

**Annual Report: Academic Year 2010-2011
Davis Division: Academic Senate**

Committee on Admissions & Enrollment

Total Meetings: 15	Meeting frequency: 2-3 meetings per quarter or as often as twice a month	Average hours of committee work each week: Variable

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
New UC Davis holistic-review policy

Issues considered by the committee:
Holistic Review
Non-Resident Admissions

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
Continued development of UC Davis holistic-review practices

Committee's Charge

The Admissions & Enrollment Committee (A&E) is a standing committee of the Academic Senate and its charge is the stewardship of the admissions process that includes selection of undergraduate students. The Academic Senate has authority (delegated to it by the Regents) to determine the conditions for undergraduate admission, what the degree requirements are, and what the curriculum should be.

Committee Narrative (2010-11)

The Admissions & Enrollment Committee (A&E) met 15 times during the academic year 2010-11 and considered issues pertinent to undergraduate admissions. The major focus of the committee during the year was holistic review and nonresident admission.

Holistic Review:

The Admissions and Enrollment committee reviewed the models of holistic review used by UC Berkeley and UCLA. All members attended an all-day workshop on holistic review conducted by UCLA on the Davis campus to learn about the holistic-review process in practice at UCLA, including the use of a "read sheet" showing an applicant's academic performance within the context of available opportunities.

The committee developed holistic-review policies for implementation at UC Davis beginning fall 2011, which were endorsed by the Executive Council of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate on 5/20/11 and approved by the Representative Assembly of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate on 6/3/11. A copy of the approved holistic-review proposal is included as an attachment to this report. The A&E committee will continue the development and implementation of holistic-review procedures and practices during the 2011-2012 academic year.

Non-Resident Admission

Because the University and the State of California face an era of severe budget constraints, increases in the enrollment of international and domestic non-resident students may become a partial solution to UC's fiscal crisis, and discussions about appropriate levels of non-resident enrollment will likely continue in the context of a broader discussion about how to return the University to a sound fiscal basis. UC must seek a balance between fiscal concerns, its goal of enrolling a broad range of undergraduates, and its commitment to serving California residents, particularly its role as an engine of social mobility to lift the state economy and serve underrepresented populations

who continue to grow in number and who desire and deserve access to UC. A&E discussed these issues and anticipates an increase in the enrollment of undergraduate non-residents who compare favorably with California residents admitted to UC Davis, in accordance with the Principles of Non-resident Enrollment authored by the UC Board of Admissions & Relations with Schools (BOARS) and approved by the Academic Council of the Academic Senate of the University of California

http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/DS_MGY_LPBOARSNRPrinciple6.pdf).

Respectfully submitted,

Mark M. Rashid, Co-Chair
Ralph C. Aldredge, Co-Chair
Orhan C. Orgun
Ning Pan
Joseph Sorensen
Cynthia J. Bates (*AF Rep*)
Ryan Meyerhoff (*ASUCD Rep*)
Lora Jo Bossio (*Ex-Officio*)
Gillian Butler (*Consultant*)
Darlene Hunter (*Consultant*)
Solomon Bekele, Analyst

PROPOSAL FOR A UC DAVIS FRESHMAN ADMISSION PROCESS BASED ON HOLISTIC REVIEW

**Prepared by the 2010-2011
Admissions & Enrollment Committee
of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate**

**R. C. Aldredge & M. M. Rashid (Co-Chairs), O. C. Orgun, N. Pan, J. Sorenson
C. J. Bates (Acad. Fed. Rep.), L. J. Bossio (Acting Ex-Officio), R. J. Meyerhoff (ASUCD Rep.)**

Background

The Resolution Regarding Individualized Review and Holistic Evaluation in Undergraduate Admissions (Appendix A) adopted by the UC Regents on January, 19 2011 requires (a) that each applicant to the UC receive an individualized, comprehensive review in which trained readers examine the applicant's full file to evaluate accomplishments in the context of opportunity and (b) that single-score holistic review be the explicit means of comprehensive review. Single-score holistic review (HR) involves the assignment of a single score to an applicant on the basis of an individualized comprehensive review involving a human read of the entire application. The comprehensive review considers a wide range of both academic and non-academic achievements evaluated within the context of available high-school and life opportunities, while accounting for how fully the applicant has taken advantage of opportunities and resources. Fourteen specific comprehensive criteria considered are listed in the attached Guidelines for Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions adopted by the Academic Senate in 2002 (Appendix B).

