Senator Teresa Hughes (D-Inglewood), proposed a constitutional amendment that would abolish the SAT-I requirement for UC Eligibility and would force the UC to guarantee spaces to students in the top 12.5 percent of each public high school’s graduating class based solely on GPA. This proposal sought to give high schools, rather than UC campuses, the power to decide which students are eligible for admission.

Studies projected that if the Hughes’ plan had become law, the ethnic balance of the eligibility pool would have changed. The percentage of white students in the eligible pool would have gone from 54 percent at present to 46 percent, Asians from 29 percent to 27 percent, Latinos from 9 percent to 17 percent, and African-Americans from 2 percent to 4 percent (Seligman 1998). While Hughes’ 12.5 percent proposal was highly criticized for being too inclusive (i.e., not maintaining the high selectivity that UC enjoys), the proposal sparked great interest in adopting a plan like Texas’ Top 10 percent rule.

The UC Regents were much more receptive to another proposal -- known widely as “the 4 percent Solution” -- which was proposed by UC President Atkinson and moderately supported by BOARS, a UC faculty admissions committee chaired by Keith Widaman from Riverside. The proposal offered to make the top 4 percent of students from each public high school in California eligible for UC admission. Under the current policy, extra grade points can be earned in honors courses, allowing students attending schools with honors courses to achieve grade-point averages well above 4.0.

Keith Widaman further suggests that the plan does not appreciably impact standards for admission. According to Widaman, two-thirds of the students in the top 4 percent of their high school classes are already eligible under UC’s regular admissions criteria, and therefore the affect on standards would be minimal. The plan, however, would add between 300 and 700 black and Hispanic students to the pool qualified for admission (San Jose Mercury News, 1998). Widaman has framed the proposal as targeting outreach, stating that UC officials “would encourage those students to become fully

eligible under UC's normal admissions policies by completing a series of required classes and a set of standardized tests, without which they would not be able to attend UC.

On March 19, 1999, the Board of Regents approved the 4 percent rule that will go into effect for the class entering in fall of 2001. UC calls this new eligibility path "Eligibility in Local Context (ELC)". This new policy will provide automatic eligibility for top students (top 4 percent of each high school). Like Texas' Top 10 percent rule, California's ELC aims to account for the differences in educational opportunity and achievement among California's diverse schools. According to Dennis Galligani, Associate VP for Student Academic Services at the UCOP, the policy specifics of the ELC Plan are as follows:

- Students ranking in the top 4 percent of their high school class and who have completed 11 of the 15 required "a-f" year-long courses by the end of their junior year will be declared UC-eligible
- Students will be ranked on performance on the UC required academic courses, not on straight high school ranking
- Students must complete the remainder of eligibility requirements (testing requirements and complete course-taking pattern).

The ELC is not an automatic admissions policy. Rather, it is an automatic eligibility policy; students who qualify as Eligible in a Local Context will be eligible for a place somewhere in the UC system, but will not be guaranteed admission to the campus of their choice. Logistically speaking, the UC is requesting each high school to forward the transcripts to the top 10 percent of their students based on their academic GPA, as defined at the school site. UC staff will then analyze the transcripts to determine the top 4 percent of student in each school based on students' performance in 11 of the 15 required a-f courses required by the ELC policy.

The ELC would add 1.3 percent to the UC eligibility pool or by 3,600 students (UC, 1999a). Under the current requirements, only 11.1 percent of high school seniors are eligible. Thus, with the additional students from the ELC, the UC would almost reach its 12.5 percent eligibility that the Master Plan recommends.

De-valuing the Extra Credit Awarded for Honors and AP Coursework

The UC Faculty Senate considered eliminating or modifying the practice of giving extra grade points for advanced placement and honors classes. However, Delaine Eastin, State Superintendent for Public Instruction and UC Regent, is wary about actions taken to devalue honors classes and manipulating admissions eligibility percentages, stating, "If we guarantee a certain number of students admission, there will actually be a disincentive for high schools to offer and for students to take those advanced placement or honors classes" (quoted in Monroe, 1998, p. 3B).

Increased Emphasis on Outreach

Efforts toward increased outreach -- which SP-1 does not affect, according to initial legal review -- have been increased, and those we interviewed seem to hold hopes that outreach efforts will somewhat mitigate the negative effects of SP-1.

In October 1997 the UC Davis Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Undergraduate Admissions and Outreach Services division submitted a report to the UCOP²⁷ describing much of the new effort in the area of outreach. According to the report, the UC Office of the President established the 35-member University of California Outreach Task Force in August 1996, in response to the projected changes in the University's affirmative action policy. The Outreach Task Force's report titled "New Directions for Outreach" was released in the spring of 1997 and was adopted by the UC Board of Regents in July 1997. The Task Force Report recommended that campuses target schools that have a higher proportion of disadvantaged students than the average statewide, and show indications of low student performance. It also called for the following:

- UC should undertake a major expansion of its academic outreach to the state's K-12 schools, creating long-term partnerships with selected high schools and their associated junior high and elementary feeder schools
- Each UC campus should work intensively with a group of partner schools, which would be selected based on significant educational disadvantage, such as low numbers of college-bound students or limited college preparatory courses
- UC partner schools also would be chosen based on their potential for improvement and their willingness to participate in collaborative efforts with the University

The UC Regents commissioned the research center, Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), to report on and synthesize outreach programs, in order to inform university systems' discussions regarding systematic responses to SP-1. The PACE report reviews evaluations of current outreach programs, identifies effective practices, and makes recommendations for the improvement of programs and of the methods used to evaluate programs. According to the report, "The University of California has a long-standing commitment to the diverse population of this state. As part of this commitment, the University also has a long history of involvement in pre-collegiate education, one form of which is 'outreach'--an array of programs and other activities designed to help prepare students so that they become competitive for, admitted to, and successful in the University" (PACE, 1996, p. 1)

The most significant finding of the PACE report was a lack of evidence regarding the effectiveness of the myriad UC outreach programs. According to a San Jose Mercury News article:

Now that Proposition 209 has ruled out race-based affirmative action immediately, the University of California is scrambling to expand its programs to bring underrepresented black, Latino and American Indian students to its nine campuses. But a draft of a report commissioned by UC concludes there's no hard evidence the university's more than 800 tutoring and counseling programs -- which cost \$20 million this year -- are increasing admissions of targeted minorities. "The current

²⁷ UC Davis Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Undergraduate Admissions and Outreach Services Division (1997, Oct 13).

outreach efforts of the university are inadequately coordinated, unsatisfactorily documented and poorly evaluated,” said the unreleased report by Policy Analysis for California Education, a research group based at UC-Berkeley and Stanford University.... Evaluations of UC's outreach programs “have little helpful information about which programs deserve to see their budgets increase or decline,” the report said (Lubman, November 19, 1996).

The PACE report made several recommendations:

- UC President Richard Atkinson's office should be “explicit” about long-term goals, such as deciding whether to focus on helping students get into the university or graduate from it. UC should also figure out short-term goals for outreach programs and hold them accountable for results
- UC should track undergraduates who have gone through outreach programs and monitor their success
- UC should provide financial and administrative support for research on outreach programs, which currently lack the resources to evaluate themselves

The report concludes by urging for coordination of programmatic efforts throughout the system. In 1998, the UC Office of the President used the report as policy, issuing grants to UC campuses to increase outreach activities along the lines of the PACE report.

According to Hayward (1998), President Atkinson announced in January 1998 that the Office of the President will devote an additional \$2 million to its outreach activities that year. These internal funds are in addition to a \$60 million a year expenditure on outreach, which is to increase by at least \$12 million in 1998. Furthermore, the President said that the university also will seek money from the federal government, private donors, and Proposition 98, which is the funding guarantee for K-12 schools.

According to Bob Polkinghorn, UCOP Director of Higher Education/Lower Education Relations, outreach is the primary vehicle for getting the message out regarding additional selection criteria beyond solely academic indicators (i.e., UCD's “steps 2 and 3”). For non-disadvantaged students, who are not targeted through outreach, the message regarding non-academic factors is not disseminated in any coherent fashion: “To be honest, ... to the audience you're talking about, there *isn't* a UC-wide strategy...” or a mechanism through which the message goes out to high schools or students regarding what competitively eligible looks like.²⁸

Polkinghorn also added that the UC Office of the President is developing a strategic plan to integrate four program components that currently exist: (1) student-centered work such as academic development; (2) dissemination of targeted information; (3) research on effective practices; and (4) partnership activities, including outreach. Furthermore, at a UC-wide level, the Office of the President is trying to develop a “cadre of teacher leaders who know the University's criteria, standards, etc.”²⁹ Right now, Polkinghorn said that these activities, including partnerships with K-12 segments, are primarily undertaken on a campus-by-campus basis and have many different possible forms, such as UC campus

²⁸ Polkinghorn, Robert, (1998, February 25). Interview.

²⁹ Ibid.

links with districts, schools, specific high school departments, or less formal arrangements.

SECTION 4

CASE STUDY OF THE CSU SYSTEM AND CSU SACRAMENTO

This section contains descriptions of admission and placement policies in the California State University system as well as the campus-level policies at the Sacramento campus during the 1997-1998 academic year.

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

CSU Governance and Policymaking

According to a recent study, the California State University or CSU “has a history of being micro-managed by state agencies” (California Higher Education Policy Center, 1997, p. 26). However, as Donald Gerth, current President of CSU Sacramento, explains, pre-1960 governance by the State Board of Education was “nominal” (Gerth and Grenier, 1981). Gerth further explains that although the State Board had the power to approve presidential and faculty appointments as well as curricula, the campuses were “largely semi-independent fiefs of the presidents” (Gerth and Grenier, 1981, p. 17). Each campus was relatively independent, though subject to the controls of a line item budget from the Legislature and the resulting agency controls carried on by state departments such as Finance, the Personnel Board, and Public Works.

The individual California State Colleges were brought together as a system by the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960. In 1972, the system became The California State University and Colleges and in 1982, the system became simply The California State University. The Master Plan was a major turning point in the character and development of the CSU campuses. The Master Plan defined more clearly than before the differentiation and overlapping of functions among the three segments of public higher education and created a Coordinating Board for Higher Education as a voluntary coordinating body composed of segmental and public representatives to advise the governor, legislature, and segments (Gerth and Grenier, 1981). Unlike the University of California, which essentially grew as a complex from the expansion of a single campus, the state colleges were federated into a system from a series of campuses that had been relatively independent for most of their history. Indeed, a principal internal faculty drive for the Master Plan had been made to gain greater independence from state government. The conversion of the California State Colleges to University status gave more funding for research and sabbaticals, and a greater role for faculty in governance (Gerth and Grenier, 1981).

Articulation or intersegmental coordination tends to occur on a local/regional level. The CSU is credited for doing the best job of coordination, and the community colleges are considered the worst. However, no central body in the state is in charge of

articulation. In short, the CSU system functions as a state bureaucracy without clear state goals, and there is a large degree of autonomy for individual campus governance.

Board of Trustees

The Master Plan recommended the establishment of a new board of Trustees of the CSU System and its own central staff, which would closely parallel the autonomy, composition, and terms of office of the Regents of the University of California. However, these trustees have only statutory power, and therefore do not have the kind of constitutional protection that the UC Regents enjoy. The Board consists of 24 voting members. Five Trustees are ex-officio members: the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the CSU Chancellor. The Alumni Trustee is appointed by the CSU Statewide Alumni Council, and the Student and Faculty Trustees are appointed by the Governor. The Student, Alumni, and Faculty Trustees serve for two years. Sixteen additional Trustees are appointed by the Governor (and confirmed by the State Senate) for eight-year terms.

