



**University of California Academic Senate
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools**

**2026-2027 Policies and Partnerships Roadmap for First-Year
Undergraduate Admissions**

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Purpose

In March 2026, Academic Senate Chair Palazoglu charged the University of California's (UC's) Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to, in part, develop a "Policies and Partnerships Roadmap" for the 2026-27 academic year that outlines BOARS' plans to lead the design, discussions, and direction of any actions the UC might take to address first-year undergraduate admissions policy issues and build stronger K-12 partnerships. This Special Charge was issued to empower BOARS to develop recommendations to strengthen policies for first-year admissions (where necessary) in order to 1) provide access to a UC education for the most promising high school students in California and beyond, and 2) increase the likelihood that future first-year students entering UC have adequate preparation in reading, writing, math, and/or critical thinking skills to be successful in college-level courses and UC degree programs following matriculation.

Importantly, BOARS continues to be firmly committed to the UC Board of Regents' (or Regents') [long-standing policy](#) (originally articulated in May 1988) that "[t]he University seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that, beyond meeting the University's eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socioeconomic backgrounds characteristic of California." Originally developed nearly 25 years ago, BOARS' comprehensive review guidelines and selection criteria reflect this ongoing commitment to Regents policy. Moreover, in addition to alignment with Regents policy, BOARS continues to be actively engaged in consultation and productive collaborations with the UC Office of the President (UCOP) and California State Board of Education to identify potential solutions for strengthening K-12 preparation and first-year undergraduate admissions policies while, at the same time, ensuring that eligible California residents continue to have the opportunity to access a world-class education in alignment with the mission of the UC.

1.2 California's Master Plan for Higher Education

In 1960, the California legislature adopted the Donahoe Higher Education Act, more commonly known as the California Master Plan for Higher Education – a plan for efficient and rational growth to accommodate California's workforce needs. Developed primarily by former UC President Clark Kerr, this unique tripartite public system of higher education continues to be widely recognized and influential across the U.S. and around the world. Major features of the original Master Plan include 1)

establishment of the Cal Grant program, and 2) establishment of separate governance roles – UC Board of Regents, California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees, and California Community Colleges (CCC) Board of Governors. While many of the principles such as access, affordability and quality remain in place, there have been changes over the last 65+ years. However, public higher education is no longer tuition-free to residents – as it was imagined in the original Master Plan – and funding for the higher education coordinating body, known as the California Postsecondary Education Commission (or CPEC), was eliminated in 2011 under former Governor Jerry Brown.

One of the key features of the Master Plan that remains – and is most relevant to undergraduate admissions – is the differentiation of functions among the three systems. First, as described in the 2009 Legislative Analyst Report, “The Master Plan at 50”, UC was envisioned as the state’s primary public research university and directs it to grant baccalaureate, master’s, doctoral, and other professional degrees. Second, CSU’s focus is on undergraduate instruction and teacher education, with regional campuses offering undergraduate, graduate, and professional education (primarily through the master’s degree) and a few limited doctoral programs that are not duplicative of UC programs. Finally, CCCs offer the first two years of academic instruction, vocational and workforce development programs, and a limited number of bachelor’s degrees that are not duplicative of UC and the CSU.

The Master Plan also established the principles of universal access and choice as well as differentiation of admission pools. UC admits from the top one-eighth (12.5%) of high school graduates; CSU admits from the top one-third (33.3%) of high school graduates; and CCC is open to 100% of Californians. Eligible CCC students are also given priority in the transfer admission process to UC and CSU over transfers from other institutions (including other UCs and CSUs). The transfer function is an essential component of the Master Plan’s principle of access. As set forth in the Master Plan, UC’s goal is to enroll two resident first-year students for every one resident transfer student. In theory, an enrollment ratio of 2:1 first-year:transfer students enables UC to achieve a 40% lower-division student to 60% upper-division student ratio as outlined in the Master Plan.

