

Research & Occasional Paper Series: CSHE.16.08

CSHE | Center for Studies in Higher Education

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/>

NOT SO FAST!
A Second Opinion on A University of California
Proposal to Endorse the New SAT

November 2008

Saul Geiser

Center for Studies in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Copyright 2008 Saul Geiser, all rights reserved.

ABSTRACT

A University of California faculty committee, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), has recommended eliminating achievement tests and requiring only the "New SAT" for admission to the UC system. The proposal to endorse the New SAT has thus far drawn relatively little notice, as it is part of a broader and more controversial set of proposed changes in how UC identifies the top 12.5 percent of California high school graduates who are eligible for admission. Yet the testing proposal deserves much more attention in its own right since, if approved by the Regents, it would reverse a decade of UC research and policy development. In 2002 UC was among the first universities to adopt a formal policy on admissions testing. That policy strongly favored achievement tests, which measure students' knowledge of college-preparatory subjects, over tests of general reasoning such as the SAT. UC research showed that achievement tests predicted student performance in college at least as well as reasoning tests, while having a less adverse impact on low-income and minority applicants. In response to UC, the College Board introduced several changes in the SAT in 2005, including the addition of a writing exam, intended to position the New SAT as more of an achievement test. The UC Regents provisionally approved use of the New SAT on the understanding that BOARS would conduct a careful evaluation of the extent to which the test conformed to UC's 2002 testing policy before the New SAT was adopted on a permanent basis. That evaluation has never been completed. Moreover, a closer look at BOARS' proposal reveals that it is based on questionable and often misleading evidence. Like the old SAT, the New SAT remains a relatively weak predictor of student success at UC and a strong deterrent to admission of low-income and underrepresented minority applicants. Achievement tests remain the better standard for UC admissions.

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, the UC faculty committee responsible for recommending admissions policy, has proposed a number of sweeping changes in how the university identifies the top 12.5% of California high school graduates who are eligible for admission. The proposals are controversial-- faculty

representatives at three UC campuses have voted in opposition— and, if approved by the Regents, would represent arguably the most significant change in UC eligibility requirements since the advent of California's Master Plan for Higher Education in 1960. BOARS has proposed reducing the percentage of students who are eligible based on statewide rank from 12.5 percent to 9 percent, while increasing the percentage of students who are eligible based on class rank in high school from 4 percent to 9 percent. A third group of students would have no fixed eligibility requirements but would be identified based on local campus admissions criteria. BOARS' hope is that the proposed changes will yield a high-performing and more diverse pool of applicants than under current policy.¹

While these proposals have understandably stimulated much discussion within the UC community, there has been relatively little notice of another BOARS proposal – a proposal to eliminate achievement tests and to require only the “New SAT” for admission to the UC system. The College Board introduced a number of changes in the SAT in 2005, including the addition of a writing exam, and UC has been using the new test for the last few years on a provisional basis.

The proposal to endorse the New SAT and drop achievement tests deserves much more attention in its own right since, if approved by the Regents, it would reverse a decade of UC policy on admissions testing. Closer scrutiny of the BOARS proposal reveals that it is based on questionable and sometimes misleading evidence. Like the old SAT, the New SAT remains a relatively weak predictor of student performance at UC and a strong deterrent to admission of low-income and minority applicants. Achievement tests, which measure students' knowledge of college-preparatory subjects, are a better standard for UC admissions than tests of general reasoning such as the SAT.

A. UC and the SAT

Under former president Richard Atkinson and BOARS chairs Keith Widaman and Dorothy Perry, UC became a national leader in the effort to reform admissions testing and to reduce the emphasis on tests of general aptitude or reasoning ability such as the SAT (Atkinson, 2001; BOARS, 2002). UC has long required students to take both reasoning and achievement tests, and UC's policy on admissions tests was buttressed by an extensive body of research showing that achievement tests predict student performance in college at least as well as reasoning tests, while having less adverse impact on low-income and minority applicants (BOARS, 1965; Kowarsky, Clatfelder, and Widaman, 1998; Geiser with Studley, 2002). Achievement tests, such as the SAT II Subject Tests or Advanced Placement exams, measure students' knowledge of specific subjects like biology or US history and are more closely aligned with what students study in high school.

In 1999, spurred by plummeting Latino and African-American admissions following passage of Proposition 209, BOARS substantially reduced the weight given to SAT scores, while increasing the weight for high-school grades and achievement-test scores in the statewide eligibility index that UC uses to identify the top 12.5% of California high-school graduates.

