The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has proposed to modify the Comprehensive Review admissions criteria for freshman admissions, to be implemented for the fall 2012 admissions cycle. The proposed changes described in this memo are transitional and incremental in nature, and represent a first step in an ongoing process of change and evolution of freshman admissions procedures at UCR. (See Part III of this memo for a more detailed time line for changes to the freshman admissions process, for fall 2012, and for fall 2013.)

This memo is organized as follows: Part I briefly summarizes the current Comprehensive Review admissions process at UCR and the proposed changes in that process. Part II provides a detailed rationale for the proposed changes. Part III provides an outline and general time line for continued revision of the Comprehensive Review process.

I. CURRENT ADMISSIONS PROCESS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

UCR currently admits freshmen students through a Comprehensive Review process that weighs five factors in an additive model to calculate an Academic Index Score (AIS). These five factors are a subset of the 14 factors that were recommended by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and approved by the Regents in 2001. The full list of the 14 factors that currently may be considered is given in Appendix A of this memo.

The current admissions process, referred to as Comprehensive Review, Phase I, was implemented in 2005. The proposed revision described here is referred to as Comprehensive Review, Phase II. The current weighting distribution, and the proposed weighting distribution, are both outlined in Table 1 (on the next page). The Table lists the factors and their current and proposed weights. These proposed weights were determined through extensive analyses performed by Student Affairs Research and Evaluation (SARE) in the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, using graduation, dismissal, and UCR GPA data, and admissions criteria available through an electronic read of student applications.
Table 1.
Factors and Weights for Current and Proposed Calculation of Academic Index Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.4578</td>
<td>.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Reasoning / ACT plus writing</td>
<td>.1962</td>
<td>.4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Exam</td>
<td>.0654</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Exam</td>
<td>.0654</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility in Local Context</td>
<td>.1308</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of A-G courses beyond minimum</td>
<td>.0409</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of AP/IB courses</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note – High School GPA is weighted and capped; AP/IB denotes Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses.

The criteria that enter into the Academic Index Score have very different scales. For example, the SAT score has a maximum score of 2400, whereas High School GPA has a maximum score of 4.5. Also, First Generation Status and Low Family Income are binary variables that are assigned values of 0 and 1. Thus, in order to calculate the AIS, the variables are re-scaled. Each variable is then scored as a proportion of the maximum (re-scaled) score possible, and these proportions are weighted and summed, and multiplied by a scalar which is the total possible AIS value. The calculation of the Academic Index Score is illustrated in Appendix B of this proposal.

It is clear from the Table that the largest changes in the calculation of the AIS are: (1) the increase in the weight given to SAT scores, (2) the removal of the SAT Subject Exams, and (3) and the removal of Eligibility in Local Context (ELC).

The calculation of the Academic Index Score will be the same for all colleges – the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS), the School of Business (SoBA), the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), and the Bourns College of Engineering (BCoE) – based on the weights shown in the right-hand column of Table 1.

For CHASS and SoBA, admissions decisions will be based on the calculation of the AIS. For BCoE and CNAS, admissions decisions will be based primarily on the calculation of the AIS, but some admissions decisions will be made on the basis of exam scores that reflect mastery of mathematics, chemistry, and physics. These decisions are described as follows:

It is proposed that the following information be provided to prospective applicants to majors within the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences: “Applicants to the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences are strongly encouraged to take the SAT Math Subject Exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to take the ACT Science Reasoning Test and an AP Calculus Exam.”
It is proposed that the following information be provided to prospective applicants to majors within the Bourns College of Engineering: “Applicants to the Bourns College of Engineering should ensure strong preparation in Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics. Their mastery of Mathematics should cover at least Pre-Calculus, but an advanced Placement course in Calculus is recommended. Applicants are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of adequate preparation by taking the SAT Math Subject exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam, or the ACT Science Reasoning Test.”

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee proposes a plan that would empower CNAS and BCoE to form committees within their colleges to review a subset of freshman applications that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off for the 2012 admissions cycle, and to make admissions decisions based on the criteria listed above. For this subset of applications the CNAS and BCoE committees may also, in making admissions decisions, consider the Math portion of the SAT reasoning Test.

II. RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED CHANGES

The development of Phase II of Comprehensive Review was guided by four goals: (1) To effectively respond to the UC systemwide changes in the UC eligibility construct that will be implemented for the Fall 2012 admissions cycle, (2) To raise the academic profile of undergraduate students admitted to UCR, (3) To maintain the diversity of the student body, and (4) To maintain the transparency and integrity of the admissions process at UCR.