The Trustees appoint the chancellor, who is the chief executive office of the system, and the presidents of each campus. The Board also establishes system-wide minimum criteria for admission, procedures for course placement, and various other policies for its 23 campuses, and six off-campus centers, across the state. The following set of relevant policies (described in detail in following sections of this report) are established at this central-system level:

- General freshman requirements
- Subject requirements
- Eligibility index
- Application procedures and fees
- Transfer requirements
- Course placement policies
- Tuition costs, fees
- Impacted program/campus application procedures

The CSU system headquarters is located in Long Beach, and this Southern California location was intentional. Because the Office of the President for the UC system is located in Oakland (Northern California), the Trustees chose to geographically diversify the governance of the CSU system. A larger reason, however, was political; it was felt that a location far away from Sacramento would afford it “greater autonomy” (Gerth and Grenier, 1981, p. 30).

Admissions policy for the CSU is formulated by the Admissions Advisory Council of the Board of Trustees. The Advisory Council initiates discussions and proposals to alter and amend policies. This group has regional campus representatives as well as individuals appointed by the Trustees. Donald Gerth, CSU-Sacramento president, has headed this group since 1982. For placement policy matters, the Trustees have two faculty committees, each of which deals with English and mathematics placement.

Current Undergraduate Admission Policies for the CSU System

According to official CSU policy, first-time freshmen are admitted based on courses taken in high school and a combination of high school grade point average (GPA) and either SAT-I or ACT composite scores. California residents with a high school GPA of 3.0 or better are not required to submit test scores, but are encouraged to do so (this figure is 3.61 for non-residents). A student qualifies for regular admission as a first-time freshman if he/she: (1) Is a high school graduate; (2) Has completed with a grade of C or better each of the courses in the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subject requirements (see Table 4-1 below); and (3) Has a qualifying eligibility index (see Table 4-2 below). These are mandated, system-wide minimum requirements for regular admission to the CSU.

System-wide Subject Requirements

The CSU-system requires first-time freshman applicants to complete, with a grade of C or better in each course, the following comprehensive pattern of college preparatory study totaling 15 units. A "unit" is defined as one year of study in high school.

Table 4-1
CSU Course Subject Requirements

| Course | Years/Units |
|--|--|
| US history or US history and government | 1 year required. |
| English | 4 years required. |
| Mathematics | 3 years required. algebra, geometry, and intermediate algebra. (A fourth year of advanced mathematics is recommended. |
| Science | 1 year with laboratory: biology, chemistry, physics, or other acceptable laboratory science |
| Foreign Language | 2 years in the same language, subject to waiver for applicants demonstrating equivalent competence ^a |
| Visual and performing arts | 1 year: art, dance, drama/theater, or music |
| Electives | 3 years: selected from English, advanced mathematics, social science, history, laboratory science, foreign language, visual and performing arts, and agriculture |

^aThe foreign language subject requirement may be waived if you demonstrate competence in a language other than English equivalent to or higher than expected of students who complete two years of foreign language study. Students are encouraged to consult with their school counselor or any CSU campus admission or relations with schools office for further information.

All regularly-admitted students must earn a minimum GPA of 2.0. Students with a GPA under 3.0 must submit SAT-I or ACT scores; however, students with GPAs above

3.0 need not submit these scores and qualify automatically for CSU eligibility based on an index (see below). CSU campuses do not admit any student solely on the basis of SAT-I or ACT scores.

System-Wide Eligibility Index

The eligibility index is the combination of high school grade point average and composite test score on either the American College Test (ACT) or the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT-I). The grade point average is based on grades earned during a student's final three years of high school (excluding physical education and military science) and bonus points (1 additional point) for each C or better grade in approved honors courses. Up to eight semesters of honors courses taken in the last two years of high school can be accepted. Table 4-2 illustrates a number of sample combinations of test scores and grade-point-averages required for regular admission.

Table 4-2
CSU Eligibility Index for CA Residents

| High School GPA | ACT Score | SAT-I Score* |
|---|-----------|--------------|
| 3.00 and above qualifies with any score | | |
| 2.99 | 10 | 510 |
| 2.79 | 14 | 670 |
| 2.59 | 18 | 830 |
| 2.39 | 22 | 990 |
| 2.19 | 26 | 1150 |
| 2.00 | 30 | 1300 |
| Below 2.00 does not qualify for regular admission | | |

Note: This table is only a partial scale; the original runs continuously from GPAs of 3.99 to 2.00.

*Reflects recentering of SAT I tests taken in April 1995

Selection Criteria

The following is an outline of the array of selection criteria the CSU currently uses for selecting new students (1997-98 academic year).

High School Graduation. A high school diploma or equivalent is required for final admission.

Test Scores. CSU campuses do not admit students based solely upon their test scores. Composite ACT or SAT-I test scores factor into the eligibility index, as described above. Individual SAT-I verbal, SAT-I math, or ACT scores can exempt a student from taking the placement tests in English and/or mathematics. The CSU 1997-98 undergraduate admission booklet "urges" students to take the SAT-I or ACT even if they have a GPA of 3.0 or above (3.61 for nonresidents) "since campuses use test results for advising and placement" (CSU, 1996, p. 7).

High School GPA. The CSU requires high schools to compute GPA based on grades earned during a student's final three years of high school (excluding physical education

and military science). Bonus grade points (according to a standard scale) are allowable for each C or better grade in approved honors courses.

Senior Year Grades. Because CSU eligibility is determined in November of the senior year, senior year grades do not play a prominent role in most admission decisions. Admission offices maintain the power to revoke admission to a student who fails senior year courses.

High School Class Rank. High school rank is currently not considered.

Required Coursework. See Table 4-1 above. As the 15-unit course pattern requirement was phased in from 1984 until 1995, individual campuses could waive up to two semesters of required high school coursework for admission into the CSU. Today, the only exception to the 15-unit course pattern is with the visual and performing arts requirement, which is specific to the CSU but not to the UC system. Since 1995 and continuing (at least) through the 1998 admission process, CSU campuses will admit students who are eligible either under the CSU course pattern or under the UC course pattern. This policy is expected to continue. The Director of Admissions and Records estimated that of approximately 3,500 entering students, 10 percent follow the UC-pattern exception at CSUS.³⁰

Recommendation Letters and Personal Statements. Letters of recommendation and personal statements are not considered, unless requested under Special Admission review (see below).

State Residency. Admission requirements are somewhat higher for non-residents (see section above).

Status of Sending High School. The applicant's high school is not considered in the normal admissions process. However, consideration may be made in the Special Admission review.

Special Admissions Policies

Special Admits. The CSU has a Special Admission policy through which each campus may admit students not qualifying under the above policies. Campuses may choose to admit up to 8 percent of its incoming students through this policy. According to a CSU report (CSU 1995, January), two categories of "special admits" exist: (1) applicants who are not otherwise eligible provided they are "eligible veterans" as defined in Subdivision (a) (1) of Section 1652, Title 38, United States Code (40756.1) and (2) applicants not otherwise eligible and who are not classified as "disadvantaged."

Minimum Level for Conditional Admission. The CSU application booklet states that students must have at least a 2.0 GPA to be eligible for regular admission (CSU, 1996, p. 6), but there is no minimum SAT-I score. One recent change in eligibility policy (noted above) is the waiver of either one-year of visual and performing arts or one year of the

³⁰ Glasmire, L. (1997, September 2). Interview.

foreign language requirement, provided the admitted student completes this deficiency in his/her first year at the CSU. This policy aimed to address a CPEC Eligibility Study in 1996, which indicated that the CSU was admitting from only the top 29.6 percent of high school seniors and not the top 33 percent.³¹

As noted above, the CSU Eligibility Index qualifies a student with a high GPA (i.e., above 3.0) for admission without considering his/her SAT-I or ACT scores. The Director of Admission at CSUS, Larry Glasmire, voiced concern that although high school GPA may be extremely high for some admitted students, their test scores may be quite low. Such students undoubtedly will need some sort of remediation/development once they are at the university. He suggested that the CSU System consider some minimum SAT-I or ACT score, as “a high GPA may mean nothing,” and that the index should continue above 3.0 GPAs.”³² However, Donald Gerth, CSUS President, does not believe that higher admission standards have, or will in the future, reduce remediation within the CSU. He commented that the CSU has raised its course requirements twice since 1970, and he has seen a “steady deterioration” in writing skills of undergraduate students. Further, Gerth thinks that the CSU math placement tests might be “outdated.”³³

Basic Application Procedures

The CSU-system sends out to schools and interested and/or promising students a document called *The California State University Undergraduate Admission* each year. This document contains: one-sentence descriptions of each campus in the system; charts of majors and programs leading to undergraduate degrees and/or credentials (including information on those majors that are impacted); detailed information on eligibility requirements, including the Eligibility Index; and an application. This information also can be retrieved on-line via the CSU-system homepage or any homepage maintained by individual campuses.

Most applicants apply through the mail. This process begins in November and extends through the first day of classes. Applications are sent to the specific CSU campus, rather than to the central system in Long Beach. The application form asks students to submit it to their first-choice campus; they may designate an alternate campus to which the application is forwarded in the event that the first-choice campus cannot accommodate the student (i.e., in the case of impaction). For each CSU campus receiving an application, the student must submit a \$55 filing fee. The application also requests the name of intended major; however, getting admitted to various departments occurs only at the upper division level (and, therefore, is beyond the scope of our study). The process is somewhat more complicated if the department or program is impacted, and stricter application time frames apply.

Applicants are urged to file early. Applications to impacted majors must be filed during the initial filing period, which is the first month of the filing period. If applying after the initial filing period, students are urged to consult the campus admission office for current information. Except for impacted majors, most campuses continue to accept

³¹ California Postsecondary Education Commission (1996). 1996 Eligibility Study. Retrieved November 28, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/CompleteReports/Eligibility1996/Eligibility4.asp>

³² Glasmire, L. (1997, September 2). Interview.

³³ Gerth, D. (1997, October 29). Personal letter to Michael W. Kirst.

applications throughout the filing period until enrollment categories are filled. Most campuses acknowledge the receipt of an application within two to four weeks.

Campus-level Admissions Policies

Within the policy parameters established centrally by CSU, each campus is responsible for the administrative specifics of undergraduate selection, placement, and financial aid. Criteria regarding impactation³⁴ are determined both centrally and at the individual campus level. The CSU institutions with impacted programs or campuses may work with the trustees to determine impacted status and appropriate admission procedures into these programs. Both programs and entire campuses can be impacted. At CSUS, impacted programs in the 1996-97 school year were Physical Therapy and Nursing.

Formally, the campus level is the weakest in terms of policymaking. In terms of the details of how campuses implement policy, however, each campus has strong influence. In addition, each CSU campus creates and maintains its own individualized enrollment plan. For example, according to central CSU system policy, each CSU campus may admit annually up to 8 percent of students through the Special Admission policy. Some campuses are under this figure, while some (including CSU Sacramento, in recent years) have exceeded it.