The guiding policy for undergraduate admissions is articulated within [Regents Policy 2102](#). In short, UC should select from the top one-eighth, or 12.5%, of California high school graduates (as required per the Master Plan). Following principles laid out in Regents and Academic Senate policy, Regents Policy 2102 allows each campus to establish and customize its own local procedures for selecting students as appropriate for the enrollment goals of their campus. The Regents have delegated authority to the Academic Senate through BOARS to set the conditions for undergraduate admission. All UC campuses use the same BOARS-approved comprehensive review factors when reviewing applications, but the method of review may differ by campus. New systemwide undergraduate admissions policies, or revisions to existing systemwide undergraduate admissions policies, recommended by BOARS to the Academic Senate must be approved by the Regents prior to implementation.

Through delegation from the UC President, UCOP's Office of Undergraduate Admissions implements systemwide undergraduate admission policies and collaborates with the nine undergraduate campuses to ensure compliance. The admission process at UC has two components – eligibility and selection – for both first-year and transfer admissions. Minimum eligibility requirements are identical across the UC system, whereas selection criteria are dependent on the campus and major. Each campus has its own methods of determining which students it will admit in compliance with state and federal law.

Since the passage of Proposition 209 in 1996, the UC has implemented race-neutral admission policies aimed at meeting a commitment to excellence and equity in education for all of California's students. In the review and selection process, campuses consider multiple measures of academic achievements, considering the student's education, personal environment, and opportunities available to them. Campuses may consider individual context such as income level, first generation to attend college, neighborhood or community circumstances, disadvantages that have been overcome, low-performing secondary school attended, and the impact of an applicant's background and experiences on academic achievement. In addition, systemwide guarantees for first-year applicants are provided for students who 1) are within the top 9% of California high school graduates and meet minimum admissions requirements or 2) are within the top 9% of their local high school, have a GPA of 3.0 or higher in a specific set of courses, and meet a 9% benchmark GPA for their high school.

1.3 BOARS' Guiding Principles and Selection Criteria for Comprehensive Review

As described within BOARS' [*Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions*](#) (issued 2002, last revised December 2022), comprehensive review is defined by BOARS as "[t]he process by which students applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment." Section II of BOARS' *Guidelines* states that campus admissions committees should adhere to 12 guiding principles to ensure that comprehensive review practices are consistent and fair across all nine UC undergraduate campuses. Importantly, BOARS' *Guidelines* state that an applicant's various forms of achievement and promise should be recognized and, for first-year applicants that meet UC's minimum eligibility criteria (completion of 15 year-long, high school-level A-G courses with a letter grade of C or better, with at least 11 of these A-G courses completed prior to the last year of high school; GPA of 3.0 or higher for California residents and GPA of 3.4 or higher for non-residents), the overarching goal of comprehensive review is to elevate an applicant's achievements beyond the minimum eligibility criteria, especially in light of challenging circumstances.

Per BOARS' *Guidelines*, the 13 selection criteria for comprehensive review of first-year applicants at the campus-level include:

1. "Academic Grade Point Average (GPA) calculated on all academic courses completed in the subject areas specified by the University's admission requirements (the A-G subjects), including additional points for completion of University certified honors courses (see 4, below). It is recommended that the maximum value allowed for the GPA shall be 4.0."
2. "The number, content of, and performance in courses completed in academic subjects beyond the minimum specified by the University's eligibility requirements."
3. "The number of and performance in University approved honors courses, College Board Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, and transferable college courses completed. It is recommended that caution be exercised in order not to assign excessive weight to these courses, especially if considerable weight already has been given in the context of 1, above. Additionally, in recognition of existing differences in availability of these courses among high schools, it is recommended that reviewers assess completion of this coursework against the availability of these courses at the candidate's secondary school."
4. "Being identified as eligible in the local context, by being ranked in the top 9% of the class at the end of the junior year, as determined by academic criteria established by the University of California."
5. "The quality of the senior year program, as measured by type and number of academic courses (see 3 and 4, above) in progress or planned."
6. "The quality of academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school."
7. "Outstanding performance in one or more specific academic subject areas."
8. "Outstanding work in one or more special projects in any academic field of study."
9. "Recent, marked improvement in academic performance, as demonstrated by academic grade point average and quality of coursework (see 3 and 4, above) completed and in progress, with particular attention being given to the last two years of high school."
10. "Special talents, achievements, and awards in a particular field, such as in the visual and performing arts, in communication, or in athletic endeavors; special skills, such as demonstrated written and oral proficiency in other languages; special interests, such as intensive study and exploration of other cultures; or experiences that demonstrate unusual promise for leadership, such as significant community service or significant participation in student government; or other significant experiences or achievements that demonstrate the applicant's promise for contributing to the intellectual vitality of a campus."
11. "Completion of special projects undertaken either in the context of the high school curriculum or in conjunction with special school events, projects or programs co-sponsored by the school, community organizations, postsecondary educational institutions, other agencies, or private firms,

