

## **Annual Report: Academic Year 2012-2013**

### **Davis Division: Academic Senate**

#### **Committee on Admissions & Enrollment**

The Committee on Admissions & Enrollment (CAE) 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.

The committee met as a whole three times in the fall quarter and once in each of the other two terms and considered the following matters:

- Technical details concerning the implementation of the holistic review procedure
- University of California undergraduate financial aid funding options (report available [here](#))
- The growth in the international undergraduate student population and the BOARS “compare favorably” policy
- Long-range enrollment planning and how this may impact diversity (report [here](#))
- A proposal for an early application opening (report [here](#))

The most significant policy action was a change in the procedure for determining the holistic score for freshman admissions decisions. It was decided, by unanimous vote, that, effective for the class entering in fall 2013, the procedure will be as follows:

1. All applications are given two HR scores, **each of which** must be an integer from 1 to 7, or be treated computationally as such.
2. One of these two HR scores is given by a trained UC Davis reader; the other is Erika Jackson’s predicted HR score (rounded).
3. If these scores do not differ by more than one, they are averaged to produce the final score, such that each applicant can be placed into one of the 13 UC Davis rank-ordered bins: 1 > 1.5 > 2 > 2.5, etc.
4. If these scores differ by more than one, a senior reader determines the final score, which may be any of the 13 bin values.

This version of the score determination procedure eliminates the use of HR scores from UCLA (and other campuses), has at least one human read of ALL applications to UC Davis, and uses the predicted HR score as a surrogate for a second human read, such that our 13 score bins can be derived via averaging of the predicted and human scores. This way of doing things has numerous advantages:

- It makes it possible for the Admissions staff to tell the public what they apparently want to hear, i.e., that Davis readers holistically review every application and we do not substitute scores from other campuses.
- The overall number of human reads at Davis can actually be reduced significantly, relative to last year, in spite of the elimination of score-sharing.
- We can eliminate the entire score calibration step in the process, since there will be no need to translate scores from other campuses.
- We can avoid introducing UCLA-specific biases in the generation of HR scores, since the predicted HR scores are to be based (at least from the 2013 admissions cycle onwards) wholly on the HR scores of Davis readers who have access to percentile scores for applicants to Davis rather than to those for applicants to UCLA.
- As the application reading process is refined, the score prediction procedure will be able to seamlessly incorporate the results of the refinements.
- We can avoid costly delays in the review process by not having to wait for scores to trickle in from UCLA (or other campuses).
- The timeline improvement and reduction in total human reads will make it possible for Admissions staff to focus more attention on the augmented (or supplemental) review process and other critical aspects of the complex selection procedure that follows the generation of HR scores.
- This refined single-score HR procedure is, if anything, a better fit with the guiding principles of our HR policy than last year's procedure, since it depends crucially on “holistic review of each applicant’s file,” while at the same time significantly increasing “efficiency and economy.”

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick Farrell, Chair

Carlos Jackson

Martine Quinzii

Joseph Sorensen

Rena Zieve

Sean McDonnell, AF Representative

Joshua Coronado, ASUCD Representative

Haley Robinson, ASUCD Representative

Hannah Waterhouse, GSA Representative

Ralph Aldredge, Guest

Walter Robinson, Ex-Officio

Darlene Hunter, Consultant

Erika Jackson, Consultant