Appendix B: Admission Processes at Selective Campuses

- Narrative Profiles of Campus Processes
Berkeley Campus Description

Overview
Readers scored all undergraduate applications to Berkeley on a scale of one to five, with an additional category for applicants who were not UC eligible. Academic factors were weighted most heavily in the scoring process, although there were no fixed weights governing the score. The comprehensive score reflects applicants’ relative levels of achievement in both academic and non-academic areas. Admissions staff generated summary sheets that included student rankings and school information, such as ELC status and course offering lists, to allow readers to consider achievement in context. Readers could refer applicants who were close to being competitive for admission to an augmented review process, in which applicants were requested to submit supplemental information in the form of a questionnaire and letters of recommendation. Less than six percent (approximately 2,100 out of the 36,084 applicants) were reviewed under augmented review. The final admission decision was based on a ranking of scores, with students with the highest scores admitted.

Reader Training, Monitoring and Reliability
Readers participated in 40 hours of training and 20 hours of independent work (“homework”) before the review process began, complemented by three-hour norming sessions each week during the reading process. Readers received information on how to evaluate grades and test scores, in addition to how to interpret other information provided on the read sheet. Admissions staff considers training and reader preparation, while labor intensive, to be crucial to the success of the review process. During the reading process, admissions staff management provides weekly reports to supervisors to monitor individual readers and counsel readers who may assign divergent scores.

Each application was scored by at least two readers, and scores that differed by one point were averaged. When scores assigned by the two readers differed by more than one point, applications were referred to a third reader, which occurred in less than two percent of all cases.

Role of Faculty
Berkeley faculty design admission policies and review documents drafted by staff. Individual faculty members referred potential readers, attended the reader training and participated in leader-reader norming, although no faculty members served as readers.

Future Directions
UC Berkeley has been developing and using comprehensive application review for five years, and is planning only minor adjustments to the process for 2003. The campus hopes to speed up its regular review process in order to leave time to request supplemental materials for augmented review. Staff is considering options such as hiring additional readers or holding one or two mandatory reading marathons on weekends in January to achieve this goal. Based on internal review and discussions with other campuses, admission staff also believe it may be possible and advisable to reduce the intensity of the reader training, without sacrificing the thoroughness and quality of reader preparation.
Davis Campus Description

Overview
For the 2002 admission process, Davis read all undergraduate applications that met UC eligibility criteria. Applications were assigned a maximum of 13,000 points based on a fixed weight formula, which includes:

- High School GPA (up to 4,000 points)
- Required entrance exam scores (up 4,000 points)
- Number of “a-f” courses beyond the minimum of 35 required for UC eligibility (100 for each course with a maximum of 500 points)
- Achieving UC eligibility in the local context (1,000 points)
- Participation in a precollegiate motivational program (500 points)
- Membership in the Educational Opportunity Program (500 points)
- Individual initiative factors as defined by reaching UC eligibility from an educationally disadvantaged high school environment (500 points)
- First generation of university attendance (250 points)
- Demonstrated leadership (250 points)
- One or more special talents (250 points)
- Demonstrated perseverance (250 points)
- Significant disability (250 points)
- Veteran/ROTC scholarship (250 points)
- Nontraditional university applicant (250 points)
- Marked Improvement in 11th grade (250 points)

Some of these factors were available electronically, while others had to be assessed and assigned by readers. Each file was reviewed by one reader. All factors except for the first three are dichotomous, meaning that students either received all the points for this characteristic if it was present in their application, or none of the points if it was not. For the first three factors, the GPA or test score or number of courses for a particular applicant was multiplied by a fixed weight to achieve the number of points. Students with the highest scores based on this comprehensive formula were admitted, and cut-offs were determined by the enrollment targets for each college/division.

Reader Training, Monitoring and Reliability
Davis conducted an inter-reader reliability study to verify the reliability of the reader scoring. As part of this study, 2,000 files were read by two readers and 200 files were read by ten readers.

Role of Faculty
Faculty designed the admission policies and draft policy documents, which are then approved by the Enrollment Work Group chaired by the Chancellor. Faculty created the formula for scoring applicants, including the factors to be included and their weights. Faculty also provided feedback on reader training materials. Some faculty members participated in internal reader training, and ten faculty members read applications.

Future Directions
Davis is considering refining the way the number of “a-f” courses is weighted in the admissions formula. For 2002, all applicants who completed five or more courses beyond the required “a-f” coursework were awarded the maximum 500 points for this factor. Because 99% of Davis applicants had completed 40 or more “a-f” courses, the formula did not effectively differentiate between students completing an average versus an exceptional amount of college preparatory coursework. In addition, Davis uses a GPA that considers up to eight honors courses and is capped at 4.0. For future
years, the campus may extend this to a 4.5 cap on the GPA, but still limit the number of honors courses it incorporates.

**Irvine Campus Description**

**Overview**
The Irvine 2002 admission process consisted of an initial review to assign applicants to academic profiles or cohorts, and a secondary process in which applicants placed in certain cohorts received Irvine’s personal profile review.

In the initial computer-assisted review, applicants were assigned an academic profile from A to G, plus an additional H category for applicants who were not UC eligible. Each profile or cohort had minimum requirements for GPA, test scores, the number of courses beyond the minimum subject requirement, and the quality of the applicant’s senior year program. For all applicants assigned to cohorts D through H, reviewers checked the accuracy of these electronically-coded inputs to ensure correct profile placement. No applicant was denied without an academic review.

Applicants who met the criteria of the highest academic profile were admitted without further review, as were all ELC students (although the Departments of Dance and Music and the School of Engineering did not accept all ELC applicants; if not selected by their first choice major, these applicants were offered an alternate major). Applicants assigned an academic profile of B through E received a personal profile review. Readers considered additional elements of the application in the personal profile review, such as outstanding performance in one or more academic areas, exceptionally rigorous academic program, trends in academic performance, potential to contribute to campus life, sustained participation in UC outreach programs, and academic achievements in light of personal circumstances. A minimum of two readers reviewed each application assigned a profile of B, C or D; applicants placed in the E cohort received a personal profile review by at least one reader. Applicants assigned a G profile (admission by exception candidates) received further review only if they were low-income or first-generation students who attended a low performing or partnership school.

The final admissions decision was made considering both the academic profile and the personal profile of the applicant. Subject to the capacity of individual academic units, applicants with the highest combination of scores were offered admission.

**Reader Training, Monitoring and Reliability**
Readers participated in an initial four-hour training, and were given fifteen sample files to review, discuss and score. After scoring ten sample files independently, they sent their results to admissions staff for review prior to the release of additional applications. Admission staff monitored reader scoring trends through weekly reports on scoring variance.

**Role of Faculty**
Faculty reviewed all admission documents and articulated the minimum requirements for each academic profile. The chair of the Irvine faculty admission committee read applications.

**Future Directions**
Irvine has been developing its comprehensive application review process since 1997, and has only minor adjustments planned for next year’s admission process. UC-eligible applications from students with excessive D and F grades will be reviewed, rather than being placed in cohort H and considered not competitive. In addition, the letter to ELC students will clarify that while they are guaranteed admission to the Irvine campus, they are not assured a spot in the School of Engineering.
Los Angeles Campus Description

Overview
For 2002, the UCLA undergraduate admissions process involved three reviews: an academic ranking review, and a dossier evaluation that consisted of both a personal achievement and life challenge level review. Two readers reviewed each applicant to assign an academic ranking from one to six. The admissions office provided these readers with an academic summary for each applicant, and instructed them to review the information and assign the ranking in the context of other students from the same school. Using a balancing process, with no fixed weight assigned to individual factors, readers considered first GPA, then strength of curriculum, test scores (SAT II and then ACT or SAT I scores), AP courses, and finally ELC status in determining the academic ranking.

The dossier evaluation included an examination of all parts of the application, including the personal statement. One reader conducted a two-part dossier evaluation for each applicant. For the personal achievement review, the reader was instructed to consider strength of formal schooling as demonstrated by curriculum, literacy in a foreign language, mastery of academic subjects such as grades and AP test scores, extracurricular intellectual development, honors or awards, leadership, cultural awareness, and personal development as evidenced by community service or engagement. For the life challenge level review, readers started with a computer-generated score including parental education and income levels, neighborhood and school characteristics, and were instructed to assess a life challenge level, taking into account non-quantitative environmental factors such as those posed by an inner city or rural setting, family circumstances such as a serious illness or physical or emotional dysfunction of the student or an immediate family member, and personal characteristics or experiences such as a learning disability. Using a balancing rather than a fixed-weight approach, readers assigned two scores on a scale of one to five for each applicant, one for the personal achievement review and one for the life challenge level review.

The College of Letters and Science, which enrolls approximately 85 percent of freshman at UCLA, considered scores from all three reviews. Based on the three scores, applicants were assigned to cells on a three-dimensional grid. Admission staff in consultation with faculty determined a border for admission and denial of applicants, with some additional review for applicants near the border.

Reader Training, Monitoring and Reliability
New and returning dossier reviewers were required to attend two four-hour training sessions; an additional four-hour training session was required for academic readers. Dossier reviewers were provided with written materials before the first session, and had an additional fifteen files to take home and assess before the second session. Norming sessions were held at the beginning of the review process.

Each applicant was reviewed by at least three readers – two to assign the academic ranking, and one to assign the personal achievement and the life challenge level. Academic ranking scores that differed by more than one point were reviewed by a senior reader, which occurred in less than seven percent of cases. For the dossier review, senior readers re-read the first batch of files reviewed; in addition, ten pre-normed applications were circulated during the process to verify reader reliability. Finally, senior readers reread approximately 4500 files near the admission border cells to verify the three review scores.

Role of Faculty
Faculty designed the admissions process and set up its goals and policies, which are written by staff and reviewed by the faculty. Admissions staff held a separate reader training for the faculty, and several faculty members read applications for experience. After the reading process was finished,
senior members of the faculty committee responsible for admissions consulted with admission staff to determine which cells of students to admit.

San Diego Campus Description

Overview
Review of applications for undergraduate admission at San Diego had two parts for 2002: an initial and secondary review. All undergraduate applicants to San Diego underwent an initial review that stressed academic achievement, as well as several socioeconomic factors. The initial review score was calculated using fixed weights for eight factors: GPA, test scores, courses beyond minimum “a-f” requirements, ELC status, low-performing school, low income, and first-generation college. Readers could make corrections to the data where needed, and the score was generated using an algorithm. The very highest academic performers, approximately 5,400 students, were admitted based on this initial review score, including all students with GPA’s over 4.3.

In a secondary review, readers scored the applications of all students with GPA’s greater than or equal to 3.0, and assigned additional points for demonstrated leadership, special talents, community service, personal circumstances, and achievement in outreach programs. Academic factors constituted 77% of the total maximum possible points in the combined initial and secondary review scores. Applicants who were not admitted through the initial review process were ranked based on the combined initial and secondary review score, and the top 11,000 applicants were admitted.

Reader Training, Monitoring and Reliability
Readers attended two half-day training sessions, which also included the scoring of sample files. Admission staff readers met for one to two hours each week to clarify questions, insure consistency in the read process, and review special cases. All files were read by at least one admissions staff member. When an outside reader’s score differed from that of an admission staff reader’s score, the score assigned by the admission staff person was used.

Role of Faculty
Faculty involvement in the UCSD admission process has increased in recent years. The admissions committee develops admission policy and, was consulted in the development of training materials for readers. Several faculty members participated in reader training, although none served as an official reader.

Future Directions
For the next admissions cycle, San Diego may eliminate the distinction between initial and secondary review, admitting all student based on the full complement of combined initial and secondary review factors. To prepare for this shift this year, San Diego conducted the secondary review for 37,000 applications (all eligible applicants with a GPA between 3.0 and 4.3), although the top 5,400 applicants were admitted based on the points from the initial review only.

In 2002, fifty readers—25 admission staff and 25 external readers—assisted with the review process. Outside readers were employed with the primary goal of building and training a larger pool of experienced readers to draw from in subsequent years. For next year, admission staff are looking at how to incorporate scores from outside readers, with two readers reviewing each application, and plan to initiate third reads by senior staff to resolve differences in scores.
Santa Barbara Campus Description

Overview
Santa Barbara had a two-part review process, consisting of an initial and an augmented review. Readers reviewed all 2002 applications, checking the GPA, number of “a-f” and honors courses, and other data derived from the freshman application centerfold. In the initial review, all applicants were assigned an academic index score called the ADM (academic decision model), determined by a combination of GPA and test scores. Applicants awarded approximately 90% of the total possible ADM points (7560 out of 8400) were granted admission to Santa Barbara, as were applicants in the top 3% of graduates at their high school based on this index, resulting in a total of 9,015 admits.

Applicants who were not admitted based on the ADM and school context underwent an augmented review. The first part of this augmented review, called the academic preparation review, included total senior year courses, total “a-f” courses, number of honors, AP and IB courses, and GPA. Applicants were electronically assigned up to six points for the academic preparation review. For the second part of the augmented review, the academic promise review, two readers reviewed each application and assigned up to nine points using selection criteria established by the faculty, including such characteristics as leadership, motivation, persistence, honors and awards, and intellectual vitality. Applicants were admitted based on a ranking of combined augmented review scores.

Reader Training, Monitoring and Reliability
Readers included professional admission staff, other professional staff from within the Santa Barbara Division of Student Affairs, faculty, and retired teachers and counselors. Santa Barbara held separate trainings for the readers who serve as editors, those who check and correct data from the freshman academic information, and the readers who conducted the academic promise review. Editor readers trained for 20 to 25 hours, and then were paired with an admissions staff evaluator to whom they took unusual cases. Academic promise readers attended twenty hours of intensive training on admissions guidelines and scoring. They were also required to participate in additional weekly norming sessions throughout the reading process.

At least one reader for each application was an experienced admission professional. Applications that received scores that differed by more than one point were referred to a third senior admission officer, which occurred in less than ten percent of cases.

Role of Faculty
Faculty set admission policy and drafted admission policy documents; admission staff helped refine the documents, and drafted the reader training materials, which faculty reviewed and approved. Faculty members participated in reader training and read student applications.

Future Directions
For 2003, Santa Barbara plans to integrate the elements of their current process into just one score, a composite of an electronically-generated academic score (school context plus a revised ADM score which weights test scores and grade point average based on predictive validity studies) and a comprehensive reader review, which will be used to determine admission for all applicants.