that offer significant evidence of an applicant's special effort and determination or that may indicate special suitability to an academic program on a specific campus.

12. “Academic accomplishments in light of the applicant's life experiences and special circumstances. These experiences and circumstances may include, but are not limited to, disabilities, low family income, first generation to attend college, need to work, disadvantaged social or educational environment, difficult personal and family situations or circumstances, refugee status, or veteran status.”

13. “Location of the applicant's secondary school and residence. These factors shall be considered in order to provide for geographic diversity in the student population and also to account for the wide variety of educational environments existing in California.”

Note: While the intent of criterion #13 is to promote geographic diversity throughout the state, this criterion does not prohibit a campus from considering local/regional secondary school location either.

2. POLICIES AND PARTNERSHIPS ROADMAP FOR FIRST-YEAR ADMISSIONS

2.1 Roadmap for evaluation of BOARS’ admissions policies for first-year applicants

As discussed in Section 1.1, the Academic Senate’s Special Charge empowered BOARS to develop recommendations to strengthen policies for first-year admissions (where necessary) in order to 1) provide access to a UC education for the most promising high school students in California and beyond, and 2) increase the likelihood that future first-year students entering UC have adequate preparation in reading, writing, math, and/or critical thinking skills to be successful in college-level courses and UC degree programs following matriculation. Therefore, as requested by this Special Charge, below is a 2026-2027 “Policies and Partnerships Roadmap” for review of BOARS’ key admissions policies for first-year applicants. BOARS’ roadmap outlines the workgroup charge, composition, meeting frequency, and deliverables. In addition, BOARS’ roadmap includes plans for 1) workgroup chairs to present their findings and recommendations during BOARS’ regularly scheduled meetings; 2) BOARS to convene meetings with internal and external stakeholders to receive input on draft recommendations; and 3) BOARS to finalize and transmit written recommendations to Academic Council based on workgroup findings/recommendations and input received from internal/external stakeholders. If approved by Academic Council, written recommendations will then be forwarded to the Assembly of the Academic Senate. If approved by Assembly, written recommendations will then be forwarded to the UC President and ultimately the Regents for final review and decision. Depending on the nature of the findings and recommendations, these may first need to be sent out by Academic Council for 90-day systemwide review before the sequence of transmittals occurs.

From July 2026-September 2026, the systemwide University Committee on Committees and BOARS Chair will, for each workgroup, actively recruit colleagues who have relevant experience and expertise regarding college preparation (including discipline-specific expertise for standardized

tests and A-G requirements), undergraduate admissions policy/research (including standardized testing), and/or K-12 educational policy/research. These colleagues may include, but are not limited to, UC faculty from systemwide Senate committees (e.g., BOARS, University Committee on Educational Policy [UCEP] and University Committee on Preparatory Education [UCOPE]); at-large UC faculty with relevant expertise; non-Senate colleagues within UCOP (e.g., Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs [GUEA] and Institutional research and Academic Planning [IRAP]) and at the campus level (i.e., Admissions Directors and Enrollment Management Leads); representatives from the State Board of Education and the California K-12 system; and faculty with relevant expertise from the California State University (CSU) system. Additional information about BOARS' proposed workgroup composition and nomination/recruitment process are provided within Sections 2.2 and 2.3 below.

