March 10, 2021

To: Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

From: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

CC: Kim A. Wilcox, Chancellor
Thomas M. Smith, Interim Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor
Leondra Jacobs, Academic Senate Analyst
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Emily Engelschall, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services

RE: Amendment to the approved proposed dual-AIS score admission policy

During its March 8, 2021 meeting, Executive Council by unanimous vote in lieu of the Division approved the subject amendment. The approved proposal and amendments are attached for your information.
The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions met on Friday, February 19, 2021 and voted in favor of adopting the test-blind AIS score for the 2022 admission cycle in lieu of the approved proposed test-inclusive and test-blind AIS options. The preliminary injunction by the Superior Court of The State of California against UC for using testing-optional admissions (Case No. RG19046222, Sept 1st, 2020) is still pending. As noted in the original proposal, the Regents unanimously approved the suspension of the standardized test requirement (ACT/SAT) for all California freshman applicants until fall 2024, and also outlined a plan for phasing out the ACT and SAT tests entirely and possibly replacing them with a new standardized test format.

The primary rationale for this amendment to the previously approved proposed dual-AIS score admission policy is due to pending litigation and the unavailability of testing centers in California. As a result, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions believes it’s in the best interest for UCR and the 2022 applicant pool to adopt the test-blind AIS score for the 2022 admission cycle so that Undergraduate Admissions can communicate a clear and consistent 2022 undergraduate admissions testing and comprehensive review policy to students as soon as possible.

cc: Cherysa Cortez, Director of the Academic Senate
September 29, 2020

To: Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

CC: Kim A. Wilcox, Chancellor
    Thomas M. Smith, Interim Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor
    Emily D. Engelschall, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Services

From: Jason Stajich, Chair
      Riverside Division

Subject: Approval - Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model for Freshman Admission for Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 and Amendment regarding Fall 2020

During its September 28, 2020 meeting, Executive Council voted in lieu of the Division to approve (22 in favor, 1 abstention) the subject proposal and its amendment from the Committee on Undergraduate Education regarding the UCR Comprehensive Review Model for Freshman Admission for Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 and Amendment for Fall 2020. The approved proposal and amendment are attached for your information, as well as the responses from committees tasked with review.

Executive Council’s robust discussion revealed there is insufficient time to fully consider the implications of changes and how that will impact the student demographic UCR is privileged to serve in Inland Southern California. We plan to continue to discuss how to best assess UCR applicants.
Dear Jason and Cherysa,

Please find attached to this email the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions memo to amend the proposal submitted on July 27, 2020. Given the recent preliminary injunction by the Superior Court of The State of California against UC for using testing-optional admissions (Case No. RG19046222, Sept 1st, 2020), the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions voted in favor of adopting the test-blind AIS score only for the 2021 admission cycle in lieu of the currently proposed test-inclusive and test-blind AIS options. Please note that the proposal includes a request for the urgent approval of this proposal by the Division as the application for the Fall 2021 term is currently open.

Best,
Leondra

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail communication and any attachments may contain confidential and privileged information for the use of the designated recipients named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error and that any review, disclosure, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify UCR Academic Senate Office immediately by telephone at (951) 827-4771 or email leondra.jacobs@ucr.edu and permanently delete all copies of this communication and any attachments.

Leondra Jacobs
Committee Analyst
Academic Senate Office
University of California, Riverside
231 University Office Building
Riverside, CA 92521
P: (951) 827-4771
F: (951) 827-5545
http://senate.ucr.edu/about/
COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

September 14, 2020

To:      Jason Stajich, Chair
         Academic Senate

From:    Sheldon Tan, Chair
         Committee on Undergraduate Admissions

RE:      Amendment to the proposed dual-AIS score admission policy

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions met on Tuesday, September 8, 2020 and given the recent preliminary injunction by the Superior Court of The State of California against UC for using testing-optional admissions (Case No. RG19046222, Sept 1st, 2020), the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions voted in favor of adopting the test-blind AIS score only for the 2021 admission cycle in lieu of the currently proposed test-inclusive and test-blind AIS options. The test-inclusive AIS will remain in place as an option for the 2022 admissions cycle, pending the final outcome of the court case.

The primary rationale for this amendment to the previously proposed dual-AIS score admission policy is due to the recent preliminary injunction by Superior Court of The State of California and the campus must comply with the new order from the Superior Court. As a result, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions believes it's in the best interest for UCR and the 2021 applicant pool to adopt the test-blind AIS score for the 2021 admission cycle so that Undergraduate Admissions can communicate a clear and consistent 2021 undergraduate admissions testing and comprehensive review policy to students as soon as possible given that the application for the Fall 2021 term is currently open.

Additionally, it is critical that the Undergraduate Admissions office have an approved test-blind AIS score only for the 2021 admission cycle no later than September 30, 2020 (as the application for the Fall 2021 term is currently open).

cc:      Cherysa Cortez, Director of the Academic Senate
COMMITTEE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS
REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION
JULY 27, 2020

PROPOSAL TO MODIFY UCR’s COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW MODEL
TO INCLUDE A TEST OPTIONAL AIS FOR FRESHMAN ADMISSION
FOR THE FALL 2021 AND FALL 2022 ADMISSIONS CYCLE

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has proposed to modify UCR’s Comprehensive Review model for freshman admission, to be implemented for the fall 2021 and fall 2022 admission cycles. The proposed changes described in this memo were developed in response to the University of California Board of Regents unanimous decision on May 21, 2020 to suspend the standardized test requirement (ACT/SAT) for all California freshman applicants until fall 2024. The regent’s actions further included a mandate to create a test optional admission policy for both fall 2021 and fall 2022. In response, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions in consultation with Institutional Research (IR) at UCR has developed a revised and optimized model to calculate both test blind and test inclusive Academic Index Scores (AIS). When determining admission, the Undergraduate Admissions office will use whichever score is higher during UCR’s selection process.

(See Part III of this memo for a more detailed timeline for changes to the freshman admissions process for fall 2021 and for fall 2024.)

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 timeline for continued revision of UCR’s 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 II, was implemented in 2012. The proposed revision described here is referred to as Comprehensive Review, Phase III. 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 Institutional Research (IR), using graduation 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 WITH TEST</th>
<th>PROPOSED WITHOUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>.5020</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Scores/ ACT Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Reasoning / ACT plus writing</td>
<td>.4119</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Exam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Subject Exam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility in Local Context</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of A-G Courses Beyond minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation Status</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Family Income</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of AP/IB courses</td>
<td>.0673</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</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 1600, 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 decrease in the weight given to SAT/ACT scores and the addition of an alternate formula that computes AIS entirely without Standardized Test scores, (2) the doubling of the weight of the number of AP/IB courses, and (3) the re-inclusion of Eligible in the Local Context (ELC) which was last used in UCR’s AIS calculation in 2011.