Currently, a two-stage, multiple-score implementation of comprehensive review is employed at UC Davis for evaluation of applicants and selection for admission. This process involves the combination of a purely computational evaluation which renders 87.7% of the final score and a reader's evaluation which renders the remaining 12.3% of the final score. Applicants with sufficiently high scores based only on the computational evaluation, for a given major, are admitted without an individualized human read of their application. This group represents 25-30% of the entire applicant pool. It is recognized, however, that as admission to UC Davis becomes increasingly more selective, individualized evaluation involving a human read of all applications will be necessary in order to fairly delineate between even the most competitive applicants, in accordance with the Regents Resolution. It is recognized also that such delineation is facilitated by evaluation of each applicant's achievement within the context of available opportunities, accounting for how fully the applicant has taken advantage of opportunities and resources, also in accordance with the Regents Resolution and the guiding principles of comprehensive review outlined in Section II of Appendix B.

This proposal outlines the guiding principles and design of a new freshman admissions process at UC Davis based on single-score holistic review. The proposal also describes how UC Davis will collaborate with other UC campuses employing similar holistic-review processes (such as UCLA) to reduce the local workload and cost of holistic review and thereby contribute toward an increase in the efficiency of holistic review system-wide. A comparison of the single-score holistic-review processes employed at UCLA and UC Berkeley, upon which the proposed process is based, with the two-stage, multiple-score implementation of comprehensive review currently employed at UC Davis is given in Appendix C.

Assumptions and Constraints

It is assumed that UC Davis will make use of holistic-review (HR) score information provided by other campuses for applicants we share in common with those campuses. In many cases, UC Davis will not re-read these shared applications. However, UC Davis will have to develop and maintain the ability

to read and score applicant files locally, both to accommodate applicants for whom we have no HR score from another campus, and for other reasons. Specifically, in-common applications will be read at UC Davis if they fall within a particular score range, based on the HR score from the other campus. Also, a modest number of in-common applications from across the entire score range will be read locally, in order to establish the correspondence between locally-generated scores and those from the other campus. These features of the proposed process are described more fully below.

Although HR scores from a number of other campuses may eventually be available to UC Davis, it is assumed that, for the Fall 2012 cycle at least, UCLA scores are likely to be the only scores available. Therefore, the balance of this document refers to “UCLA” and “UCLA scores” with the understanding that, eventually, other campuses may be added to the list of score sources used by UC Davis. The process described below is designed to incorporate scores from other sources as they become available.

It is explicitly assumed that the relative assessment and weighting of the various factors in the UC Davis HR process will be very similar to those of the UCLA process. This assumption implies that, although the UC Davis and UCLA applicant pools may differ in some respects, the processes of the two campuses would result in a very similar ordering of UC Davis applicants.

It is further assumed that UC Davis knows in advance which applications are shared in common with UCLA, but that UC Davis has no control over, nor influence on, the timing of the receipt of score information for the common files. The campus is nonetheless obliged to complete all admit/deny actions by the mid-March deadline.

Guiding Principles

This proposal was designed with the following principles, goals, and objectives in mind:

1. Admit/deny decisions should be based, to the greatest extent possible within the bounds of practicality and resource constraints, on holistic evaluation of each applicant's file. This means, in part, that the process should resort to an algorithmic mechanism for distinguishing between applicants for admit/deny purposes in only a small number of cases. This “tie-breaking” process should be limited to cases where holistic evaluation cannot reasonably distinguish the level of merit among these cases. This principle carries implications regarding the design of the HR scoring rubric.

2. The process should aspire to a high degree of fairness and uniformity in the way applicants are treated, regardless of where, in addition to UC Davis, they may have applied.

3. Although the new HR-based process is certain to be somewhat more labor-intensive than the current UC Davis CR process, it should nonetheless exhibit the highest level of efficiency and economy possible, consistent with the other principles stated herein.

4. In keeping with longstanding practice at UC Davis, the new process should accommodate variability in the admission rate across different majors.

5. The holistic read process should be designed in such a manner that the lessons learned and procedures developed by other campuses should be utilized to the greatest extent possible, in pursuit of the principles enumerated herein.

6. The read process should be designed so that a high degree of reliability and high reader morale are likely to be maintained. This means, in part, that readers should not be asked to partition files into an excessively large number of ranks.