2.2 Standardized test scores (Workgroup 1)

Rationale: In July 2018, former UC President Janet Napolitano requested that the UC Academic Senate evaluate standardized tests in UC admissions. In early-2019, the UC Academic Senate convened an 18-member Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) to review the role of standardized tests in first-year undergraduate admissions. The STTF objectively and analytically approached these issues to evaluate the best course of action, with the goal of developing recommendations for implementation in undergraduate admissions. In January 2020, the STTF transmitted a set of actionable recommendations to the Academic Council, one of which included the continued use of standardized tests in UC admissions. Despite the STTF's recommendation, President Napolitano recommended to the Regents to phase out the use of existing tests (SAT and ACT) and explore development of a UC-specific exam. During their May 2020 meeting, the Regents unanimously approved President Napolitano's recommendations, a policy change that was effective with the first-year cohort entering in Fall 2021. In their May 2020 action, the Regents stated that "the Regents approve a suspension of the current standardized test (SAT/ACT) requirement for undergraduate admissions until 2024 to allow the University to modify or create a new test that better aligns with the content UC expects applicants to have learned and with UC's values." Furthermore, the Regents stated that "if UC is unable to either modify or create a test that meets these criteria and can be available for applicants for fall 2025, UC will eliminate altogether the use of the SAT/ACT for freshman admissions."

Following this decision in May 2020, UCOP formed a Feasibility Study Steering Committee and Work Group in Summer 2020 to evaluate the viability of creating a UC-specific test for use in admissions. In January 2021, the Feasibility Study Work Group determined that UC could not create a new test within the timeline provided by the Regents (i.e., implementation by Spring 2024 for Fall 2025 applicants). Within their report, the Feasibility Study Work Group also stated that it might be possible to leverage an existing test that meets many of UC's requirements. Therefore, in April 2021, former UC President Michael Drake requested that the Academic Senate examine the Smarter Balanced assessment to determine if it can provide added value to the UC's freshman admissions process.

However, in September 2021, the Academic Senate’s Smarter Balanced Study Group, after exploration and analysis, recommended that the Smarter Balanced assessment should not be used in the UC admissions process – a recommendation that was endorsed by President Drake.

As a result of the actions above, Section I.B.2 of [Regents Policy 2102](#) currently states that “[s]cores from the SAT/ACT shall not be used as part of the University’s comprehensive review process described above ([e]ffective beginning fall 2021 admission)” and “[a]pproval of future standardized tests for admissions and scholarships shall be determined by the Academic Senate through its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and approved by the Regents.” BOARS has expressed interest in revisiting the potential use of standardized tests as an additional indicator for student preparedness in reading, writing, and math.

Charge: Workgroup 1 (WG1) will consider the use of standardized tests in the first-year admissions process. Compared to UC’s current test-free policy for standardized test scores, WG1 will investigate the advantages and disadvantages of relying on SAT/ACT scores and/or 11th grade Smarter Balanced Assessment ELA/Math scores for use in the admission of first-year California resident and non-resident applicants, as these tests may have evolved since 1) the STTF’s recommendations were provided in January 2020 and 2) standardized test requirements were eliminated for the first-year cohort entering in Fall 2021. WG1 will provide recommendations about whether standardized tests should be used for admissions or not. As part of their deliberations, WG1 will consider guiding principle #5 within Section II of BOARS’ *Guidelines* which states that “[f]aculty on individual campuses should be given flexibility to create admission policies and practices that, while consistent with Universitywide criteria and policies, are also sensitive to local campus values and academic priorities.”

