COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

MEMBERS’ HANDBOOK

2016-2017
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Committee on Undergraduate Admissions Membership 2016-17** 3

**Introduction** 4
- Senate Regulations Pertaining to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions
- Composition
- Leadership Roles
- Meeting Schedule
- Online Resources

**Glossary of Admissions Terms** 6

**A-G Courses** 7

**UCR Admissions Process** 11

**Holistic Review** 13

**Path to UC for CA Residents** 14

**Transfer Admissions** 15

**Blue & Gold Opportunity Plan** 17

**Appendix 1:** Guidelines for Admission by Exception 18

**Appendix 2:** 2016 Admissions Data 24

**Appendix 3:** 2016 UC Application & Personal Insight Questions Guide 26

**Appendix 4:** Proposal to Modify the Comprehensive Review for Freshman Admissions The Fall 2012 Admissions Cycle 40

**Appendix 5:** AIS Calculation 62

**Appendix 6:** April 23, 2015 Request to Opt Out of Holistic Review 64
COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS
COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP
2016-17

Peter Sadler, Earth Sciences (Chair & BOARS Rep.)
Khaleel Abdulrazak, Psychology
Uma Jayakumar, GSoE
Mart Molle, Computer Science
Kristoffer Neville, Art History
David Volz, Environmental Sciences
Jim Sandoval, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (Ex Officio)
TBD, CNAS

TBD, ASUCR Student Representative

Beth Beatty, Committee on Undergraduate Admissions Analyst
Academic Senate
University Office Building (UOB), room 232
951-827-2544 (x-22544)
beth.beatty@ucr.edu
INTRODUCTION

This handbook is a compilation of relevant bylaws of the Academic Senate related to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions (UAC), a standing committee of the Senate and descriptions of common practice. The handbook is intended to provide UAC members with an overview of the committee’s responsibilities and procedures and to provide a glossary and additional information on admissions terms and practices to assist them in carrying out their duties and responsibilities.

A. Senate Regulations Pertaining to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

Senate bylaw 8.23 establishes the duties and membership of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and is written as follows:

8.23 Undergraduate Admissions Committee (En 5 Jun 75) (Am 19 May 09)

8.23.1 The Committee consists of seven members of the Division, one of whom shall be the Chair; one Divisional representative to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools; one undergraduate student representative, who shall not have the right to vote; and the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, ex officio, or his/her designee. The Chair can also serve as the Division representative in addition to his or her Chair duties. (Am 5 Nov 87)(Am 18 Nov 03) (Am 19 May 09) (Am 28 May 13)

8.23.2 It is the duty of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee to: (Am 19 May 09)

8.23.2.1 Advise the Division and the administration on matters having to do with admissions and enrollment on the Riverside campus. These matters, which are the primary concern of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee, include but are not limited to: recruitment and outreach; special action admissions; articulation with community colleges; and relations with high schools and community colleges. (Am 5 Nov 87)(Am 19 May 09)

B. Composition

The Committee is composed of 7 members and the only Committee officer is the Chair. One member of the Committee, often the Chair, serves as the Divisional representative to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs also serves on the Committee as an ex officio with voting rights.

Per Bylaw 8.2.5, each committee must annually adopt a Conflict of Interest Statement to ensure committee business is being conducted with the highest possible degree of credibility. The Committee’s full Conflict of Interest Statement is as follows:

If a member of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee has personal affiliation with a department or a program bringing business before the committee, this should be brought to the attention of the committee. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee at that time will vote (1) to allow or disallow the member from participating in the discussion of the item of business in question or (2) to allow or disallow the member from voting on a motion(s) related to the item of business in question. If a member's spouse, partner, or family member (current, former, or future) brings business before the committee, the member will be automatically recused from all discussion and voting on the motion(s) related to the item of business brought before the Committee.
C. Leadership Roles

The Chair of the Committee is appointed by the Committee on Committees. The Chair’s responsibilities include conducting Committee meetings; writing correspondence on behalf of the Committee; representing the Committee on the Academic Senate Executive Council; and representing UAC on BOARS as an ex officio on the Committee on Preparatory Education.

The BOARS Representative is appointed by the Committee on Committees for typically a 2 year term and can be the Chair of UAC. BOARS is the Systemwide equivalent of the campus Committee on Undergraduate Admissions. Each campus has a representative to BOARS. The BOARS representative will report a summary of BOARS activities at each UAC meeting and leads discussions on topics of interest to it. The following is the link to the BOARS webpage, which includes the BOARS charge, roster, agendas, reports, and resources: http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/boars/.

A member of the Committee is appointed as a representative and Chair of the Special Review Committee (SRC) at the beginning of each academic year. The Special Review Committee review applicants who do not qualify for Admission by Exception (AxE) and make final admissions decisions for such applicants based on its assessment of the likelihood of their academic success at UCR. The SRC meets approximately 3-4 times a year with the majority of meetings occurring during the winter and spring quarters. More information on the SRC can be found in the Guidelines for AxE in the appendix of this handbook.

D. Meeting Schedules

The Committee meets on the first and third Wednesday of every month from 10AM to 12PM. Meetings are scheduled with consideration of the Academic Senate meeting schedule to prepare business for submission to the Senate. The Academic Senate Executive Council, on which the Chair serves, meets twice a month.

E. Online Resources

UAC maintains its own page on the UCR Academic Senate website at http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=23. Many materials regarding the policies and procedures of UAC are posted there for the convenience of members and for the campus faculty at large.

UAC also maintains the Academic Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions iLearn page that all members have access to. All meeting agendas, reports, data, and BOARS agendas and correspondence are posted to the iLearn page.

The following webpages also serve as a resource to the Committee:

UCR Undergraduate Admissions Webpage: http://admissions.ucr.edu/

University of California Admissions Webpage: http://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/
GLOSSARY OF ADMISSIONS TERMS

AIS: Academic Index Score (used in UCR's Comprehensive Review Model)

AP: Advanced Placement course

APP: Admission Preparation Program

AxE: Admission by Exception

ASSIST: ASSIST is an online student-transfer information system that shows how course credits earned at one public California college or university can be applied when transferred to another. ASSIST is the official repository of articulation for California’s public colleges and universities and provides the most accurate and up-to-date information about student transfer in California.