Undergraduate Placement in the CSU

The following section draws heavily from the work of Carrie Penner, as documented in her report on CSU remediation policy (Penner, 1996). The increasing rates of remediation at the California State University has been a source of growing concern over the past several years, and has peaked as the number of incoming freshmen who require remedial³⁵ courses in math and/or English has risen to over 50 percent of entering freshmen taking the placement tests. Of the 25,019 first-time freshmen in 1994, 10,818 or 43 percent required remedial English courses and 11,670 or 46.6 percent required remedial mathematics before being ready to enter freshman level coursework. This shows a significant increase in remediation since 1989, when 35.9 percent and 23.2 percent were the corresponding numbers of students requiring remedial courses in these subjects.³⁶

The public has become increasingly concerned over the high number of students entering CSU from California public high schools who have not been adequately prepared, questioning the quality of education in the public schools and the standards which are developed by the California State Department of Education. Furthermore, the high level of remediation is expensive. The University must absorb the cost of providing

³⁴ The CSU designates programs as impacted when more applications are received in the first month of the filing period than can be accommodated. Some majors are impacted at every campus where they are offered; others may be impacted only at some campuses. Applicants to impacted majors must file the application for admission during the first month of the filing period and will be subject to supplementary admission criteria. The postmark will be used to determine if the applicant filed in the first month. Priority for admission to impacted programs is given to California residents.

³⁵ An equivalent term for "remedial" education and courses that is increasing in usage is "developmental" education.

³⁶ California State University's Homepage. Retrieved in 1997, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.calstate.edu>

classes and teachers for courses which are not offered for college credit. Parents and students bear additional expenses since remedial courses do not count towards graduation, and consequently, students to take longer to finish college (Pesqueira and Hoff, 1995, p.3).

The continuing increase in the number of students who require remediation prompted the CSU Board of Trustees to direct its attention to the problem of remedial education at CSU in the fall of 1994. The Board established the Trustees' Subcommittee on Remedial Education to explore issues surrounding the problem of remediation across the CSU system (Simms, 1995). A second group, the Workgroup on Under-Prepared Students, is a systemwide group which the Office of Academic Affairs commissioned in 1994 to explore the issues surrounding remediation at CSU. In January 1995, the Education Policy Committee presented the Board with background information on remediation at CSU and made several preliminary recommendations to the Board (Simms, 1995). At this time, the Workgroup on Under-prepared students had not reported back to the Trustees, and while the initial Educational Policy Committee recommendations were endorsed, the issue was tabled until further information and recommendations were received by the Board. In July of 1995, the Subcommittee proposed policy changes, which included a recommendation that the need for remedial education at CSU be eliminated by the year 2001 (Pesqueira and Hoff, 1995).

The ensuing debate following the presentation of this policy resulted in hearings across the state during the fall of 1995. Participants in the hearings were CSU representatives, through the Trustees' subcommittee, as well as students, teachers, faculty, legislators, and representatives from CPEC, the California Education Round Table, and others. The State Department of Education and the State Superintendent for Public Instruction, Delaine Eastin, also discussed this policy with CSU representatives, regarding the effect that this policy would have on the K-12 public education system in California and the time period in which the original policy was to take effect (Pesqueira and Hoff, 1995).

Initially, the policy was to eliminate remedial courses by 2001, only six years from when the policy was first presented (Pesqueira and Hoff, 1995). Due to the importance placed in the policy on collaboration between higher education and K-12 education and the need to find better ways in which to prepare students graduating from high schools and going on to college, the dates adopted in the modified policy include a series of phase-in target dates to reduce the need for remediation, extending the final target date to 2007 (Pesquiera and Hoff, 1995).

The policy that was ultimately adopted targets students completing high school and directly entering CSU, to ensure that they are well-prepared for college level work upon entering the University. It establishes a series of benchmarks over a 12-year period to reduce the number of regularly admitted students needing remedial education. The first of these targets is that by 2001, the need for remediation for regularly admitted freshmen would have declined from 1996 levels by 10 percentage points. This number is to be further reduced by 2004, when the number of students requiring remedial classes will be one-half of the 1996 rates. By the final target date of 2007, it is hoped that the need for remediation among regularly admitted freshmen be only 10 percent of those incoming freshmen. The policy also endorsed principles presented by the Workgroup on Under-prepared Students and adopted the report and recommendations of the Trustees'

Subcommittee on Remedial Education (Pesqueira and Hoff, 1995). The Remedial Education Policy Implementation Advisory Committee was created to examine potential implementation strategies for the policy and to make recommendations back to the Board (Pesquiera & Hoff, 1995).

It now appears that the Workgroup on Under-prepared students has absolved, and a new CSU group (reporting to the Trustees) has taken its place. This group is the Pre-collegiate Education Policy Implementation Committee, headed by Marualene Hughes at one of the CSU campuses.

This response to rising remediation rates is one of several that are currently being discussed both inside individual CSU campuses and within the California state legislature. Two other proposals have surfaced to mitigate concerns for remediation:

- *Delay admissions -- An informal practice.* Another solution that is used in practice but is not an official policy is to delay admission to students who need remediation until they demonstrate that they are prepared for college-level work (Finney, 1997). In this approach, placement and/or admission individuals within CSU campuses counsel these students to go elsewhere (to a California Community College, for example) and take the necessary coursework to bring them up to a level where they are ready to begin college-level work at CSU. While delaying admissions to particular students who need remediation is currently an informal practice, it could serve as a possible approach to solving the problem of remediation.
- *Bill high schools -- A California legislator's proposal.* California legislator Bruce Firestone has proposed that high schools sending students to CSU in need of remedial coursework pay CSU for the cost of bringing these students' performance levels up to par with college level expectations (Finney, 1997). This bill lacks support and is unlikely to pass. However, it represents a policy example informed by the extreme view that K-12 schools are at fault for incoming CSU students' need for remediation.

As far as the CSU Central Office is concerned, the bottom-line is to sharply reduce the numbers of students requiring remediation/development before students begin the standard freshman course sequence in English and mathematics. Ultimately, this standard will affect who is admitted to the CSU.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Because the CSU is charged with admitting from the top third rather than the top eighth (as is UC's charge), competition for spaces at each campus is not as fierce as at the UC. The only exception within the CSU is the San Luis Obispo campus, a polytechnic which is quite selective and turns away many minimally qualified students. In this section, we offer a case summary of admission and placement at one particular CSU campus, the California State University, Sacramento (CSUS or Sacramento State). The Sacramento campus celebrated its 50th anniversary in 1998. Located in the state's capital city, CSUS serves 24,000 students, of which approximately 5,000 are graduate students. Nearly half of the freshmen class each year comes from outside the Northern California region. CSUS graduates approximately 4,500 students each year, and 80 percent of its graduates remain in California and approximately half of these graduates live in the greater Sacramento region³⁷ (see Appendix B for more student demographics).

Current Undergraduate Admission Policies at CSUS

The Admissions and Records Division (headed by Larry Glasmire) is responsible for receiving, processing, and selecting applicants. This division also maintains data on course placement and remedial needs for those admitted. It is overseen by the Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Division, headed by Dr. Eric Gravenberg, the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs and Enrollment Management. Dr. Gravenberg's position is only one year old; he also oversees outreach and financial aid. The academic affairs counterpart to Gravenberg is Isabel Hernandez-Serna, Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs, whose office advises incoming students about courses and placement. Gravenberg and Hernandez-Serna both report to the Vice President of Student Affairs who reports to the President.

Sacramento State has chosen to supplement the CSU system-wide admissions procedures in the following ways:

- The Admission and Enrollment Office at CSUS offers two special filing days in November ("Priority Admission Days") where students may be admitted "on the spot." Students wishing to apply during this time come to campus with required and/or recommended documents (e.g., high school transcript, test scores) and meet with admission office representatives for about 15 minutes. Admission may be offered to applicants at this time. In addition, according to *Mapping Your Education*, a document provided by CSUS for student use, both freshmen and transfer applicants can be admitted "on the spot" by appointment with an admissions counselor on the CSUS campus as long as applications are still being accepted (CSU, 1995, p. 4).

³⁷ California State University Sacramento Public Affairs Homepage. Retrieved on November 28, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://csus/pubaf/quickfacts/students.html>.

- Most applicants submit an application and wait for notification by mail. Students meeting the minimum criteria are notified immediately that they are admitted, subject to completion of required high school courses and adequate continued performance. However, admission offers are rarely revoked. Students who have less than a 3.0 GPA or those who are likely to not meet the 15-unit course requirement are sent a letter requesting the first-semester senior year transcript. In some of these cases, admission decisions are deferred until the spring semester. If the pattern of course-taking in the senior year looks “promising,” and if the student is currently enrolled in a necessary course, he/she will more than likely be admitted at the time of application, rather than delaying the decision.³⁸
- At Sacramento State, individual colleges or departments are generally not involved in the admission process, except in the case of impacted programs for upper-division transfer students. Occasionally, a department (e.g., theater) or program (e.g., sports, debate) may submit a special request that an individual be admitted. The Admission Director estimated that about 2 percent of students are admitted on the basis of such requests.
- In accordance to CSU policy, campuses may admit 8 percent of its students under the Special Admission policy. Generally, students are asked to submit recommendation letters and personal statements for review to be admitted under this policy. CSUS has exceeded the 8 percent maximum in recent years, but campus officials said that they are no longer willing to continue this practice.

The Office of Admissions and Records makes the final admission decision. This decision may be influenced by a letter of request from a department or program on behalf of a specific student. In the case of “border-line” applicants, the Director of Admission said that high school grade and course enrollment patterns, personal statements, and recommendation letters play a significant role in the final decision of border-line applicants. There is also a group called the Pre-Collegiate Education Policy Implementation Committee, which reports to the Trustees on such matters.

Current Undergraduate Placement Policies at CSUS

The Academic Affairs Division at CSUS is headed by the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs (Isabel Hernandez-Serna), who reports to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (Shirley Uplinger). The Academic Affairs office advises students about courses and coordinates a network of advisors -- including peers, faculty members, and admission officers -- who inform potential and incoming students about the General Education-Breadth Requirements at the campus and the need to take placement tests. Her office plays a prominent role in the one-day new student orientation, which occurs prior to both the fall and spring semesters and is attended by approximately 70 percent of incoming students.

³⁸ Glasmire, L. (1997, September 2). Interview.

Basic Placement Procedures

Official CSU policy states that non-exempt students must take placement tests by the end of their first semester or first quarter on campus. These tests are intended to identify deficiencies in preparation necessary to perform adequately in typical English and mathematics freshmen-year courses. This policy is becoming more stringent; beginning in 1998, non-exempt students must take placement tests before they enroll in any classes their first semester/quarter. Those avoiding the tests will have a hold placed on their registration until the required tests are taken. At Sacramento State, for example, placement tests serve as gatekeepers to Math 1 and English 1A, which begin the typical course sequence in those subjects for freshmen. A student may qualify as exempt if he/she submits high enough SAT-I, ACT, or AP test scores. Exempt students and those who make the cut-off scores on math and English placement tests may enroll in these courses upon entry into the university.