Composition: WG1 membership will consist of 1) two UC Senate faculty representatives who will serve as WG1 Chair and Vice Chair; 2) at least eleven at-large UC Senate faculty, including at least five members with content expertise in lower-division English/composition, mathematics, and related disciplines, which are the specific subject areas to be tested, plus at least two members with expertise in the use of standardized testing for undergraduate admissions; 3) one *ex officio* representative from the California State Board of Education; 4) one *ex officio* representative from UCOP’s Office of Undergraduate Admissions; 5) one *ex officio* representative from UCOP’s IRAP; and 6) two non-Senate *ex officio* UC representatives with relevant expertise at the campus-level (e.g., one Admissions Director and one Enrollment Management Lead). In addition to supporting the WG1 Chair, the WG1 Vice Chair will serve as an alternate to the WG1 Chair in the event there are time-sensitive needs and/or scheduling conflicts. UC faculty on WG1 will serve as voting members, whereas the *ex officio* WG1 members will serve as non-voting members. WG1 will be supported by a Committee Analyst from the systemwide UC Academic Senate. To the extent possible, UC faculty on WG1 should represent a range of academic disciplines (e.g., humanities, arts, social sciences, STEM, etc.) and undergraduate campuses within the UC to ensure that WG1 is well-balanced and offers a diversity of perspectives.

For UC faculty that will serve as voting members (including the WG1 Chair and WG1 Vice Chair), the systemwide University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Analyst will send a “special request” to the campus-level Committee on Committees (CoCs) requesting members for WG1. This request will include the WG1 charge, background, rationale, timeframe, duties of appointed members, number/frequency of meetings, location of meetings, and term of appointment, but not suggestions for members. All proposed members will be vetted and confirmed by campus-specific CoCs before being reviewed and appointed by UCOC. For all *ex officio* (non-voting) members, the BOARS Chair will solicit nominations in consultation with systemwide UC Academic Senate leadership, the California State Board of Education, and UCOP. All WG1 members will be asked to complete and sign a conflict-of-interest disclosure form to minimize the influence of financial, personal, or professional conflicts on WG1’s deliberations, findings, and recommendations.

Meeting frequency: WG1 will convene Zoom meetings once per month from early-October 2026 through late-April 2027 (at least 7 half-day meetings in total) and beyond, if necessary, to review available resources/data, identify additional data needs, discuss findings and recommendations, and develop a draft workgroup report. Members are expected to participate in all meetings, and proxies or replacements to act as a WG1 member will not be allowed. Voting practices during WG1 meetings will be consistent with systemwide UC Academic Senate [bylaws](#). Seventy-five percent of voting WG1 members present within a meeting will constitute a quorum, and WG1’s final recommendations will require approval of simple majority of all voting members present within meetings. If votes on final recommendations are not unanimous, a minority report summarizing the points of dissent will be included in WG1’s final written report.

Deliverables: WG1 will provide periodic interim updates to the BOARS Chair (with a cc to BOARS’ Committee Analyst) as well as a final written report containing findings and recommendations to the BOARS Chair (with a cc to BOARS’ Committee Analyst) by May 15, 2027. The WG1 Chair will also present a summary of WG1’s findings and recommendations to BOARS during their regularly scheduled meeting on June 4, 2027.

Background resources:

- Academic Council’s Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) [report](#) from 2020
- IRAP’s 2025 [report](#) on the impact of elimination of standardized testing on admission outcomes and performance of freshman cohorts
- Smarter Balanced Study Group (SBSG) [report](#) from 2021
- IRAP’s 2021 [brief](#) on the potential use of Smarter Balanced scores in admissions and placement

2.3 A-G framework for assessing academic achievement and preparation (Workgroup 2)

Rationale: Section I.B.2 of [Regents Policy 2102](#) currently states that “[f]irst-year applicants will be required to complete a minimum of 15 high school year-long courses to be taken during grades 9

through 12...[t]hese fifteen must be academic or college preparatory courses approved by the University and consisting of courses in a) history/social science (2 courses); b) English (4 courses); c) mathematics (3 courses including elementary algebra, geometry, and intermediate algebra); d) laboratory science (2 courses to be taken from two disciplines); e) foreign language (2 courses); f) visual and performing arts (1 course); and g) college preparatory elective courses (1 course, to be chosen from the fields listed above)”; “[e]leven academic or college preparatory courses must be completed by the end of the 11th grade. At least seven must be taken during the last two years of high school”; “[t]he minimum grade point average required for resident students is 3.0 and 3.4 for nonresident applicants (weighted up to 8 semester honors courses) or its equivalent for alternative grading scales”; and “[a]ll first-year resident applicants who meet these criteria will be entitled to a comprehensive review of their admission application at each UC campus to which they apply, but will not be guaranteed admission to any UC campus unless they meet the conditions to be Eligible in the Statewide context or Eligible in the Local Context...”.