BOARS: Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (Systemwide Committee)

D/N: Direct and New applicants

ELC: Eligible in the Local Context (top 9% of CA high school graduates)

ETR: Entitled to Review

IB: International Baccalaureate course/certificate/diploma

IGETC: Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum

QOT: Qualified On-Track (segment of high school graduates just under ELC)

SIR: Statement of Intent to Register (Freshman Deadline: May 1; Transfer Deadline: June 1)

SRC: Special Review Committee (policy included in AxE guidelines)

TAG: UC Transfer Admissions Guarantee

TAP: UC Transfer Admissions Planner
A-G COURSES

To be considered for admission to a UC campus, students must complete 15 yearlong high school courses with a grade of C or better – at least 11 of them prior to the student’s senior year. Taking approved high school ("a-g") courses is not the only way to satisfy these requirements. They can also be met by completing college courses or earning certain scores on SAT, Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate exams.

A) History/social science

UC-approved high school courses
Two years of history/social science, including:
- one year of world history, cultures and geography (may be a single yearlong course or two one-semester courses), and
- one year of U.S. history or one-half year of U.S. history and one-half year of civics or American government

SAT Subject Examination
U.S. History: Score of 550 satisfies one year.
World History: Score of 540 satisfies one year.

AP or IB Examination
U.S. History: score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP U.S. History exam; score of 5, 6 or 7 on the IB History of the Americas HL exam

U.S. Government: Score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP Exam satisfies a half year.

World History/Cultures/Geography: score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP exam in European History, World History or Human Geography; score of 5, 6 or 7 on the IB History HL or Geography HL exam

College courses
U.S. History/Civics/American Government: grade of C or better in a transferable course of 3 or more semester (4 or more quarter) units in U.S. history, civics or American government

World History/Cultures/Geography: grade of C or better in a transferable course of 3 or more semester (4 or more quarter) units in world history, cultures and geography

B) English

UC-approved high school courses
Four years of college-preparatory English that include frequent writing, from brainstorming to final paper, as well as reading of classic and modern literature. No more than one year of ESL-type courses can be used to meet this requirement.

SAT Reasoning Examination
Writing section: Score of 560 satisfies first three years; score of 680 satisfies entire four-year requirement.

ACT with Writing
Combined English/Writing or English Language Arts (ELA) score of 24 satisfies first three years; score of 30 satisfies entire requirement.

SAT Subject Examination
Literature: Score of 560 satisfies first three years.
AP or IB Examination
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP English Language and Composition or English Literature and Composition Exam; score of 5, 6 or 7 on the IB HL English: Literature exam (formerly IB HL English A1)

College courses
For each year required through the 11th grade, a grade of C or better in a course of 3 or more semester (4 or more quarter) units in English composition, literature (American or English) or foreign literature in translation. Courses used to satisfy the fourth year and/or the entire requirement must be transferable. For lower-division transfer, all courses must be transferable. Literature courses must include substantial work in composition.

C) Mathematics

UC-approved high school courses
Three years (four years recommended) of college-preparatory mathematics that include the topics covered in elementary and advanced algebra and two- and three-dimensional geometry. Approved integrated math courses may be used to fulfill part or all of this requirement, as may math courses taken in the seventh and eighth grades if the high school accepts them as equivalent to its own courses.

SAT Subject Examination
Math Level 1: Score of 570 satisfies the two years of required elementary and advanced algebra.
Math Level 2: Score of 480 satisfies the two years of required elementary and advanced algebra.

AP or IB Examination
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP Statistics Exam satisfies elementary and intermediate algebra.
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP Calculus AB or Calculus BC Exam satisfies three years.
Score of 5, 6, or 7 on the IB Mathematics HL exam

College courses
Three semester (4 quarter) units of non-transferable college courses in elementary algebra, geometry, intermediate algebra or trigonometry, with a grade of C or better, satisfy one year of the math requirement.

Grade of C or better in a transferable mathematics course of at least 3 semester (4 quarter units) that has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite satisfies the entire requirement. Freshman applicants cannot satisfy the entire 3-year requirement with a statistics course alone.

D) Laboratory science

UC-approved high school courses
Two years (three years recommended) of laboratory science providing fundamental knowledge in two of these three foundational subjects: biology, chemistry and physics. The final two years of an approved three-year integrated science program that provides rigorous coverage of at least two of the three foundational subjects may be used to fulfill this requirement.

SAT Subject Examination
Each test clears one year:
- Biology: Score of 540
- Chemistry: Score of 530
- Physics: Score of 530

AP or IB Examination
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on any two AP Exams in Biology, Chemistry, Physics (B, C, 1 or 2) and Environmental Science; score of 5, 6 or 7 on any two IB HL exams in Biology, Chemistry or Physics

**College courses**
For each year of the requirement, a grade of C or better in a transferable course of at least 3 semester (4 au in a natural (physical or biological) science with at least 30 hours of laboratory (not "demonstration")

**E) Language other than English**

**UC-approved high school courses**
Two years, or equivalent to the 2nd level of high school instruction, of the same language other than English are required. (Three years/3rd level of high school instruction recommended). Courses should emphasize speaking and understanding, and include instruction in grammar, vocabulary, reading, composition and culture. American Sign Language and classical languages, such as Latin and Greek, are acceptable. Courses taken in the seventh and eighth grades may be used to fulfill part or all of this requirement if the high school accepts them as equivalent to its own courses.