The 1981 General Education-Breadth curriculum (Title 5, Section 40402.1) requires the CSU to assess incoming students in basic skills, including English and mathematics, before they begin college-level work in these subjects. In general, incoming non-exempt students are required to take two placement tests -- the English Placement Test (EPT) and the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) Test -- during the first semester or by the end of the second quarter of enrollment at a CSU institution. The EPT has been given since 1983 and the ELM Exam since 1987. According to Eric Gravenberg, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs/Enrollment Management, "the EPT and ELM have emerged as a cottage industry."³⁹

Each test has a cut-off score, which must be exceeded in order to matriculate directly into the standard freshmen general education course sequence. Students not exceeding the cut-off scores on either the ELM or the EPT are directed to remedial courses of varying levels, depending on their precise score. Students must pass the remedial course(s) as prerequisite(s) to enrolling in the typical course sequence, which is required for completion of the General Education (GE) graduation requirement. If EPT test scores are particularly low, a student might need to pass one remedial course to advance to the next level of remediation.

Cut-off scores are determined centrally by the CSU Central Office.⁴⁰ However, the specific process through which remediation/development occurs (i.e., the specific courses, the number of levels of remediation/development) appear to be determined by each institution. According to Agenda Item 2 of the Committee on Educational Policy (CSU Committee on Educational Policy, 1995), each recipient of the bachelor's degree from the CSU must have completed a series of specific GE requirements.⁴¹ However,

...the specification of numbers of units implies the right of discretion on each campus to adjust reasonably the proportions among the categories in order that the conjunction of campus courses, credit unit configurations, and these requirements

³⁹ Gravenberg, E. (1997, September 2). Interview.

⁴⁰ According to CSU System memo from Office of the Chancellor (from Allison Jones), describing the ELM and EPT assessment and placement process.

⁴¹ The CSU Committee on Educational Policy. (1995, July). Report of the Subcommittee on Remedial Education, Executive Summary (This is the original policy proposal to combat remediation in CSU. It was not enacted.)

will not unduly exceed any of the prescribed semester or quarter unit minima...[T]he total number of [GE] units...should not be less than 48 semester units or 72 quarter units (p. 14).

Accordingly, a CSU-systems document graphically depicting the course placement routing (attached to memo document mentioned above) differs somewhat from the process followed by CSUS. The differences seem to stem from the required GE courses for all students. For example, at CSUS, the composition course is English 1A; in this CSU system document, several GE courses including English 100, Asian American Studies 100, Black Studies 100, and Chicano and Latino Studies 104 also seem to fill this requirement. The remedial courses leading up to these courses parallel this diversity of course offerings. While the cut-off requirements are CSU-wide, each campus designs its own series of remedial courses for students not meeting the cut-off. The cut-off level is intended to indicate that any student meeting or exceeding this score is ready to begin the standard General Education course sequence at any CSU campus. In addition, campuses may administer additional diagnostic exams to either place students in more advance courses or to more precisely determine their level of deficiency.

At CSUS, most of these remedial courses are offered through the Learning Skills (LS) Center; two are offered through the math department. This center (Gravenberg called it a “department”) staffs the faculty for remedial math courses and coordinates the English faculty for English remediation needs. All of these courses are listed as “basic skills courses” in the 1996-98 CSUS Course Catalog, which states:

These courses carry workload credit and may be counted only toward establishing full-time enrollment status. Basic skills course units are not applicable to the bachelor’s degree...Entering freshmen [with specific ELM and/or EPT scores--see below] must enroll in their first semester at CSUS in the course which corresponds to their ELM Exam...or EPT...score. In subsequent semesters they must enroll in the next course in the sequence until [both or either] their GE quantitative reasoning requirement is met [and/or] Engl. 1A is completed (CSUS, 1996a, p. 418).

The courses generate no credit for graduation, and are taken on a pass/fail basis.

CSU Placement Exams: Content and Scoring

The English Placement Test (EPT)

This exam is a two and one-half hour test. The cut-off score to begin the typical course sequence of English 1A (“College Composition”) is 150. This course sequence begins the General Education requirements for graduation. At Sacramento State, there are two possible remedial (developmental) levels for low-scoring EPT students (see Table 4-3). Students just missing the cut-off, with EPT scores ranging from 142 to 150, are directed toward English 1, “Basic Writing Skills” (3 units, graded credit/no credit). Those with EPT scores between 120 to 141 must take Learning Skills (LS) 15, “College Language Skills” (4 units, graded credit/no credit/satisfactory progress). LS 15 serves as a prerequisite to English 1; hence, if the EPT determines that English skills are particularly wanting, a student would need to take and pass both LS 15 and English 1

before enrolling in English 1A. The EPT may only be taken once, and is not re-administered after completion of the remedial course(s) as a check for understanding.

Table 4-3

Required Developmental Courses for Students Not Exceeding 150 on the EPT

| EPT Score Range | Required Developmental Course(s) |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 142-150 (less severe level) | English 1 (“Basic Writing Skills”) (prerequisite: LS 15 or EPT score between 142-150) |
| 120-141 (more severe level) | LS 15 (“College Language Skills”) |

The Entry Level Mathematics Exam (ELM)

The ELM Exam is a one and one-half hour exam. The cut-off score to begin the typical course sequence of Math 1 is 540. There are three possible remedial levels for low-scoring ELM students (see Table 4-4).

Table 4-4

Required Developmental Courses for Students Not Exceeding 540 on the ELM

| ELM Score Range | Required Developmental Course(s) ^a |
|----------------------------------|--|
| 480-540 (least severe level) | LS 10B or Math 9 or Math 11 |
| 380-470 (mid-range level) | Either LS 10A and LS 10B <u>or</u> LS 10A and Math 9 |
| 370 or below (most severe level) | LS 7A and LS 7B; Math 9 |

^aAs explained in footnote 32 of the *Class Schedule Fall 1997* CSUS guide, to enroll in either Math 9 or Math 11, a student must take and make a passing score on the Elementary Algebra Diagnostic Exam.

The least severe level is for students just missing the cut-off and who have ELM scores of between 480 and 540. Depending upon which General Education course pattern requirement they intend to fulfill for CSUS graduation requirements, these students must take either: (a) LS 10B (“Entry Level Math II,” 4 units, graded credit/no credit); (b) Math 9 (“Essentials of Algebra and Trigonometry,” 3 units, graded credit/no credit); or (c) Math 11 (“College Algebra,” 4 units, graded credit/no credit).

The mid-range remedial level is for students with ELM scores of between 380 and 470, who take either (a) LS 10A (“Entry Level Math I,” 4 units, graded credit/no credit) and LS 10B or (b) LS 10A and Math 9.

The most severe remedial level is for students scoring 370 or below on the ELM. Such students must take LS 7A (“Intensive Learning Experience (ILE) Entry Level Math I,” 4 units, graded credit/no credit) and LS 7B (“ILE Math II,” 4 units, graded credit/no credit). Depending upon the selected GE course pattern, they may also need to take Math 9.

The ELM is taken only once, and is not re-administered after completion of the remedial course(s) as a check for understanding. However, all students who enroll in Math 1 must first take a diagnostic test in pre-calculus math, as explained in footnote 29 of the *Class Schedule Fall 1997* CSUS guide (CSUS, 1997a). As mentioned above, such

diagnostic exams are at campus discretion to facilitate further course placement, either advanced or remedial.

For low-scoring placement test takers, while enrollment in the first credit-bearing General Education composition requirement course English 1A means traversing through a progression of courses and levels, enrollment in Math 1 is less sequential. To “satisfy the ELM,” students are slated into one route and do not move from one level to the next of remediation/development. However, Math 9 appears to be the primary gatekeeper course to enrolling in Math 1. The course catalog lists Math 9 and completion of ELM requirements as prerequisites for Math 1, but states that the Math 9 prerequisite can be waived if a student has taken three years of high school mathematics, including two years of algebra and one of geometry. Interestingly, regularly-admitted CSUS students are supposed to have completed three years of high school math, including two years of algebra and one of geometry. As noted above, enrollment in Math 9 means passing the Elementary Algebra Diagnostic Exam and enrollment in Math 1 means passing a diagnostic test in pre-calculus.

Exemptions

Students may prove that they are prepared for college-level work (and, therefore, for the typical General Education course sequence in English and mathematics) through a variety of ways, including scoring high on the SAT-I, the ACT, Advanced Placement Exams, or the College Board Achievement Test. Such students (about one-third of incoming CSU students, system-wide) are exempt from taking entry-level placement exams. At CSUS, in fall 1996, high SAT-I or ACT scores exempted 18.5 percent of students from taking the ELM and 18.5 percent of students from taking the EPT. While the CSU campuses use an Eligibility Index that combines SAT/ACT verbal and math scores, exemption from placement examinations is based on individual verbal and math scores.

According to the CSUS Class Schedule Fall 1997 booklet (CSUS 1997a), the specific exemptions at CSUS from taking the EPT are as follows:

- Completion (grade “C-minus” or better) of English 1A or its equivalent at another college
- A score of 470 or above on SAT-I verbal (before April 1995; 550 or above after April 1995)
- A score of 22 or above on the ACT (before October 1989; 2 or above after October 1989)
- A satisfactory score on the CSUC English Equivalency Exam
- A score of 3, 4, or 5 on the AP Language and Composition or Composition and Literature Examination of the College Board AP Program
- A score of 600 or above on the College Board Achievement Test in English with essay (before January 1994)
- A score of 600 or above on the College board SAT-II Writing Test (between January 1994 and March 1995; 660 or above after March 1995).

The specific exemptions at CSUS from taking the ELM are:

- A score of 3, 4, or 5 on the College Board Advanced Placement Examination (AB or BC)
- A score of 560 or above on the math section of the SAT-I
- A score of 560 or above on Level I, IC, or IIC (C = calculator) on the SAT-II: Mathematics Test
- A score of 24 or above on the ACT Math Test (prior to October 1989; 25 or above after October 1989).

Remediation Levels: Student ELM and EPT Data

Because of incomplete data, it is worth noting that the figures available from Sacramento State on remediation levels of students should be interpreted with some degree of caution⁴². Since 1995, CSUS has begun to clarify and strengthen its data collection. With this in mind, the total number of students admitted for fall 1995, for instance, appears to be much higher than fall 1996 and fall 1997 (see Table 4-5 below). At that time, CSU Sacramento did not have any mechanism in place to gather data on those who were admitted but did not plan to enroll. For fall 1996, Gravenberg’s office conducted a phonathon in late May, and received feedback from some admitted students who indicated they were not planning to attend CSUS. Therefore, the office updated its Student Information System to change their admit status from “admitted” to “withdrawn” in mid to late June. Beginning in fall 1997, the campus implemented its intent to enroll process, which has resulted in many admitted students changing their status to “withdrawn” much earlier in the cycle.

Table 4-5
CSUS Admits and Their Rates of Meeting Prerequisites

| | Year | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|------------------------|
| | Fall 1995 | Fall 1996 | Fall 1997 ^a |
| Total number of high school graduates accepted to CSUS | 3,132 | 2,666 | 2,528 |
| High school admits that met all prerequisites | 2,570 (82.1%) | 2,142 (80.3%) | 2,328 (92.1%) |
| Special Admits admitted | 562 (17.9%) | 524 (19.7%) | 200 (7.9%) |

^athrough 6/1/97

Note: Unless indicated otherwise, these data are regular admits only. The Office of Student Affairs/Enrollment Management notes that students admitted as “special action” have significantly higher rates of failing or not taking the EPT and the ELM.