Consistent with [Senate Bylaw 145](#), BOARS is responsible for overseeing the structure of the A-G framework for admission to the UC. Moreover, BOARS has the responsibility to “consult with representatives from the State Board of Education and K-12 subject matter specialists on proposed changes to course requirements for undergraduate admissions.” Therefore, in consultation with the State Board of Education and K-12 subject matter specialists, BOARS has the authority to revise UC’s A-G framework as needed. Some BOARS members and various stakeholders within and outside of the UC have expressed concerns that the UC’s current A-G framework may be overly prescriptive/rigid and, as such, may not effectively address changing workforce needs, widespread adoption of AI, UC faculty concerns about preparation, ongoing shifts in student learning styles, and students’ need to apply knowledge and skills to current real-world scenarios. Therefore, consistent with BOARS’ authority under Senate Bylaw 145, BOARS has expressed an interest in considering revisions to the A-G framework – either in part or as a whole – to better prepare students for a modern, rapidly evolving educational landscape and 21st century workforce.

Charge: Workgroup 2 (WG2) will conduct an overarching review of the UC’s current A-G framework to determine whether A-G requirements adequately prepare first-year applicants for success after matriculation at the UC. WG2 will provide recommendations about whether the current A-G framework should be modified or not. If WG2 concludes that modifications to the UC’s current A-G framework are necessary, WG2 will recommend specific modifications as well as investigate the advantages and disadvantages of removing and/or replacing existing course requirements and/or subject areas within the A-G framework. WG2 will not consider the addition of new subjects beyond the seven (A-G) subject areas, nor additional courses beyond the 15 total, unless an equivalent number of subjects or course requirements are removed from the existing A-G requirements.

Composition: WG2 membership will consist of at least 1) two UC Senate faculty representatives that will serve as WG2 Chair and Vice Chair; 2) at least eleven at-large UC Senate faculty, including members that represent a range of academic disciplines (e.g., humanities, arts, social sciences,

STEM, and business) and other members with expertise in K-12 preparation and college readiness; 3) one at-large *ex officio* CSU Senate faculty member with expertise focused on K-12 preparation and college readiness; 4) one *ex officio* representative from the California State Board of Education; 5) two *ex officio* representatives from the California K-12 system with expertise and knowledge about A-G requirements and A-G-approved courses; 6) one *ex officio* representative from UCOP's Office of Undergraduate Admissions; 7) one *ex officio* representative from UCOP's IRAP; and 8) two non-Senate *ex officio* UC representatives with relevant expertise at the campus level (e.g., one Admissions Director and one Enrollment Management Lead). In addition to supporting the WG2 Chair, the WG2 Vice Chair will serve as an alternate to the WG2 Chair in the event there are time-sensitive needs and/or scheduling conflicts. UC faculty on WG2 will serve as voting members, whereas the *ex officio* WG2 members will serve as non-voting members. WG2 will be supported by a Committee Analyst with the UC Academic Senate. To the extent possible, UC faculty on WG2 should represent a range of undergraduate UC campuses to ensure that WG2 is well-balanced and offers a diversity of perspectives.

For UC faculty that will serve as voting members (including the WG2 Chair and WG2 Vice Chair), the systemwide University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Analyst will send a "special request" to the campus-level Committee on Committees (CoCs) requesting members for WG2. This request will include the WG2 charge, background, rationale, timeframe, duties of appointed members, number/frequency of meetings, location of meetings, and term of appointment, but not suggestions for members. All proposed members will be vetted and confirmed by campus-specific CoCs before being reviewed and appointed by UCOC. For all *ex officio* (non-voting) members, the BOARS Chair will solicit nominations in consultation with systemwide UC Academic Senate leadership, CSU Academic Senate leadership, the California State Board of Education, the California K-12 system, and UCOP. All WG2 members will be asked to complete and sign a conflict-of-interest disclosure form to minimize the influence of financial, personal, or professional conflicts on WG2's deliberations, findings, and recommendations.