The calculation of the Academic Index Score will be the same for all colleges – the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS), the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS), the Bourns College of Engineering (BCoE), the School of Public Policy, and the Graduate School of Education’s undergraduate program – based on the weights shown in the “Proposed” columns of Table 1.

II. RATIONALE FOR PROPOSED CHANGES

The development of Phase III of Comprehensive Review was guided by four goals: (1) To effectively respond to the UC systemwide changes in the UC policy that mandated both a test optional and eventually a test blind selection process, (2) To maintain the academic profile of undergraduate students admitted to UCR, (3) To maintain the diversity of the student body, and (4) To maintain the transparency, integrity, and clarity of the admissions process at UCR.

Goal 1:
To Effectively Respond to the UC Systemwide Changes in the UC Policy Removing the Standardized Testing Requirement for Undergraduates.
In May 2020, the Regents unanimously approved the suspension of the standardized test requirement (ACT/SAT) for all California freshman applicants until fall 2024, and also outlined a plan for phasing out the ACT and SAT tests entirely and possibly replacing them with a new standardized test format.

The following outlines the Regents’ actions:

- **Test-optional for fall 2021 and fall 2022:** Campuses will have the option to use ACT/SAT test scores in selection consideration if applicants choose to submit them, and will develop appropriate policies and procedures to implement the Board’s decision.

- **Test-blind for fall 2023 and fall 2024:** Campuses will not consider test scores for California public and independent high school applicants in admissions selection, a practice known as “test-blind” admissions. Test scores could still be considered for other purposes such as course placement, certain scholarships and eligibility for the statewide admissions guarantee.

- **New standardized test:** Starting in summer 2020 and ending by January 2021, UC will undertake a process to identify or create a new test that aligns with the content UC expects students to have mastered to demonstrate college readiness for California freshmen.

- **Elimination of the ACT/SAT test requirement:** By 2025, any use of the ACT/SAT would be eliminated for California students and a new UC-endorsed test to measure UC-readiness would be required. However, if by 2025 the new test is either unfeasible or not ready, consideration of the ACT/SAT for freshman admissions would still be eliminated for California students.

- **Elimination of writing test:** The University will eliminate altogether the SAT Essay/ACT Writing Test as a requirement for UC undergraduate admissions, and these scores will not be used at all effective for fall 2021 admissions.


**Implications of the Removal of UC Standardized Test Requirement**

The change in policy has two immediate consequences (1) It requires an immediate development of an AIS score that does not use standardized test scores in its calculations, and (2) The test-optional policy for 2021-2022 seems to indicate that there should still be a means of factoring in the standardized test scores for students who have invested time and resources to take them.

To answer the first charge, the committee determined it was necessary to develop an Academic Index Score that did not factor in the standardized test scores. For the second charge, the committee determined that there would need to be an alternative method of calculating the AIS that includes the standardized test scores but otherwise weighs the chosen factors in a manner as similar as possible to the non-test AIS calculation.

**Goal 2:**

To Maintain the Academic Profile of the Undergraduate Student Body at UCR

The committee examined factors currently utilized in Comprehensive Review (Phase II) to determine the extent to which they were associated with academic success at UCR. Academic success was defined primarily by four year graduation rates as the most definable metric.
The relationship between admissions criteria and graduation rates is based on the fall 2012 to 2015 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 reduced by the exclusion of standardized tests across a variety of weighting models (See Appendix C).

*Optimization of Admissions Criteria*

Institutional Research (IR) conducted an analysis that adjusted the weights on the current Comprehensive Review factors to identify the set of weights that would optimize the four-year graduation rate. High school GPA, and the number of AP/IB courses were strongly correlated with academic success measured by graduation rate and were strongly recommended. Low income and first-generation status were recommended at very low values of around 1%. The IR evaluation (Appendix B) 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 those 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 graduation rates 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. Eligibility in the Local Context was not recommended as it was negatively correlated with graduation rates once high school GPA is known (see Appendix B), but it did benefit diversity and it was felt by the committee that this factor captured students who performed well at underserved and resource-limited academic institutions.

IR further conducted a study to determine the optimal weights for the four measures of high school GPA, AP/IB courses, and Eligibility in the Local Context in comparison with SAT/ACT scores. The results can be seen in the form of a chart graph in Table 2. High school GPA is the most effective predictor of four-year graduation rates and its predictive acumen peaks at 70.7% of weighting. SAT/ACT standardized test scores are most effectively predictive up to 21.95% of weighting. AP/IB courses are most predictive at 6.9%. Eligibility in the Local Context is maximally predictive at .45% (see Table 3). These most effective weights were then used as benchmarks to determine their relative weights in the AIS in consideration and dialogue with the third goal, which was to maintain or increase the diversity of the student body.
Table 2

Admissions Simulations

Notes:
• Improved = Equal or higher predicted percentages than status quo in 4-year graduation, first generation, low income, Black/African American, and Chicano/Latino
• Low income and first generation not included due to not being associated with improvements over status quo as defined above
• Total simulated admissions scenarios: 5501
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.”

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, for which it would otherwise be ineligible. To qualify as a Hispanic-Serving Institution, a minimum of 25% of the student body must be comprised of Hispanic students.

Taking these priorities into consideration, the relative weights for the factors used to determine AIS were then evaluated by IR with a focus on how they might affect both graduation rates and the diversity of the student body (Table 4 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AIS Weighting Factors</th>
<th>Status Quo AIS Weights</th>
<th>Optimized AIS Weights</th>
<th>Enrolled Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>Predicted</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School GPA</td>
<td>50.20%</td>
<td>70.70%</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT</td>
<td>41.19%</td>
<td>21.95%</td>
<td>1669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB Courses</td>
<td>6.73%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility in the Local Context</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Unknown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment and Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Yield</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Year Grad Rate</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
—Optimized weights and predicted outcomes based on average of top 20 admissions scenarios in which improvement was seen in predicted percentages of 4-year graduation, first generation, low income, and underrepresented minority (URM)
—Low income and first generation not included in optimization model due to not being associated with improvements over status quo as defined above
Regarding the consequences of optimizing for UCR four-year graduation rates or for the diversity of the student body, Table 4 demonstrates that there are tradeoffs in terms of maximizing graduation rates and maintaining or even increasing student diversity. Scenario 1 in the table uses only the weights for the two factors, high school GPA and A/IB courses, that actually improve graduation rates. Even with these weights maximized and no others utilized, graduation rates are simply maintained in the absence of the standardized tests. Scenario 2 attempts to replicate the current Phase II weights but without the SAT/ACT scores. Scenario 2.5 includes the ELC and attempts to maintain UCR’s demographic diversity. Scenario 3 increases the weight of EIC at the expense of high school GPA and AP/IB courses. Scenario 4 shows the effects of an increase weighting of low income and first generation factors. Scenario 5 dramatically increases all of the other weights at the expense of high school GPA, and is intended to simply show the diminishing returns for pursuing a more diverse demographic at the expense of graduation rates.