Goal 1: To Effectively Respond to the UC Systemwide Changes in the UC Eligibility Construct

In February 2009, the Regents approved several changes in the UC eligibility construct. These changes, originally proposed by BOARS are as follows:

1. Entitled to Review. High school seniors who meet all of the criteria described below will be entitled to a full review of their applications for admission:

   (a) Complete the SAT Reasoning or ACT plus writing examination.

   (b) Successfully complete the list of courses known as the “a through g curriculum” consisting of 15 year-long, college preparatory courses certified by UC at each high school.

   (c) Achieve a minimum GPA of 3.0, weighted with up to 8 semesters of honors.

2. Statewide Context. Students determined to be in the top 9% of the state based on an index of their honors-weighted GPA and test scores will be guaranteed admission to UC. The 9% figure represents a change from the current eligibility construct of 12.5% for statewide context.
3. **Local Context (ELC)**. Students determined to be in the top 9% of their public high school graduating class based on an index of their honors-weighted GPA and test scores will be guaranteed admission to UC. This 9% figure represents a substantial change from the current 4% figure.

**Implications of the Changes in UC the Eligibility Construct**

The full scope of the implications of these changes is not completely clear. However, two aspects of the proposed changes are particularly salient. (1) The change in ELC from 4% to 9% will likely expand the pool of eligible students and may increase the number of applicants who are less well-prepared and who have weaker academic preparation for college. (2) The removal of the requirement for SAT subject tests should remove a barrier to gaining access to UC. College Board data show that in 2007, 195,406 California seniors took the SAT Reasoning test, but only about half of those students (51%) took one or more of the SAT Subject Exams. These numbers are even more striking for low income students; less than half (47%) of low-income students who took the SAT-R took one or more of the SAT subject tests. The comparable percentages are even lower for African American students (34%), Native American students (37%), and Chicano/Latino students (42%).

Changes in the Eligibility construct are reflected in the weights for Comprehensive Review, Phase II. Note that the SAT Subject exams and ELC are removed from the calculation of AIS. The elimination of SAT subject exams is a simple implementation of the new UC eligibility construct. The zero weight assignment for ELC was based on careful consideration and discussion by the admissions committee. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee agrees with the principle behind the 4% to 9% change in the ELC construct. However, the change in ELC creates a new, unknown, and undefined variable, and thus it is impossible to know what weight to give to this variable, and it is impossible to know how it will affect the composition of our applicant pool, how it will be related to academic success, or how it will affect the composition of our student body. Before we can assign it a weight, we need to have a clearer picture of the cohort of students that will be defined by the new ELC variable.

**Goal 2:**

**To Raise the Academic Profile of the Undergraduate Student Body at UCR**

The committee examined factors currently utilized in Comprehensive Review (Phase I) to determine the extent to which they were associated with academic success at UCR. Academic success was defined in three ways: in terms of graduation rates, dismissal rates, and current UCR GPA.

The relationship between admissions criteria and graduation rates is based on the Fall 2002, 2003, and 2004 cohorts. (One has to go back several years in order to obtain useful graduation rate data.) These analyses revealed that graduation rates were only weakly predicted by the factors that are currently used to make admissions decisions. The correlations from these analyses ranged from -.048 to .098, and are shown in Table 2. Why should these correlations be so weak? Our tentative explanation is that retention and graduation rates are determined in large part by factors that have little to do with admissions criteria. Specifically, students may withdraw from the University or transfer to other academic institutions for a variety of personal
and financial reasons that have little or nothing to do with their aptitude or preparation for college.

Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRAD</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT 1 Total</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT-verbal</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT-Math</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to G courses beyond minimum</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP / IB courses</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Courses</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because graduation rates for the campus are weakly correlated with the current admissions criteria, we considered a different measure of academic success, UCR GPA. The correlations between admissions criteria and UCR GPA, using the same cohort, were much stronger and are shown in Table 2. The strongest predictor of UCR GPA was high school GPA, followed quite closely by the total SAT reasoning score.

The committee also examined the relationships between admissions criteria and measures of success in a more recent incoming class, from fall 2008. Of course, graduation rate data are not available for this group of students who came to UCR only two years ago. Thus, rather than graduation rates, we examined dismissals, in addition to UCR GPA. The correlations are given in Table 3. For this cohort the strongest predictor of UCR GPA is the total SAT reasoning score.