**SAT Subject Examination**
The following scores satisfy the entire requirement:
- Chinese With Listening: 520
- French/French With Listening: 540
- German/German With Listening: 510
- Modern Hebrew: 470
- Italian: 520
- Japanese With Listening: 510
- Korean With Listening: 500
- Latin: 530
- Spanish/Spanish With Listening: 520

**AP or IB Examination**
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP Exam in Chinese Language and Culture, French Language and Culture, German Language and Culture, Italian Language and Culture, Japanese Language and Culture, Spanish Language, Spanish Language and Culture, Spanish Literature and Culture or Latin; score of 5, 6 or 7 on an IB Language A2 HL exam

**College courses**
Grade of C or better in any transferable course(s) (excluding conversation) held by the college to be equivalent to two years of high school language. Many colleges list the prerequisites for their second course in language as "Language 1 at this college or two years of high school language." In this case, Language 1 clears both years of the requirement.

**F) Visual and performing arts**

**UC-approved high school courses**
One yearlong course of visual and performing arts chosen from the following: dance, drama/theater, music or visual art

**AP or IB Examination**
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on the AP History of Art, Studio Art or Music Theory Exam; score of 5, 6 or 7 on any one IB HL exam in Dance, Film, Music, Theatre Arts or Visual Arts

**College courses**
Grade of C or better in any transferable course of 3 semester (4 quarter) units that clearly falls within one of four visual/performing arts disciplines: dance, drama/theater, music or visual art

G) College-preparatory elective

UC-approved high school courses
One year (two semesters), in addition to those required in "a-f" above, chosen from the following areas: visual and performing arts (non-introductory-level courses), history, social science, English, advanced mathematics, laboratory science and language other than English (a third year in the language used for the "e" requirement or two years of another language)

SAT Subject Examination
U.S. History: Score of 550
World History: Score of 540
Writing/English Compositions or Literature: Score of 560
Mathematics Level 2: Score of 520
Science (other than taken for "d" requirement): Same tests and scores as listed above under "d"

Language Other Than English, third year
- Chinese With Listening: 570
- French/French With Listening: 590
- German/German With Listening: 570
- Modern Hebrew: 500
- Italian: 570
- Japanese With Listening: 570
- Korean With Listening: 550
- Latin: 580
- Spanish/Spanish With Listening: 570

A second Language Other Than English: Same tests and scores as listed under "e"

AP or IB Examination
Score of 3, 4 or 5 on any one AP Exam in Computer Science A, Computer Science AB, Microeconomics, Macroeconomics, Human Geography, Psychology, U.S. Government or Comparative Government; score of 5, 6 or 7 on any one IB HL exam in Economics, Philosophy, Psychology, Social and Cultural Anthropology, or Computer Science

College courses
Grade of C or better in transferable college courses of at least 3 semester (4 quarter) units beyond those listed above as clearing any of the "a-f" requirements.
UCR ADMISSION PROCESS

Comprehensive Review is the current admissions process that UCR (and all UC campuses) utilize. The process evaluates applicants’ academic achievements in light of the opportunities available to them and takes into consideration the capacity each student demonstrates to contribute to the intellectual life of the campus. The process consists of 14 academic and personal factors with the highest importance placed on academic achievements, however, academic accomplishments alone do not guarantee admission to a particular campus.

The **14 academic and personal factors** are:

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

2. Scores on the following tests: ACT with Writing or the SAT Reasoning Test.

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


5. Identification by UC as being ranked in the top 9 percent of your high school class at the end of your junior year (Eligible in the Local Context, or ELC).

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

7. Quality of your academic performance relative to the educational opportunities available in your high school.

8. Outstanding performance in one or more specific 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 your high school curriculum or in conjunction with special school events, projects or programs.

13. Academic accomplishments in light of your life experiences and special circumstances, including but 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 your secondary school and residence.

Currently UCR only considers 5 of the 14 factors when considering admissions. The Undergraduate Admissions Committee selected 5 of the 14 criteria to use based on 1) factors that are “machine readable”; 2) factors that are best predictive of student success at UCR and; 3) factors that contribute to the diversity of the undergraduate student body. UCB, UCD, UCI, UCLA, UCSD and UCSC use a form of comprehensive review called holistic review (or single score review) that considers all 14 comprehensive review criteria. UCSB uses a hybrid approach that considers GPA, test scores and A-G coursework (50%) and Awards and Activities (50%). UCM admits all UC eligible students. The admissions model was last updated by the Committee for the 2012 admissions cycle and the proposal to make the change can be found in Appendix 2.

The criteria used for comprehensive review are calculated with the Academic Index Score (AIS). The following is the current AIS model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Weight Assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA (weighted/capped)</td>
<td>.5020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT</td>
<td>.4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of AP/IB Courses</td>
<td>.0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The formula for calculating the AIS can be found in Appendix 3.

UC Riverside admits freshman applicants by major. Differential AIS cut offs are determined at the individual college and major level based on college and major enrollment targets. AIS cut offs are determined by the Associate Deans (in consultation with the Deans and Provost/EVC) after reviewing the predictive enrollment regression model developed by Institutional Research.

UCR’s comprehensive review model does not require a “tie-breaking” process or an augmented review process. Tie-breaking is needed when too many students have the same “score” assigned and if every student with that score was admitted, the campus, college or department risks enrolling too many students. Augmented review is a process currently used by several campuses in order to gain additional information from a sub-set of students to make a more informed admission decision.

Every year UCOP conducts a verification process on a sub-set of the applicant pool that is randomly selected and asked to verify designated (non-academic) portions of what was reported on an application. Students are asked to verify employment, activities, leadership roles and awards. If a student does not respond to the verification request, their application is cancelled. If a student is found to have misrepresented themselves on the application, the application is cancelled and is the student is permanently flagged at UCOP to alert campuses of the previous falsification if the student applies again in the future.

1 Weighted and capped GPA is the standard GPA used by all UC campuses to determine eligibility to UC. The weighted/capped GPA weights up to eight semesters of AP, IB, and/or UC approved honors level coursework.
HOLISTIC REVIEW

Holistic Review is one method of implementation of comprehensive review. It is the process of admissions that allows for the establishment of admissions selection criteria that is consistent with the campus’ mission, values, and goals for undergraduate education, insofar as they are consistent with University-wide criteria. The process of holistic review is data-driven and rely on a variety of academic and socioeconomic indicators that are available electronically to all campuses via a “read sheet”.