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 unanimously agreed that the weights decided upon in Scenario 2.5 struck the best balance between maintaining graduation rates and diversity. This model has only a projected .6% decrease in four year graduation rates, includes the ELC factor, includes a modest increase in Black/African American students (.3%), and a more significant increase in Chicano/Latino students (8.6 %).

### Goal 4: Maintaining the Transparency and Integrity of the Admissions Process

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

#### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Status Quo Weights</th>
<th>Actual Enrollment Outcomes</th>
<th>Modeled AIS Weights</th>
<th>Δ From Actual Outcomes</th>
<th>Modeled AIS Weights</th>
<th>Δ From Actual Outcomes</th>
<th>Modeled AIS Weights</th>
<th>Δ From Actual Outcomes</th>
<th>Modeled AIS Weights</th>
<th>Δ From Actual Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Notes:
- Scenario 1 - use modeled data set that included 10,000 scenarios with different weights for HSGPA, AP/IB, low income, first generation, and ELC, and take the scenario with the best overall predicted 4-year graduation rate regardless of the AIS weights.
- Scenario 2 - keep similar weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HSGPA and AP/IB.
- Scenario 2.5 - similar to Scenarios 2 and 3 but about halfway between.
- Scenario 3 - keep similar weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HSGPA, AP/IB, and ELC, which is not currently part of AIS.
- Scenario 4 - increase weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HSGPA, AP/IB, and ELC, which is not currently part of AIS.
- Scenario 5 - AIS is calculated entirely based on HSGPA.
- Scenario 6 - keep HSGPA weights similar to status quo at 50%, include a strong weight for ELC, and let the other weights rise to make up the remainder.

### Test Inclusive and Test Exclusive Option Models
The Regents decision to make the 2021 and 2022 admissions process test optional suggested strongly to the committee that there was a need to consider whether and how to include a different weighted model that factor in SAT/ACT scores for those students who wish to submit them. The committee essentially saw two primary choices, each of which is addressed below.

The first option, the Non Test AIS, was to simply not include SAT/ACT scores for any students. This would be simple to implement and would remove any concerns about the possible and perceived bias of standardized tests. It is also inevitable that the standardized test scores will be abandoned for the 2023 and 2024 cohort (see Appendix A). However, completely abandoning standardized tests prematurely unnecessarily removes a criterion that has proven to be moderately effective for predicting student success. As recent [Academic Council’s Standard Testing Task Force (STTF) report](#) shows that standardized test scores can indeed aid in predicting important aspects of student success, including undergraduate grade point average (UGPA), retention, and completion. Additionally, not having this criterion will make it more difficult to differentiate among the highest scoring applicants and will increase uncertainty surrounding predicting yield outcomes and make it harder to limit/increase admissions numbers. It could also hinder opportunities for disadvantaged students with low GPAs who are able to test well and could disaffect students who invested time and resources on the standardized tests before the UC’s decision was announced. Finally, not including a standardized test option removes a transition window to test-blind admission planned for 23-24 for high school students and will make it more difficult to know how the transition to a test blind admissions process affects the student body.

The second option, the Better with or without Test AIS, would allow applicants who submit SAT/ACT scores to have two AIS scores (one calculated with standardized test scores and one calculated without them using the AIS described above) and use the higher score. One of the primary advantages of this approach is that this would capture students who test well but have low grades. For reference, 20.3% of students admitted under old AIS weights would not be admitted without test scores factored in (see table 4, model 2.5, Enrollment Overlap with Status Quo). Academic success should be more predictable for the portion of pool who do submit test scores, and it gives students more ways to get admitted, which should make students feel welcome and encourage them to apply regardless of whether they have or have not taken the tests. This will also allow us to be able to see how inclusion of SAT/ACT comparatively affects AIS scores.

The potential disadvantages of this approach are that this does not completely eliminate the possibility or perception of bias in standardized tests, is significantly more complicated as it requires two sets of calculations for some students, and also requires the development of AIS weighting model that includes the SAT/ACT scores for those who submit them and which is balanced against the non-test AIS scoring method.

While these concerns are significant, the committee unanimously agreed that it was important to use the Better with or without Test AIS model. IR then proposed two possible methods for calculating both the test and non-test AIS scores (see table 5 on next page). The test inclusive AIS score used the weight of 20% for the SAT/ACT factor as that was a close round number to the 21.95% weight at which standardized test scores were maximally predictive of four year graduation rates (Table 3).

**Table 5**

New AIS with SAT/ACT =

\[
10000 * \\
\text{HSGPA} / 4.5 * .60 \\
+ \text{SATACT} / 1600 * .20 \\
+ \text{APIB Courses Taken} / 28 * .12 \\
+ \text{First Generation } (1=\text{yes}, 0=\text{no}) * .01 \\
+ \text{Low Income } (1=\text{yes}, 0=\text{no}) * .01
\]
+ ELC (1=yes, 0=no) * .06

New Test-Blind AIS  = 
10000 * 
( 
HSGPA / 4.5 * .80 
+ APIB Courses Taken / 28 * .12 
+ First Generation (1=yes, 0=no) * .01 
+ Low Income (1=yes, 0=no) * .01 
+ ELC (1=yes, 0=no) * .06 
)

These calculations were then evaluated by IR for their potential effects on applying students. In this modeling only a relatively small percentage of students (18%) are projected to score higher with a test inclusive AIS (see table 5 below), and for most minority groups and for low income and first generation students the proportions are even smaller.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test version gives better AIS</th>
<th>Test-free version gives better AIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All 2012-2015 enrolled frosh</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Unknown</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This should mean that there is more opportunity and access for disadvantaged and minority students while also allowing for students who have scored well on standardized tests to have that achievement factored in but it will not provide an overwhelming advantage. There is a great deal more analysis on this done by IR (see appendix D).