In 2001 UC adopted a new policy extending eligibility for admission to the top four percent of graduates from each California high school, based on their GPA in college-preparatory subjects. The effect of this change, too, was to diminish the emphasis on the SAT.

In 2002 BOARS crafted what may be the first comprehensive policy adopted by any major US university on standardized testing in college admissions. The policy concluded that “... achievement-oriented tests are both useful to the University in identifying high-achieving students and philosophically preferable to tests that purport to measure aptitude” (University of California, 2002).

¹ The proposal forwarded to the University of California Board of Regents by the Academic Council of the UC Academic Senate is available at: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/assembly/jun2008/as.eligibility%200608.pdf>

B. Enter the “New SAT”

UC accounts for a substantial share of the national market for admissions tests, so that the College Board, which owns and administers the SAT, was understandably nervous about UC’s actions. In 2005 the College Board introduced several changes in the SAT intended to position it as more of an achievement test. The changes included dropping the much-criticized verbal analogies and phasing in more advanced math. Whereas the old SAT had featured math items that were known for their trickery but required only a beginning knowledge of algebra, the new test now covers some higher-level math.

The most significant change was the inclusion of a writing sample. UC research had showed that, of all admissions tests, the SAT II achievement test in writing was among the best predictors of student performance in college – a testament to the importance of writing in almost all college majors – and this finding prompted the College Board to include the writing test in the New SAT.

But it is questionable whether these changes, while positive, have moved the SAT far enough to be regarded as an achievement test (Atkinson and Geiser, 2008). The verbal and math sections of the test continue to feature item types that are far removed from what is taught in high-school classrooms. The New SAT’s provenance as an IQ test is still much in evidence, and the College Board has emphasized the psychometric comparability between the old and new versions of the test (Camara and Schmidt, 2006). At root, the New SAT remains a “norm-referenced” test, designed primarily to compare students against one another, rather than a “criterion-referenced” test, intended to measure their mastery of college-preparatory subjects (Geiser, 2008).

Nor have the changes improved the ability of the SAT to predict student performance. In a nationwide study of 110 colleges and universities, College Board researchers found that while the writing exam, as expected, was the most predictive of the New SAT’s three component tests, their overall verdict was that “... the changes made to the SAT did not substantially change how well the test predicts first-year college performance” (Kobrin, et al., 2008).

C. BOARS’ Case for the New SAT: Another Look at the Evidence

Given this backdrop, BOARS’ proposal to endorse the New SAT is surprising, to say the least. What is the basis for the proposal?

The case for the New SAT rests largely on a preliminary “predictive validity” study conducted jointly by BOARS and staff in UC’s Office of the President (Agronow and Rashid, 2007; see also Agronow and Studley, 2007). Based on that study, BOARS and UCOP staff make several claims on behalf of the New SAT. The most important of these claims is that the new test is a better predictor of student performance than the old SAT and is now superior to either high-school grades or achievement tests in predicting how students are likely to perform at UC. In addition, BOARS and UCOP staff assert that the New SAT is less of a “barrier” than achievement tests to admission of low-income and minority students.

These claims deserve much closer scrutiny than they have thus far received since they differ markedly from the findings of other studies as well as a large body of previous UC research on admissions testing. A close reading of the BOARS/UCOP study reveals that its conclusions are based on questionable evidence and even some outright errors.

Predictive validity of the New SAT vs. high-school grades

One of the most significant errors is the claim that the New SAT is superior to high-school grades in predicting student performance at UC. The College Board has featured UC’s claim prominently in their national marketing

campaign for the new test, even though the College Board's own research shows that high-school grades continue to be the best predictor of student performance in college:

For both the University of California and the College Board studies, the results are similar. Writing is the most predictive section of the SAT, slightly more predictive than either math or critical reading. *In the California study, SAT scores were slightly more predictive than high school grade point average (HSGPA).* In the College Board analysis of the more than 150,000 students included in all 110 [institutional] studies, HSGPA was slightly more predictive than SAT scores (College Board, 2008; emphasis added).

BOARS/UCOP's finding that the New SAT is a better predictor than high-school grades reflects a common error of statistical inference: drawing substantive conclusions from simple, bivariate correlations. The basis for this claim is that the correlation between the New SAT and freshman GPA is greater than the correlation between high-school grades and freshman GPA (Agronow and Rashid, 2007: Table 1, Models 1 and 3).