Table 3.
Correlations between Admissions Criteria, Dismissal, and UCR GPA, Fall 2008 Cohort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISMISSAL</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Total</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G Courses</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Courses</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB Hours</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Optimization of Admissions Criteria

Student Affairs Research and Evaluation (SARE) conducted an analysis that adjusted the weights on the current Comprehensive Review factors to identify the set of weights that would optimize the dependent variable of UCR GPA. Those weights are listed in the left-hand column (labeled OPT) of Table 4. If our goal were simply to weight admissions factors in such a way as to admit students who would demonstrate academic success as measured by their UCR GPA, this would be accomplished through the weighting of factors shown in Table 4. These factors, taken together, predict UCR GPA with a correlation of $r = .43$. This correlation can be compared to the predictive power of the current set of weights, $r = .32$. The increase from .32 to .43 represents a substantial increase in the power of admissions criteria to predict student success.

Careful inspection of the analyses revealed some peculiarities and undesirable consequences with regard to the diversity of the student body. First, regarding the peculiarity: Although honors courses are positively correlated with UCR GPA ($r = .164$), their coefficient in the optimization was negative (note that this negative coefficient is not shown in the tables). Further analysis revealed that the negative relationship was due to the double contribution of honors courses in the calculation of AIS. Specifically, because the weighted High School GPA also reflects the contribution of honors courses, entering them into the AIS equation twice over-represents their contribution. In order to factor the double-contribution out of the AIS calculation, honors courses were removed as a separate component in calculating AIS. As for the undesirable consequences, the optimized weights appear to produce potentially undesirable shifts in the ethnic distribution of the student body (see Goal 3 in the section to follow).

The Academic Index Score will be the primary factor in determining admissions decisions for the fall 2012 admissions cycle. However, based on consultation with faculty within CNAS and BCoE, the Admissions Committee believes that it is crucial that students who are admitted to majors in CNAS and BCoE have additional preparation and mastery in math, physics and chemistry, in order to succeed. For that reason, the Admissions Committee has consulted with both CNAS and BCoE faculty to propose the plan described above that would empower CNAS and BCoE to form committees within their colleges to review a subset of Freshman applications (that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off), and to make admissions decisions based on scores for the Math portion of the SAT, the Math, Physics, and Chemistry Subject Exams, and the ACT Science Reasoning Test (as described on page 3 of this proposal).

Table 4.

Weights on Admissions Criteria, Optimized and Adjusted Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Optimized ($r = .43$)</th>
<th>Adjusted ($r = .41$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>.4334</td>
<td>.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.3598</td>
<td>.4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G Courses</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>.0334</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB</td>
<td>.1552</td>
<td>.0667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>.0180</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal 3:
To Maintain the Diversity of the Undergraduate Student Body at UCR

On May 20, 1988, the Regents adopted UC Policy on undergraduate admissions, which stated in part, “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 a high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California.” (Emphasis added.)

UCR is in a strong position with respect to diversity. Unlike other UC campuses, UCR has been successful in enrolling a diverse student body that is representative of the state of California. UCR has received considerable praise and national attention for the diversity of its student body. Moreover, UCR qualifies as a Hispanic Serving Institution, making the university eligible for grants it would otherwise be ineligible for. To qualify as a Hispanic-Serving Institution, the student body must include a minimum 25% Hispanic student body.

Regarding the consequences of optimizing for UCR GPA for the diversity of the student body, Table 3 shows that first generation status and low income are both negatively associated with academic success. The negative weight, however, cannot be justified in any reasonable admissions policy, as it penalizes students whose admission to UC is a core component of our mission as educators in a public, state-funded institution. The committee speculated that the negative correlation with GPA may reveal a post-enrollment vulnerability of first generation and low income students that should be addressed not through the admissions process, but through post-enrollment support.

The committee also examined the ethnic distribution of the student body based on these optimized weights. SARE analyzed the distributions for ethnicity of the undergraduate student body, for fall 2010, based on the current AIS calculation and the optimized AIS calculation, as a function of various admissions cutoffs. Of course, if UCR admitted 100% of the fall 2010 incoming class, the distributions would look exactly as they do currently, irrespective of how the AIS is calculated. The data in Table 5 are based on an assumption of increased selectivity as a 70% cutoff, i.e., they are based on the top 70% that would be selected in each model. (This assumption of increased selectivity is reasonable in light of the increased yield in recent admissions cycles.)