III. Urgent Need for Approval of this AIS Methodology

The proposed changes in the Comprehensive Review model were required by the sudden decision on the part of the UC Regents to adopt a test optional model for the fall 2021 and 2022 application cycles in May of this year. These actions were taken in light of the Covid-19 pandemic that is still affecting us, and which made the decision to have a non-test option a necessity as
normal standardized testing was disrupted. The committee moved quickly to construct these proposed new AIS models and to determine, with the help of IR, the most efficacious weights for the various factors used to determine that score.

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee has unanimously supported the measures outlined above, and now it is imperative that the Academic Senate take this up with great expedience as this updated comprehensive review model requires system programming which will take time and resources to develop and test in advance of implementation for the 2021 undergraduate admissions review cycle which begins in November 1, 2020. Additionally, it is critical, and recommended by BOARS, that the Undergraduate Admissions office have an approved test optional comprehensive review policy that can be clearly communicated to rising high school seniors not later than September 1, 2020 (as, so they can make educated decisions around submitting test scores to UCR for admission consideration.)
### Appendix A

**Timeline for the future of standardized testing at UC:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entering class</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>What this means</th>
<th>Campuses may use test scores for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2021-2022</strong></td>
<td>Test-optional</td>
<td>• All students have the option of submitting ACT/SAT scores.</td>
<td>• Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(current 10th and 11th graders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students will not be penalized in the admissions review process for not submitting ACT/SAT scores.</td>
<td>• Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students will no longer be required to submit the SAT Essay/ACT Writing Test.</td>
<td>• Post-enrollment course placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Statewide eligibility for admissions guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2023-2024</strong></td>
<td>Test-blind</td>
<td>• All California public and independent high school students have the option to submit ACT/SAT scores, but those scores may not be used in making admissions decisions.</td>
<td>• Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(current 8th and 9th graders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic Senate to work with University administration on appropriate approach for nonresident students.</td>
<td>• Post-enrollment course placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Statewide eligibility for admissions guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2025-beyond</strong></td>
<td>*If there is a new test by fall 2025</td>
<td>• All California high school students submit scores from new test.</td>
<td>• Admissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(current 7th graders)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• New test made available to private/independent and out-of-state schools.</td>
<td>• Scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*If no new test is ready by fall 2025</td>
<td>• Nonresidents and international students submit test scores from the new test or will follow the appropriate approach as determined by the University.</td>
<td>• Post-enrollment course placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Statewide eligibility for admissions guarantee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If there is a new test by fall 2025

*If no new test is ready by fall 2025
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# Appendix B
Assessing Possible Contributors to a New AIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Levels Tested</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS GPA</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>A good predictor of graduation rates without a high diversity cost that should stay in the mix at the status quo weight of 50% of AIS or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP/IB Classes Taken</td>
<td>Count (0-20)</td>
<td>Promising</td>
<td>Simulations show that a modest weight for AP helps predict academic outcomes without significant risk to diversity. Actual AP scores would be a stronger predictor but are usually not known at the time of admission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Could be used for small weights in the range of 1% or less</td>
<td>There are more optimal ways to maintain diversity and student quality, like increasing the weight for HS GPA at the expense of SAT/ACT. Including this will increase diversity at the expense of graduation rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Could be used for small weights in the range of 1% or less</td>
<td>There are more optimal ways to maintain diversity and student quality, like increasing the weight for HS GPA at the expense of SAT/ACT. Including this will increase diversity at the expense of graduation rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT</td>
<td>Continuous (ACT converted to SAT scale)</td>
<td>Use for best predictive value, but alternative models are possible without it.</td>
<td>SAT/ACT is a useful predictor of graduation rates above and beyond other AIS metrics such that removing it from AIS will lead to lower graduation rates under almost all circumstance. However, it is also negatively correlated with measures of diversity, so removing it will tend to increase those measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCFF+ Schools</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Still requires testing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELC</td>
<td>Binary and individual percentile ranks (1-9)</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>Negatively correlated with graduation rates once HS GPA is known. Some benefits to diversity, but other predictors are more effective for this purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>Excessively correlated with certain ethnic groups and has the potential for unintended consequences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-G 11 and 15, A-G Excess</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>As a binary indicator these do not have predictive value. Almost all applicants have these units. In the future we could test specific subject areas if the committee wishes and the data can be loaded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal Member</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>There are too few applicants with this information to meaningfully affect outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Parent</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>More negatively correlated with graduation rates than first gen and low income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from campus of home address on application</td>
<td>Category (0-20, 20-50, 50-140, 140+ miles)</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>The closest students have the lowest graduation rates even after controlling for other factors, so we would have to prioritize long-distance admits to avoid harming rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Board Environmental Context Score</td>
<td>1-100</td>
<td>Do not use</td>
<td>This tested poorly in a previous analysis. Also it appears to be discontinued.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Use modeled data set that included 10299 scenarios with different weights for HS GPA, AP/IB, low income, first generation, and ELC, and take the scenario with the best overall predicted 4-year graduation rate regardless of the AIS weights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Keep similar weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HS GPA and AP/IB.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Similar to Scenarios 2 and 3, but average halfway between.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HS GPA, AP/IB, and ELC, which is not currently part of AIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Increase weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HS GPA, AP/IB, and ELC, which is not currently part of AIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Use modeled data set that included 10299 scenarios with different weights for HS GPA, AP/IB, low income, first generation, and ELC, and take the scenario with the best overall predicted 4-year graduation rate regardless of the AIS weights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Keep HS GPA weight similar to status quo at 50%, include a strong weight for ELC, and let the other weights rise to make up the remainder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Notes:
- Scenario 1 - use modeled data set that included 10299 scenarios with different weights for HS GPA, AP/IB, low income, first generation, and ELC, and take the scenario with the best overall predicted 4-year graduation rate regardless of the AIS weights.
- Scenario 2 - keep similar weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HS GPA and AP/IB.
- Scenario 2.5 - similar to Scenarios 2 and 3, but average halfway between.
- Scenario 3 - increase weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HS GPA, AP/IB, and ELC, which is not currently part of AIS.
- Scenario 4 - increase weights for low income and first generation as status quo, and make up missing SAT/ACT weights with HS GPA, AP/IB, and ELC, which is not currently part of AIS.
- Scenario 5 - use modeled data set that included 10299 scenarios with different weights for HS GPA, AP/IB, low income, first generation, and ELC, and take the scenario with the best overall predicted 4-year graduation rate regardless of the AIS weights.
- Scenario 6 - keep HS GPA weight similar to status quo at 50%, include a strong weight for ELC, and let the other weights rise to make up the remainder.
Appendix D

Two-Track AIS Implementation Initial Findings

Below we outline initial attempts and findings for implementing a best-of-two AIS freshman admissions process for UCR in anticipation of the policy for the fall 2021 admission process.