Meeting frequency: WG2 will convene Zoom meetings once per month from early-October 2026 through late-April 2027 (at least 7 half-day meetings in total) and beyond, if necessary, to review available resources/data, identify additional data needs, discuss findings and recommendations, and develop a draft workgroup report. Members are expected to participate in all meetings, and proxies or replacements to act as a WG1 member will not be allowed. Voting practices during WG2 meetings will be consistent with systemwide UC Academic Senate [bylaws](#). Seventy-five percent of voting WG2 members present within a meeting will constitute a quorum, and WG2's final recommendations will require approval of simple majority of all voting members present within meetings. If votes on final recommendations are not unanimous, a minority report summarizing the points of dissent will be included in WG2's final written report.

Deliverables: WG2 will provide periodic interim updates to the BOARS Chair (with a cc to BOARS' Committee Analyst) as well as a final written report containing findings and recommendations to the

BOARS Chair (with a cc to BOARS' Committee Analyst) by May 15, 2027. The WG2 Chair will also present a summary of WG2's findings and recommendations to BOARS during their regularly scheduled meeting on June 4, 2027.

Background resources:

- [Summary](#) of UC's A-G requirements for undergraduate admissions
- UC's A-G Policy Resource [Guide](#)
- UC's A-G Course [List](#)
- Current articulation criteria for A-G subject requirements: [Area A](#) – History/Social Science; [Area B](#) – English; [Area C](#) – Mathematics; [Area D](#) – Science; [Area E](#) – Language other than English; [Area F](#) – Visual & Performing Arts; [Area G](#) – College-Preparatory Elective
- California's Common Core State [Standards](#) (Areas B and C)
- California's Next Generation Science [Standards](#) for California Public Schools (Area D)
- ICAS' competency statements for Areas B, C, D, and E are [here](#) and [here](#)
- IRAP's 2025 [analysis](#) of the relationship between AP, IB, Honors, and college level coursework, UC admissions, and student completion
- IRAP's 2025 [analysis](#) of the relationship between academic preparation in selected A-G subject areas and performance at UC
- IRAP's 2025 [report](#) entitled "Expanding Opportunity: Chemistry, Math, and the Future of STEM at UC"

2.4 Stakeholder engagement and transmission of recommendations

After WG1 and WG2 Chairs present their findings and recommendations to BOARS during their regularly scheduled meeting on June 4, 2027, BOARS will host a hybrid (in-person with Zoom access) meeting at UCOP in mid-June 2027 to maximize participation within and outside of the UC as well as receive a range of perspectives and input on the recommendations. Invited internal and external stakeholders will include representatives from the UC undergraduate student body, campus-level Admissions and Enrollment Management Offices within the UC system, public K-12 districts within California, higher education segments within California (CSU, CCC, and AICCU systems), and non-governmental organizations focused on higher education-related issues and policies. The BOARS Chair will organize and lead this meeting; present a summary of WG1 and WG2's findings and recommendations; and facilitate Q&A with participants. BOARS will consider input received from internal/external stakeholders during BOARS' regularly scheduled meeting on July 2, 2027, followed by BOARS' review and transmission of approved recommendations to Academic Council by the end of July 2027 for 90-day systemwide review in Fall 2027. If approved by Academic Council, written recommendations will then be forwarded to the Assembly of the Academic Senate. If approved by Assembly, written recommendations will then be presented to the systemwide UC Provost and UC President, the latter of whom will decide whether to forward to the Regents or not for consideration during a public Regents meeting, as the Regents have final authority for approving or denying Academic Senate-recommended modifications to existing criteria for undergraduate admissions. If

any or all recommended modifications to existing criteria for undergraduate admissions are approved by the Regents, then these modifications would, at the earliest, be implemented for first-year applications submitted in Fall 2028 for students matriculating in Fall 2029 depending on the nature of the modifications, recognizing that some types of changes may require a longer notification period prior to implementation.