Another piece of information that is important when looking at these data is that many non-exempt students admitted to Sacramento State have not taken either the EPT or

⁴² Data on similar areas from CSU Long Beach, for example, is much more complete. Historically, CSU campuses have varied in the amount and quality of their data collection. With the new remediation policy passed by the CSU Board of Trustees, however, it is expected that each campus will need to collect and maintain more specific data regarding remediation and development levels.

the ELM. According to the Office of Students Affairs/Enrollment Management at CSUS, virtually all of the admitted students who did not take the EPT or the ELM for fall 1995 and 1996 were students who did not plan to enroll at CSU Sacramento. Therefore, for those who did not take the tests, there is no way of determining whether the student would have met all of the prerequisites for enrolling in college-level English and math courses. At the time that the data were collected for this report, the students admitted for fall 1997 had had only one opportunity to take the placement tests (May 3, 1997). Thus, the numbers not taking the test are higher than in prior years (see Table 4-7). Admitted students have four additional testing opportunities prior to enrollment in September 1997.

The data in Table 4-6 show the level of remediation required for fall 1996 CSUS students in English and math, based on EPT and ELM results. While the data provided by the CSUS Admissions Office are separate for each test, some students needed remediation in both English and math. These data include both first-time freshmen and lower-division transfers.

Table 4-6
Required Remediation at CSUS, 1996

| | Placement Test | |
|--|----------------|---------------|
| | EPT | ELM |
| # of non-exempt first-time freshmen and lower-division transfers | 1346 (66%) | 1471 (72%) |
| # of non-exempt who did <u>not</u> take test as required | 440 (33%) | 543 (37%) |
| # Deemed unqualified for pursuing regular course sequence | 562 (27.5%) | 741 (50%) |

Table 4-7
Level of Preparation of Incoming CSUS Students

| | Year | | |
|--|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| | Fall 1995 | Fall 1996 | Fall 1997 ^a |
| Admits (not withdrawn who meet regular admission requirements) | 2,570 | 2,142 | 2,328 |
| Exempt or passed EPT and ELM | 529 (20.6%) | 454 (21.2%) | 403 (17.3%) |
| Exempt or passed EPT; did not pass ELM | 236 (9.2%) | 299 (14.0%) | 170 (7.3%) |
| Exempt or passed ELM; did not pass EPT | 115 (4.5%) | 145 (6.8%) | 61 (2.6%) |
| Did not pass both EPT and ELM | 294 (11.4%) | 344 (16.1%) | 205 (8.8%) |
| Did not pass EPT; never took ELM | 6 (0.2%) | 3 (0.1%) | 6 (0.3%) |
| Did not pass ELM; never took EPT | 7 (0.3%) | 2 (0.1%) | 5 (0.2%) |
| Exempt or passed EPT; never took ELM | 115 (4.5%) | 84 (3.9%) | 121 (5.2%) |
| Exempt or passed ELM; never took EPT | 164 (6.4%) | 104 (4.9%) | 163 (7.0%) |
| Took neither EPT nor ELM (did not enroll) | 1,104 (43.0%) | 707 (33.0%) | 1,196 (51.4%) |

^athrough 6/1/97

The data in Table 4-7 were provided by CSUS at the request of the Colleagues in Conversation group (see below) in summer 1997. These data provide the number and percentage of students certified by high schools as having all prerequisites, but who do not meet one or more of the skill level achievement areas as specified by CSU as satisfactory.

Time Frame for Assessment and Placement

Students are to be assessed within their first semester at the university. As stated in the CSUS 1997 course catalog:

Non-exempt students are required to take the ELM Exam before the end of their first semester of enrollment and before registering in any quantitative reasoning course, including ELM equivalency courses. Failure to take the exam before the end of your first semester on campus will prevent registration in any classes the following semester. The diagnostic tests given by the Mathematics Department do not substitute for the ELM Exam or satisfy the ELM requirement (CSUS, 1996, p. N, emphasis original.).

Similarly, the catalog also states:

...failure to take the EPT will prevent you from registering for English 1A, English 1, or LS 15. Failure to take the EPT before the end of your first semester on campus will prevent your registration in any classes during your second semester (CSUS, 1996a, p. L).

However, as the table above indicates, 33 percent of non-exempt students failed to take the EPT and 37 percent did not take the ELM in 1996. According to Admissions and Records, which maintains these data, repeated notices were sent out to these individuals before a hold was placed on their registration.

The time frame for taking the tests is changing, according to a new CSU-system policy to be implemented in fall 1998. Non-exempt students will be required to take the ELM and EPT exams prior to registration in their first semester. This policy change is discussed further below.

Administration of Exams

Non-exempt students take the placement tests on any CSU campus and according to a published CSU placement test schedule. As a statewide policy, each CSU campus offered the EPT and the ELM at least four times in each academic year--once in October, once sometime during the winter months, November through January; once in May, and once in June. The EPT is free of charge to students, but the ELM costs takers \$16, which covers the costs of scoring. The CSU contracts with the Education Testing Service (ETS) to administer and score these exams; the turn-around time is about two to three weeks for the CSU to receive test scores from ETS.

Centrally-coordinated testing dates are insufficient to accommodate all of the students who must take the exams. Therefore, CSUS offers some additional times for non-exempt students to take these tests, as do other CSU campuses. However, there is an

additional cost of \$15 for the EPT and \$5 for the ELM for local scoring, if students choose these supplemental times. Local scoring is done by faculty members from the CSUS math and English departments. Pre-registration is required, and must be received on average 15 days prior to test administration. Students wishing to take both exams in one sitting may do so on the days that both exams are administered.

ELM and EPT Data Collection and Reporting

The Admissions and Records division at Sacramento State collects, maintains, and monitors data on incoming students, including those who need to take placement tests. According to Glasmire, Director of Admissions, part of the new policy on remediation requires each CSU campus to maintain and report placement test scores of individual students, and then to track and report their progress to the CSU Central Office until they begin the standard course sequence in English or math.

According to the Director of Admissions, CSUS tracks and reports placement test scores to the CSU Central Office, but the data are not sent to high schools unless requested.⁴³ Currently, the system is developing software to report such data to high schools in a timely manner. The data that CSUS (and other campuses) sends to the CSU-system are compiled by the Chancellor into performance reports on community colleges and high schools. This information is then sent to the relevant parties, but the information, according to Eric Gravenberg, is “too useless by the time of dissemination -- one year later.”⁴⁴ Gravenberg indicated that Sacramento State was in the process of developing its own mechanism to report such data back to schools within its region and schools that traditionally send a large number of students to the campus. Such a process has not yet been developed.

Tensions between CSU System and Individual Campuses

Two primary tensions with respect to placement appear to exist between the CSU central system and individual campuses. First, there is concern for the manner in which students are placed into college courses. A second concern is the timing and deadlines of the required assessments for placement.

Use of SATs for Placement Purposes

Campuses such as CSU Long Beach, and to a lesser degree, CSU Sacramento, have been relatively active in terms of advocating for more flexibility in how entering students are placed in college courses. According to Dr. Gravenberg, the CSU faculty have had “major discussions” regarding the relevancy or necessity of the EPT or the ELM exam, given that most students already take the SAT-I. Repeatedly during our interviews, respondents (e.g., Gravenberg, Glasmire, Joy, Hernandez-Serna) stated that the SAT-I (or the ACT) scores would be sufficient for course placement and/or assessing developmental or remedial needs if students were also required to submit a writing sample or they completed the SAT-II writing portion.

At CSU Long Beach, the Director of Testing prepared a document that simulates the use of the SAT-I (and ACT) on predicting EPT and ELM scores. These data suggest that the SAT-I scores can be used to accurately predict performance on the EPT and, less

⁴³ Glasmire, L. (1997, September 2). Interview.

⁴⁴ Gravenberg, E. (1997, September 2). Interview.

closely, the ELM. Specifically, this study found a 0.79 correlation between the SAT-verbal and the EPT and a 0.70 correlation between the SAT-math and the ELM, suggesting that the SAT-I could be a reliable proxy for current CSU placement exams. However, there is little indication that the CSU system is inclined to drop or diminish the ELM and EPT. Furthermore, the placement testing at the CSU is significant to ETS, which has a financial stake in the continued administration of the EPT and ELM. As a final note to this alternative assessment discussion, when asked about the potential of using the Golden State Exam in admission/selection and placement criteria, Marilyn Jensen, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs at Cal State University Long Beach said “We have lots of things we’d like to try. Just give us an opening!”⁴⁵

Timing of Placement Exams

A second, and related, tension between the CSU and campuses concerns the timing of the placement tests. According to Nancy Sprotte of the CSU Enrollment Management Division, timely assessment and placement of incoming students is one of the most major concerns for the CSU system right now. The CSU remediation policy states that all students are to be assessed prior to enrollment. However, campuses interpret this somewhat loosely. At CSULB, for example, the campus interprets it to mean by the fourth week of classes. What has not changed in CSU policy is the “expiration” date of the ELM: test scores are only valid for one year. Therefore, a student must take the test in September of the senior year (or later) in order for the ELM score to be “valid” on the first day of classes at any CSU campus.

CONTINUING POLICY CONCERNS AT THE CSU

Admissions

Neither the *Hopwood* decision nor Proposition 209 described in Section 1 of this report has affected the CSU campuses very much. Gerth downplayed the impact of affirmative action on CSU, saying that the university has never had quotas nor has it needed to use different indexes for race. CSU focuses on outreach, and only a few impacted programs needed to allocate scarce space. CSU needs to be careful how it talks about affirmative action, he suggested; the university needs to ensure that personnel do not unintentionally use quotas. Only a few CSU departments used racial criteria, and they were told to stop. Nancy Sprotte of the CSU Enrollment Management Division further confirmed that Proposition 209 has not had much of an effect.

⁴⁵ Jensen, M (1998, January 27). Interview

Placement and Remediation

At the CSU, attention has focused on the area of placement and remediation. A July, 1995 document by the CSU Committee on Educational Policy⁴⁶ gives flavor to the debate concerning admission and remediation that lately has captivated the CSU. It stresses the importance of entering CSU students' proficiency in basic skills as the primary method for ensuring that remediation course rates decrease. It states:

To communicate the importance of having basic skills at the beginning of university study and to ensure that students arrive with these skills, it is proposed that possession of basic skills become an admission requirement for all undergraduate students. It is also recommended that all freshman applicants be required to submit SAT or ACT scores (CSU Committee on Educational Policy, 1995a, p. 8).

The document proposes the development of a new "eligibility standard that factors in the applicant's possession of skills needed to succeed in entry-level General Education courses in English and mathematics." Further, it proposes investigation (with the UC system and K-12 representatives) into an experimental competency-based admissions process which "would involve agreement between postsecondary education and K-12 on specific performance criteria for high school graduation" (CSU Committee on Educational Policy, 1995a, p. 8).

According to Gravenberg, administration of the placement tests to assess preparation for college-level work represents a political "compromise" over time. Unlike the UC system, the CSU decided not to require achievement tests as a condition for admission. As a compromise, the placement tests became the primary mechanism through which student preparation was judged.