Table 5.
Distribution of Ethnicity of UCR Student Body Based on Current, Optimized, and Adjusted Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Optimized</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>24.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>44.45</td>
<td>46.71</td>
<td>44.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>14.54</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note – Columns do not sum to 100.00. “Other” and “Not specified” responses are not included in the table.

The data in Table 5 suggest that the optimization of weights would increase the proportion of all ethnic groups except for Mexican-American and Latino students. The proportion of Mexican American students shows the largest decrease, from 26.32 percent to 21.92 percent. The combined percentage for Mexican American and Latino students decreases from 32.96 percent to 27.31 percent.

With the goal of maintaining the diversity of the UCR student body, and to extend access as broadly as possible to UC qualified students, the Undergraduate Admissions Committee considered an Adjusted Model that re-coded low income and first generation status in order to favor (rather than disfavor) their admission to UCR. The ethnic distribution based on this Adjusted Model is shown in the right-most column of Table 5. The table shows a proportional increase in all ethnic groups, with the exception of a small decrease in the proportions of Mexican-American and Latino students, compared to the current model. As the table shows, these decreases in Mexican-American and Latino students are much smaller in the adjusted model than in the optimized model.

The weights derived from this Adjusted model are shown in the right-hand column of Table 4, next to those of the optimized model, for comparison. The predictive power of the adjusted model is $r = .41$, which represents only a very small decrease relative to the optimized model ($r = .43$).

The adjusted model is a much stronger predictor of academic success, measured by UCR GPA, compared to the current model. It deviates only very slightly from the optimized model ($r = .41$ versus .43 in the optimized model). This is accomplished with very little change in the ethnic distribution of students.

**Goal 4:**

**Maintaining the Transparency and Integrity of the Admissions Process**

The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Review process maintain the transparency and integrity of the admissions process. Admissions decisions are determined by a structured decision process based on objective criteria. Admissions decisions are not based, in any way, on subjective judgments. The criteria and the relative importance of the criteria are clearly specified.

**III. TIME LINE FOR ADDITIONAL REVISION OF COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW**

The proposed changes in the Comprehensive Review model represent an important, necessary, but incremental change in the admissions procedures. Because of the very short time frame and the necessity of responding to the changes in the UC eligibility construct for fall 2012, the committee restricted itself to consideration of factors that were currently available through the electronic read of admissions applications.

We were unable to consider factors that would require a human-review of the applications to identify factors such as leadership, significant community service, special talents
(i.e., Factor 11 as they are numbered in the list of BOARS recommendations). The committee recognizes that such factors may provide valuable information, but did not have adequate time to code those factors in the current applications, in order to run the simulations that would provide the empirically justified basis for incorporating such factors into the admissions equation. (One of the key factors in the time line is that changes in admissions must be made public and must be distributed to high schools prior to the start of the fall 2012 admissions cycle. Although Fall, 2012 may seem to be a long way off, the pathway from approval to public distribution is also a long process.)

Although the Admissions Committee has proposed small variations across the colleges, specifically to allow CNAS and BCoE to more carefully examine applications for evidence of mastery in mathematics, physics, and chemistry, the Committee has not yet given full attention to the consideration of college-specific, or major-specific, admissions criteria. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee will take up the consideration of these additional admissions criteria in March 2011 (after the divisional meeting for the UCR academic senate in February).

The Committee also plans to revisit the consideration of ELC after the fall 2012 admissions cycle. The fall 2012 admissions cycle will provide us with the first cohort of applicants for whom ELC data (based on the top 9% ELC) will be available.
APPENDIX A

CURRENT COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW CRITERIA

1. Academic grade point average in all completed “a-g” courses, including additional points for completed University-certified honors courses.

2. Scores on the ACT Assessment plus Writing or SAT Reasoning Test, and two SAT Subject tests.

3. Number of, content of, and performance in academic courses beyond the minimum “a-g” requirements.

4. Number of, and performance in University-approved honors courses and Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and transferable college courses.

5. Identification by UC as being ranked in the top 4 percent of the student’s high school class at the end of his or her junior year (“eligible in the local context” or ELC).

6. Quality of the student’s senior-year program, as measured by the type and number of academic courses in progress or planned.