Process Design

The basic structure of the proposed process is as follows. At the beginning of the application-processing period, applications that are not shared in common with UCLA are scheduled for local

reading. Two reads of all such applications are performed, much like in the UCLA process. In addition to the non-shared files, some of the in-common files (i.e. those shared by UCLA) are scheduled for reading as well. This “local re-read” pool consists of (a) applications from students with UCLA HR scores that are potentially not well differentiated at UCLA (e.g., those receiving a score of 4 or 4.25 from UCLA) but who are expected to be still competitive for admission at UC Davis, together with (b) a modest number of files from across the UCLA score range. The files in category (b) will be used for calibrating the UCLA and UC Davis scores to a common scale. Because UCLA scores will not all be available before reading of the local-re-read pool must commence, a statistical model of the UCLA scoring process will be used to determine a preliminary composition of this pool. The great majority of the local-re-read pool will consist of files associated with category (a). These files are expected to constitute as many as 15-20% of all UCD applications.

An important element of the proposed process is that admit-deny decisions will be made by establishing a single score cut-off, determined irrespectively of where the file was read. This element is particularly motivated by principle 2 above, but it also is consistent with a number of the other principles as well. Specifically, it facilitates the assignment of different cut-offs to different majors.

The details of the proposed process are as follows.

1. Davis readers are to be trained using the same principles and strategies of evaluation as are UCLA readers. As with the UCLA process, readers have 7 score levels to select from in scoring files. However, the “bin sizes” – i.e. the approximate proportions of the applicant pool that should fall within each score level – are not the same as at UCLA. Instead, they are set to fit UC Davis's circumstances of selectivity. Specifically, the percentage of applicants within the top and bottom bins should be a multiple of 5 (e.g. the top 25% or the bottom 30%), with the other five bins of approximately equal size in between. The size of the top bin should be such that its lowest HR score is higher than the HR-score cut-off for the most selective major on campus, to accommodate admission of all applicants within the top bin. The size of the bottom bin should be such that its highest HR score is lower than that of all students accepted into the least selective major on campus, to accommodate potential denial of all applications within the bottom bin.
2. Consistent with UCLA's process, two independent, blind reads of each Davis-only file should be carried out, in which local and UC Davis context information is used. In cases where the two scores are neighboring or identical, the final score for the file is the average of the two read scores. The reported scores can thus take one of 13 values. In cases where the two scores are not neighboring (i.e. they differ by more than one), a third read is undertaken by a senior reader, whose score stands as the final reported score. This procedure is identical to the UCLA procedure.
3. Again consistent with UCLA's process, readers may recommend files for Supplemental review. The criteria and procedures governing Supplemental Review should be the same as in the UCLA process.
4. Applications in common with UCLA are subjected to an automated prediction of their eventual UCLA HR score using a multiple-linear-regression statistical model. The predictive model is necessarily calibrated on the previous year's UCLA applicant pool. The predictor variables in the model consist of the range of quantitative indicators from the UCLA read sheet. The model predictions are not used to influence the admit/deny decision for any student. Instead, they are used only to estimate which of the in-common files are likely to receive a UCLA HR score in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g., 4 or 4.25). These files constitute the bulk of the in-common files that are to be re-read locally. Were UC Davis to wait until the actual scores arrived from UCLA, insufficient time might remain to read them all locally, prior to the decision-release

deadline. By predicting UCLA score outcomes at the beginning of the reading period, UC Davis can get a head start on reading the in-common files that will, in all likelihood, have to be read. Should this prediction-driven process fail to mark for local reading a file whose actual score turns out to be in the range selected for re-evaluation (e.g, 4 or 4.25), then that file must be read locally as soon as is practical. The predictive model is also used to randomly select a modest number of files for calibration (e.g., on the order of 1000) whose scores are likely to uniformly cover the UCLA score range.

5. Because in-common files receiving a score from UCLA in the range selected for re-evaluation have already been read twice, these files should receive only a single local read. The “calibration” files (taken from throughout the score range), however, receive two local reads, in order to maximize the resolution of the calibration process.
6. All applicants, including those with UCLA-averaged scores and those with UC Davis-averaged scores, are ranked on a common scale. The UCLA-to-common-scale conversion is calibrated using the local read outcomes for the 1000 “calibration files.” The conversion also facilitates the assignment of a single common-scale score to each application with “mixed” HR scores (e.g., a 4 or 4.25 from UCLA and a separate, independent single read score from UC Davis).
7. At the end of the reading period, the integration of all applicant HR scores (whether derived at UCLA or UC Davis) into a common-scale is achieved using a fast, entirely algorithmic procedure. Recommended-admit cut-offs are then established on the common scale for each major. Applicants who fall near the cut-off on the common scale will be subject to an automated tie-breaking process. The tie-breaking process should not involve any additional reading by a human reader; instead, it should algorithmically combine multiple criteria to render a quantitative result.