Reducing Remediation in the CSU

The new CSU-system policy on remediation (adopted in 1996) sets a series of benchmarks over the next decade to reduce the number of regularly-admitted students needing remedial education. The first target is that by 2001, the need for remediation for regularly admitted freshmen would have declined by 10 percentage points from the 1996 levels. The second target is that by 2004 the number of students requiring remedial classes will be one-half of the 1996 rates. By the final target date of 2007, it is expected that the need for remediation will be only 10 percent of incoming freshmen. This policy was adopted after a series of public hearings and discussions about a more stringent policy proposal (to eliminate remedial classes by 2001) which was originally proposed. The Trustees, through the Committee on Educational Policy, have taken the initiative in establishing this new policy.

The CSU is also developing a structure in which students are not able to register for courses until they have either showed that they are exempt from taking the exams or have completed the tests in necessary subjects. This new policy -- Executive Order No. 665 -- went into effect in fall 1998.

⁴⁶ The CSU Committee on Educational Policy. (1995, July). Report of the Subcommittee on Remedial Education, Executive Summary (This is the original policy proposal to combat remediation in CSU. It was not enacted.)

To accommodate an expected surge in demand for taking the tests in a timely manner, there is a wide discussion within CSU in general, and within the CSUS in particular, about administering the placement tests at local high schools. Mr. Gravenberg said that CSUS officials would like to work with high school teachers and students to help them prepare for the EPT and ELM exam. In a report he prepared for a regional Colleagues in Conversation meeting, Gravenberg remarked:

At this juncture, CSU, Sacramento has not provided these tests at local high schools. The current systemwide contract with ETS makes it very difficult for CSU, Sacramento to administer the placement exams “on demand.” Systemwide efforts are underway to renegotiate the contract with ETS to provide more flexible scheduling options (Gravenberg, 1997)

Gravenberg, Glasmire, and Hernandez-Serna all recognized that the new CSU policy on remediation will have very direct implications for admissions. As Hernandez-Serna stated, “Although the new 1998 placement policy isn’t an admissions one, one could say that it is.” Furthermore, it implies a much stronger relationship between Sacramento State and, in particular, regional high schools and community colleges.

Strengthening Articulation: Communication Procedures and Outreach Efforts

Through its Outreach Office, under the Student Affairs and Enrollment Management Division, CSUS is positioning itself to play a much stronger community role in strengthening articulation. Articulation arrangements are being made through formal memorandums of understanding between Sacramento State and regional high schools and/or school districts. It is expected that these efforts will go far in increasing the number of freshmen who exceed minimal admission requirements and are prepared to begin the normal freshmen sequence of courses (i.e., are not in need of remediation/development). It is equally hoped that these outreach efforts will improve the number of freshmen admitted from underrepresented groups and will increase retention of all students at the university.

Dr. Uplinger, Vice President for Student Affairs, says that articulation with high schools and with community colleges is a major concern within CSU Sacramento. But top-down policies and procedures aside, she indicated that a major “cultural change” is in order that would inspire change on a more individualized level. “We’re talking about changing the responsibilities of college [CSUS] faculty, [where they’re] talking with high school faculty about changes and expectations...about formalized articulation agreements between [for example] math department and math department, English department and English department.” She continued, “In K-12, there are all these signals to students. And in California, we’ve done a major disservice to our society by reducing college counselors and therefore the information [that students receive] is unclear.”⁴⁷

According to a document prepared by Dr. Gravenberg, *Academic Preparation of Students Admitted to CSU, Sacramento*, the data collection process is in a state of transition: “Virtually all of the admitted students who did not take the EPT or ELM for fall 1995 and 1996 were students who did not plan to enroll at CSU Sacramento.” Therefore, prior to fall 1997, it was not possible to provide accurate data to high schools

⁴⁷ Uplinger, S (1997, September 2). Interview.

about preparation of those students who were admitted to CSUS, who were supposed to take the placement exams, but who decided not to attend. According to Dr. Gravenberg, a change in data collection procedures will allow the office of Student Affairs and Enrollment to classify these students as “withdrawn” applicants, and report more complete and less confusing data to high schools.

Each CSU campus has an enrollment plan that addresses how it wants to grow and how to influence the local demographic trends. CSU Sacramento decided it needed to work more with the K-12 segment, in particular, to increase district-specific initiatives to increase curricular coordination/congruence and student preparation. Gravenberg mentioned that this campus used to have a strong articulation system, but that somewhere along the way, it “lost sight of that. Now we’re trying to come back.” A part of this district-specific approach is to track who enrolls in college preparatory courses within high schools and who completes the 15-unit course pattern. He spoke of efforts to better collaborate with high schools, instead of simply dictating to them. “We particularly don’t want to miss that human element, he stated, “If we don’t collaborate, nobody’s really going to survive and public trust will be more wanting.”⁴⁸

Nancy Sprotte, CSU Enrollment Management Division, said that at a system-wide level, the primary group responsible for communicating to high schools is the Office of Access and Retention. She indicated that there are a number of different venues for getting the word out about expectations and requirements, including annual conferences for counselors and a program called the Special Advisory team. Begun in 1998, the program encourages each campus and each regional high school to work together to understand prior trends in data and to discuss curricular changes at both the campus and the high school. The communications mechanisms that are most important at the CSUS are discussed below. This most recent group -- the Special Advisory team -- was not operational at the time of our visit.

Outreach Innovations at CSUS

There are two recent innovations that Sacramento State has made to increase coordination with high schools: 1) Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) with districts and schools, and 2) Colleagues in Conversation.

A *Memorandum of Understanding* or MOU is an arrangement between CSUS and a school or district that draws upon an Upward Bound program model. In this arrangement, Sacramento State places a staff member at participating MOU schools. So far, CSUS has established MOUs with several schools and school districts in the greater Sacramento area. These MOUs entail “a different level of expectation of services” from CSUS, according to the VP for Enrollment, Eric Gravenberg.⁴⁹ CSUS helps to develop education plans, determine what educational needs exist, provide support services such as tutoring, and coordinate community-based organizations to work in and with the schools. While each MOU is unique, the cornerstone is broad-based support and ownership on the part of school faculty, parents, and students.

⁴⁸ Gravenberg, E. (1997, September 2). Interview.

⁴⁹ Gravenberg, E. (1997, September 2). Interview

We were given a copy of the MOU with one particular district, and were told that it resembles the other MOUs. There are four main purposes of this MOU: (1) to increase college awareness among parents and students in the district; (2) to increase the college preparation of students in the district beginning in grade nine; (3) to enroll 299 students per year from the district's high schools; and (4) to ensure that matriculants from the district receive support to facilitate their graduation from CSUS. According to the MOU, the "Guiding Principles" are as follows:

- Central to increasing the college going rate of students in [the district] to CSU Sacramento is the identification of students who have college aspirations. But most importantly, this project also includes the motivation of those students who may not see college as their first option...Course counseling, academic skills assistance, progress monitoring, and special work with students and parents to decode and demystify the process of applying and enrolling at a postsecondary institution are among the strategies planned.
- CSU Sacramento and [the district] are committed to increasing the number of students who enroll at CSU Sacramento with the requisite courses to reduce the need for remediation and ensure their graduation. As a corollary, articulation conferences hosted by CSU Sacramento will engage the faculty and staff of the respective institutions. It is expected that such articulation and collaboration will have a salutary impact on the continuity and thus a success of any college effort...
- CSUS will place an outreach admissions professional within the district office. This person will, with the help of district officials, principals, teachers, and counselors, coordinate the delivery of services from CSU Sacramento...
- CSUS and [the district] are committed to the value that it is possible and attainable that every child can learn...
- Additionally, it is crucial that the collective efforts include the monitoring, when necessary, of students' decisions regarding coursework and to allow for intervention, when necessary, to insure that students consult with a counselor prior to changing programs when they register for future terms...

Among the special target services offered through this MOU are: Co-sponsored math and English articulation conferences; tutoring and mentoring; ACT/SAT test preparation workshops; application workshops; proactive college planning and guidance; monitoring of students' academic progress; and administering the EPT/ELM on-site.

A second step to increase coordination is through Colleagues in Conversation meetings. These are meetings set up with representatives of CSUS, high schools, and community colleges.

In addition to the MOUs and the Colleagues in Conversation opportunities described above, CSUS has a regular process for informing K-12 individuals about procedures, changes in policies, and the like. First, in the fall, there are system-wide conferences that convene counselors. "They're given the party line, and then they're

given a chance to grill us,” said the VP for Enrollment at CSUS.⁵⁰ Second, at the local level, there are articulation councils, which convene members of high schools, community colleges, and four-year institutions in the area. Counselors come to the Sacramento State campus about three times each year. A third method of passing along information is via telephone, on an informal basis. A fourth is through distribution of newsletters. “They get a lot of information, so they know,” said the VP for Enrollment at CSUS. “But for a long time, we weren’t sending any messages or we were sending the wrong message.”⁵¹

⁵⁰ Gravener, E. (1997, September 2). Interview

⁵¹ Gravener, E. (1997, September 2). Interview

SECTION 5 CONCLUSIONS TO PHASE I

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Lack of Policy Alignment

Richard Richardson et al. (1999) summarize California's challenges for creating effective educational policy in a frank way:

An ongoing question concerns how effectively higher education can meet public needs in a state system that features formidable institutional independence, weak statewide coordination, and few clear messages from the political or policy environment. (Richardson et al., 1999, p. 45).

California has made great strides in aligning standards with assessments in K-12, as evidenced by the development and implementation of the STAR program described in Section 1 of this report. Unfortunately, efforts to improve compatibility and coherence between K-12 and higher education have lagged behind such efforts. The lack of compatibility between K-12 and higher education policies and practices in California is evident in two ways: (1) policymaking bodies in the two education sectors have minimal interaction and opportunity for collaboration and coherence, and (2) educational standards and assessments are not aligned.

A theme that repeatedly surfaced in the interviews conducted for this case study was the near-complete absence of communication between policymakers working or concerned with higher education and their policymaking counterparts in secondary education. Possible linkages between policy formulation in the two sectors can be recognized yet alone formulated without inter-sector communication and dialogue. Public institutions of higher education seem focused on their processes from the admissions point forward. In addition to such pressing concerns such as student safety, mental health concerns, and the professional development of teachers, high schools must expend their energies on the many assessments required by the State. From a policy perspective, there are few incentives for either system to look outside its traditional boundaries and understand educational issues from a broader perspective.

As Kirst (1999) has noted, assessments used in California secondary education are primarily driven by state standards and accountability pressures, while the assessments in higher education are driven by a variety of different purposes, from assessing general aptitude for success in college to placing entering college students in appropriate levels of coursework. That these two sets of purposes are seen as competing and not complimentary is problematic since the resulting preparation and assessment maze may serve as a barrier to successful student transitions from high school to college. For example, the math portion of the CSU math placement test is a mismatch with the STAR math test for high school juniors (Le et al., 1998), so preparation for state assessments may actually constitute somewhat limited preparation for placement tests in college.

We also found that each university system, and frequently each campus, has its own set of admission selection criteria and academic placement standards and procedures. The lack of communication and alignment of policy endemic between sectors is also characteristic of the public higher education sector itself, despite a legislated Master Plan that was supposed to encourage coordination throughout the sector. The classic example in this regard is the different course requirements that define preparedness for college-level work in the CSU and the UC. The requirements are similar, but one is not subsumed by the other. Students aspiring to postsecondary education, therefore, are ostensibly given two definitions for college preparatory coursework, and we can expect that only the most savvy students will know these differences as well as the consequences for completing the requirements for only one of the two universities.