7. Quality of the student’s academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in his or her high school.

8. Outstanding performance in one of more 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 GPA and the quality of coursework completed or in progress.

11. Special talents, achievements, and awards in a particular field, such as visual and performing arts, communication or 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; 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 student’s promise for contributing to the intellectual vitality of a campus.

12. Completion of special projects undertaken in the context of the student’s high school curriculum, or in conjunction with special school events, projects, or programs.

13. Academic accomplishments in light of the student’s life experiences and special circumstances.

14. Location of the student’s secondary school and residence.
APPENDIX B

Sample AIS Calculation Using Proposed Weights
Freshman Admissions, Fall 2012
University of California, Riverside

The Academic Index Score calculation is illustrated below, based on the weights on GPA, SAT, Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate courses, First Generation Status, and Low Income, as proposed by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Max Values</th>
<th>Max Values Scaled to SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>.5020</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>.4119</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB</td>
<td>.0673</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST GEN</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 1. Scale variables to SAT.
GPA is weighted more heavily than SAT, by a ratio of .5020/.4119 = 1.2187. Thus, the maximum GPA, scaled to SAT, and reflecting the higher weighting of GPA relative to SAT, is:

\[(.5020/.4119) \times 2400 = 2924.98\]

Advanced Placement Courses are weighted less heavily than SAT, by a ratio of .0673/.4119 = .1634. Thus, the maximum score for Advanced Placement Courses is:

\[(.0673/.4119) \times 2400 = 392.13\]

Step 2. Divide each score \(S_i\) by its maximum score \(S_i(max)\) to obtain the proportion of maximum, and sum over the scores. Multiply this sum by the total number of points (5827) to obtain the AIS Score.

\[\text{AIS} = 5827 \sum [S_i / S_i(max)] w_i\]

where \(s_i\) denotes the student’s scores on GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, \(S_i(max)\) are the maximum possible for GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, and \(w_i\) are the weights.
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Professor David R. Parker, Chair  
Executive Committee,  
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences  
University of California, Riverside  
Riverside, CA  92521  

January 19, 2011  

Dear David,  

I am writing to you in my capacity as the Chair of the Academic Senate Undergraduate Admissions Committee.  

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee voted to approve the following amendment to the admissions criteria (in addition to the calculation of the Academic Index Score) to be used for freshman admissions for the 2012 admissions cycle:  

“Applicants to the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences are strongly encouraged to take the SAT Math Subject exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam. Applicants are also strongly encouraged to take the ACT Science Reasoning Test and an AP Calculus exam.”  

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee also voted to approve a plan that would empower the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences to form a committee to review a subset of freshman applications that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off for the 2012 admissions cycle, and to make admissions decisions based on the criteria listed above. For this subset of applications, the committee may also, in making admissions decisions, consider the Math portion of the SAT Reasoning Test.  

These additions append the Undergraduate Admissions Committee’s November 9, 2010 Proposal to Modify the Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria. The November 9, 2010 proposal is also attached.  

In order for the Proposal, with the additions noted above, to go forward to the Academic Senate Divisional meeting, I ask that the CNAS Executive Committee vote on the proposal, as amended, at your earliest convenience.  

Sincerely,  

Steven E. Clark, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Undergraduate Admissions Committee
To: Mary Gauvain, Chair  
Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Undergraduate Admissions Committee:  
Steven Clark, Committee Chair (Department of Psychology)  
J. William Gary (Department of Physics and Astronomy)  
John Heraty (Department of Entomology, BOARS Representative)  
Ray Kea (Department of History)  
Mindy Marks (Department of Economics)  
Heejung Jung (Department of Mechanical Engineering)  
Adam Lukaszewski (Department of Botany and Plant Sciences)  
James Sandoval (Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs)

Re: Proposal to modify Comprehensive Review of admissions criteria and calculation of Academic Index Score (AIS) for freshman admissions, to be implemented for fall 2012.

January 21, 2011

The Academic Senate Undergraduate Admissions Committee proposes to modify the Comprehensive Review process for Freshman Admissions for the fall 2012 Admissions Cycle. The proposal and supporting documents are attached.

The original proposal (of November 9, 2010) has been revised to reflect the Admissions Committee’s consultation with faculty in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences and the Bourns College of Engineering. Memoranda reflecting those consultations are attached.

Sincerely,

Steven E. Clark, Chair  
Academic Senate  
Undergraduate Admissions Committee
Steve:

I think Mike and I can bless this on behalf of the Committee; it is 100% consistent with their intent when they voted to endorse the Larsen report from December.