Viskanta, Rimga <rimga.viskanta@sduhsd.net>

Re: Confirming what I took from our conversation yesterday

rich leib <richleib.ucregents@gmail.com>

Wed, Jun 17, 2026 at 1:45 PM

To: "Viskanta, Rimga" <rimga.viskanta@sduhsd.net>

I think this accurately describes our conversation. A couple of points-

I don't know if the Regents will even consider the roadmap in July. I heard it was on the agenda as a discussion item but not sure where it stands today.

I do think the Regents could informally express their position on the roadmap but I think most if not all the Regents agree with the roadmap as it was described to them and will let the process play out as suggested. I'm sure I will hear more about the process over the next few weeks and if I do I will let you know. But I think it's fine to send this out with the proviso that even a discussion item in July is uncertain. Certainly no vote or action

Rich Leib
Chair
University of California
Board of Regents
619-992-4680

From: Viskanta, Rimga <rimga.viskanta@sduhsd.net>**Sent:** Tuesday, 16 June 2026 10:33:42**To:** richleib.ucregents@gmail.com <richleib.ucregents@gmail.com>**Subject:** Confirming what I took from our conversation yesterday

Dear Rich,

Thank you again for your time yesterday. Your context on where UC stands on standardized testing was a real help, and I want to be sure I captured it accurately before I put any of it to use. Here is my understanding—please correct anything I have wrong and add whatever you think I am missing.

The headline I took away is that the process is already in place and well underway. The Academic Senate carries real weight in these decisions, and BOARS has built the roadmap that will govern any review. The Regents are not being asked to approve that roadmap, and they will not weigh any change until the process produces well-researched recommendations. As you put it, you expect the roadmap to surface on the Regents' July agenda as a discussion item, not an action item—no decision is imminent.

You also described the current board's position as fluid. Despite the decision made years ago, there is real appetite to reconsider testing in some form, though which test is far from settled—and a UC-specific test is not feasible in our lifetime. The driver, as you explained it, is that chancellors need more than GPA to distinguish among an enormous applicant pool. Equity remains part of the conversation too: the challenge is to identify the best-prepared students while acknowledging that scores are improved by those who have the means for test-taking preparation services.

Timing our district's advocacy is important. There will be a moment when weighing in on behalf of our district carries real power, but we are not there yet—right now, our voice would go into the void. Since we spoke, I read BOARS' full roadmap, and it bears out what you described: the workgroups form this fall, study through spring 2027, and BOARS then holds a stakeholder meeting in mid-2027 that expressly invites California K-12 districts to give input on the recommendations. Any change would reach applicants no sooner than fall 2028. That mid-2027 window is when our voice would land on something concrete.

I am sharing this because a resolution urging UC to reinstate an SAT/ACT math requirement for STEM majors by the 2027-28 cycle is on my board's agenda Wednesday night. I want to fully understand the situation as I consider the merits of the resolution.

Can you confirm whether I captured our conversation correctly and whether I may share this email and your reply with the

Superintendent and the rest of the Board publicly at the meeting?

With thanks,



Rimga Viskanta
Board of Trustees
rimga.viskanta@sduhsd.net | <http://sduhsd.net> |
710 Encinitas Blvd., Encinitas, CA 92024

***** Stay connected and up to date with accurate information about our district by following the ONLY official [SDUHSD Facebook page](#). *****

Correspondents should be aware that all communications to or from this email address are subject to public disclosure and may be reviewed by third parties.

This communication and any documents, files, or previous e-mail messages attached to it constitute an electronic communication within the scope of the Electronic Communication Privacy Act, 18 USCA 2510. This communication may contain non-public, confidential, or legally privileged information intended for the sole use of the designated recipients(s). The unlawful interception, use or disclosure of such information is strictly prohibited under 18 USCA 2511 and any applicable laws.