In 2011, the Regents passed a resolution on holistic review that recommended single-score holistic evaluation as the expected implementation of Comprehensive Review for admissions at UC campuses. However, in the resolution, the Regents allowed for flexibility for campuses that can demonstrate that alternate approaches employed by their campuses are equally effective in meeting campus and University goals.

In the Spring of 2015, after a thorough review of the effectiveness of the current admissions process at UCR, the UAC determined that the current method of comprehensive review was an effective model of admissions for UCR. UAC sent a letter to BOARS requesting that UCR opt out of holistic review and continue to use the current model for admissions. The letter to opt out of holistic review can be found in Appendix 4.

The following UC Campuses currently use Holistic Review model of admissions:
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Davis
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, San Diego
University of California, Santa Cruz
TWO PATHS TO UC FOR CA RESIDENTS: STATEWIDE & LOCAL

For the highest-achieving California applicants to the UC, there are two programs that guarantee admission at a UC campus. If students are not admitted to any of the UC campuses they apply to, they will be offered a spot at another campus if there is space.

Students that rank in the top 9 percent of California students according to the UC admissions index are eligible for admission to a UC campus through the Statewide Index.

Students that rank in the top 9 percent of their graduating class at a participating California high school are eligible for admission to a UC campus through the Eligible in the Local Context path (ELC). The ELC program ensures that academically talented and deserving California resident students from all over the state have the opportunity to attend a UC campus. ELC status adds value to the application and is one of the 14 factors considered when applications are reviewed. Additionally, ELC students not admitted to any of their campus choices are offered a spot at a UC campus that has space, if minimum UC requirements are met.
UCR does not use comprehensive review to admit transfer students.

The following factors qualify a student as a transfer student:

- Registered at a college or university for a regular session (besides the summer after graduation) after completing high school. Students are not allowed to disregard your college record and apply as freshman.
- Transferring from a four-year university, out of state community college or another UC campus.
- Transferring from a California Community College.

The following are the required classes that transfer students must complete:

- Complete 60 semester (90 quarter) units of transferable college credit with a minimum GPA of 2.4 (California residents) or 2.8 (nonresidents). Admission is selective. Strive to surpass the minimum GPA. No more than 14 semester (21 quarter) units may be Pass/Not Pass.
- Complete (with grades C or better) the UC Seven Course Pattern:
  - 2 courses in English Composition
  - 1 course in mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning
  - 4 courses selected from at least two of the following subject areas: arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, physical and biological sciences.
  - Each course must be transferable and worth at least 3 semester (4-5) quarter units.

Students transferring from California Community Colleges may be eligible for the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) program that guarantee students admission to UCR through the completion of certain coursework.

Transfer students can use the ASSIST, online student-transfer information system to determine how course credits earned at a public California college or university can be applied when transferring to another. ASSIST is the official repository of articulation for California's public colleges and universities and provides the most accurate and up-to-date information about student transfer in California.

The Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) is a series of courses that prospective transfer students attending California community colleges may complete to satisfy the lower-division breadth/general education requirements at both the University of California and the California State University.

In addition, transfer students need to meet major selection criteria. Each major has different prerequisites, required GPA and overall selection criteria. The following is the minimum selection criteria for each college:

- **BCOE** - Students are selected on the basis of academic preparation. Admission is selective based on the GPA in all transferable coursework with a minimum GPA of 2.8, and completion of required major preparatory course work.
- **CHASS** - Admission is selective based on GPA in all transferable coursework with a minimum GPA of 2.4. Neuroscience, Psychology, and Psychology/Law and Society applicants must have a minimum GPA of 2.7 in all transferable college coursework.
- **CNAS** - Students are selected primarily on the basis of academic preparation, as assessed by their GPA in academic coursework and strength of preparation for the intended major.
Admission is selective based on the GPA in all transferable coursework with a minimum GPA of 2.7 and completion of required major preparatory coursework.

- **SoBA** - The Business Administration major is selective based on GPA and the strength of academic preparation for the major. Students must: 1.) Complete community college courses equivalent to seven lower division UCR Business Administration major requirements listed on [ASSIST](#); 2.) Attain a minimum GPA of 2.7 in all UC-transferable coursework and a minimum 2.5 GPA in the seven lower division major prerequisites. These GPAs are a baseline for consideration and not a guarantee of admission; and 3.) Complete IGETC or the UCR breadth pattern for the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences.
BLUE AND GOLD OPPORTUNITY PLAN

Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan is a financial aid program intended to expand access to UC for lower-income students.

The Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan ensures that students will not have to pay UC’s Systemwide tuition and fees out of their own pocket if they are a California resident whose total family income is less than $80,000 a year and who qualifies for financial aid. Students apply for the plan through the completion of the FAFSA/California Dream Act Application + Cal Grant GPA Verification Form. If eligible, the plan combines all sources of scholarship and grant awards received (federal, state, UC and private) to go toward covering students’ Systemwide tuition and fees. Students with greater financial need can qualify for even more grant support to help defray other educational expenses (like books, housing, transportation, etc.).

The eligibility requirements to qualify for the Blue and Gold Plan are as follows:

- Submission of a FAFSA or California Dream Act Application and Cal Grant GPA Verification Form by March 2
- California resident or have AB 540 status
- Demonstrate total family income below $80,000 and financial need, as determined for federal need-based aid programs
- Be in the first four years as a UC undergraduate (first two for transfer students)
- Meet other campus basic requirements for UC grant aid (for example, be enrolled at least half-time during the academic year, meet campus academic progress standards, not be in default on student loans, etc.)
Admission by Exception (AxE) is an offer of admission reserved for applicants who meet the minimum academic requirements and
1. Have a special talent, or
2. Have attained academic achievement despite major disadvantages compared to other students.

Effective Fall 2006, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions may admit the number of AxE applicants required to yield 6% of total freshman enrollment and 6% of total transfer enrollment.

Up to 1% of the AxE enrollments may be reserved for Special Talent applicants and the remaining 5% may be reserved for Disadvantaged applicants.