Such correlations are misleading, since they are notorious for masking the "proxy" effects of socioeconomic and other factors. Family income and parents' education, for example, are highly correlated not only with SAT scores but also with performance in college, so that much of the apparent predictive power of the SAT actually reflects the proxy effects of socioeconomic status. A recent, authoritative study by Princeton economist Jesse Rothstein conservatively estimates that simple correlation studies that omit socioeconomic factors overstate the predictive power of the SAT by 150 percent (Rothstein, 2004).

In place of correlations, the preferred methodology is to employ multiple-regression techniques in order to isolate the predictive power of SAT scores when socioeconomic and other factors are taken into account. This method generates standardized coefficients, or predictive weights, that permit direct comparison of the relative strength of individual admissions factors in predicting college outcomes, controlling for other factors.

In fact, multivariate regression results are reported elsewhere in the BOARS/UCOP study that contradict the authors' own claims on behalf of the New SAT. The last regression analysis in the study reports standardized coefficients from a model that considers all available admissions factors simultaneously (Agronow and Rashid, 2007: Table 1, Model 22). Those results show that, controlling for socioeconomic and other factors, high-school grades are by far the best predictor of UC freshman GPA. Each one standard-deviation change in high-school grades results in about one-third of a standard-deviation change in freshman grades, holding other factors constant. None of the New SAT writing, critical reading, or math tests carry anywhere near this weight and, indeed, the coefficient for the New SAT math test is negative.

In short, the New SAT has much less predictive power than high-school grades and continues to be a relatively weak indicator of student performance at UC. It is troubling to see the name of the University of California being used in a national marketing campaign based on such obviously questionable evidence.

Predictive validity of the New SAT vs. achievement tests

Another misleading claim is the assertion by BOARS members that the changes in the New SAT – particularly the inclusion of the writing exam – have improved the test to the point where it is now superior to achievement tests in predicting student performance at UC:

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

No, because the SAT Reasoning examination – the successor to the old "SAT I" exam – now includes a writing component. In fact the SAT Reasoning test incorporates the content of the old SAT II Writing test essentially in its entirety. The previous SAT I examination did not include writing. Statistical studies found that the previous SAT II Writing examination had a strong correlation with the academic performance of students at UC. However,

among UC freshmen entering in fall 2006 — the first class that took the new SAT Reasoning test — statistical studies now find that the new SAT Subject examinations, which are taken in subjects elected by the student, do not add significantly to the accuracy of predictions of academic performance at UC, once scores on the Reasoning test are taken into account (BOARS, 2007a).

This statement is a partial and misleading account of the evidence. A fuller and more impartial account must begin with these facts:

- (1) high-school grades are the best predictor of student performance at UC,
- (2) admissions tests add a small but statistically significant increment to the prediction, and
- (3) achievement tests and reasoning tests are highly correlated, so that the two kinds of tests add about the same incremental prediction.

These findings have been confirmed repeatedly in earlier BOARS' studies dating back to the 1960s. In 1965, BOARS found that, after high-school GPA, reasoning tests and achievement tests both offered about the same marginal improvement in predicting freshman grades, though achievement tests had a slight advantage in that regard (BOARS, 1965; Douglass, 2007:89-92). More recent UC studies have found the same pattern (Kowarsky, Clatfelder, and Widaman, 1998; Geiser with Studley, 2002; Geiser and Santelices, 2007). Like the 1965 study, a study commissioned by BOARS in 2002 also found that while achievement tests held a small edge over reasoning tests, "... the incremental gain in prediction is relatively modest and there is substantial redundancy across the tests" (Geiser with Studley, 2002).

Data presented in the current BOARS/UCOP study show that the New SAT and the SAT II achievement tests continue to be largely overlapping and redundant, contrary to the authors' claims. The study reports results from a regression model that excludes admissions tests but includes all other available predictors such as high-school grades, class rank, socioeconomic and other factors (Agronow and Rashid, 2007: Table 1, Model 19). Together these factors account for about 26 percent of the variance in UC freshman grades, before test scores are considered. Adding SAT II achievement-test scores to this model increases the explained variance to 29 percent (Model 21), while adding New SAT scores increases the explained variance to 30 percent (Model 20). The tests are largely interchangeable as predictors, in other words, and there is only a one-percent difference in explained variance.