1. General Approach Proposed by UCR Institutional Research

Our first implementation decision was to calculate each of the indexes as a percentage of the maximum points possible. This has the advantage of having a fixed reference point (a perfect score) and values should be more comparable across years. This is similar to the concept of a “criterion-referenced score” and is not dependent on the particular distribution of student attributes in the application pool.

To operationalize this idea, we set an arbitrary maximum of 10,000 for each AIS using the following formulas:

\[
\text{New AIS with SAT/ACT} = 10000 \times \\
( \text{HSGPA} / 4.5 \times .60 \\
+ \text{SAT/ACT} / 1600 \times .20 \\
+ \text{APIB Courses Taken} / 28 \times .12 \\
+ \text{First Generation (1=yes, 0=no)} \times .01 \\
+ \text{Low Income (1=yes, 0=no)} \times .01 \\
+ \text{ELC (1=yes, 0=no)} \times .06 \\
)
\]

\[
\text{New Test-Blind AIS} = 10000 \times \\
( \text{HSGPA} / 4.5 \times .80 \\
+ \text{APIB Courses Taken} / 28 \times .12 \\
+ \text{First Generation (1=yes, 0=no)} \times .01 \\
+ \text{Low Income (1=yes, 0=no)} \times .01 \\
+ \text{ELC (1=yes, 0=no)} \times .06 \\
)
\]

The resulting scores would be rounded to the nearest whole number. An individual score can be thought of as the “percentage of perfect,” so a score of 8500 implies that the applicant received 85% of the possible points on a given index. Given the distributions of the measures that make up each index, there are extremely few perfect scores. Note that this is not the same as being in the 85th percentile; in practice it could be considerably higher or lower on a percentile basis in the actual distribution of index values assigned.

Our next assumption is that the two indexes would be equated at face value and the applicant would be admitted on the better of the two scores. For example, an applicant with an 8500 on the AIS with tests and 8750 on the test-blind AIS would be ranked for admission using 8750.

Using our reference sample of 2012-2015 California resident applicants, Figure 1 below shows the frequency distribution of the actual admitted applicants on the two proposed scales along with the existing AIS, which has been rescaled to a maximum of 10,000 to allow for comparisons.
The centers of each index fall in somewhat different scores, and the new proposed AIS measures are a bit less smooth and more skewed than the prior AIS. These are not necessarily problems by themselves, but we show below that the difference in midpoints can have some unexpected consequences.

2. Evaluating the Effects of These Choices
To understand how these indexes might be used in practice, we scored all of the actual enrolled resident freshman from 2012-2015 and compared which AIS would have given them a higher score. Table 1 shows the results overall and by several demographic groups.

Unlike in earlier simulations performed by the Institutional Research (IR) office, in which the test version of AIS was generally favorable to past students who enrolled, in this case only about 18% of actual freshman would have had a higher score on the test-based AIS, while the remaining 82% would have done better on the test-blind AIS. The disparity is even more extreme for some underrepresented and underserved groups.
We also considered the relative benefits of each index for a wider set of applicants who could have enrolled at UCR if these indexes had been in place at the time. This group includes the counterfactual cases of students who were not actually admitted or who did not enroll, but would have been predicted to be admitted and enrolled on the basis of one or both of the two proposed AIS scores. Again, the test-blind methodology is much more favorable for this group, in fact, even more so. Results for the students predicted to be enrolled are given in Table 2.

Why does the test-based AIS only appear to help a small minority of applicants? The main reason is in the implementation choices outlined above. Specifically, very few applicants have perfect SAT/ACT scores, and thus the distribution curve of the proposed new test-based AIS shifts further to the left—toward lower scores—than in the test-blind AIS. This implies that a given absolute rank on one AIS scale would not equate to the same rank on the other scale. In Table 3 below we report a few descriptive statistics on the distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test version gives better AIS</th>
<th>Test-free version gives better AIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 2012-2015 enrolled frosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Unknown</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Test version gives better AIS</th>
<th>Test-free version gives better AIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Best-of-2-AIS enrolled frosh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Unknown</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
of scores on the two proposed AIS metrics for 2012-2015 applicants who were admitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Test-Blind AIS</th>
<th>New Test-Based AIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>7412</td>
<td>7198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>7309</td>
<td>7105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th percentile</td>
<td>6305</td>
<td>6205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th percentile</td>
<td>6736</td>
<td>6569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th percentile</td>
<td>8112</td>
<td>7781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th percentile</td>
<td>8912</td>
<td>8355</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

As the percentiles above indicate, it is less common to receive a top score on the SAT/ACT. In fact, generally the test-based AIS, as we defined above, is primarily a benefit for those applicants with extremely high test scores. More precisely, SAT scores at or above the 89th percentile appear to be most likely to improve an applicant’s chances above the test-blind AIS. Below we illustrate the range of SAT scores needed for the test-based AIS to be an advantage over the test-blind AIS.

This may or may not be consistent with the committee’s intention of having test scores be a viable route for gaining admission to UCR. As formulated, only those who do unusually well on the SAT/ACT gain an advantage in admissions.
The Committee had a robust email discussion on the amended proposal. Most members pointed out the difficulty of making a decision on the matter with such a limited amount of time and information. While members acknowledge that the timeline was forced on our campus by external factors, they still regret the fact that such a consequential action has to be decided in these circumstances. A criticism that has been pointed out by several members is that much reliance has been given to AP courses. While we have no quantitative information on the statewide offering of these courses, there is anecdotal evidence that areas and school districts have unequal access to these courses, which prevents them from being a fair and equitable metric. Some members are supportive of giving more weight to A-G courses or ELC, and believe that a negative correlation with graduation rate could be mitigated by addressing post-enrollment vulnerability. Also, some members criticized the fact that the proposal's aim seems to be to maintain the same enrollment outcome that the previous scoring system had, keeping therefore the same biases. Finally, while the Committee understands that the timeframe has prevented adequate feedback to our previous response, many members find it difficult to be supportive of the proposal without such feedback and other relevant data.
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY, EQUITY, & INCLUSION

September 25, 2020

To: Jason Stajich
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Xuan Liu, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion

Re: Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model for Freshman Admission for Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion considered the Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle.