The following criteria have been developed and approved by the Undergraduate Admissions Committee of the UC Riverside Academic Senate.

I. Minimum Academic Requirements

Applicants who are ineligible will meet the following minimum academic criteria in order to be considered for AxE.

Freshman Applicant
1. GPA – 3.00 minimum in a-g subjects.
2. SAT Reasoning - 420 minimum score on the Math component and a 420 minimum score on either of the two remaining components (Critical Reading and Writing).
3. ACT composite score of 17 (sum of SAT Critical Reading and Math = 830) and a minimum ACT English/Writing score of 17 (SAT Writing = 420).
   • Applicants who are unable to meet the above exam requirement prior to high school graduation because either, 1) the exams are not offered in their home country and/or 2) they will participate in the UCR Extension Intensive English program prior to taking the exams, may be considered for admission by completing the exams post high school graduation.
4. a-g Course Omissions - 3 courses or less (no Math or English omissions/deficiencies are allowed).
5. Transferrable coursework taken after the summer following high school graduation – up to 30 units of transferrable coursework can be considered for freshman admission for international students in the Admission Preparation Program and other circumstances as warranted.
6. Gap Year – Freshman applicants with a gap in their educational record of up to two years may be considered for freshman admission.

Transfer Applicant
1. GPA - 2.00 minimum allowed in transferable courses.
2. Units - A minimum of 24 transferable quarter units.
3. Subject Requirements – At least one transferable English Composition course, one transferable math course (has intermediate algebra as a prerequisite), and one appropriate third course from the required 7-course pattern.

All applicants who meet the above academic criteria may compete equally for AxE consideration. Declining academic performance is a factor used to defer applicants even though they may meet the criteria described above. Exceptions to the above criteria are rare. Applicants who do not meet these criteria must demonstrate acceptable alternative academic achievement (see below: IV. Special Committee Review).

II. Definitions of Applicants to be Considered for AxE

1. Special Talent Applicants (up to 1%) – Applicants satisfying the above-stated minimum academic requirements may be considered for AxE if one or more of the following factors have been demonstrated at an exceptional level:

   - outstanding achievement in a specific subject area;
   - self-motivation and initiative;
   - leadership;
   - public or community service;
   - athletics;
   - completion of significant special projects;
   - special endorsement of academic promise from their school;
   - demonstration of academic promise by achievement in specific areas of study; and/or
   - marked improvement in academic performance as demonstrated by academic grade point average and/or enrollment in accelerated, challenging course work (e.g., honors, Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and transferable college courses).

   There is no specific breakdown of the 1% according to these factors. In particular, there is no assumption that there must be a balance of students admitted from the spectrum of factors. Thus, one or just a few factors may account for the majority of special talent admissions. At the same time, however, no one special talent factor should prevent other factors from being fully considered and accommodated.

2. Disadvantaged Applicants (up to 5%) - Students satisfying the above-stated minimum academic requirements may be considered for AxE if they have demonstrated academic achievement in the presence of major disadvantages compared to typical student applicants. Disadvantages may include geographical, physical, psychological, financial, or personal and may include, but are not limited to:

   - **Low Income**: Family income and household size will be used to determine if an applicant is financially disadvantaged. The family income cutoff will be directly linked to the size of the family. A scale is used to assign variable points. The actual income cutoffs would be based upon annually published federal standards. The University of California Office of the President will provide the Undergraduate Admissions office applicable standards on an annual basis.
   - **First-Generation College Attendee**: Parents of applicant have not attended college or have just recently begun attending college.
• Disability (Learning, Physical, and/or Psychological): Applicant will require further review by Student Special Services for recommendation.
• English as a Second Language: Applicant’s native language is other than English.
• Veteran: Applicant is veteran of U.S. military.
• Re-entry: Applicant is 24 years of age or older by term of entry and has been out of school for two years or more.
• Unusual Life Circumstances/Personal Hardship Indicators: Applicant is or has one or more of the following: ward of the court; recent or chronic illness/injury; lives in foster home; comes from single parent family; single parent; runaway; death in the immediate family (parent, guardian, sibling); homeless; emancipated minor; incarcerated parent; a current/former inmate of a correctional facility; parolee; and/or a victim of physical/sexual abuse.
• Location of Residence and/or Limited Educational Opportunity Indicators: Applicant lives in or around one or more of the following: inner city dwelling/school or rural dwelling/school community with a high crime rate, high unemployment rate, and/or low education level.
• Applicant Attends High School Where the Following Occurs: Applicant is bussed to school (therefore, cannot participate in extra curricular/enriching activities); high school does not offer AP/Honors curriculum or high school does not send many applicants to UC; and/or high school has low college-going rate, low high school graduation rate, and low high school test scores (mean average less than 500 on SAT I Math and Verbal).
• Job: Applicant is working during school year to supplement family income, save for college, or fulfill other basic needs.
• Recent Immigrant Status: Applicant has moved within last six years from non-English speaking country.
• Applicant from Another Country: Applicant attended high school or higher level education in another country and is unable to meet traditional UC admission requirements.

The mere presence of one or more of the above factors does not justify review for AxE since such factors exist to some degree for many applicants. Review is justified only in situations where the student’s achievement, despite harsh challenges, is truly astounding. Such situations are expected to be rare.

******************************************************************************

III. Review Process
Applicants who qualify for AxE may be identified by the Undergraduate Admissions office in its regular review of applications, by academic departments, or by the Athletics Department. Applicants identified through any of the aforementioned offices will be processed as follows:

1. **Undergraduate Admissions Office:** Applicants identified by the Undergraduate Admissions office will be forwarded by the Admissions Counselor to the Assistant Director - Freshman Evaluations, the Assistant Director - Transfer Evaluations, or the Assistant Director - International Evaluations as appropriate. Upon review and in consultation with the Director of Admissions, a decision will be made to determine if an AxE offer will be made.

2. **Academic Departments:** Academic departments, which independently identify applicants, will prepare a letter of endorsement and forward it to the Undergraduate
Admissions office for a final decision. The application file will be reviewed by the Assistant Director - Freshman, Transfer, or International Evaluations, who will consult with the Director of Admissions to determine if an AxE offer will be made.