Even this one-percent difference is questionable, moreover, due to methodological glitches in the BOARS/UCOP study. UC Davis professor Keith Widaman, former chair of BOARS and a nationally recognized psychometrician, has criticized the study as biased against achievement tests due to the manner in which SAT II Subject Test scores were counted: Rather than counting scores on each subject test, the BOARS/UCOP study grouped together students' highest scores from different tests, leading to "... restriction of range and a resulting negative bias in its correlations" (Widaman, 2007). Another problem was that the study omitted any consideration of Advanced Placement exams, which previous UC research has shown to be the best of all achievement tests in predicting college performance (Geiser and Santelices, 2004).

Some have been surprised by the lack of improvement in the predictive power of the New SAT, given the addition of the writing test. But another recent study, conducted by economists at the University of Georgia, provides an explanation. That study showed that adding the writing exam to the SAT has made the old verbal-reasoning test (now called "critical reading") largely redundant, with the result that there has been no overall gain in prediction (Cornwell, Mustard and Van Parys, 2008).

Technical issues aside, the main point is that reasoning tests and achievement tests continue to predict college performance about equally well. It follows, therefore, that the choice of tests to be used in college admissions needs

to be made on *educational* grounds, based on criteria other than predictive validity. This was precisely the position that BOARS took earlier in crafting its 2002 policy on admissions testing:

In BOARS' view, the statistical analyses support the use of achievement tests as predictors of student success at least equivalent to aptitude tests. But the evidence is not so compelling that we believe it should drive a decision to prefer one type of test over another. Rather, the University should carefully consider the policy implications and justifications of its use of tests and base its conclusions and future actions on educational policy grounds (BOARS, 2002).

Among the most important educational considerations emphasized in BOARS' 2002 policy were the following: Admissions tests should measure students' mastery of college-preparatory subjects and should align with and reinforce what is taught in the classroom. They should have diagnostic value in informing students about specific areas of strength and weakness. They should be fair across demographic groups. The burden that tests impose should be justifiable both in terms of their utility to the university and their cost to students. Above all, admissions tests should provide an incentive for students to take rigorous coursework in high school:

In the view of BOARS, achievement tests reinforce this message: students who take challenging courses and work hard will see their effort pay off not only in good grades but also in high scores on tests that measure mastery of the work they have undertaken in high school. This message is consistent with, and underscores, current efforts to improve the quality and rigor of K-12 education in the state (BOARS, 2002).

Against this far-sighted and expansive vision of admissions testing, it is incongruous that BOARS would now base its decision to endorse the New SAT on a narrow, technical claim involving extremely small – and questionable -- differences in predictive validity. The debate over admissions tests has never been primarily about prediction, and reasoning and achievement tests are virtually interchangeable in that regard.

Impact of the New SAT vs. achievement tests on minority admissions

Yet another questionable claim that BOARS has made in support of its proposal to endorse the New SAT is that the achievement tests are more of a "barrier" to underrepresented minority students:

The SAT Subject test requirement, in particular, contributes to underrepresentation of certain groups. From an analysis of 2004 CBEDS and College Board data, it is estimated that 54% of all a-g completers also took the eligibility-enabling SAT Subject exams required by UC3. However, among African American students, only 35% of those completing the a-g curriculum also took the required SAT Subject exams. Among Chicano/Latino students the number was 38%. These gaps in SAT Subject test-taking behavior have a major negative impact on the size of the pool of high-achieving ethnic-minority students who are visible to UC (BOARS, 2007a; italics in original).

Again, this is a partial and misleading account of the evidence. Admissions tests are part of the college-application process, and the particular tests that students take reflect the requirements of the particular colleges or universities to which they are applying. While many colleges and universities in California require the SAT, only UC requires the SAT II Subject Tests as well, with the result that the statewide pool of SAT-takers is much larger and more diverse than the pool of those taking the SAT II Subject Tests. It does not follow, however, that the latter are more of a barrier to admission of low-income and minority students.

For most "potentially UC-eligible" students – those with otherwise strong academic records in high school who do not take the SAT IIs or complete UC's other eligibility requirements – the primary obstacle is not the tests, *per se*, but the aspiration to attend UC and the perception that it is a realistic possibility. Many of these students come from poorer families where neither parent has attended college. They tend to be less aware of opportunities for financial aid and often do not see UC as a realistic option, more often aspiring to attend CSU or a community college. UC is not on their radar, and as a result, they do not complete UC's eligibility requirements or take the SAT IIs.