Office of the President

TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY:

ACTION ITEM

For Meeting of January 19, 2011

**RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC
EVALUATION IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

RECOMMENDATION

The President recommends that the Committee on Educational Policy recommend to the Regents that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, the University of California is committed to achieving excellence and inclusiveness in its undergraduate student body; and

WHEREAS, in May 1988, the Regents adopted a Policy on Undergraduate Admissions that states in part that “Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...seeks to enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity of...backgrounds characteristic of California;” and

WHEREAS, in 2002, the University, acting on the recommendation of the Academic Senate, implemented an application evaluation procedure that calls for campuses to utilize a broad range of criteria to assess each applicant’s academic and personal achievement in the context of opportunities; and

WHEREAS, proper evaluation of applicants’ achievements in the context of opportunity requires that information about their schools and community be available in a uniform manner, and several campuses have made considerable progress in accomplishing this through the use of extensive school-based information; and

WHEREAS, evaluation of applicants’ achievement in the context of opportunities and challenges requires that a trained reader examine the entire application in considering personal achievements, challenges, leadership, and contributions to applicants’ communities alongside context information; and

WHEREAS, a form of Comprehensive Review in which the reader produces a single holistic score based on all information in the applicant's file has been shown to thoroughly evaluate each applicant's achievement in relation to opportunities and challenges; and

WHEREAS, the Regents expect the Office of the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and local admissions committees, to exercise leadership in the realization of best practices in undergraduate admissions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to ensure that all applicants receive an individualized review that ensures trained readers examine applicants' full files to evaluate their accomplishments in the context of opportunity;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to continue to research and develop a database to be used with the human read of every application that provides background on the available opportunities and challenges faced by the applicant within his or her school and community;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, to affirm that single-score holistic evaluation is the expected implementation of Comprehensive Review, while allowing flexibility for campuses that can demonstrate that alternate approaches employed by their campuses are equally effective in achieving campus and University goals;

BE IT RESOLVED that University of California campuses must remain committed to recruiting students from the full range of California high schools and regions in order to achieve the potential of the University's admission policy for California's students;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President to annually report to the Board on the progress of these initiatives on each campus.

BACKGROUND

At the July 14, 2010, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Chair Sylvia Hurtado presented the BOARS report on *Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions at the University of California, 2003 - 2009*. Educational Policy Chair Regent Island requested an update on the progress of the recommendations in the report.

This resolution establishes the Regents' expectations of the President, faculty and campuses with respect to the admissions process.

Following the adoption of the resolution, annual reports will be presented to the Committee on Educational Policy, starting in May 2011. The purpose of these reports is to highlight specific efforts towards achieving the University's comprehensive review objectives.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVERSITY POLICY ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

I. OVERVIEW

On May 20, 1988, The Regents of the University of California adopted a University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions. The Policy states in part that:

"Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...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 socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California."

In December 1995, following passage the previous July of Regents Resolution SP-1, a task force convened by the President of the University reviewed existing *Guidelines for the Implementation of University Policy on Undergraduate Admissions* and recommended substantive changes. The revised *Guidelines* were issued in July 1996 and revised in May 2000 to reflect the University's newly adopted Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) policy.

In May 2001, The Regents adopted Resolution RE-28, which rescinded Resolution SP-1 and reaffirmed the goals of the 1988 Policy as follows:

"the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California."

Following the passage of RE-28, the President asked the Academic Senate to consider the adoption of evaluation procedures that would look at applicants in a comprehensive manner and would utilize a variety of measures of achievement.

The present revision of the *Guidelines* follows extensive deliberation on the part of the Academic Senate, its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), and its individual campus divisions and faculty admissions committees undertaken during the summer of 2001. The work of the Academic Senate built on themes already developed by the 1995 Task Force. For example, the report of the Task Force commented on the "need for a comprehensive review of the methods used for assessing academic performance, beyond utilizing criteria such as GPA and standardized test scores" and suggested that "the selection process could be altered in the future to include a more comprehensive approach to reviewing students' academic accomplishments and personal backgrounds." The work of the Academic Senate should be considered as yet another step in the continuing evolution of undergraduate admissions practices and policies.