Although the Committee is concerned about whether the weighting method will be able to substantially increase the admissions of Black students, given that a decision has to be made very soon, the Committee is generally in support of the proposed weighting scheme. However, we strongly urge that methods for next year be considered in light of the minimal change for our enrollment of Black/African American students across all tested scenarios, and the assumptions made regarding graduation rate changes.

Here are specific comments supporting our recommendation:

We are somewhat surprised that the authors did not explore the minimal increase in Black/African American students across all scenarios. An increase of 0.3% Black/African American students over the current enrollment of 3.7% is only an 8% increase in the number of enrolled students who identify as Black/African American. The increase for Chicano/Latino students was closer to 23% of current enrollment for that subgroup in Scenario 2.5. We would like to know more about why there was not an exploration of weighting schemes that would result in a more evenly distributed increase in enrollment across less-represented subgroups.

Our major comment on the methodology used here is that we're discussing modeling expected graduation rate, and if the models show graduation dips that are too large for a given scenario (with large being something like -3.8% as shown in Scenario 6 of Appendix C), then that scenario is considered undesirable. The weights and their associated graduation rates suggest that increasing the weight for first-gen and low-SES results in a lower estimated graduation rate. The use of this modeled graduation rate assumes that nothing changes with respect to the support provided to students who are first-gen or demonstrate a low-SES, which might compensate for an expected decrease in graduation rate that would be observed if no additional supports were provided. Do decreases in graduation rates that are a result of higher first-gen and low-SES weighting suggest that UCR needs to do a better job of supporting students who have these identities?
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

September 25, 2020

To: Jason Stajich  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Patricia Morton, Chair  
Committee on Faculty Welfare

Re: [Campus Review] Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model for Freshman Admission for Fall 2021 and Fall 2022

The FWC considered the proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model for Freshman Admission for Fall 2021 and Fall 2022. The amended proposal from the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions details an amendment to the proposed dual-AIS which removes the use of the ACT/SAT. A recent California Superior Court case has issued the ruling that UC must suspend the use of these standardized tests for the 2021 admissions cycle. The Committee is in support of the proposal to adopt the test-blind AIS score for the 2021 admission cycle.
The Committee on Preparatory Education reviewed the amended proposal to modify the UCR Comprehensive Review model for undergraduate admissions. Members responded with the following:

The proposal is a response to a court case, so altering UCR’s procedure to be test-blind for this upcoming admissions cycle makes sense. We have no choice but to conform the decision to the state supreme court ruling. However, there are some concerns about the proposed procedures, e.g., the weights for each admission criteria in Table 1 for the "Without" option. Members believe that the GPA is weighted too high (0.8 or 80%). The text of the IR report states that GPA has a maximum prediction at about 0.7 (see page 6, paragraph 3). Besides that, a problem with weighting GPA too high is that it will likely promote grade inflation. Some members would like to down weight GPA to 0.7. That is still 40% higher than in the past (i.e., 0.7 vs. 0.5 in the past; 7/5 = 1.4; whereas the report is proposing to increase the weight of GPA by 60% from 0.5 to 0.8).
September 25, 2020

TO: Jason Stajich, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Philip Brisk, Chair
      BCOE Executive Committee

RE: Amendment to the proposed dual-AIS score admission policy

Dear Jason,

The proposed amendment to the proposed dual-AIS score admission policy does not address the concerns that the BCOE Executive Committee raised in the letter that was submitted to former-Chair Rodriguez on August 18, 2020. The concerns remain relevant to the amended proposal, which removes the use of ACT/SAT.
TO: Jason Stajich, Chair
Riverside Division

FROM: Lucille Chia, Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Amendment to the proposed dual-AIS score admission policy

The CHASS Executive Committee has reviewed and voted yes (nine yes; one not voting) to approve the Amendment to the proposed dual-AIS score admission policy.
September 24th, 2020

To: Jason Stajich, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division

From: Declan McCole, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

Subject: SOM FEC Response to Amended Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle

Dear Jason,

The SOM Executive Committee reviewed the Amended Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle. We vote to approve the adoption of the test-blind AIS score as recommended by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions.

We would like to reiterate a number of considerations from the earlier proposal from the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions that SOM FEC forwarded in our previous response that we feel should be considered for future revisions to the admissions model:

- Strong concerns were expressed regarding weighting of AP/IB and imposition of an unintended handicap on applicants from economically disadvantaged school districts.

- The committee was also unanimous in its concern that the Model is based on 4-year graduation rates that does not factor in that many UCR students have to work to support themselves (or possibly additional family members) financially and will need 5-6 years to graduate.

Yours sincerely,

Declan F. McCole, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of Medicine
August 18, 2020

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Academic Senate

FROM: Philip Brisk, Chair
BCOE Executive Committee

RE: Proposal to Modify UCR’s Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle

Dear Dylan,

The BCOE Executive Committee reviewed the proposal via email discussion. The Executive Committee consulted with BCOE student advising office (OSAA) to solicit feedback. OSAA has direct contact with students, and the nature of those meetings are quite different than student contact with faculty, which is typically about specific courses. For example, a student who is experiencing academic difficulty and may be considering switching to another College or withdrawal from the university is more likely to discuss these matters with OSAA staff, as opposed to a faculty member. Roderick Smith, Director of OSAA, has written a letter summarizing OSAA’s assessment of the proposal, which I am transmitting in addition to this letter; the BCOE Executive Committee has reviewed and endorses OSAA’s assessment.

The BCOE Executive Committee understands that elimination of the SAT as a UC admission requirement necessitates a recalibration of the AIS; the Executive Committee appreciates the time and effort that the Undergraduate Admissions Committee allocated to put together this recommendation. The BCOE Executive Committee views the general sentiment of the proposal favorably, but identified a few significant issues that should be addressed before the proposal is approved.

The BCOE Executive Committee opposes the use of the four-year overall graduation rate from-campus to assess the success of the modified AIS. Instead, the analysis should be redone use the five- or six-year graduation rate from the College of initial entry. The key issues here are that the campus-level graduation rate does not accurately reflect the student admission process or the situation within the individual Colleges; there is also strong case to be made that four years is insufficient, given UCR’s undergraduate socioeconomic demographics, and that five- and six-year graduation rates should also be considered.