If you would like, I can obtain a confirming vote next week, but I would like to make sure this gets on the agenda for the Division meeting (deadline is today I believe).

Let me know.

Dave

On 1/20/2011 5:30 PM, Steven Clark wrote:

    Hi David.
    The last eVote just came in that pushed the revised CNAS proposal over the top. It's a done deal.

    Can the CNAS executive committee approve the undergraduate admissions proposal for Comprehensive Review, amended as indicated in the my Jan 19th letter (which I've attached).

    -steve

David R. Parker
Chair of the Faculty, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
Professor, Department of Environmental Sciences
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
voice: 951-827-5126
fax: 951-827-3993
Date: January 21, 2011

To: Mary Gauvin
   Chair of the Academic Senate
   University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell
   Chair of the Faculty Executive Committee
   Bourns College of Engineering
   University of California, Riverside

RE: BCOE Amended Admissions Criteria

Dear Mary:

At our meeting today, the BCOE Executive Committee discussed and voted to approve the following amendment to the admissions criteria (in addition to the calculation of the Academic Index Score) to be used for Freshman admissions for the 2012 admissions cycle:

"Applicants to the Bourns College of Engineering should ensure strong preparation in Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics. Their mastery of Mathematics should cover at least Pre-Calculus, but an Advanced Placement course in Calculus is recommended. Applicants are strongly encouraged to provide evidence of adequate preparation by taking the SAT Math Subject exam, and either the Physics or Chemistry SAT Subject Exam, or the ACT Science Reasoning Test."

Please route this to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee for their approval as soon as possible, as BCOE would like to have it on the agenda of the next Division meeting. The request to the Undergraduate Admissions Committee is twofold:
   1. To approve the above amendment;
   2. To approve a plan that would empower BCOE to form a committee to review a subset of Freshman applications that have AIS scores below the AIS cut-off for the 2012 admissions cycle, and to make admissions decisions based on the criteria listed above and the Math portion of the SAT Reasoning Test.
TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
   Academic Senate

FROM: David Herzberger, Chair
      CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposal to Modify Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria and Calculation of Academic Index Score (AIS) for Freshman Admissions, to be Implemented for Fall 2012.

On January 5, 2011, the CHASS Executive Committee approved by majority vote the Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria and Calculation of Academic Index Scores for Freshman Admissions. All members of our committee appreciated the work undertaken by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee chaired by Steven Clarke; we also understand that the Admissions Committee had access to more data and more analyses than CHASS Exec, and that the Committee devoted a great deal of time to their deliberations. However, there were concerns raised both by those who voted in favor of the proposal and those who voted against it.

For those voting in favor of the proposal, the following reservations were voiced: UCR should maintain diversity in a broad sense, including cultural, racial, geographic, and socioeconomic backgrounds, as stated in the 1988 Regents' policy on admissions. To this end, we recommend that changes to the weighted criteria applied to admissions be changed incrementally. We note that academic success is only partially indicated by GPA. The goal of "raising the profile of UCR students" should not come at the expense of UCR's ethnic and economic diversity and access for low-income and first generation students. Finally, we strongly urge the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to integrate a firm timetable for implementation of a holistic approach to admissions, one that incorporates the 14 comprehensive review factors approved by BOARS.

For those voting against the proposal, the following reservations were raised (to a large degree these echo the concerns of the majority): UCR should take a more gradual approach to changing the weights used to determine the academic index score so that diversity will not be negatively affected. The minority felt that the concerns raised by several members of CHASS Exec were serious enough to require additional adjustments to the proposed weights. This group would like to see a proposed set of weights that seeks to improve academic performance--although perhaps by a little less--without reducing the share of minority students at UCR. This group was also concerned that impacts on other dimensions of diversity were not discussed in the proposal. Given these limitations, the minority favored a more cautious approach to increasing the weight on SAT scores and to reducing the weights on first generation status and low family income.
November 29, 2010

TO:  MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
     RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR:   GERHARD GIERZ, CHAIR
      COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

RE:   UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL

At the November 22 Committee on Preparatory Education meeting, Professor Steve Clark, chair of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, visited us to discuss the proposal to Modify Comprehensive Review of Admissions Criteria and Calculation of Academic Index Score for Freshman Admissions. We appreciate the detailed analyses and hard work done by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee.