Effective with applicants seeking admission for the fall 2002 term and thereafter, the following revised guidelines and procedures shall be followed for implementation of the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and RE-28, adopted in May 2001.

These selection guidelines apply to campuses that have to select from a pool of eligible applicants, and to students who have met the established UC eligibility requirements for admission. These eligibility requirements are established by the University in conformance with the specifications outlined in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which specifies that the top one-eighth of the State's public high school graduates, as well as those community college transfer students who have successfully completed specified college work, be eligible for admission to the University of California.

These guidelines provide the framework within which campuses shall establish specific criteria and procedures for the selection of undergraduate applicants to be admitted when the number of eligible applicants exceeds the places

available.

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications. BOARS defines comprehensive review as:

The 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.

In designing campus procedures, campus admissions committees should adhere to the following guiding principles:

1. The admissions process honors academic achievement and accords priority to students of high academic accomplishment. At the same time, merit should be assessed in terms of the full range of an applicant's academic and personal achievements and likely contribution to the campus community, viewed in the context of the opportunities and challenges that the applicant has faced.
2. Campus admissions procedures should involve a comprehensive review of applications using a broad variety of factors to select an entering class.
3. No fixed proportion of applicants should be admitted based solely on a narrow set of criteria.
4. Campus policies should reflect continued commitment to the goal of enrolling classes that exhibit academic excellence as well as diversity of talents and abilities, personal experience, and backgrounds.
5. Faculty 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.
6. The admission process should select students of whom the campus will be proud, and who give evidence that they will use their education to make contributions to the intellectual, cultural, social, and political life of the State and the Nation.
7. The admissions process should select those students who demonstrate a strong likelihood that they will persist to graduation.
8. Campus selection policies should ensure that no applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review of his or her file.

Faculty takes their responsibilities for admission and selection very seriously. BOARS anticipates that campuses will act autonomously in designing campus-specific policies and processes that are consistent with Universitywide policies and guidelines. BOARS will continue to monitor campus policies and work with faculty to continuously improve the processes and outcomes.

III. SELECTION CRITERIA

Campuses receiving applications in excess of the number required to achieve their enrollment target for a specific term shall select students for admission as follows:

A. Freshman Applicants

The following criteria provide a comprehensive list of factors campuses may use to select their admitted class. Based on campus-specific institutional goals and needs, admissions decisions will be based on a broad variety of factors to ensure attainment of the goals set forth in the 1988 University of California Policy on Undergraduate Admissions and

RE-28.

1. Academic Grade Point Average (GPA) calculated on all academic courses completed in the subject areas specified by the University's eligibility requirements (the a-f 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. Scores on the following tests: the Scholastic Assessment Test I or the American College Test, and the College Board Scholastic Assessment Test II: Subject Tests.
3. The number, content of, and performance in courses completed in academic subjects beyond the minimum specified by the University's eligibility requirements.
4. 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.
5. Being identified as eligible in the local context, by being ranked in the top 4% of the class at the end of the junior year, as determined by academic criteria established by the University of California.
6. 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.
7. The quality of academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in the applicant's secondary school.
8. Outstanding performance in one or more specific academic subject areas.
9. Outstanding work in one or more special projects in any academic field of study.
10. 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.
11. 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.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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.

B. Advanced Standing Applicants

Advanced standing applicants shall be selected by each campus using the criteria listed below as well as criteria 11-14 listed above. Priority consideration for admission of advanced standing applicants shall be given to upper division junior transfers from California Community Colleges.

Criteria to Select Advanced Standing Applicants

1. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that meet breadth or general education requirements.
2. Completion of a specified pattern or number of courses that provide continuity with upper division courses in the major.
3. Grade point average in all transferable courses, and, in particular, grade point average in lower division courses required for the applicant's intended major.
4. Participation in academically selective honors courses or programs.

(Refer to items 2 through 6 in Section A above for additional criteria to consider.)

IV. APPLICATION PROCEDURES

A common filing period for submission of applications shall be established by the Office of the President in consultation with the campuses. These dates shall be observed by all campuses and may be extended only if a campus determines that additional applications are required to meet enrollment targets. All applications submitted during the prescribed dates shall receive equal consideration for admission.

Applicants shall file one application on which they shall indicate all the campuses where they wish to be considered for admission.

Campuses shall observe and publish a common notification period for notifying applicants of their admission status.