3. **Athletics Department**: The Athletics Department will prepare a letter of endorsement and forward it to the Undergraduate Admissions office for a final decision. Upon receipt of the Athletic Release Authorization Form and the Request for Admission by Exception Form, the Assistant Director - Freshman, Transfer, or International Evaluations will process the AxE offer.

************************************************************************

**IV. Special Review Committee**

Applicants who do not qualify for AxE and are supported by a UCR faculty, staff, or department may be reviewed by a Special Review Committee (See Appendix A.)
Appendix A

Special Review Committee (SRC)

Charge:
Applicants who do not qualify for Admission by Exception and are supported by a UCR faculty, staff, or department may be reviewed by a Special Review Committee comprised of UCR faculty, with faculty or staff from the appropriate UCR unit, staff from the Academic Resource Center, and the Director of Undergraduate Admissions as Ex-Officio members. The Special Review Committee will make final admissions decisions for such applicants based on its assessment of the likelihood of their academic success at UCR, which in turn is based on:

1. Academic history as reported on the Application for Undergraduate Admissions and Scholarships;
2. An academic evaluation by the Undergraduate Admissions office of all requested official transcripts and completed test scores;
3. The Personal Statement; and other relevant materials provided to the Special Review Committee for consideration
4. Additional requested materials.

As a condition of admission, the Special Review Committee may require the applicant to:
1. Meet specific goals at The Academic Resource Center; and/or
2. Meet specific goals from the Athletics Department’s required Study Table; and/or
3. Meet other conditions as deemed appropriate.

There will be approximately 3-4 meetings each year with the majority of the meetings occurring during the winter and spring quarters. Meetings may occur during the summer only when necessary.

Membership:
The Special Review Committee is comprised of at least four Academic Senate faculty members and up to five non-voting University faculty or staff members in Ex-Officio status. Membership is as follows:

Senate Faculty Members
Undergraduate Admissions Committee Representative, Chair
-Appointed by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions
Faculty Representative from CHASS
-Appointed by the Committee on Committees
Faculty Representative from CNAS
-Appointed by the Committee on Committees
Faculty Representative from BCOE
-Appointed by the Committee on Committees
Faculty Representative
-Appointed by the Committee on Committees

Ex-Officio Members
ACE Program Coordinator, The Academic Resource Center
Director of Undergraduate Admissions
Admissions Counselor
Faculty Athletic Representative to NCAA when appropriate
Chair, Committee on International Education when appropriate
Other pertinent individuals as deemed appropriate by the chair
Voting members must recuse themselves from any case file for which they serve as the faculty advocate. Further the SRC shall be considered a senate committee for the purpose of executing an annual COI.
APPENDIX 2

2016 UCR ADMISSIONS DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of UCR Applicants</th>
<th>UCR Applicants Admitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>42,625</td>
<td>28,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>10,967</td>
<td>6,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53,592</td>
<td>34,640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Generation</th>
<th>Average GPA</th>
<th>Average SAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCR did over enroll for Fall 2016. Although final numbers will come after the 3rd week of instruction. Preliminarily data shows that UCR will come in 330 over target for Freshman California Resident students, 100 under for Transfer California Resident students, under target for Freshman Nonresident students and slightly under target for Transfer nonresident students.

As of 9/29/2016, 2% of enrolled students did not meet minimum UC requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman 2016 Targets</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Nonresident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>2494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4819</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer 2016 Targets</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Nonresident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCOE</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASS</td>
<td>722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNAS</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBA</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE APPLICATION STATUS REPORT
FALL 2016
(as of Friday, September 23, 2016)

Freshmen

Transfers
Getting started

This worksheet is designed to help freshman applicants start the writing process for the personal insight questions in the undergraduate admissions application. Additional hints and suggestions can be found on UC's admissions website at ucal.us/personalquestions.

What are the personal insight questions?

These questions are about getting to know you better — your life experience, interests, ambitions and inspirations. Think of it as your interview with the admissions office. Be open. Be reflective. Find your individual voice and express it.

While this section of the application is just one part we consider when making our admission decision, it helps provide context for the rest of your application.

The basics

• You will have 8 questions to choose from. You must respond to any 4 of the 8 questions.

• Each response is limited to a maximum of 350 words.

• Which questions you choose to answer is entirely up to you: But you should select questions that are most relevant to your experience and that best reflect your individual circumstances.

• All questions are equal: All questions are given equal consideration in the application review process, which means there is no advantage or disadvantage to choosing certain questions over others.

Freshman questions & brainstorm exercise

The following exercises are suggestions to help you get started. Remember, you don’t have to answer all eight questions – you only need to answer four. So if some questions aren’t the right fit for you, that’s OK. The important thing is expressing who you are, what matters to you and what you want to share with UC.

1. Describe an example of your leadership experience in which you have positively influenced others, helped resolve disputes, or contributed to group efforts over time.

How do you define “leader”? List three words that you think describe what a leader is:

1.

2.

3.

Do any of these words apply to you? How? Is there a time in your life when you displayed any of these traits?

2. Every person has a creative side, and it can be expressed in many ways: problem solving, original and innovative thinking, and artistically, to name a few. Describe how you express your creative side.

Can you think of a time your viewpoint was unique compared to others? What was the issue or problem from your perspective? Now think of the same situation from the perspective of another person who was there with you. How was your approach different from that other person’s?

Was there ever a problem where your imagination and intuition guided you to the solution?

Do you have a passion for music, theater, visual art, dance, etc.? What have you gained from it that has affected other parts of your life?

3. What would you say is your greatest talent or skill? How have you developed and demonstrated that talent over time?

List three of your talents or skills:

1.

2.

3.

Were these talents or skills the same a few years ago? What changed? What improved?

Which one of the three talents or skills you listed is the most meaningful or important to you and why? Does the talent come naturally or have you worked hard to develop this skill or talent?
4. Describe how you have taken advantage of a significant educational opportunity or worked to overcome an educational barrier you have faced.