Forces Preserving Misalignment Within Higher Education

Clearly, the chasm of communication, mission, and shared history between the K-12 and higher education sectors of public education has resulted in the current state of misalignment among policies that affect postsecondary transitions to higher education. Within the higher education sector, however, two major issues may be serving to preserve misalignment of admission and placement policy between the state's two university systems, the CSU and the UC -- preserving racial diversity in the UC and reducing remediation in the CSU. Ironically, the legislation that essentially coordinates the activities of the two systems -- the California Master Plan for Higher Education -- may be responsible for keeping policy coordination at bay.

UC's Struggle for Diversity in the Post-209 Era

Since the Master Plan legislates the higher selectivity of the UC relative to the CSU, access for racial minorities is a much more salient issue at the University of California. Proposition 209, passed by voters in 1996, prohibited the use of raced-based affirmative action policies in state university admissions and subsequently caused all of the UC campuses to quickly and substantially re-draft their admissions policies. CSU campuses, although technically effected by Proposition 209, have very few impacted (more demand than seats) programs and therefore do not have the equity and access issues that the highly competitive UC campuses do.

In response to the passage of Proposition 209 (and the UC Regent resolution, SP-1, which preceded it), there has been continued activity in the realm of admissions policy at the UC. These activities have focused on all phases of the admission process: outreach, eligibility, and selection. Increasing attention to outreach is aimed at improving the academic preparation and application rates of underrepresented students. In renewing its commitment to outreach, the UC adopted a proposal in 1997 to create more school-university partnerships to improve achievement patterns of disadvantaged students, expand successful academic development programs in schools such as MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement), create educational information programs targeted at disadvantaged students and families, conduct research to identify causes of educational inequity and improve outreach programs, and to coordinate outreach activities across the University (Colvin, 1997). Efforts to improve the eligibility rates of underrepresented students has resulted in the development and implementation of

a new policy, commonly referred to as "Eligibility in Local Context." This policy removes the grade point average criterion from the eligibility guidelines. Continuing deliberation on selection policy centers on the weight given to the SAT-I, the SAT-II, and grades received in honors and Advanced Placement courses. All of the activity and discussion surrounding these issues have essentially occurred within a UC-only sphere.

Reducing Remediation Rates in the CSU

Since the CSU is the less selective public university in the state or the four-year institution legislated to have the most open access, the system does not have problems turning away qualified applicants. Rather, the CSU experiences far greater needs with regard to remedial education. Approximately half of the incoming CSU freshmen fail to gain passing scores on English or Math placement tests and are required to take remedial or developmental courses. The current high level of remediation is expensive to the university and to the state. Consequently, the CSU system is developing a structure in which students are not able to register for courses until they have either shown that they are exempt from taking the placement exams or have completed the tests in necessary subjects. Concern over remediation has also led to the implementation of a policy to significantly reduce the extent of remedial education by 2007. In other words, the focus of discussion with respect to transitions to college at the CSU is on preparation and basic skills. The UC has not placed similar amounts of effort or concern on remediation, despite having a remediation rate of about 30 percent in English, for example.

A major conclusion of this analysis is that differentiation of mission and function within public higher education in California, while promising to be efficient from a systemic point of view, may actually contribute to inefficiency with respect to serving the K-16 educational needs of the state. The roots of the inefficiency lie in the continued pursuit of uncoordinated policy development, itself a result of a lack of within- and between-sector communication and the narrow framing of educational policy issues as sector or system specific.

Promising Developments in Alignment and Coordination

Despite the lack of collaboration within and between sectors, we found a few promising exceptions that demonstrate recognition of the need for greater alignment of educational policy for improving the state's ability to foster successful transitions from secondary to postsecondary education.

A Memorandum of Understanding between CSUS and Regional School Districts

At CSU Sacramento, articulation arrangements are being made through formal Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between CSUS and regional high schools and/or school districts. It is expected that these efforts will go far in increasing the number of freshmen who exceed minimal admission requirements and are prepared to begin the regular college-level freshmen sequence of courses (i.e., are not in need of remediation). For example, the bottom line goal of one MOU between Sacramento State and a local school district is to enroll 200 students annually at CSUS from the district's five high

schools. This MOU specifies that the university will contribute to the school district in five ways:

1. Assign an outreach counselor half-time to the district
2. Arrange for tutors and liaison staff to conduct various activities and programs
3. Host English and math articulation conferences
4. Provide periodic reports regarding the progress of the proposed project
5. Co-sponsor a parent workshop. (Memorandum of Understanding between [X]USD and CSU, Sacramento, 1997, p. 4).

Alignment of CSU and UC Course Requirements

One of the most promising examples of policy coordination between the UC and the CSU is occurring in the context of admission policy. The two systems recently developed a standardized 15-unit course requirement list which will affect students applying for admission in Fall 2003. The new “a-g” Subject requirements to be used for both the UC and CSU are described below:

Table 5-1

Subject Requirements for Admission Eligibility to the UC and CSU, Fall 2003

| New "a-g" requirements | Previous UC requirement | Previous CSU requirement |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| History/Social Science, 2 years | Same | 1 year |
| English, 4 years | Same | Same |
| Mathematics, 3 years | Same | Same |
| Laboratory Science, 2 years | Same | 1 year |
| Foreign Language, 2 years | Same | 1 year |
| Visual and Performing Arts, 1 year | none | Same |
| Elective, 1 year | 2 years | 3 years |
| Total:15 years of college prep coursework | Same | Same |

As noted in this table, the subject unit will remain at 15. To merge requirements, the UC gave up one of its two elective requirements for a visual and performing arts requirement. The CSU relinquished two electives for an additional year of history/social science and an additional year of laboratory science. This alignment has been met with enthusiasm by high school counselors throughout California (Galligani, 1999, audience response to this presentation). With its unified structure, the new policy greatly simplifies the policy communication and outreach efforts for schools, teachers, counselors, and the two universities themselves. The merge also signals hope that the two public systems in California are cognizant of the problems inherent in policy misalignment and are willing to collaborate on efforts to simplify the educational policy maze that may be limiting educational access and the overall performance of the system.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A1: UCD Student Data Sheet

| Student Body Demographics (Undergraduates) | 1996 | 1997 |
|---|---|---------------|
| % White/Caucasian | 45.2% | 47.7 |
| % Chinese/Chinese-American | 13.6% | 12.7 |
| % Other Asian/Southeast Asian | 9.6% | 8.3 |
| % Chicano/Mexican-American | 6.9% | 6.1 |
| % Latino/Other Spanish-American | 3.8% | 3.7 |
| % Filipino/Filipino-American | 3.7% | 3.6 |
| % Black/African-American | 3.4% | 2.9 |
| % Korean/Korean-American | 2.5% | 2.3 |
| % East Indian/Pakistani | 2.2% | 2.2 |
| % Japanese/Japanese-American | 1.9% | 1.9 |
| % American Indian/Alaskan Native | 1.2% | 1.1 |
| % Pacific Islander | .5% | 0.5 |
| % Ethnicity not specified | 5.5% | 7.2 |
| % International | 1% | 1 |
| High-sending counties | Santa Clara, 11.9% Alameda, 9.6% Sacramento, 9.5% Contra Costa, 9.1% San Francisco, 7.5% Los Angeles, 6.8% San Mateo, 5.6% San Diego, 3.5% Solano, 3.4% Yolo, 3.2% | (unavailable) |

Source: Office of Undergraduate Admission (Gary Tudor, Darlene Hunter)

Appendix A2: Subject A Statistics, UC Davis (Part I)

| | # of entering UCD frosh and transfers | # of entering frosh who took May Subj A Exam | # of students who passed the May Exam | # of entering students who did not earn passing score on the exam | # of students who took campus Subject A Exam (orientation + as course final) | # who passed campus Subject A Exam (orientation + as course final) | # who didn't pass campus Subject A Exam (orientation + as course final) | # of students enrolled in English 57 (including repeaters) | # of students submitting portfolios for review; number of portfolios that "passed" |
|---------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| '96-'97 | 3788 | 2853 | 1687 (59%) | 1166 (41%) | 872+1371=2243 | 304+784=1088 (48%) | 568+587=1155 (52%) | 1396 | 196; 151 (77%) |
| '95-'96 | 3327 | 2385 | 1466 (61%) | 919 (39%) | 1045+1365=2410 | 314+659=973 (40%) | 731+706=1437 (60%) | 1398 | 219; 173 (79%) |
| '94-'95 | 3256 | 2378 | 1131 (48%) | 1247 (52%) | 1028+1433=2461 | 412+718=1130 (46%) | 616+715=1331 (54%) | 1466 | 172; 137 (80%) |
| '93-'94 | 3207 | 2285 | 1285 (56%) | 1000 (44%) | 1850 | 896 (46%) | 954 (52%) | 1125 | 86; 71 (83%) |

Source: UC Davis

Appendix A3: Subject A Statistics¹, UC Davis (Part II)

| | # of entering UCD frosh and transfers | # of entering freshmen who took Subj A Exam (May + orientation + as course final) | # of students who passed the Subj A Exam (May + orientation + as course final) | # of entering students who did not pass Subj A Exam (May + orientation + as course final) | # of students enrolled in English 57 (including repeaters) | # of students submitting portfolios for review; # of portfolios that "passed" |
|---------|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|
| '96-'97 | 3788 | 2853+872+1371 =5096 | 1687+304+784 =2775 (54%) | 1166+568+587 =2321 (46%) | 1396 | 196; 151 |
| '95-'96 | 3327 | 2385+1045+1365 =4795 | 1466+314+659 =2439 (51%) | 919+731+706 =2356 (49%) | 1398 | 219; 173 |
| '94-'95 | 3256 | 2378+1028+1433 =4839 | 1131+412+718 =2261 (47%) | 1247+616+715 =2578 (53%) | 1466 | 172; 137 |
| '93-'94 | 3207 | 2285+1850 =4135 | 1285+896 =2181 (53%) | 1000+954 =1954 (47%) | 1125 | 86; 71 |

Source: UC Davis

¹ These data include double-counting. A student may take the Subject A Exam more than once in a year, and student may or may not be a freshman or entering transfer.

Appendix A4: Statistics² on Required Remediation/Development at UCD

| | # of entering UCD frosh and transfers | # of entering undergrads whose Subj A May and Orientation Exams scores indicated possible ESL classification (flagged as "E") | # of "E" flagged students placed into Engl 57 (normal route for remediation/development) | # of "E" flagged students placed into Linguistics 23 (least severe English language proficiency); # who enrolled in Fall or Winter Quarter | # of "E" flagged students placed into Linguistics 22 (moderately severe); # who enrolled in Fall or Winter Quarter | # of "E" flagged students placed into Linguistics 21 (most severe); # who enrolled in Fall or Winter Quarter | # of "E" flagged students satisfying Subject A off-campus |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1996 | 3788 | 399 ³ | 109 | 97; 89 | 142; 121 | 37; 31 | Linguist 21:1 Linguist 22:12 Linguist 23:11 |
| Fall 1995 | 3327 | 367 ⁴ | 103 | 96; 108 | 115; 102 | 38; 33 | Linguist 21:1 Linguist 22:12 Linguist 23: 12 |
| Fall 1994 | 3256 | 416 ⁵ | 111 | 130; 150 | 132; 133 | 40; 35 | N/A |
| Fall 1993 | 3207 | 396 | 127 | 112; 98 | 132; 118 | 25; 22 | N/A |

² These data include double-counting. A student may take the Subject A Exam more than once in a year, and student may or may not be a freshman or entering transfer.

