

**COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW AT THE SIX SELECTIVE UC CAMPUSES**  
**2003 ADMISSIONS PROCESS AND IMPLEMENTATION BY ACCOUNTABILITY PRINCIPLES\***

<b>PRINCIPLES 1 AND 2: DEFINITION OF CAMPUS GOALS, CRITERIA AND SELECTION PROCESS IN CONFORMANCE WITH UNIVERSITYWIDE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES, CAMPUS-SPECIFIC EDUCATIONAL VALUES AND PHILOSOPHY AND IN THE CONTEXT OF CAMPUS ENROLLMENT GOALS</b>						
	<b>Berkeley</b>	<b>Davis</b>	<b>Irvine</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>San Diego</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>
Does campus have written admission policies approved by the faculty?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Fall 2002 campus context for admissions decisions**	For 2003, received 36,982 freshman applications for enrollment goal of 3,755. Mean GPA of applicants 3.90. Mean GPA of admits 4.31. Admission rate of 23.9% (same as fall 2002).	For 2003, received 32,502 freshman applications for enrollment goal of 4,780. Mean GPA of applicants 3.69. Mean GPA of admits 3.93. Admission rate 56.9% (62.8% in 2002).	For 2003, received 34,403 freshman applications for enrollment goal of 4,043. Mean GPA of applicants 3.68. Mean GPA of admits 3.96. Admission rate 53.8% (56.6% in 2002).	For 2003, received 44,992 freshman applications for enrollment goal of 4,390. Mean GPA of applicants 3.83. Mean GPA of admits 4.24. Admission rate 23.6% (24.1% in 2002).	For 2003, received 43,461 freshman applications for enrollment goal of 3,800. Mean GPA of applicants 3.80. Mean GPA of admits 4.17. Admission rate 37.4% (41.0% in 2002).	For 2003, received 37,590 freshman applications for enrollment goal of 4,000. Mean GPA of applicants 3.66. Mean GPA of admits 3.93. Admission rate 50.0% (51% in 2002).
Process Overview	<u>Unitary</u> All applications are given a single comprehensive score by two readers who consider academic performance in context of school attended, family income and parents' occupation, education level, and students' personal circumstances. Admissions decisions are made based on the linear ranking students' read scores.	<u>Fixed Weight</u> All application reads consider academic and personal achievement/life challenge attributes, assigning points for elements not available electronically. Academic factors accounted for 75% of the total points (14,000). Admissions decisions are made based on linear ranking of students' scores by college, division and major.	<u>Matrix</u> Applications assigned to one of seven academic cells by computer, with bottom four cells reviewed for proper placement. Top cell is admitted, bottom (ineligible) cell is denied, and one or two readers review other cells. Admissions decisions based on two-dimensional matrix guided by faculty.	<u>Matrix</u> The comprehensive review consists of three assessments: an academic ranking, a personal achievement ranking and a life challenge ranking. Admissions decisions based on three-dimensional matrix guided by faculty.	<u>Fixed Weight</u> Three-stage review and admission process where academic and non-academic factors are assigned a pre-determined number of points. Academic factors account for 77% of the total points (11,100). Admissions decisions are made based on linear ranking of students' scores.	<u>Fixed Weight</u> Process considers academic factors and student ranking in high school graduating class as initial basis for decisions. Applicants not granted admission based on this process have their files read by two readers for additional academic and non-academic factors.

\*Accountability principles were developed by the faculty's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS).

\*\*Campuses use different methods for computing high school Grade Point Average (GPA). While Berkeley and Santa Barbara make admissions decisions based on uncapped honors-weighted GPAs in "a" – "g" coursework; Los Angeles, San Diego, Davis and Irvine utilize honors-weighted GPAs in "a" – "g" coursework capped at eight honors.