Feel free to speak about either an opportunity or a barrier. It’s OK if you’ve experienced one and not the other.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES:
List any programs or additional classes that have better prepared you for college:
1. 
2. 
3. 

How did you find out about these programs or classes? How did you take what you learned and apply it to your schoolwork or other aspects of your life?

EDUCATIONAL BARRIERS:
Have you faced any barriers or challenges related to school and/or your schoolwork? How did you overcome or strive to overcome them? List three personal characteristics or skills you had to call on to overcome this challenge:
1. 
2. 
3. 

5. Describe the most significant challenge you have faced and the steps you have taken to overcome this challenge. How has this challenge affected your academic achievement?

Have you had a difficult experience in your life? How did you get through it? What did you learn going through this experience? If you’re currently working your way through a challenge, what are you doing now and does that affect different aspects of your life? For example, ask yourself, “How has my life changed at home, at my school, with my friends, or with my family?”

6. Describe your favorite academic subject and explain how it has influenced you.

Think about all of your classes. Now fill in the blank:
I would go to [class name] even if I didn’t have to.

It doesn’t have to be a class in which you’ve earned good grades — the important thing is you enjoyed the subject and it impacted you in some way.

7. What have you done to make your school or your community a better place?

Did you contribute to a positive change at your school or in your community? What steps have you taken to accomplish this? Remember, even small changes can have a big impact. Why were you inspired to act? What did you learn from your effort?

8. What is the one thing that you think sets you apart from other candidates applying to the University of California?

Don’t be afraid to brag a little. Even if you don’t think you’re unique, you are — remember, there’s only one of you in the world. Lots of things can influence who you are, such as your experiences, family, interests and values. Here are a few lists to help you get started.

List three of your personality traits (if you need help, ask your friends or family how they would describe you):
1. 
2. 
3. 

What do you value in your life? What’s important to you? List three of them here:
1. 
2. 
3. 

What are you passionate about?
1. 
2. 
3. 

What items or possessions do you cherish? List them here and think about why they’re meaningful to you:
1. 
2. 
3. 

Does anything overlap? Is there one thing that stands out? Are there any that you would want to share more information about?

Next steps

As you filled out the worksheet, were there any topics that seemed particularly interesting? You might consider answering those questions as part of your application. But the choice is yours! Take your time in selecting which questions to answer and how to answer them. For more information, visit our website at ucal.us/personalquestions.
Getting started

This worksheet is designed to help transfer applicants start the writing process for the personal insight questions in the undergraduate admissions application. Additional hints and suggestions can be found on UC’s admissions website at ucal.us/personalquestions.

What are the personal insight questions?

These questions are about getting to know you better — your life experience, interests, ambitions and inspirations. Think of it as your interview with the admissions office. Be open. Be reflective. Find your individual voice and express it.

While this section of the application is just one part we consider when making our admission decision, it helps provide context for the rest of your application.

The basics

• There is one required question you must answer.

• You will also need to answer 3 out of 7 additional questions.

• Each response is limited to a maximum of 350 words.

• Which three questions you choose to answer of the seven are up to you: But you should select questions that are most relevant to your experience and that best reflect your individual circumstances.

• All questions are equal: All questions are given equal consideration in the application review process, which means there is no advantage or disadvantage to choosing certain questions over others.

Transfer questions & brainstorm exercise

As a transfer applicant, you’ll need to answer the following required question:

Please describe how you have prepared for your intended major, including your readiness to succeed in your upper-division courses once you enroll at the university.

Here are some questions to help you get started:

How have classroom experiences shaped your interest in your major? What experiences outside of the classroom have helped develop this interest? What other influences (culture, community, family, etc.) have steered you toward this major? How is your intended major tied to your long-term goals?

Additional questions

You’ll also need to answer any three of the following seven questions.

1. Describe an example of your leadership experience in which you have positively influenced others, helped resolve disputes, or contributed to group efforts over time.

How do you define “leader”? List three words that you think describe what a leader is:

1. 
2. 
3.

Do any of these words apply to you? How? Is there a time in your life when you displayed any of these traits?

2. Every person has a creative side, and it can be expressed in many ways: problem solving, original and innovative thinking, and artistically, to name a few. Describe how you express your creative side.

Can you think of a time your viewpoint was unique compared to others? What was the issue or problem from your perspective? Now think of the same situation from the perspective of another person who was there with you. How was your approach different from that other person’s?

Was there ever a problem where your imagination and intuition guided you to the solution?

Do you have a passion for music, theater, visual art, dance, etc.? What have you gained from it that has affected other parts of your life?

3. What would you say is your greatest talent or skill? How have you developed and demonstrated that talent over time?

List three of your talents or skills:

1. 
2. 
3. 

Were these talents or skills the same a few years ago? What changed? What improved? Which one of the three talents or skills you listed is the most meaningful or important to you and why? Does the talent come naturally or have you worked hard to develop this skill or talent?
4. Describe how you have taken advantage of a significant educational opportunity or worked to overcome an educational barrier you have faced.

Feel free to speak about either an opportunity or a barrier. It’s OK if you’ve experienced one and not the other.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES:
List any programs or additional classes that have better prepared you for college:
1. 
2. 
3. 

How did you find out about these programs or classes? How did you take what you learned and apply it to your schoolwork or other aspects of your life?

EDUCATIONAL BARRIERS:
Have you faced any barriers or challenges related to school and/or your schoolwork? How did you overcome or strive to overcome them? List three personal characteristics or skills you had to call on to overcome this challenge:
1. 
2. 
3. 

5. Describe the most significant challenge you have faced and the steps you have taken to overcome this challenge. How has this challenge affected your academic achievement?

Have you had a difficult experience in your life? How did you get through it? What did you learn going through this experience? If you’re currently working your way through a challenge, what are you doing now and does that affect different aspects of your life? For example, ask yourself, “How has my life changed at home, at my school, with my friends, or with my family?”