Admission process: UCR admits students directly to Majors within Colleges, or to an undeclared Major within a College; some Colleges, including BCOE, do not have an undeclared Major. While the official admission letter to students goes out from campus, the Colleges (especially the Associate Deans) have a lot of control over who gets admitted. Each College uses the AIS score to determine whom to admit to individual Majors; AIS is a major component of the admissions decision, but the decision need not rely on AIS exclusively. At present, BCOE uses a per-Major AIS cutoff, but in the past, other criteria have been considered as well. In short, given the College/Major-specific admission process, the evaluation criteria should emphasize graduation from the College and/or Major to which the student was admitted.

Retention with Colleges: Building on the prior point, the culture of the campus is that students admitted to a specific College become that College’s responsibility. It reflects poorly on BCOE if a student does poorly and moves to another College, even if they successfully graduate within four years: under the proposed evaluation metric, this would be viewed as a success—and it may be viewed as a success at the campus level; however, one could argue that the admissions process did not successfully place the student. BCOE is accountable to the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET), and an excessive loss of students to other Colleges would not be acceptable, even if many of the students successfully graduate from other Colleges within for years. Lastly, individual Colleges take budget hits for students who move to another College, which places an additional premium on in-College retention. These arguments buttress the opinion stated above, which is that the evaluation criteria should emphasize graduation from the College and/or Major to which the student was admitted.

Four-year graduation rate: The four-year graduation rate does not adequately encompass the socioeconomic diversity of UCR’s student body: it favors students who come from means, entering UCR with substantial AP credit, who maintain a high GPA throughout their tenure at UCR, and take high per-quarter unit loads. The four-year graduation rate does not adequately count students who have several quarters of poor academic performance, but are able to turn things around and graduate, possibly after retaking some courses; it also does not count students who change Majors or Colleges as a result. Many of UCR’s
students work 20+ hours per week, and as a result, they rarely take more than 12-13 units per quarter, which is sufficient for full-time enrollment and to qualify for financial aid, but is insufficient to graduate in four years. There is significant variance in the minimum unit count required to graduate from certain majors, and BCOE has some of the highest unit-count majors on campus. Lastly, focusing on four-year graduation favorably views students who take courses in Summer, and penalizes students who take internships (which have evolved into a de-facto prerequisite for employment in top companies in Engineering fields) or students who work full-time in order to satisfy family responsibilities. In short, the evaluation criteria should also consider five- and six-year graduation rates.

A separate area of concern is the proposal to increase the weight of AP/IB courses in the revised policy with and without the standardized tests. First and foremost, this hurts students from underserved schools that do not offer AP/IB courses. A second concern is that students who become aware of this change could be pushed to take even more AP/IB courses, which may not be the best option for their overall success. A third concern is that the high-school GPA already accounts for AP courses, so factoring the number of AP courses taken effectively doubles the weight. This emphasis may be detrimental to the admissions process for the underrepresented students whose education is central to UCR’s branding; the Undergraduate Admissions Committee should consider a more equitable weighting of AP/IB courses.

Lastly, the BCOE Executive Committee would like the proposal to clarify if it is exclusive to California residents, or if it encompasses out-of-state and international students as well.
Dear Dr. Brisk and the BCOE Executive Committee,

Overall, the OSAA unanimously supports removal of SAT/ACT from AIS, and development of a UC exam that assesses college readiness. Varying thoughts on the value of SAT/ACT in validating HSGPA in the admissions process are provided below:

1. While the elimination of the SAT/ACT is a necessity, as research supports HSGPA as being a stronger predictor of retention and persistence to graduation, there can be some unintended potential complications in the admissions process. The SAT/ACT provided a necessary measuring stick by which the University could evaluate students regardless of prior institution attended. Considering that high schools vary in the number and variety of AP/IB courses, the number of seats available in these classes, the quality of instruction, and the amount and intensity of outside factors (housing insecurity, food insecurity, legal disputes, etc.) influencing educational success, these exams had the potential to validate the grades. With federal and state mandates to increase high school graduation rates, grade inflation is also an issue. The creation of a UC-created exam is a wonderful opportunity to replace the measuring stick and avoid some of the biases associated with the SAT/ACT.

2. The SAT/ACT validate cultural bias. The exams are simply tools used to deny access. The SAT in particular has no connection to California HS curriculum, so the suggested validation of HAGPA is likely unintentional at best. The fact is HSGPA, with all its flaws, is still a much stronger predictor of graduation in 4-years compared to SAT/ACT. That speaks volumes about how ill-suited the SAT/ACT exams are as predictors of 4-year graduation. There is also clear socioeconomic disadvantage in SAT/ACT preparation opportunities. For these reasons, SAT should be excluded from AIS immediately, and development of a UC exam should be fast tracked.

OSAA also believes HSGPA and rigor of curriculum completed are the best indicators for success. The new admissions model acknowledges this, but there are a couple of areas in which could benefit from some additional investigation. The new model calls for the HSGPA to be 80% of the AIS calculation without the use of the SAT/ACT. The increase in the weight of AP/IB also seems to offer an advantage to students with greater access to an enriched curriculum with more rigor. Those advantages must be offset. Eligibility in the Local Context seems to address this; other viable measures should be considered as well.

Two UC Comprehensive Review areas can be used to evaluate rigor of preparation:

A. Number of, and performance in, UC-approved honors and Advanced Placement courses

B. Number of, content of, and performance in, academic courses beyond the minimum A-G requirements
Currently only area A is used in the AIS calculation, but the addition of area B could prove beneficial in predicting success, especially in engineering majors. Emphasis can be placed on the number of courses that a student attempts in the areas of mathematics and laboratory sciences. As some schools do not offer many AP classes, the addition of this variable in AIS may offer an alternative way to assess rigor of preparation in areas deemed critical.

The last item that deserves some additional evaluation is students who completed courses at colleges/universities during their high school career. There are students who attend middle college programs that include courses from high school and local community college. Also, there is an increasing number of students who are just opting to augment their high school education with coursework from their local community colleges. These courses/grades are incorporated into students' HSGPAs, and they receive an extra grading point as they would for UC-approved AP/IB coursework in the admissions HSGPA calculation, yet they are excluded from the AP/IB weight. CCC coursework completed by high school students should also be evaluated for correlation with 4-year graduation and diversity. If CCC coursework positively correlates with 4-year graduation and is diversity neutral to positive, then it should also be considered for inclusion in AIS. This might indeed support our efforts to promote pipelines from HS to UCR, but also, HS to CCC to UCR.