**PRINCIPLES 3 AND 4: ENSURING THAT FACULTY ARE ENGAGED IN THE PROCESS, PROFESSIONAL STAFF ARE WELL QUALIFIED AND TRAINED,  
AND NO SYSTEMATIC BIAS TAKES PLACE**

	<b>Berkeley</b>	<b>Davis</b>	<b>Irvine</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>San Diego</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>
<b>Faculty Involvement</b>	Faculty members determine criteria and policy, help design process, and review and approve implementation guidelines. Faculty participate in reader norming sessions and in full reader training sessions.	Faculty members determine criteria and policy, help design process and review and approve implementation guidelines. Faculty participate in staff training, norming and read admission files.	Faculty members determine criteria and policy, help design process and review and approve specifics of academic cohort definitions and implementation guidelines.	Faculty members determine criteria and policy and help design process and review and approve implementation guidelines; faculty review and approve decisions regarding which cells in three-dimensional matrix should be admitted.	Faculty members determine criteria and policy, help design process and review and approve implementation guidelines; faculty members of admissions committee participate in reader training. Faculty members also read a random sample of 60 files at the conclusion of the reading process.	Faculty members determine criteria and policy, help design process and review and approve implementation guidelines. Faculty members participate in reader training. Faculty of the admissions committee read sample files.
<b>Reader Selection and Training</b>	External readers include high school teachers and counselors, retired admissions staff, emeritus faculty and other educators. Reader selection process includes application and interview. Training consists of 33 hours of preparation before the process begins and three hours per week during the reading process.	Guest readers are recruited from Academic & Student Affairs and have professional faculty positions. Guest readers are required to read minimum of 100 applications, attend sixteen hours of training and weekly norming sessions and read in a timely manner. In addition, spot checking and reliability study are conducted.	Admissions staff read all applications once. A trained outside reader conducts the second review. Readers are UCI staff and faculty and high school counselors. Reader selection process includes application and job description. All readers receive extensive training and are monitored for reliability.	Potential readers complete application and phone interview and are required to hold a B.A. Four-hour initial training session with 12-15 take-home files reviewed at second four-hour session. At beginning of process, senior readers hold norming session and review initial batches to review rankings. Senior readers available for consultation throughout the read period.	Internal and external recruitment, seeking geographical representation. Preference for those with experience and credentials in the field of education. The pool includes high school guidance counselors, campus administrators and internal admissions professionals. Training includes two half-day meetings and a manual. Weekly meetings for internal readers. External readers have ongoing consultation and interaction with training coordinator.	Reader selection process includes references and interview. External readers include retired teachers, counselors and admissions staff. 20-25 hour training on application editing; 15-20 hours training on admissions guidelines and scoring; Weekly norming sessions account for additional ~10 hours of training.

Number of Readers and Process for Adjudication of Differences	Minimum of two readers per application. Scores that differ by one point or less are averaged. Those that differ by more are given to a third reader.	One reader per application with a second read for any application that is randomly selected and/or is deemed necessary.	Two readers for most applications. If score is within one point, higher score used; If score >one point, discrepancy results in third read.	Minimum of two readers for academic ranking review; one reader for dossier review. If academic ranking score differs by >one point, file reviewed by senior reader.	Each file read twice. If discrepancy greater than one factor, file referred to a senior admissions officer for a third read. The score assigned by the third reader serves as the tie-breaker.	Two readers per application. Score difference of more than one point results in third read.
Process for Monitoring to Avoid Bias	Readers not allowed to score applicants they know or from their own schools or programs. Scores patterns of individual readers monitored.	Readers not allowed to review and/or score applicants they know. Scores patterns of individual readers monitored; random checks are completed as readers return the application and reliability study is completed.	Readers not allowed to score applicants they know or from their own schools or programs. Scores patterns of individual readers monitored.	For academic review, readers do not receive applications from their own schools or programs. Scores patterns of individual readers monitored. Anonymous batch of pre-scored applications sent through entire reader group to ensure consistency. Reread of all students' files if borderline.	Readers not allowed to score applicants they know or from their own schools or programs.	Readers not allowed to score applicants they know or from their own schools or programs. Files are passed to another reader or placed in special "bias bin." Issue heavily addressed in training sessions. Scores patterns of individual readers are monitored daily and intervention occurs as needed.

**PRINCIPLE 5: PROCESS TO MONITOR ACCURACY AND RELIABILITY OF DATA USED IN DECISION MAKING PROCESS**

	<b>Berkeley</b>	<b>Davis</b>	<b>Irvine</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>San Diego</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>
Verification (in addition to systemwide verification)	Accuracy of academic information checked against official transcript for all enrolled students; spot check questionable files during review process. Additional information requested of 2,400 students before admit decision made (Augmented Review).	Accuracy of academic information checked against official transcripts for all SIR applicants and enrolled students; spot check questionable files during review process.	Accuracy of academic information checked against official transcript for all enrolled students; spot check questionable files during review process.	Accuracy of academic information checked against official transcript for all enrolled students; spot check questionable files during review process.	Accuracy of academic information checked against official transcript for all enrolled students; spot check questionable files during review process.	Accuracy of academic information checked against official transcript for all enrolled students; spot check questionable files during review process.

**PRINCIPLES 6, 7, AND 8: PROCESSES EVALUATED AND REFINED OVER TIME, INFORMATION ON EFFECTIVE PRACTICES DISSEMINATED**

	<b>Berkeley</b>	<b>Davis</b>	<b>Irvine</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>San Diego</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>
<b>Evaluation</b>	<p>Debriefing meetings held with readers and committee members. Internal annual review process. External review conducted in 1998 and 2002. For Fall 2002, faculty read files from a stratified random sample of 66 to compare their assessments with those of readers. For Fall 2003, an inter-reader reliability study of a random sample of 80 applications was conducted.</p>	<p>Internal review and debriefing meetings/retreat conducted annually. For 2003, random check with a second read to verify that initial read and assigned scoring was appropriate and correct.</p>	<p>Debriefing meetings held with readers and committee members. Annual Report analyzes outcomes in terms of campus's six admissions principles.</p>	<p>Receiving feedback from admissions committee faculty. Debriefing sessions for staff and readers in May. Evaluating the total process and comments or recommendations from faculty, staff and readers by senior management during Summer 2002.</p>	<p>Debriefing meetings are held with internal and external readers. Internal data analyses are conducted.</p>	<p>Institutional Research looks at admissions data at various points in the process. Regular debriefings occur with readers and staff.</p>
<b>Changes for 2004</b>	<p>Logistical changes to complete initial read earlier and speed up Augmented Review. Addition of a second intermediate score, after having added an intermediate score to the scoring scale for Fall 2003. Intermediate scores refine, rather than expand, the scoring scale. Faculty to review a subset of files (criteria TBD) before final decisions are made.</p>	<p>No changes.</p>	<p>All applicants receive at least one comprehensive review (academic grouping and profile review); most will receive two independent file reads with profile score differences of one point automatically referred to a third read.</p>	<p>Eliminate all academic-related elements in the Personal Achievement ranking (PAR), slightly increasing recognition for students from low quintile schools in the Life Challenge ranking. All readers must pass a new "Reader Certification" process following training before they are permitted to read actual applications.</p>	<p>Continue to pair external and internal readers in order to insure that every file is read by an internal reader; continue to encourage reading and scoring online; limit the number of reads for applicants who fall into the highest and lowest academic bands.</p>	<p>ELC and school-context identified applicants will be admitted for 2004. Some SES characteristics will be automated as part of profile review.</p>

Potential examples of particularly effective practices*	Gathering and presentation of context information for academic achievement; Augmented Review process. Training yields third read rate of 3%.	Inter-Reader Reliability Study and consistent random spot checking of the reads/scores.	Use of readers to verify computer-generated rankings; evaluation according to articulated principles.	Academic evaluations conducted by high school; faculty involvement in decisions on which cells to admit. Quality control features for readers.	Continue to implement technical changes that help to track the application flow and monitor reader outcomes. Identified sites on high school campuses to ease the travel time for high school counselors involved in reading.	By-school ranking and selection process.
---	--	---	---	--	---	--

\*BOARS and Admissions Directors meet annually to identify “best practices.”

<b>PRINCIPLES 9 AND 10: SYSTEMATIC STUDY OF OUTCOMES</b>						
	<b>Berkeley</b>	<b>Davis</b>	<b>Irvine</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>San Diego</b>	<b>Santa Barbara</b>
Study of Admission Process Outcomes	Campus has submitted detailed data on applicants and admitted student to UCOP.	Campus has submitted detailed data on applicants and admitted student to UCOP.	Campus has submitted detailed data on applicants and admitted student to UCOP.	Campus has submitted detailed data on applicants and admitted student to UCOP.	Campus has submitted detailed data on applicants and admitted student to UCOP.	Campus has submitted detailed data on applicants and admitted student to UCOP.
Study of Relationship to Academic Performance and Student Success	Studies will be conducted after students have been enrolled long enough to collect outcome data.	Studies will be conducted after students have been enrolled long enough to collect outcome data.	Studies will be conducted after students have been enrolled long enough to collect outcome data.	Studies will be conducted after students have been enrolled long enough to collect outcome data.	Continue to conduct analyses of student performance.	Studies will be conducted after students have been enrolled long enough to collect outcome data.