The effect of student aspiration on test-taking behavior is dramatically illustrated by UC's experience with the Top 4% Plan, which extended eligibility for UC admission to the top four percent of graduates from each California high school. Prior to this policy, many top students in poorer high schools did not apply to UC even though they were potentially eligible; they had completed most "a-f" courses required by CSU and UC, but not the full battery of UC-required tests. With the advent of the new policy, those in the top four percent of their schools now received a letter from UC informing them of their eligibility, advising them of opportunities for financial aid, and spelling out the remaining steps needed to complete UC's application and admissions requirements. In a stroke, UC was firmly on these students' radar, and the great majority responded affirmatively to the university's offer.

The result was a substantial increase in SAT II-taking within high schools that had sent few students to UC in the past. It is estimated that the Top 4% Plan stimulated approximately 2,000 new applicants to UC in the first year, over half of whom were underrepresented minorities. Virtually all of these new applicants had taken the SAT II subject exams (UCOP, 2002).

UC's experience with the Top 4% Plan demonstrates that the subject-test requirement is not the formidable barrier to underrepresented minority access that BOARS now suggests. BOARS' assertion that dropping subject tests and requiring only the SAT would make more minority students "visible" to the university (BOARS, 2007b) fails to take account of this simple fact: students cannot be visible to UC until they apply. Test-taking is primarily a function of student aspiration and where students apply to college.

BOARS' proposal to endorse the New SAT also ignores another important reality about standardized tests: The most significant barrier to minority access is not test-taking but test *scores*. Test-score gaps contribute significantly to lower rates of admission among underrepresented minority students. Indeed, previous UC research has shown that, of all admissions criteria, SAT scores have the most adverse impact on low-income and minority applicants. High-school grades have the least adverse impact, while achievement-test scores fall in between (Geiser with Studley, 2002; Geiser and Santelices, 2008).

As with the old SAT, student performance on the New SAT continues to be highly correlated with family income, parents' education and other indicators of socioeconomic status. BOARS' own data show that, among UC students, scores on the New SAT are more closely associated with socioeconomic status than are SAT II achievement-test scores or high-school grades (Agronow and Rashid, 2007: Table 2). Such correlations are important because underrepresented minority applicants come disproportionately from disadvantaged backgrounds. The BOARS/UCOP study does not present any data with which to assess the differential impact of the New SAT by race, but the impact is undoubtedly similar to that shown in previous studies.

One reason why achievement tests have a less adverse impact on minority students than the SAT is because of the way UC's subject-test requirement is structured: UC has long allowed students an element of choice in the subject tests they submit for admission. This provides students an opportunity to demonstrate subjects in which they excel and helps level the playing field for students from high schools where the college-preparatory curriculum is uneven. Previous UC research showed that the elective subject test had the lowest correlation of all tests with students' socioeconomic characteristics. At the same time, the elective subject test was a relatively good predictor of student performance at UC and, of the tests required for UC admission, was second only to the SAT II writing test in that regard (Geiser with Studley, 2002).

Oddly for a proposal that aims to broaden diversity and access to UC, eliminating subject tests and, with them, the elective test requirement, is likely to have the opposite effect. BOARS' failure to address or even mention the adverse consequences of the SAT reasoning tests for minority admissions is a serious omission.

D. Not so fast!

When the Academic Council and Regents prospectively approved use of the New SAT in 2003 (together with the ACT's new writing test), their approval was conditional. The understanding was that BOARS would conduct a full-scale evaluation of the new test before it was approved for use on a permanent basis. As stated in the Regents' July 17, 2003 action item:

[I]n April 2003, Academic Council unanimously approved BOARS' recommendation for a transition plan in which, beginning with the entering freshman class of 2006, the University will accept, on an interim basis, scores on the ACT with Writing and the new SAT examinations in satisfaction of the core test requirement. These interim approvals will be in effect for two years. *BOARS will complete an in-depth review of the new admissions tests and their alignment with the testing principles no later than 2008* (UC Office of the President, 2003; emphasis added).

To date, however, no such review has been completed. BOARS has conducted only what it describes as a "preliminary" study of the predictive validity of the New SAT, and there has been no formal evaluation of how the test aligns with the broader principles set forth in BOARS' original policy on admissions testing. As BOARS acknowledges, "The extent to which these changes bring the SAT and the ACT into conformance with BOARS' 2001 testing principles remains under study" (BOARS, 2007a).

BOARS needs to keep its word. Ideally, BOARS' recommendation on the New SAT should have followed, not preceded, an in-depth review of the test. As this did not occur, the best course now is to separate the choice of tests used in UC admissions from the broader, structural changes in UC's eligibility requirements that BOARS is proposing in order to allow time for more careful evaluation of the new test.

None of the structural changes that BOARS has proposed – reducing statewide eligibility from 12.5 percent to 9 percent of California high school graduates, expanding local eligibility from 4 percent to 9 percent from each high school, or selecting the remainder of the eligibility pool based on campus review – is contingent upon use of the New SAT. Achievement tests could equally be used for purposes of UC's "core" exam requirement without preventing any of those structural changes, if approved.

Indeed, achievement tests could help ameliorate some of the more problematic features of the current BOARS proposal. One problem area, for example, is the proposed reduction of the statewide portion of the UC eligibility pool from 12.5 percent to 9 percent. Past experience suggests that, if enacted, this change would likely have an adverse impact on both the number and proportion of underrepresented minority students within the statewide pool. And if, at the same time, UC were to drop achievement tests and consider only SAT scores in the statewide eligibility index, the adverse impact would be even greater. This was one reason why BOARS chose to de-emphasize SAT scores while doubling the weight for achievement tests when it last revised the statewide eligibility index in 1999.

The broader, symbolic effects of the SAT need also to be considered. The near-universal experience of those colleges and universities that have dropped the SAT or gone "SAT optional" has been a substantial increase in new applications from underrepresented minority students (Hiss, 2004).

The National Association of College Admissions Counseling recently issued a major report calling on American colleges and universities to re-examine their reliance on both the SAT and ACT, the two most widely used admissions tests. NACAC is no radical, fly-by-night organization. NACAC's commission on testing, which wrote the report, included many high-profile admissions officials and was chaired by William Fitzsimmons, dean of admissions and financial aid at Harvard. The report is worth quoting at length:

There are tests that, at many institutions, are both predictive of first-year and overall grades in college and more closely linked to the high school curriculum, including the College Board's AP exams and Subject Tests as well

as the International Baccalaureate examinations. What these tests have in common is that they are—to a much greater extent than the SAT and ACT—achievement tests, which measure content covered in high school courses; that there is currently very little expensive private test preparation associated with them, partly because high school class curricula are meant to prepare students for them; and that they are much less widely required by colleges than are the SAT and ACT. ...

Such achievement tests have a number of attractive qualities. Their use in college admission sends a message to students that studying their course material in high school—not taking extracurricular test prep courses that tend to focus on test-taking skills—is the way to do well on admission tests. Using achievement tests would encourage high schools to broaden and improve curricula, and would promote a sense of transparency about what tests measure. Further alignment of college entrance testing and preparation with high school curricula would also reduce the inequities inherent in the current system of preparation for and administration of college admission tests. ...

By using the SAT and ACT as one of the most important admission tools, many institutions are gaining what may be a marginal ability to identify academic talent beyond that indicated by transcripts, recommendations, and achievement test scores. In contrast, the use of state level end-of-high school achievement tests, College Board Subject Tests and AP tests, or International Baccalaureate exams, would create a powerful incentive for American high schools to improve their curricula and their teaching. Colleges would lose little or none of the information they need to make good choices about entering classes, while benefiting millions of American students who do not enroll in highly selective colleges and positively affecting teaching and learning in America's schools (NACAC, 2008).

NACAC's call for colleges and universities to re-examine their reliance on the SAT and to expand use of achievement tests is inspired in no small part by research and policy development at the University of California over the past decade. It is unfortunate that BOARS must now be reminded of its own policy on admissions testing and its unfulfilled promise to conduct a careful evaluation of the New SAT in light of that policy.

REFERENCES

- Agronow, S. and M. Rashid. (2007). "Examining the predictive value of the SAT subject exams in the prediction of first year UC GPA – A report to BOARS." <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.eligibility.02.08.pdf>.
- Agronow, S. and R. Studley. (2007). "Prediction of college GPA from New SAT test scores – a first look." Paper presented at annual meeting of the California Association for Institutional Research, Nov. 16, 2007.
- Atkinson, R. (2001). "Standardized tests and access to American universities." The 2001 Robert H. Atwell Distinguished Lecture, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
- Atkinson, R. and S. Geiser. (2008). "Beyond the SAT." *Forbes*, August 8, 2008. http://www.forbes.com/2008/08/13/college-admissions-sat-oped-college08-cx_ra_sg_0813atkinson.html.
- Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. (1965). "Progress report on the Fall 1963 achievement test study." Minutes from February 25-26, 1965 meeting. Berkeley, CA: UC Academic Senate.
- Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. (2002). "The use of admissions tests by the University of California." Oakland, CA: UC Academic Senate. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/admissionstests.pdf>.
- Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. (2007a). "Proposal to reform UC's freshman eligibility policy." Oakland, CA: UC Academic Senate. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.eligibility.reform.0807.pdf>.

- Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. (2007b). "The BOARS eligibility-reform proposal – Q and A." Oakland, CA: UC Academic Senate.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/committees/boars/boars.supplmnt..eligibility.propsl.09.07.pdf>.
- Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. (2008). "BOARS' revised proposal to reform UC's freshman eligibility policy." Oakland, CA: UC Academic Senate.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/underreview/sw.rev.elgibilty.reform.02.08.pdf>.
- Camara, W. and A. Schmidt. (2006). "The New SAT Facts." Powerpoint presentation. New York: College Board.
http://www.collegeboard.com/prod_downloads/forum/forum06/the-new-sat_a-comprehensive-report-on-the-first-scores.PPT.
- College Board. (2008). "SAT Validity Studies." Website content downloaded October 29, 2008.
<http://professionals.collegeboard.com/data-reports-research/sat/validity-studies>.
- Cornwell, C., Mustard, D. and J. Van Parys. (2008). "How does the New SAT predict academic performance in college?" Working paper. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia. <http://www.terry.uga.edu/~mustard/New%20SAT.pdf>.
- Douglass, J. (2007). *The Conditions for Admission: Access, Equity, and the Social Contract of Public Universities*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Geiser, S. with R. Studley. (2002). "UC and the SAT: Predictive validity and differential impact of the SAT I and SAT II at the University of California." *Educational Assessment*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-26.
- Geiser, S. and R. Studley. (2002). "Research addendum: Additional findings on UC and the SAT." Oakland, CA: UC Office of the President: <http://www.ucop.edu/news/sat/resaddendfinal.pdf>.
- Geiser, S. and M. Santelices. (2006). "The role of advanced placement and honors courses in college admissions." Pp. 75 -114 in P. Gandara, G. Orfield and C. Horn, (eds.), *Expanding Opportunity in Higher Education: Leveraging Promise*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Geiser, S. and M. Santelices. (2007). "Validity of high-school grades in predicting student success beyond the freshman year: High-school record vs. standardized tests as indicators of four-year college outcomes." Research and Occasional Paper Series, Center for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley:
<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=265>.
- Geiser, S. (2008). "Back to the basics: In defense of achievement (and achievement tests) in college admissions." Research and Occasional Paper Series, Center for Studies in Higher Education, UC Berkeley.
<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=313>.
- Hiss, W. (2002). "20 years of optional SAT's at Bates." Paper presented at the 60th Annual Meeting of the National Association for College Admissions Counseling. Milwaukee, WI: NACAC.
- Kobrin, J., Patterson, B., Shaw, E., Mattern, K., and S. Barbuti. (2008). "Validity of the SAT for predicting first-year college grade point average." College Board Research Report No. 2008-5. New York: College Board.
- Kowarsky, J., Clatfelter, D. and K. Widaman. (1998). "Predicting university grade-point average in a class of University of California freshman: An assessment of the validity of GPA and test scores as indicators of future academic performance." Institutional research paper. Oakland, CA: UC Office of the President.
- National Association of College Admissions Counseling. (2008). "Report of the commission on the use of standardized tests in undergraduate admissions." Arlington, VA: NACAC.
- Rothstein, J. (2004). "College performance predictions and the SAT." *Journal of Econometrics*, vol. 121, pp. 297-317.
- UC Office of the President. (2002). "Eligibility in the Local Context program evaluation report." Report prepared for May 2002 Regents meeting. Oakland, CA: UC Office of the President.
<http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/may02/304attach.pdf>.

UC Office of the President. (2003). "Adoption of Academic Senate recommendations regarding freshman admissions testing." Regents action item #303, July 17, 2003. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/july03/303.pdf>.

Widaman, K. (2007). "Actual UC data and simulation results." Report to UC Davis Committee on Admissions and Enrollment, November 29, 2007.