6. What have you done to make your school or your community a better place?

Did you contribute to a positive change in your school or in your community? What steps have you taken to accomplish this? Remember, even small changes can have a big impact. Why were you inspired to act? What did you learn from your effort?

7. What is the one thing that you think sets you apart from other candidates applying to the University of California?

Don't be afraid to brag a little. Even if you don't think you're unique, you are — remember, there's only one of you in the world. Lots of things can influence who you are, such as your experiences, family, interests and values. Here are a few lists to help you get started.

List three of your personality traits (if you need help, ask your friends or family how they would describe you):
1. 
2. 
3. 

What do you value in your life? What's important to you? List three of them here:
1. 
2. 
3. 

What are you passionate about?
1. 
2. 
3. 

What items or possessions do you cherish? List them here and think about why they're meaningful to you:
1. 
2. 
3. 

Does anything overlap? Is there one thing that stands out? Are there any that you would want to share more information about?

Next steps

As you filled out the worksheet, were there any topics that seemed particularly interesting? You might consider answering those questions as part of your application. But the choice is yours! Take your time in selecting which questions to answer and how to answer them. For more information, visit our website at ucal.us/personalquestions.
APPENDIX 4

(PDF Proposal to Modify the Comprehensive Review for Freshman Admissions to the Fall 2012 Admissions Cycle to be attached)
PROPASAL TO MODIFY THE COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW FOR FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS FOR THE FALL 2012 ADMISSIONS CYCLE

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has proposed to modify the Comprehensive Review of 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</td>
<td>.1962</td>
<td>.4119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>.1308</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of A-G courses</td>
<td>.0409</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beyond minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0218</td>
<td>.0094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of AP/IB</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.0673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></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) 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 reasons.
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>

45
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></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 timeline 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 = 0.1634. 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 \(S_i(\text{max})\) 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.

\[\text{AIS} = 5827 \sum \left[ \frac{S_i}{S_i(\text{max})} \right] w_i\]

where \(s_i\) denotes the student’s scores on GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, \(S_i(\text{max})\) are the maximum possible for GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, and \(w_i\) are the weights.
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 Gauvain  
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.
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.
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>0.5020</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>0.4119</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST GEN</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOW INCOME</td>
<td>0.0094</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 \( \frac{0.5020}{0.4119} = 1.2187 \). Thus, the maximum GPA, scaled to SAT, and reflecting the higher weighting of GPA relative to SAT, is:

\[
(0.5020/0.4119) \times 2400 = 2924.98
\]

Advanced Placement Courses are weighted less heavily than SAT, by a ratio of \( \frac{0.0673}{0.4119} = 0.1634 \). Thus, the maximum score for Advanced Placement Courses is:

\[
(0.0673/0.4119) \times 2400 = 392.13
\]

Step 2. Divide each score \( S_i \) by its maximum score \( S_i(\text{max}) \) 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.

\[
\text{AIS} = 5827 \sum \left[ \frac{S_i}{S_i(\text{max})} \right] w_i
\]
where $s_i$ denotes the student’s scores on GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, $S_i(\text{max})$ are the maximum possible for GPA, SAT, AP/IB, First Generation Status, and Low Income, and $w_i$ are the weights.
April 23, 2015

Re: Opt-out of Holistic Review

Prepared by: Kathryn DeFea, BOARS Representative, UC Riverside
Emily Engelschall, Director, Undergraduate Admissions

Dear BOARS Chair, Ralph Aldredge:

In anticipation of reaching an admission rate below 50%, the UC Riverside Academic Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions (UAC) has examined a proposed methodology for the implementation of a single-score holistic admission review process for the 2016-17 academic year. For this purpose, the UAC formed a holistic review subcommittee consisting of 3 members of the UAC, a member from the Senate Committee on Preparatory Education, and the Director of Undergraduate Admissions.

This subcommittee thoroughly evaluated the 14 criteria for holistic review provided by BOARS and studied the “best practices” provided by 3 other UC campuses currently using holistic review. In addition, the subcommittee performed extensive analysis on the success of UCR’s current admissions policy using the formula adopted in 2012.

The outcome of this evaluation revealed that the quality of UCR’s admitted pool of students has steadily increased, as demonstrated by an increase in the average UCR GPA and retention rate, and a decrease in the percentage of students on academic probation. Furthermore, UCR continues to maintain one of the most diverse student body populations in the UC system. For this reason, UC Riverside requests that we be allowed to opt out of the holistic review process at this time.

The current formula for comprehensive review at UCR utilizes 5 of the 14 factors recommended by BOARS. These are assigned a given weight in the overall UC Riverside Academic Index Score (AIS). This process was first established in 2005 and was modified for the 2012 application cycle. The current AIS score is calculated based on the weights in the table below.

Each variable is re-scaled to its maximum; the values are summed and multiplied by a scalar corresponding to the maximum possible AIS. The high school GPA used is the weighted and capped value. When the formula was modified in 2012, weights of both high school GPA and SAT reasoning or ACT plus writing were increased (from .4578 and .1962, respectively). Weights of both First Generation Status and Low Family Income decreased from .0218. The following factors were eliminated from UC Riverside’s comprehensive review formula in 2012: SAT Subject Exam (formerly weighted .0654), Eligibility in Local Context (formerly weighted .1308) and Number of A-G courses beyond minimum (formerly weighted .0409).

The committee believes there is merit in modifying our current comprehensive review process to look at additional non-cognitive factors that reflect leadership, commitment and well-roundedness, but the current application makes it difficult to extract reliable information on these factors. As UCR’s admit rate drops
further below 50%, the holistic review subcommittee and the UAC will continue to evaluate ways to add to and/or modify the current comprehensive review process to include more non-cognitive factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weights</th>
<th>Max Value</th>
<th>Scaled to Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT / ACT</td>
<td>0.4119</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>2400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of AP/IB courses</td>
<td>0.0673</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Generation</td>
<td>0.0094</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Kathryn DeFea, PhD  
Associate Professor of Biomedical Sciences  
Chair, Undergraduate Admissions Committee  
University of California, Riverside

cc Jose Wudka, Chair, Riverside Division