V. ACCOMMODATION OF UC ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

UC eligible resident applicants, who have not been admitted at any of the campuses of their choice shall be offered a space at other UC campuses where space is available. This process, called referral, reaffirms the long-standing University commitment to provide a place for every eligible California applicant who wishes to enroll.

In addition to the referral process, campuses may choose to offer other enrollment alternatives to UC eligible applicants. Examples of such alternatives may include:

1. Fall term admission to a different major,
2. Deferred admission to another term; or,
3. Enrollment at a community college with provision for admission at a later time, if a stated level of academic achievement is maintained (for freshman applicants only).

Last updated February 15, 2002.

Single Score Holistic Review Processes

UC Berkeley had been using comprehensive “holistic” review since 2001, and has refined the process over the intervening years. In 2006, **UC Los Angeles** became the second UC campus to implement a holistic evaluation process, basing its model on Berkeley’s process but also incorporating some locally developed measures regarding school context. UCLA trains readers to review files and assign a single score to candidates on the basis of a review of the entire application. No single attribute or characteristic guarantees the admission of any applicant. The review is based on a wide range of both academic and non-academic achievements, which are considered in the context of the available high school and life opportunities, and how fully the student has taken advantage of those opportunities and resources. UCLA considers all Comprehensive Review factors except for location of the applicant’s secondary school and residence (#14). Both Berkeley and UCLA devote a significant amount of time to norming student ratings and crosschecking the ratings of readers (see section on reader training). At UCLA, at least two readers review each file; whereas at Berkeley, students with the highest read score (less than 5% of applicants) and the lowest read scores are read once. Additional reads are used in the case of discrepant scores or if readers flag the student’s file for additional attention (called “augmented” review at UCB and “supplemental” review at UCLA). These third reviews sometimes require obtaining additional information from the student to clarify their case. Third reads can also “break ties” on cases where there are similar ratings and fewer places for students in score ranges that are near the boundary of normally admissible ratings. Details about the process and criteria are clearly described on campus websites.²⁰ Finally, all UCLA and UCB applicants receive a review regardless of eligibility, which allows both campuses to make use of admissions by exception for unusual cases.

At the end of the process, several post-decision reviews determine if any decisions need to be reconsidered before admission offers are extended. This includes a By High School review, in which senior readers view an array of quantifiable academic data from applicants from the same high school to either validate decisions or identify apparent anomalies. Berkeley also undertakes a Weighted Index review that takes into account academic measures, socio-economic factors, and contextual factors weighted more heavily based on a scale of predicted outcomes derived from regression analyses of previous admissions cycles. This prompts a further review by the Director of Undergraduate Admissions for a final decision based upon criteria specified by the faculty admissions committee. At Berkeley, the faculty admissions committee also reviews the 100 admits with the lowest scores on the eligibility index to confirm the decisions.

Single score holistic processes, based on the judgments of trained readers, also undergo many cross checks based on quantifiable information on each file and indices. For example, in 2005-06, Berkeley also introduced a High Index Review as quality control that selects for further review applicants who have high test scores and/or grade point averages but received low reader

While local practices differ, all campuses incorporate both academic and contextual factors into the comprehensive review assessment to judge student talent and potential.

²⁰ <http://students.berkeley.edu/admissions/freshmen.asp?id=56&navid=N>;
http://www.admissions.ucla.edu/Prospect/Adm_fr/FrSel.htm

ratings. Senior readers look for any evidence that the original decision to deny admission should be reversed. Consequently, considerable deference is still given to “traditional” measures of achievement at the same time that they place great value on the expert judgments of readers to take into account multiple criteria in their ratings of applicants.

Assessment of Single Score Holistic Processes

The Berkeley and UCLA processes are distinctive for the single rating that is based on the large range of indicators that readers review. This includes approximately 28 school profile characteristics (Appendix G); a student’s ranking in terms of GPA (weighted and unweighted); and coursework and test scores relative to other applicants within the school, the pool of applicants to the campus, and the school’s applicants in the entire UC applicant pool. There is also a high degree of individualized student review to determine the merits of each case. Readers are instructed to review the student’s coursework and consider the strength of the senior year load, identify improvement in performance, and other indicators of striving for excellence that include honors and awards for academic accomplishments. Readers also consider extracurricular activities that demonstrate sustained involvement, awards, and commitment to service as evidence of potential contributions to the vitality of the campus, as well as life challenges and employment that might restrict engagement in activities. Readers are provided with a training manual to help identify significant student organizations, activities, awards, and seasonal sports. Finally, readers are provided copies of the Regents May 2001 resolution, the campus philosophy to guide selection developed by faculty, and instructions that they “may not under any circumstances use any information regarding race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin that may be surmised from a reading of the application” in accordance with Proposition 209.