Sincerely,

Roderick Smith
Director, BCOE Office of Student Academic Affairs
August 29, 2020

To: Senate

From: School of Business Executive Committee

Re: [Campus Review] Proposal: Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle: Distributed for Review – 7/29/20

The School of Business Executive Committee feels that the proposed UCR Comprehensive Review Model that would include a Test Optional AIS appears reasonable given the mandate by the UC Board of Regents to suspend the ACT or SAT until Fall 2024.
August 14, 2020

TO: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
    Academic Senate

FROM: Lucille Chia, Chair
    CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle

The CHASS Executive Committee discussed the Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle via email. There were no objections and our committee approved the proposal.
August 24, 2020

To: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Louis Santiago, Chair, Executive Committee
       College of Natural and Agricultural Science

Re: Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle

The CNAS Executive Committee reviewed the Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle, and although only three committee members responded, there were some substantive comments.

First, all of the committee members that responded thought that the proposal seems very reasonable and that the committee did a good job in such a short time.

One member strongly agreed that HS GPA was a better predictor of college success (both 4 year and grades in Freshman year if I recall correctly) than were standardized tests.

However, there was also concern that too much weight is being placed on the number of AP/IB courses (12% based on the proposed AIS vs. 6.73% based on the current AIS), as there is a strong correlation of the availability of AP/IB courses and high school zip codes (e.g., wealthier districts tend to have high schools that offer more AP/IB courses). As such, for lower-income students that attend under-resourced high schools, these applicants may be at a disadvantage simply because they don’t have access to as many AP/IB courses as high schools in wealthier districts.
To: Dylan Rodriguez  
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Xuan Liu, Chair  
Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion

Re: [Campus Review] Proposal: Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle

The Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion considered the Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle. The Committee is concerned that increasing the weight allocated to International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced Placement (AP) classes maybe problematic as students from underrepresented background may not have access. While the SAT was viewed as problematic, it is, at least, in principle, available to all students.
COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

August 18, 2020

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: Jingsong Zhang, Chair
    Committee on Preparatory Education

Re: Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model for Undergraduate Admissions

The Committee on Preparatory Education reviewed the proposal to modify the UCR Comprehensive Review model for undergraduate admissions. Members responded with support for the proposal.

The Committee noted the following typos in the proposal and recommends that they be addressed to improve the readability of the document:

- From page four, paragraph one, there is a missing space in the following sentence: "The relationship between admissions criteria and graduation rates is based on the fall 2012 to 2015 cohorts."

- From page four, paragraph two, there is a missing comma after "benefit diversity" in the following sentence: "Eligibility in the Local Context was not recommended as it was negatively correlated with graduation rates once high school GPA is known (see Appendix B), but it did benefit diversity and it was felt by the committee that this factor captured students who performed well at underserved and resource-limited academic institutions."

- From page seven, paragraph one has an unnecessary comma before "and" in the following sentence: "Scenario 5 dramatically increases all of the other weights at the expense of high school GPA, and is intended to simply show the diminishing returns for pursuing a more diverse demographic at the expense of graduation rates."

- From page seven, the final sentence in paragraph two is missing a word: "This model has only a projected .6% decrease in four year graduation rates, includes the ELC factor, includes a modest increase in Black/African American students (.3%), and a more significant increase in Chicano/Latino students (8.6%)."

- The margins seem to be slightly off in the first two paragraphs of page eight.
To: Dylan Rodriquez, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division
From: Declan McCole, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine
Subject: SOM FEC Response to Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle

Dear Dylan,

The SOM Executive Committee reviewed the Proposal to Modify the UCR Comprehensive Review Model to Include a Test Optional AIS for Freshman Admission for the Fall 2021 and Fall 2022 Admissions Cycle. We applaud the comprehensive efforts to address this complicated and emotive issue. A number of concerns raised in discussion are listed below:

- Strong concerns were expressed regarding weighting of AP/IB and imposition of an unintended handicap on applicants from economically disadvantaged school districts.

- The committee was also unanimous in its concern that the Model is based on 4-year graduation rates that does not factor in that many UCR students have to work to support themselves (or possibly additional family members) financially and will need 5-6 years to graduate.

- Regarding removal of standardized tests, there was some opinion in agreement with the concern expressed by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions that: “completely abandoning standardized tests prematurely unnecessarily removes a criterion that has proven to be moderately effective for predicting student success. As the recent Academic Council’s Standard Testing Task Force (STTF) report shows that standardized test scores can indeed aid in predicting important aspects of student success, including undergraduate grade point average (UGPA), retention, and completion. Additionally, not having this criterion will make it more difficult to differentiate among the highest scoring applicants and will increase uncertainty surrounding predicting yield outcomes and make it harder to limit/increase admissions numbers.”

- There appears to be a need to clarify if, in addition to California high school students, students at private/independent and out-of-state schools will be obliged to take the test rather than the current vague language which states that the “New test will be made available” to them (Appendix A).

- There was also concern expressed as to the absence of a timeline to determine the success of the new model and what metrics will be used to determine success?
The overall consensus of SOM FEC was in agreement with the assessment of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions that the “Better with or without Test AIS model” is the preferred option for the revised UCR Comprehensive Review model.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Declan F. McCole, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee
School of Medicine
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

August 18, 2020

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
   Riverside Division

From: Stefano Vidussi, Chair
      Committee on Educational Policy

RE: Proposal to Modify UCR’s Comprehensive Review Process for Admissions

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) reviewed the proposal to modify UCR’s Comprehensive Review Process for Admissions at their August 14, 2020 meeting. The Committee noted that the goal for revising the model, besides the decision to make standardized testing optional is not clear in the proposal and the Committee recommends that the proposal be updated to include a statement on how the proposed new model will transform admissions. Additionally, concern was noted by the Committee that the proposed model will advantage some groups and individuals, and disadvantage others.

The Committee recognizes the urgency of defining a new AIS that does not use standardized testing and finds the proposed model adequate. However, the Committee feels that there are remaining access and equity issues in the Academic Index Score (AIS) model that should be addressed. In particular, access to AP/IB courses varies significantly from school to school. Giving a substantial weight to the number of AP/IB courses taken give an advantage to students who are already advantaged. The Committee recommends that the proposal include an analysis of students who were admitted to UCR with low AIS scores with the proposed model to determine the impact of the proposed change.