We understand that this proposal represents a first step in a continuing process of refining admissions criteria.

We support the proposal. (10 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 1 Abstention).

In the future, the top 9% of graduating high school seniors will be “eligible in the local context” (ELC) to enroll at a UC campus, compared to the current top 4%. At the present time, we do not know how the Office of the President plans to deal with the additional ELC students, and this uncertainty raised serious concerns for members of the committee.

We have therefore requested Professor Clark report the following information to the Committee: 1) Does the Office of the President have a plan to allocate students who rank between the top four and nine percent of their high school classes? 2) If so, what are the primary features of this plan? 3) What proportion of these newly-eligible students will each campus be expected to admit? and 4) What will happen if these newly-eligible students are not admitted by any of the campuses as part of regular admissions practices?

The committee feels that it is essential that the new admissions policy to be embraced by all campuses and that all campuses, accordingly, admit a proportion of these newly-eligible students. This proportion might correspond, for example, to each campus’s state-funded undergraduate FTE count. Members of the Committee expressed a concern that our campus may otherwise carry a disproportionate share of the responsibility for admitting these newly-eligible students. Many of these students will be less well prepared for UC than students admitted under the previous admissions policy. If these less well-prepared students do not perform well at a
university level, it will be far more difficult for our campus to improve the academic profile of its undergraduate student population, an expressed goal of the campus strategic plan and one that members of the committee endorse.

In addition, the Committee feels that UC Riverside should have a plan to monitor the academic performance of these newly-eligible students once they are on campus. These studies should focus on comparisons of these newly-eligible students admitted from the top 4 percent of high school classes in terms of grades, academic probation, time to degree, and retention.

Future refinements of the undergraduate admissions policy may allow different Colleges or even different programs to develop admissions criteria linked to College or Department specific correlates of success. For instance, the Art Department might request that the students submit a portfolio, while CNAS and BCOE might require that students take the SAT II Mathematics test and achieve a minimum score on that test. Our committee supports continued work of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to refine admissions criteria along these lines and in other ways that will improve the academic profile and success of the campus’s undergraduate student body.

In addition, we understand that the Admissions Office is planning to employ wait lists this year. We support the use of wait lists to eliminate the costly over-enrollments we have seen in the last two years.
November 27, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR, RIVERSIDE DIVISION
CC: RISE AXELROD, CHAIR, COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

FM: ERIK ROLLAND, CHAIR, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
     SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION/AGSM

RE: New Undergraduate Admission Criteria

During its November 16 (2010) meeting, the Executive Committee of SoBA discussed in depth the UGA proposal to modify the criteria for freshman admissions. While the report seems to reflect the four stated goals, the committee felt that the report needs much improvement, particularly in its explanation of how the results were obtained (statistics, BOARS references, methods, results, etc.). The statistics/econometrics need to be explained fully, so that the reader can understand what was tested and how. On the content side, the committee felt that there is need for an audit of the implications of this report. The SoBA EC agrees with moving towards a more holistic admissions criteria, as the variables and regression in the report show a clear lack of correlation between the measures currently used. It is apparent that the admissions criteria should be studied in depth, using more advanced statistical and econometric methods – this could (and should) be a full research project for the right individual or group on campus.

In summary, we feel that the report sheds very little light on the implications of the new criteria, and that this must be considered an experiment until the implications are better understood. The report also needs clarifications and improvements – both in write-up and methodology.

[Signature]
November 24, 2010

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF ADMISSIONS CRITERIA AND
CALCULATION OF ACADEMIC INDEX SCORE FOR FRESHMAN
ADMISSIONS

During its November 18 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the
aforementioned proposal from the Undergraduate Admissions. We appreciated the visit from
Professor Mindy Marks of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, who outlined the
background and justification for the proposal. We also appreciated the detailed analyses that the
UAC has done to come this far. The proposal seemed appropriate for the time and therefore, we
voted to approve the proposed AIS weights (12 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 0 Abstentions).

As a separate issue, the CEP requests that the AIS scale (that is, the maximum value for this
quantity) be standardized in order to simplify longitudinal studies of admission trends.

The Committee understands that the admissions process will use waiting lists this year and
requests to be kept informed on the details of their implementation (including the targets
proposed by the colleges and any department or program) and, eventually, of the effectiveness of
the new admissions process (including the extent to which targets were met and statistics on the
consequences of the new AIS weights), and plans for improvement.