While the single score holistic method has many good features, the process has several limitations that one needs to bear in mind. First, it is extremely labor intensive and expensive because it relies on oversight and expertise of an experienced staff and external readers. Some may consider individualized attention to each file inefficient and less cost effective in the context of increasing applications and the short time frame for review. At the same time, it assures quality by using substantial information to make fine distinctions among applicants in a very competitive pool. Second, the single holistic score does not allow the campus to identify and provide additional consideration for students with extraordinary talents, leadership, and achievements outside of the academic criteria. Most private selective universities that employ an extensive individualized student review have a dual scoring system to favor the selection of “well rounded” students, or a small number of students with extraordinary personal accomplishments and more moderate academic scores. Considerable weight is given to “traditional” academic indicators in single score holistic processes. This was confirmed by the Hout Study²¹ of Berkeley’s holistic process in 2005, identifying grades were the most important determinant of readers’ scores. Third, this method is less transparent because students cannot know which criteria are valued most, nor calculate their own scores to assess the probability of admission. One can also reason, however, that this prevents students from “gaming” the system by focusing on only those areas that give them the most points and neglect other areas of excellence. The issue of transparency is addressed in a separate section (III-3).

²¹ http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/pdf_docs consolidate/Hout_Report.pdf.

Two Stage or Multiple Score Processes

Two-Stage or Multiple Score methods are also “holistic” in the sense that they consider many factors and employ the use of human reviewers to make judgments about non-quantitative information taken from the file that must be scored. Together, the multiple scores obtained through an individualized review constitute a comprehensive view of a students’ background and accomplishments. The main distinction from the Berkeley and UCLA processes is the assignment of specific points and weights to academic and personal accomplishment criteria based on principles and values as determined by faculty committees on the campus. Readers are then trained to read files and assign values in scoring in a way that is consistent with this philosophy. Otherwise, the read process is similar to the individualized student review used at Berkeley and UCLA.

UC Davis employs a two stage process that combines an electronic evaluation (87.7% of the final score) and a reader evaluation (12.3% of the final score) of academic and personal accomplishment criteria to determine an applicant’s final score. While the electronic evaluation score is generated from data based mainly on traditional academic indicators (criteria #1-3), it also incorporates ELC status (#5), EOP qualification, non-traditional student status, first generation college status, veteran status, (#13), individual initiative (#12), and evidence of marked improvement (#10). Although maximum weight is given to HS-GPA and the Sum of Standardized Tests, additional weight is given to ELC status in the point system—roughly equivalent to the maximum for the number of a-g courses (1000 points). The first score places the greatest weight on academic criteria, achievement in the local context, and also student background characteristics that influence achievement (12,500 point maximum). Thus, the first score gives somewhat more weight to students who have achieved in spite of disparities of circumstance. Using a sophisticated algorithm based on previous admissions results, students with the highest scores will be admitted without a second score based on a reviewer’s read. ELC students are actively recruited and also now receive a “fast track” pathway in admissions at Davis.

For all other Davis applicants, a second score (1,750 point maximum) is based on the reader evaluation that considers factors such as leadership promise and special talents/skills (criteria #11), participation in academic preparation programs, and evidence of educational perseverance in the face of difficult circumstances or disability (#13). Davis also implemented an Augmented Review process in November 2007 in order to conduct a more contextual review for certain unusual cases. The campus anticipates that as it becomes more selective, however, reader evaluations based on an individualized student review will be more necessary to make finer distinctions among all applicants.

At **UC Santa Barbara**, the Senate Committee on Admissions, Enrollment and Relations with Schools (CAERS) annually sets criteria that will enable the campus to achieve its goals of improving the quality and diversity of the incoming class and achieving specified enrollment targets. After assigning each applicant an academic index score called the Admissions Decision Model (ADM) based on high school GPA and test scores, the Comprehensive Review consists of an Academic Preparation Review (APR) and an Academic Promise Review (PPR). Applicants receive an APR score based on the academic factors comprising the ADM. The PPR score is based on a socio-economic status assessment and a read of the applicant’s personal statement,