³ One of these studetns was subsequently enrolled in English 1 directly; English 1 is the standard frosh non-remedial/developmental course at UCD.

⁴ Three of these students were enrolled in English 1 directly.

⁵ Three of these students were enrolled in English 1 directly.

Appendix B1: CSU Sacramento Student Data, Fall 1997

| | |
|---|--|
| Number of total applicants for fall 1997 regular admits | 5,436 |
| Number of total applicants declined for having incomplete applications | 1,671 (30.7%) |
| Number of total completed applications | 3,765 |
| Number of applicants taken for regular admissions, fall 1997 | 3,157 (83.9% of completed applications) |
| Number and percent of applicants taken for special admissions, fall 1997 | 408 (11.4% of all admitted students) |
| Number of completed applications that were declined | 200 (5.3% of completed applications) |
| Number of regular admits who enrolled, fall 1997 | 1,184 (37.5%) |
| Number of special admits who enrolled, fall 1997 | 286 (70% of special admit acceptances) |
| Total admits who enrolled, fall 1997 | 1,470 |
| Number/percent of students who applied and were admitted "on the spot", fall 1997 | (Estimate from Glasmire, Director of Admissions: About one third of all the admitted students, or about 1,200. We admitted 673 freshman in November during our Priority Admission Day program on campus and probably another 500 during the rest of the admission cycle at various high schools and on campus via individual appointments with our admission staff.) |

*Data are for first-time freshmen only.

Sources: Cass and Birnbaum's Guide to American Colleges, 1996; The Fiske Guide to Colleges, 1997; and Peterson's

**Appendix B2:
CSU Sacramento 1995-96 Student Demographic Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Student Body Data | CSU, Sacramento (Moderately Selective) |
| 1995-96 full-time undergraduate enrollment | 13,300 (1995) |
| 1995-96 total enrollment (approx.) | 22,800 (1995); 18,700 (1996) (CSU Home Page) |
| 1996 fall enrollment, freshmen only (approx.) | 1,325 (1995) |
| 1996 applications for admission | 4,600 (1995) |
| 1995-96 percentage of applicants that were accepted into university | 72 percent |
| One-year retention rates of first-time freshmen, enrolled in 1993 | 78 percent |
| Avg. high school GPA | n/a |
| SAT I Scores | Verbal: 396; Math: 426 |
| ACT Scores | Avg: 19.5 |
| Students on financial aid | 40 percent |
| Students living on-campus | 12 percent |
| Ethnicity (1993 data) | |
| White, not Hispanic | 47 percent |
| African-American | 7 percent |
| Hispanic | 13 percent |
| American Indian or Alaskan | 1.5 percent |
| Pacific Islander | .5 percent |
| Filipino | 4 percent |
| Asian | 13 percent |
| International | 2 percent |
| Other | 12 percent |

Sources: Cass and Birnbaum's Guide to American Colleges, 1996; The Fiske Guide to Colleges, 1997; and Peterson's

REFERENCES

- Breitrose, C. (1998, February 18). UC proposal could have big impact. Palo Alto Weekly, pp. 9-10.
- California Higher Education Policy Center (CHEPC). (1997). State structures for the governance of higher education: California case study summary. San Jose, CA.
- California Legislative Analysts Office. (1999, May). K-12 Master Plan: Starting the process.
- California Legislature Joint committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (1989). California faces...California's future: Education for citizenship in a multicultural democracy.
- California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). (1993). The master plan, then and now: Policies of the 1960-1975 Master Plan for Higher Education in light of 1993 realities, Report 93-6, Sacramento.
- Cass, J., and Birnbaum, M. (1996). Comparative guide to American colleges : for students, parents, and counselors, New York: Harper & Row.
- Chronicle of Higher Education (1999, August 27) Almanac Issue 1999-2000, XLVI, (1).
- Colvin, T. (1997, July 17). Regents' committee recommends UC partnership with public schools. Currents Online, 2(2). Santa Cruz, CA: UC Santa Cruz. Retrieved December 11, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ucsc.edu/oncampus/currents/97-7-21/outreach.7-97.htm>.
- California State University (CSU). (1995, January). CSU analytical studies statistical reports: CSU new student enrollments, Fall 1994. Retrieved on December 14, 2000 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.calstate.edu/tier3/as/FTP/SRS/1994-95/F94-New-Students-TOC.html>.
- California State University (CSU). (1995, September). Mapping your education.
- California State University (CSU). (1996). California State University Undergraduate admissions handbook, 1997-98.
- California State University (CSU). (1997). Admission Eligibility Checklist for Undergraduate Admission, for Students Applying for Admission for Fall 1997 and Spring 1998, May 16, 1977.
- CSU Committee on Educational Policy. (1994, November 8-9). Agenda Item 2.
- CSU Committee on Educational Policy. (1995, July). Report of the Subcommittee on Remedial Education, Executive Summary. (This is the original policy proposal to combat remediation in CSU. It was not enacted.)
- California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). (1995, September). Mapping your education.
- California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). (1996a). CSUS Catalog.
- California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). (1996b, October 2). Placement Test Data on Fall 1996 Entering Students. Electronic mail communications from Larry Glasmire to Betty Mouldsef.
- California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). (1997a). Class schedule fall 1997, CSUS guide for academic advising.

- California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). (1997b). The State Hornet's Survival Guide 1997-98.
- California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). (1997c). Institutional Scholarship Information, 1997-98.
- CSUS Office of Institutional Studies. (~1997). Undergraduate Enrollment by School and Program, 1992-96. Report 11.
- CSUS Strategic Plan, no date but around December 1993.
- CSUS Strategic Planning Process, Executive Summary of goals related to (1) university outreach; (2) admissions and records; and (3) financial aid. No date
- Douglass, J. A. (1997, February 20). Setting the conditions of undergraduate admissions: The role of University of California faculty in policy and process. (Commissioned paper for the Universitywide Office of the Academic Senate. Retrieved from World Wide Web: <http://ucsbuxa.ucsb.edu/academic-senate/admissions-report/toc.html>)
- Ed Source. (1998, November). How California compares: Indicators and implications for our public schools.
- Fiske, E. (1997). The Fiske guide to colleges. New York: Times Books.
- Galligani, D. (1999, Sept.). Overview of eligibility changes for freshman applicants. Presentation to the University of California Counselors' Conference, UC Berkeley, CA.
- Gerth, Donald R. and Grenier, Judson A. (1981). A History of the California State University and Colleges.
- Gerth, D., Haehn, J., and Associates. (1971). An invisible giant: The California State Colleges. London: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Gerth, D. (1997, October 29) personal letter to Mike Kirst.
- Gravenberg, E. (1997). Academic preparation of students admitted to CSU, Sacramento: 1995-1997. Executive summary.
- Hayward, B. (1998, January 16). UC to increase spending on its outreach efforts. The Sacramento Bee.
- Hayward, B. (1998, January 16). UC to increase spending on its outreach efforts. The Sacramento Bee.
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC). (1996, December). Committee report on K-18 Curricular Issues.
- Intersegmental Coordinating Committee (ICC). (1997). Standards in mathematics and English for California high school graduates.
- Jones, A. (1997). CSU System memo from Office of the Chancellor describing the ELM and EPT assessment and placement process.
- Kirst, M.W. (1999, Fall). A babel of standards: students face a confusing array of tests and assessments. Crosstalk 7, (4) p. 11.
- Latino Eligibility Task Force (1997). Latino student eligibility and participation in the University of California: YA BASTA! Report Number Five.
- Le, V., Hamilton, L, & Robyn, A. (2000). Alignment among secondary and post-secondary assessments in California. In E. Burr, G. Hayward, B. Fuller, and M.W. Kirst (Eds.) Crucial issues in California education 2000: Are the reform pieces fitting together? Berkeley, CA: Policy Analysis for California Education.
- Lewis, L., and Ferris, E. (1996, October). Remedial education at higher education institutions in fall 1995, National Center for Education Statistics, Report 97-584.

- Lubman, S (1996, November 19). UC's minority outreach criticized. San Jose Mercury News, p A1.
- McClelland, K., Blau, S., and Nicholson, S. (1990). College preparatory vs. college reality. UCSB.
- Memorandum of Understanding between [sic]USD and CSU, Sacramento. (1997, May 16).
- Minority admissions decline with new California policy. (1998, March 18). The New York Times, p. A19.
- Monroe, B. (1998, February 20). UC faculty offers admissions options. San Jose Mercury News, p. 3B.
- Munitz, B. (1997, February 28). Determination of Competence in English and Mathematics, Executive Order No. 665.
- Murphy, D. (1997, April 3). Letter to Dr. Gerth from David Murphy, El Dorado Union High School Superintendent.
- Ochoa, A (1995, September 20). Response to original CSU remediation proposal, Mexican American Advisory Committee to the Superintendent, San Diego Unified School District.
- Penner, K (1996). Reports written for SUSE's Policy Analysis class with Milbrey McLaughlin, examining CSU's admission, placement, and remediation policies.
- Pesqueria, R, and Hoff, P. (1995, July 18-19). CSU Committee on Educational Policy. Agenda Items 2 and 3.
- Peterson's. (1997). Guide to colleges. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's.
- Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE). (1996). Higher education outreach programs: A synthesis of evaluations.
- Seligman, K. (1998, February 12). Novel UC plan to boost diversity. San Francisco Examiner, pp. A1-2.
- Simms, K. (1995, January 24-25). CSU Committee of Educational Policy. Precollegiate Instruction in the CSU. Agenda Item 3.
- Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- UC admission idea gets cold shoulder: Regents say changing rules for qualifying might lower quality. (1998, May 15). San Jose Mercury News.
- UC Davis. (1997a). Admission Advisor.
- UC Davis. (1997b). Course Catalog. (1997-98).
- UC Davis. (1997c). UC Davis Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) Undergraduate admissions and outreach services division.
- UC Davis. (1997d). Report on Subject A, University of California, Davis, 1993-96 data.
- UC Davis. (1997e, unpublished document). Selection process for Fall 1998. General procedure.
- University of California (UC). (1995a) Admissions task force report.
- University of California (UC). (1995b). Overview of Policies and Procedures Governing Undergraduate Admission. (Paper prepared for a UC Committee on Educational Policy and Affirmative Action meeting).
- University of California (UC). (1995c). Quick reference for counselors 1996-97.

University of California (UC). (1995d). The use of socio-economic status in place of ethnicity in undergraduate admissions: A report on the results of an exploratory computer simulation

University of California (UC). (1995e). Report on UC undergraduate admissions policies.

University of California (UC). (1996a, July). Guidelines for implementation of university policy on undergraduate admissions. Retrieved November 9, 2000, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ucop/sas/adguides.html>.

University of California (UC). (1996b). Quick reference for counselors 1997-98

University of California (UC). (1996c). The university-wide Subject A examination book.

University of California (UC). (1997). 1998-99 UC application for undergraduate admission and scholarships.

University of California (UC). (1999a, May/June). California Notes.

University of California (UC). (1999b). Introducing the university.

Wolff, R. (1997 June 27). Letter to President Gerth from Ralph A. Wolff, Executive Director of the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities.