

**FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA – SANTA BARBARA: VISION  
AND POLICY FOR THE NEW MILLENIUM**

**Excerpts from the  
Report by the Committee on Admissions and Enrollments,  
Santa Barbara Division, Academic Senate,  
University of California, October 30, 2001**

**Presented to the Santa Cruz Division, Academic Senate, University of California,  
January 11, 2001**

**By  
Professor Michael T. Brown, Chair**

“I have a dream that my four children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.”

Martin Luther King, Jr.

"Some men see things as they are and ask ‘Why?’. I dream things that never were and say ‘Why not?’"

Robert F. Kennedy

Introduction

Who should be admitted into the freshman classes at the University of California and how should these determinations be made? The answers to these two questions are portentous. The stakes for California and the nation are high. A UC education is highly prized because of its superior quality and for what it symbolizes: a pathway to a dream – a uniquely American Dream, but one shared around the world. It is a dream that, with hard work and persistence, coupled with the knowledge and character developed by the University, even the least of us can ascend the mountain tops of economic, and social success from the valleys of poverty, inequity, and despair.

That dream has captured the hearts of Californians and people the world over, not only because of the great promise and power of the dream, but also because of its attainability. A University of California education was

(and is) among the most affordable and democratically available of any such education in the world (see i – John A. Douglass, Setting the conditions of undergraduate admissions: The role of University of California faculty in policy and process. Report to the Task Force on Governance, University of California Academic Senate, February, 1997). Moreover, from the beginning to 1960, the University admitted almost any high school student who successfully completed a program of study through one of the State’s accredited high schools.

In addition, the Organic Act of 1868 explicitly stated that UC admissions decisions had to be broad with respect to students’ sectarian or political orientations, geographical residence, and sex. In 1974, the California legislature called on each segment of public higher education to approximate the socio-demographic composition of California high school graduates. The Regents of the University of California approved a policy to this effect in 1988 (see ii – University of California Board of Regents, “Policy on undergraduate admission”, approved May 20, 1988)).

But powerful and seemingly irremediable socio-historical forces continue to make the UC pathway to the American Dream impassable for many. Consider that even though the University has been mandated to do so, it has never achieved a student body that approximates the general ethnic, sexual, and social class distribution of recent high school graduates.

It is impossible to escape the conclusion of the Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (see v – Report of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, California Legislature, September 1973) that the realities of unequal preparation and treatment make it extremely difficult for under-represented students to enter the University of California, especially as the admissions environment of the University becomes more selective. The more enrollment spaces are limited, the more difficult and important the challenge of admitting representative classes of students.

The demand for admission into the University of California has grown tremendously and but the resources necessary to provide a UC education have not grown at a rate that is consistent with the demand at local campuses. The University of California, and the Santa Barbara Campus in particular, has been forced to be highly selective.

The highly selective context of University admissions creates the opportunity to increase the “quality” of admitted and enrolled classes (see i and vii – Jerome Karabel, Freshman admissions at Berkeley: A policy for the 1990’s and beyond. Report by the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment, Berkeley Division, Academic Senate, University of California, May 19, 1989), but high selectivity does not necessarily result in high quality admissions. The distinction between highly selective admissions and high quality admissions lies in the manner with which “quality” is defined and the means by which admissions are determined.

Just as “selectivity” is not synonymous with “quality”, neither selectivity nor quality in admissions decisions is necessarily antithetical to broad representation of California constituents. Again, the means by which quality is defined and by which admissions decisions are made are critical. Over the years, unfortunately, “academic quality” and racial/ethnic diversity have been construed almost as antonyms and irreconcilable in admissions.

Racial/ethnic differences in certain academic quality indices like the SAT and the Eligibility Index have been construed as reflecting differences in scholastic merit and academic potential, whatever the disputed origin of the differences. In the minds of large segments of the faculty, administration, Regents, and general public, increasing the racial/ethnic diversity of the University has become synonymous with reducing the University’s academic prestige. After so many efforts to increase the diversity and quality of admitted classes, many have concluded that it just isn’t possible to do both. Consequently, the University has seemed willing to exchange the continued under-representation of certain segments of the California constituency for greater levels of measured academic quality.

UC admissions is currently mired in this conundrum. Because the tradition of research universities, like UC, and their faculty, has been to value the pursuit and production of knowledge for its own sake, they have been slow to respond to the historical, social, psychological, and political challenges of the day. Indeed, academicians characteristically eschew politics, on the whole, and believe that it is the role of others to develop and evaluate the applications and implications of their work.

Filling the vacuum, President Richard Atkinson has offered a number of proposals designed to address the issues of access and equity: Eligibility in the Local Context, Dual Admissions, elimination of the SAT in favor of comprehensive admissions review of applications, and a vice-presidential office devoted to academic outreach activities of the type that would increase the UC preparedness of a diverse constituencies. Parenthetically, no UC president in history has proposed as many admissions proposals as has the current president, President Atkinson.

Fundamentally, all of the UC President’s proposals are attempts to repair UC’s damaged reputation as an accessible and democratically available avenue to the American Dream. Moreover, all of the proposals have the intent and likelihood of expanding the pool of eligible students, after years of concerted efforts to narrow the pool (see i) and, increasing the challenge of admitting excellent and diverse classes of students by increasing selectivity.

In fulfilling our institutional responsibility with respect to admissions, the Committee on Admissions and Enrollments at UC Santa Barbara undertook the study of UCSB applicants, admits, and enrollments in the period

since 1986. The study of each of these three areas was viewed to be essential for making enlightened admissions policy.

### The Context of Santa Barbara Admissions

Today, UC Santa Barbara is among those campuses whose admissions environments are highly selective. UCSB's location on the south central coast of California, framed by mountains, the Pacific Ocean, and Channel Islands, contributes to its attraction. No other university in the entire United States has its campus wholly located on the ocean shore. Visitors are over-awed by the beauty of the Campus's picturesque setting, varied plant life, and mild climate. But there are other reasons that an UCSB education has become so highly sought.

UCSB has achieved high stature as a world-class research and teaching university. In 1995, UCSB was elected a member of the 61-member Association of American Universities which comprises the top two percent of all the universities and colleges in the United States and Canada. In 1997, the Campus was ranked in a national study as one of the top two public research universities in the country based on per capita faculty productivity and scholarship. Even more recently, a survey of U.S. universities in 21 fields by Science Watch ranked UCSB among the top ten highest impact universities based on the citation rate of research papers by our faculty. Our renowned faculty includes: a 1998 and a 2000 Nobel Prize winner in chemistry; a 2000 Nobel Prize winner for physics; a 1997 National Humanities Medal winner; Guggenheim fellows; fellows of the National Endowment for the Humanities; recipients of the National Medal of Science and National Medal of Technology; and members of the National Academy of Arts and Sciences, the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Academy of Engineering. Moreover, the quality and stature of our undergraduate programs equal that of our research programs. In fact, in the September 1999 issue of U.S. News and World Report, UCSB's undergraduate programs were ranked number 13 among all public universities.

Notwithstanding that the achievements of UC Santa Barbara faculty and administrators have contributed to Campus demand, significant resource limitations also restrict the capacity of the Campus to grow in response to that increased demand. California zoning regulations, UCSB's promontory location, limitations on the availability of land, housing limitations, and other resource constraints limit the growth of the Campus. Consequently, UCSB has an enrollment cap and a mandated "slow growth" rate.

Unless and until capacity increases at UCSB and other impacted UC campuses (e.g., Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego), selectivity will only increase. Tidal Wave II, the children of the Baby Boom generation, will soon flood all of California's colleges and universities. The multiple filing system instituted in 1985, allowing students to apply to multiple campuses in the UC System with one application, has catalyzed demand as well.

Outreach activities are yielding fruit and promise a greater harvest of UC-ready students of under-represented student groups. Anticipated efforts to enhance the accessibility and perception of accessibility of the University

will increase selectivity still further. Consequently, competition for a UC education, including at Santa Barbara, is high and expected to increase.

The development of UC Merced, the future 10<sup>th</sup> Campus in the UC System and already “fast-tracked”, will not address the problem of satisfying demand at highly selective campuses like UC Santa Barbara. There is even question that it will help enough to ease enrollment demand to the UC system. Consequently, how Santa Barbara and the other campuses effect admissions decisions will come under greater scrutiny and have greater repercussions for California citizens and the University. More importantly, how Santa Barbara, and the UC system as a whole, manages admissions in the context of present-day sociopolitical actualities is of great consequence to the hopes and dreams that have been engendered almost from the inception of the University of California.

### The Status of Santa Barbara Admissions

How selective is the Santa Barbara campus? In 1993, the campus admitted about 87% of those who applied, UC eligible or not; virtually all UC-eligible students were admitted. In 2000, the admit rate was 47%, the first time ever below 50%. This past admissions cycle, the admit rate was about 48%. *Indeed, Santa Barbara has been among the four most selective of the UC campuses for the last 4 years* (see Appendix A – University of California Application, Admissions, and Enrollment of California Resident Freshman for Fall 1995 through 2000).

*The number of applications to the Santa Barbara campus have doubled since 1986* (the earliest year for which we have electronic data). Almost the entire increase (over 93%) has occurred since 1995. While the number of applicants has increased dramatically since 1986, the capacity to enroll them has not, so the number of admissions offers made has increased at a much slower rate, by only 53% since 1986 and only 10% since 1995 (see Appendix C – Freshman Admits to UCSB by Ethnicity: 1986-2001).

### Admission of Under-represented Students

What has this high selectivity at Santa Barbara meant for the admission of under-represented students? First, it is important to observe that *the number of under-represented students who are applying to UCSB is over three and a half times what it was in 1986* (while the total pool of applicants has doubled). Most of those increases have occurred since 1995. In short, it appears that, in the last five or six years, UC Santa Barbara has become a much more attractive place for prospecting freshman applicants, most especially those from under-represented segments of the Campus community

The number of admission offers going to under-represented students have increased almost at the rate at which the number of their applications have grown (see Appendix C), almost tripling (2.9 times) since 1986.

It is useful to keep in mind that American Indians, African Americans, and Chicanos/Latinos, have always been under-represented in UC Santa Barbara's application and admission pools relative to their representation in the pools of California high school graduates. UCSB has tried to remedy this troubling situation and has been making up ground from 1986 to the present. In 1986, under-represented students constituted 10% of the applicant pool and 9% of the admitted students. Since 1994, under-represented students have been at least 18% of UCSB's applicant pools and 18% of the admitted classes last admissions cycle.

UC Santa Barbara has managed to do what few other UC campuses and no other moderate to highly selective campus have been able to do: keep the admit rates for under-represented students comparable to the admission rates for the entire pool of applicants. In 1998 and 1999, Santa Barbara was third to Riverside and Santa Cruz in the proportion of its admitted students being those from under-represented student groups (both UCR and UCSC admitted all UC eligible applicants). In 2000 and 2001, UC Santa Barbara was second to UC Riverside in the proportion of admitted students from under-represented student groups! UC Santa Barbara can be considered a model for achieving a certain degree of success in selecting talented students from under-represented constituencies in the State.

#### The Academic Quality of Admitted Students

Have the academic characteristics of admitted students declined over time as Santa Barbara has struggled to increase the racial/ethnic diversity of its student body? The data indicate that the answer, in short, is "No".

UC Santa Barbara's admitted classes evidence better preparation since 1995 (see Appendix F – Average SAT, HS GPA, and ADM for New UCSB Freshman Admits: Fall 1995 to Fall 2001). The GPAs of the admitted students has jumped 7% since 1995 (an increase of .27 in average GPA), led by increases among African American, American Indian, and Chicano students. For example, the average GPA of admitted African Americans students has increased from 3.33 in 1995 to 3.69 in 2001; an increase of .36.

Two other quality indicators have increased in UCSB's pool of admits since 1995. Average total SAT I scores have increased by 8%, again led by the increase in such scores among the African American and Asian students who were admitted. Average ADM scores have also increased by 14 percent, led by increases in the average ADM scores of African American, Chicano, and Asian students who were admitted. The increase in the average GPAs, SAT Is, and ADM scores in the admitted students may be linked to quality increases in the applicant pools.

#### The Academic Quality of Applicants

The GPAs in UCSB's applicant pools have increased 3% since 1995, accompanied by a 5% increase in total SAT I scores and an 9% increase in Academic Index (ADM) scores (see Appendix F). Such data indicates that the

students applying to UCSB are better prepared academically than they were seven years ago, if only slightly.

This increase average levels of preparation is on top of a base level of preparation that was already high. For example, in 1995, the average GPA for the total pool of applicants was 3.47 on a-f courses taken. In 2001, the average GPA was 3.59; an average increase of .12. In 1995, the average ADM index was 5887.63; in 2001, the average ADM index was 6410.

It may be startling to observe that the increase in GPA, SAT I, and ADM scores observed in the total applicant pool since 1995 has been led by increases among racial/ethnic minority group students, particularly African American and Chicano students (see Appendix F)! For example, in 1995 the average GPA among the African American applicants was 3.13. But in 2001, the average GPA among them was around 3.31; an average increase of .18. Thus, students from under represented populations who apply to UCSB are evidencing increasingly better preparation for post-secondary education and at a rate that's better than for the general applicant pool.

#### Accounting for Santa Barbara's Successes and Identifying Challenges

School context admissions. For the last three years, including this year, students have been selected for admission based upon their standing in their local high schools, called "school context admits". After all of the applications have been evaluated for accuracy, all applicants who apply to UCSB from a California accredited school and have been deemed UC-eligible are identified. The size of the graduating class of each school are estimated based on last year's information. Then, 2% of that number is calculated for each school; this number would be the number of the year's applicants to be admitted by school context. Next, applicants are admitted by descending order of ADM scores who had applied from each school until the top 2% of each school had been admitted. In 2000, the first year we employed the school context admissions, the strategy accounted for 33% of all admissions and 39% of all under-represented students admitted that year. In 2001, this strategy accounted for 28% of all admits and 37% of all under-represented students admitted that year.

Statewide ADM-based admissions. Second, we have limited the number of students only admitted based on their ADM scores in a statewide context. Essentially, students not already admitted by school context, and who possessed the highest ADM scores in Santa Barbara's applicant pool, were admitted into the Campus up to an amount determined to yield about 50% of expected enrollments by a combination of the school context and ADM-only strategies. In 2000, 39% of all admits were accomplished by this strategy and yielded only 16% of all under-represented students admitted that year. In 2001, 26% of all admissions were effected by this procedure and yielded only 11% of all under-represented students admitted that year.

The index was not used for the other 38 and 46% of admissions decisions, respectively, in years 2000 and 2001 .

It is also important to note that the ADM, Admissions Index, used by UC Santa Barbara was reformulated in 1999. As Allan Stewart-Oaten reported in his end-of-year Admissions and Enrollment Committee Report (see viii – Allan Stewart-Oaten, Committee on Admissions and Enrollment Report: 1998-1999), a number of validity studies of possible ADM components have been conducted over the years against as many validity criteria as were quantifiable (e.g., 1<sup>st</sup> year GPA, 2<sup>nd</sup> Year GPA, graduation GPA, retention after the first year, academic probation status, graduation in 6 years, and more). The data was examined with respect to sex, racial/ethnic group membership, college or division of major, entering year, and courses with high enrollments. It should be noted that among other possible predictors considered (e.g., number of honors courses, number of AP courses, number of college courses, number of a-f courses, etc.), none of them showed any promise after accounting for grades and test scores. Tables 1 through 14 presents data concerning the predictive validity of high school GPA and test scores over the last 5 years.

**Table 1: Variance in UC Freshman Engineering GPA Explained by HS GPA, SAT I and SAT II Scores**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>Average Explained Variance</u>
<u>Predictor Variables/Equations:</u>							
(1)	HS GPA	27.70	18.80	11.20	9.03	14.00	16.15
(2)	SAT I Verbal	8.00	6.80	1.1*	1.6*	1.40	5.40
(3)	SAT I Math	12.10	4.30	6.50	2.20	2.60	5.54
(4)	SAT II Writing	9.30	5.80	6.20	2.60	2.30	5.24
(5)	SAT II Math	10.90	6.50	9.90	4.30	4.50	7.22
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	12.80	7.80	6.40	2.40	3.90	6.66
(7)	HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	38.90	26.30	16.90	11.90	19.30	22.66
(8)	HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	37.20	26.50	20.70	13.30	21.50	23.84
(9)	HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	39.80	29.80	21.90	13.50	22.00	25.40
(10)	HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	39.80	27.60	21.50	13.30	21.70	24.86



(11)	HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	41.70	30.80	23.20	13.60	22.10	26.28
------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

\* SAT I Verbal not statistically significant in prediction equation; all other variables are statistically significant at <.01 level.

**Table 2: Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Regression Equation:**

**Predicted UCSB Engineering GPA = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
<u>Predictor Variables:</u>						
(1)	HS GPA	.48*	.41*	.26*	.28*	.40*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	-.04	.13	-.15*	.01	.03
(3)	SAT I Math	.21*	.07	-.02	.02	.03
(4)	SAT II Writing	.08	-.00	.19*	.07	.02
(5)	SAT II Math	.05	.11	.24*	.14	.19*
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	.16*	.19*	.15*	.05	.07

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

**Table 3: Variance in UC Freshman Letters & Sciences GPA Explained by HS GPA, SAT I and SAT II Scores**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>	<u>Average Explained Variance</u>
<u>Predictor Variables/Equations:</u>							
(1)	HS GPA	15.40	17.50	14.30	14.30	17.20	15.50
(2)	SAT I Verbal	8.50	9.70	7.20	8.00	9.40	8.60
(3)	SAT I Math	6.00	9.30	6.70	4.00	7.20	6.60
(4)	SAT II Writing	11.10	10.80	9.30	9.30	9.60	10.00
(5)	SAT II Math	5.50	8.60	6.00	4.00	7.00	6.20
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	4.81	4.40	3.80	3.30	2.10	3.70
(7)	HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	21.60	25.10	22.20	19.70	24.30	22.58
(8)	HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	22.40	25.30	22.20	20.50	24.10	22.90

(9)	HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	23.10	25.70	22.60	20.90	24.20	23.30
(10)	HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	23.00	26.10	23.10	21.00	25.10	23.66
(11)	HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	23.50	26.30	23.40	21.30	25.10	23.92

Note: All predictors and equations are statistically significant at or beyond the .01 level of significance.

**Table 4: Standardized Regression Coefficients for the Regression Equation:  
Predicted UCSB Letters & Sciences GPA = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
<u>Predictor Variables:</u>						
(1)	HS GPA	.32*	.34*	.34*	.33*	.36*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	.08*	.08*	.08*	.08*	.12*
(3)	SAT I Math	.04	.08*	.10*	.01	.05
(4)	SAT II Writing	.16*	.13*	.13*	.16*	.11*
(5)	SAT II Math	.02*	.06	.02	.02	.06
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	.08*	.06*	.06*	.05*	.02

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

**Table 5: Logistic Regressions of Admission Variables on UCSB Engineering Freshmen Probation Status: 1995-1999**

<u>Predictor Equations:</u>	1995			1996			1997		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	227	<b>28.81</b>	.48	223	<b>17.04</b>	.41	353	<b>21.08</b>	.31
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	230	<b>29.43</b>	.47	223	<b>17.53</b>	.42	354	<b>24.78</b>	.34
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	228	<b>32.95</b>	.50	223	<b>21.88</b>	.46	352	<b>24.01</b>	.34
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	227	<b>30.60</b>	.49	223	<b>18.25</b>	.42	352	<b>26.65</b>	.37
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	225	<b>34.02</b>	.52	223	<b>22.52</b>	.47	350	<b>25.66</b>	.36

Predictor Equations:	1998			1999		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	379	<b>10.78</b>	.22	514	<b>19.89</b>	.27
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	381	<b>15.0</b>	.24	514	<b>25.36</b>	.30
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	380	<b>14.47</b>	.23	513	<b>24.85</b>	.30
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	378	<b>15.14</b>	.24	511	<b>26.45</b>	.31
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	377	<b>14.60</b>	.23	510	<b>26.04</b>	.31

Note: Statistically significant Chi-squares (99% confidence level) are in **BOLD**.

**Table 6: Odds-Ratio Estimates for the Regression Equation:**

**Predicted UCSB Engineering Probation Status = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
Predictor Variables:						
(1)	HS GPA	12.038*	9.814*	3.615*	2.912*	4.790*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	.999	.999	.997	1.000	1.000
(3)	SAT I Math	1.002	1.003	1.000	.999	.999
(4)	SAT II Writing	1.002	.999	1.003	1.000	1.001
(5)	SAT II Math	1.002	1.002	1.006	1.006	1.005
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	1.003	1.004	1.000	1.000	1.000

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

**Table 7: Logistic Regressions of Admission Variables on UCSB Letters & Sciences Freshmen Probation Status: 1995-1999**

Predictor Equations:	1995			1996			1997		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	227	<b>28.81</b>	.48	223	<b>17.04</b>	.41	353	<b>21.08</b>	.31
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	230	<b>29.43</b>	.47	223	<b>17.53</b>	.42	354	<b>24.78</b>	.34
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	228	<b>32.95</b>	.50	223	<b>21.88</b>	.46	352	<b>24.01</b>	.34
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	227	<b>30.60</b>	.49	223	<b>18.25</b>	.42	352	<b>26.65</b>	.37

HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	225	<b>34.02</b>	.52	223	<b>22.52</b>	.47	350	<b>25.66</b>	.36
---	-----	--------------	-----	-----	--------------	-----	-----	--------------	-----

Predictor Equations:	1998			1999		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	379	<b>10.78</b>	.22	514	<b>19.89</b>	.27
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	381	<b>15.0</b>	.24	514	<b>25.36</b>	.30
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	380	<b>14.47</b>	.23	513	<b>24.85</b>	.30
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	378	<b>15.14</b>	.24	511	<b>26.45</b>	.31
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	377	<b>14.60</b>	.23	510	<b>26.04</b>	.31

Note: Statistically significant Chi-squares (99% confidence level) are in **BOLD**.

**Table 8: Odds-Ratio Estimates for the Regression Equation:**  
**Predicted UCSB Letters & Sciences Probation Status = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
Predictor Variables:						
(1)	HS GPA	4.779*	5.309*	6.035*	4.776*	9.461*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	1.002	1.002	1.003*	1.002	1.002
(3)	SAT I Math	1.000	1.002	1.002	1.001	1.000
(4)	SAT II Writing	1.005*	1.003*	1.003*	1.002	1.003*
(5)	SAT II Math	1.000	1.002	1.001	1.000	1.002
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	1.001	1.000	1.001	1.000	1.000

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

**Table 9: Logistic Regressions of Admission Variables on UCSB Engineering Freshmen Retention Status: 1995-1999**

Predictor Equations:	1995			1996			1997		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	230	4.63	.24	229	5.75	.28	358	3.89	.18
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	230	29.43	.47	223	17.53	.42	354	24.78	.34
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	228	32.95	.50	223	21.88	.46	352	24.01	.34

HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	227	30.60	.49	223	18.25	.42	352	26.65	.37
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	225	34.02	.52	223	22.52	.47	350	25.66	.36
Predictor Equations:	1998			1999					
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$			
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	386	5.16	.20	519	<b>18.26</b>	.37			
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	381	15.0	.24	514	<b>25.36</b>	.30			
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	380	14.47	.23	513	<b>24.85</b>	.30			
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	378	15.14	.24	511	<b>26.45</b>	.31			
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	377	14.60	.23	510	<b>26.04</b>	.31			
Note: Statistically significant Chi-squares (99% confidence level) are in <b>BOLD</b> .									

**Table 10: Odds-Ratio Estimates for the Regression Equation:**  
**Predicted UCSB Engineering Retention Status = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
Predictor Variables:						
(1)	HS GPA	1.396	3.255	1.541	1.815	8.786*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	1.003	1.001	.995	.998	1.001
(3)	SAT I Math	1.002	.997	.998	.999	1.006
(4)	SAT II Writing	.997	1.002	1.000	1.002	.995
(5)	SAT II Math	1.005	1.001	1.004	1.006	1.003
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	1.000	1.001	1.004	1.003	.999
* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.						

**Table 11: Logistic Regressions of Admission Variables on UCSB Letters & Sciences Freshmen Retention Status: 1995-1999**

Predictor Equations:	1995			1996			1997		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	3064	<b>21.08</b>	.14	3155	<b>37.97</b>	.20	3291	<b>19.71</b>	.15

HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	3038	<b>19.98</b>	.15	3140	<b>32.99</b>	.19	3282	<b>23.42</b>	.16
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	3033	<b>22.34</b>	.14	3128	<b>34.65</b>	.19	3272	<b>23.96</b>	.16
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	3021	<b>22.89</b>	.16	3114	<b>36.14</b>	.20	3255	<b>24.34</b>	.16
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	3016	<b>24.49</b>	.15	3102	<b>37.56</b>	.20	3245	<b>24.40</b>	.16

Predictor Equations:	1998			1999		
	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	3095	<b>21.05</b>	.15	3165	<b>26.96</b>	.20
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	3113	<b>23.29</b>	.16	3162	<b>39.74</b>	.23
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	3109	<b>26.15</b>	.16	3148	<b>40.60</b>	.23
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	3078	<b>22.37</b>	.16	3145	<b>44.76</b>	.24
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	3074	<b>25.06</b>	.16	3132	<b>47.23</b>	.24

Note: Statistically significant Chi-squares (99% confidence level) are in **BOLD**.

**Table 12: Odds-Ratio Estimates for the Regression Equation:**  
**Predicted UCSB Letters & Sciences Retention Status = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>1995</u>	<u>1996</u>	<u>1997</u>	<u>1998</u>	<u>1999</u>
Predictor Variables:						
(1)	HS GPA	1.480	1.855*	1.616*	1.580*	2.014*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.000	.997
(3)	SAT I Math	.999	1.002	.999	1.000	.999
(4)	SAT II Writing	1.001	1.001	1.001	1.001	1.004*
(5)	SAT II Math	1.002	1.001	1.001	1.001	1.002
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	1.001	1.000	1.000	1.001	1.001

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

**Table 13: Logistic Regressions of Admission Variables on UCSB Engineering Freshmen Graduation Status: in 6, 5, and 4 years**

	6 years	5 Years	4 Years
--	---------	---------	---------

Predictor Equations:	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	$\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	230	9.78	.24	229	<b>22.09</b>	.28	358	7.98	.20
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	233	9.55	.22	229	<b>21.94</b>	.35	359	7.66	.19
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	230	<b>12.76</b>	.29	229	<b>21.95</b>	.35	357	10.23	.21
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	230	<b>18.47</b>	.33	229	<b>22.24</b>	.36	357	8.66	.20
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	227	<b>23.63</b>	.37	229	<b>22.25</b>	.36	355	10.98	.21

Note: Statistically significant Chi-squares (99% confidence level) are in **BOLD**.

**Table 14: Odds-Ratio Estimates for the Regression Equation:**

**Predicted UCSB Engineering Graduation Status = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

Predictor Variables:	6 Years	5 Years	4 Years
(1) HS GPA	2.417*	6.374*	2.463
(2) SAT I Verbal	.992	1.001	.999
(3) SAT I Math	1.001	.998	1.002
(4) SAT II Writing	1.006	1.001	1.002
(5) SAT II Math	1.001	1.001	.999
(6) SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	1.005	1.000	.998

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

**Table 15: Logistic Regressions of Admission Variables on UCSB Letters & Sciences Freshmen Graduation Status: in 6, 5, and 4 years**

Predictor Equations:	n	In 6 years $\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	In 5 Years $\chi^2$	$\gamma$	n	In 4 Years $\chi^2$	$\gamma$
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math	3064	<b>64.86</b>	.17	3155	<b>96.80</b>	.21	3291	<b>186.50</b>	.28
HS GPA + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	3038	<b>66.18</b>	.18	3140	<b>102.09</b>	.22	3282	<b>180.65</b>	.28
HS GPA + SAT II Verbal + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	3033	<b>66.16</b>	.18	3128	<b>106.79</b>	.23	3272	<b>180.98</b>	.28
HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math	3021	<b>68.21</b>	.18	3144	<b>103.56</b>	.22	3255	<b>185.99</b>	.28

HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	3016	<b>68.16</b>	.18	3102	<b>107.00</b>	.23	3245	<b>187.46</b>	.28
---	------	--------------	-----	------	---------------	-----	------	---------------	-----

Note: Statistically significant chi-squares (99% confidence level) are in **BOLD**.

**Table 14: Odds-Ratio Estimates for the Regression Equation:**

**Predicted UCSB Letters & Sciences Graduation Status = HS GPA + SAT I Verbal + SAT I Math + SAT II Writing + SAT II Math + SAT II 3<sup>rd</sup> Test**

		<u>In 6 Years</u>	<u>In 5 Years</u>	<u>In 4 Years</u>
<u>Predictor Variables:</u>				
(1)	HS GPA	2.158*	2.530*	3.310*
(2)	SAT I Verbal	.999	.999	1.001
(3)	SAT I Math	1.000	1.001	1.002
(4)	SAT II Writing	1.001	1.003*	1.002
(5)	SAT II Math	1.001	1.000	.999
(6)	SAT II 3 <sup>rd</sup> Test	1.000	1.000	.999

\* Statistically significant in prediction equation at <.01 level.

A study of the tables yields the following conclusions. First, high school grades and test scores account for between 22 and 27% of academic performance at UCSB as defined by high school GPA, and lesser degrees of other performances. Thus, between at least 73% of student success at UCSB must be accountable by other factors. Second, the uncapped GPA (up to 4.4) was consistently the best predictor of student achievement (both in the College of Engineering and the College of Letters and Sciences) and, according to statistics, should constitute at least 60% of the empirical weight of the ADM, both for the Letters and Sciences and the Engineering ADMs. In the selection of Letters and Sciences students, the SAT II Writing test was consistently the second best predictor (regardless of student racial/ethnic status) and should be strongly weighted in the ADM; it was a particularly good predictor of the achievement of Chicano and Latino students. In selecting Engineering students, the SAT II Math test also demonstrated statistically significant but inconsistent relations to student performance at UCSB; however, it was the second best predictor of performance after the high school GPA, performed better than the SAT I Math test, and should be weighted strongly in the Engineering-specific ADM. Importantly, the SAT II Third Achievement Test was found to be a useful predictor of some university performances. Because of the absence of a long data record, there remains a need to study further the efficacy of using the Third Achievement Test. The SAT I Verbal and Math Tests were revealed to be weak and inconsistent predictors of student achievement, relative to the other predictors. As a consequence of such data, the 1999 Admissions and Enrollments Committee, moving conservatively in adjusting ADM weights, settled on an ADM formula where



the GPA was weighted 52% and the other components were weighted 9.5% each, with a plan to revisit the formula. We are moving to reduce the weight of the SAT I Verbal and Math tests in the ADM still further.

The Santa Barbara Admissions and Enrollments Committee believes that to overweight quantitative predictors in making admissions decisions is much like trying to find a set of keys, lost by the roadside in the dark, only by the lamppost, simply because the light is better there (despite the fact that the lost keys were elsewhere, though in the dark!).

Admissions based on file reading. After students have been selected by school context and the ADM, the rest of the UC-eligible applicants have been evaluated based on a comprehensive review of their applications. Selection has been based on the ratings of two (and sometimes three) judges with respect to the applicants demonstrated academic preparation and scholastic promise. A 24-point scale has been created, with 6 points possible on the basis of quality of academic preparation (i.e., grade point average in University-approved subjects, total Senior year courses, total university-required courses, and number of honors courses beyond 8) and another 18 points possible based on academic promise, based on evidence of leadership, honors and awards, challenges overcome, and diversity of intellectual and social experiences. The socioeconomic context of achievements and preparation was considered in making judgements. In 2000, the strategy accounted for 19% of admissions and 38% of all under-represented students admitted. In 2001, 29% of admissions decisions were accomplished by the file reading strategy, with 45% of all under-represented students being admitted this way. Clearly, the file reading process is extremely useful in identifying racially and ethnically diverse talent.

College of Engineering admissions. Previously, the College of Engineering's admissions process was separate from other University admissions and did not employ two important aspects of Campus-wide admissions processes: 1) comprehensive review of the candidate's entire application emphasizing Committee-determined criteria and 2) evaluation of the candidate with respect to opportunities and challenges in the local context. Moreover, Engineering's admissions strategy formerly relied almost exclusively on SAT I Math scores, vastly over-weighting those scores and under-weighting the high school GPA.

Recently, the College of Engineering has agreed to a more centralized arrangement where the Office of Admissions performs the evaluations and makes the admissions decisions.

### The Santa Barbara Vision, Mission, Principals, and Proposals

The Admissions and Enrollment Committee at UC Santa Barbara believes that an important part of our greatness as a university is determined by the talent of the people who come to us. Long ago, it was written:

“Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses, yearning to breathe free, The wretched refuse of your

teeming shore, Send these, the homeless, the tempest-tossed, to me: I lift up my lamp beside the golden door”

Emma Lazarus, 1883 (inscription on the Statue of Liberty)

If high quality education is the principal means of vertical social mobility for California citizens, then who has access to the best of it has access to the rest of it (social mobility).

It is clear that the largest part of the problem of high selectivity is due to the limited availability of University resources. At present, however, there does not appear to be the wherewithal or will among governmental and educational leaders to make the resources available admit everyone who desires a UC education, or even those who have been found to be UC Eligible, at selective campuses like UC Santa Barbara.

Nonetheless, if we must restrict access to a UC education, if we must select, how should UCSB proceed to do so? The Santa Barbara Committee on Admissions and Enrollments believes that a definition of merit wholly or mostly on the quantifiable academic characteristics that can be measured presently, leaves about 80% of student achievement unaccounted for.

**Principle One: UC Santa Barbara is committed to the objective of admitting applicants who we believe will take fullest advantage of what the college has to offer, contribute most to the educational process at the university, and be most successful in using what they have learned for the benefit of the larger society.**

We base this principle on a study of the history of admissions at the University of California (see i – John A. Douglass, Setting the conditions of undergraduate admissions: The role of University of California faculty in policy and process. Report to the Task Force on Governance, University of California Academic Senate, February, 1997) and of the work of Andrew H. Mellow Foundation head William Bowen, an economist and former President of Princeton University, and former Harvard University President and former Harvard Law School Dean Derek Bok (see William G. Bowen and Derek Bok, The shape of the river: long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1998).

Every society has positions of authority and expertise that must be filled. The ability to fill those positions and to do so effectively can dictate the course of that society. Those who are prepared by the University of California should recognize the purpose for which they have been chosen. They are not chosen to satisfy their own personal desires and ambitions alone. Else, students will come here, not necessarily for the purpose of learning anything of benefit to the State or world we live in. They will come for the credential, for the name of a UC campus on their transcript. After receiving those things, they will continue on and attempt to cash in on their association with the University. The citizens of California, and beyond, want and need more out of University

of California students.

So, Santa Barbara seeks to admit such students for whom a UC education is likely to have the greatest impact, both on them and on society through them: students for whom a UC education would significantly advance them and the social good.

**Principle Two: Such students are likely to be those who have made the most of their educational opportunities, despite circumstances and possible hardships.**

All of a student’s achievements in all areas of life are viewed as relevant: educational, occupational, physical, social, civic, familial, aesthetic, etc. Moreover, those achievements should be assessed with consideration given to the context of opportunities and challenges that circumscribe their development.

UC Santa Barbara is also interested in selecting students with academic promise: who exhibit the qualities necessary to both advance society in applying that knowledge to the multitudinous and apparently intractable problems that challenge California and the society at large. The kinds of qualities that UCSB faculty believe are necessary and that we already assess include: tough-mindedness in the face of challenge or disadvantage, capacity to endure hardship, leadership, drive/motivation, initiative, diversity of intellectual and social experiences, special talents, creativity, insight into contemporary societal challenges facing California and beyond, a personal investment in addressing some one or more of those concerns, and a discerning mind for apprehending the social, economic, psychological, scientific, technical, historical, political, artistic, humanitarian concerns of the day.

We are convinced that 1) such a high and lofty admission’s mission, 2) UCSB’s dedication to this mission, and 3) UC Santa Barbara’s present and future success at achieving the mission will earn and maintain for us the levels of elite status that are desired. But far more importantly, we believe that such a mission is worthy of pursuit, regardless to how others view us. It is the right thing to do. A great University cannot afford to be insular.

In pursuing our admissions goals, we do not believe that people deserve entry into the University of California merely because of the socio-demographic category to which they may be ascribed. A great university such as UC Santa Barbara cannot appreciate some applicants and not others, purely based upon the external packaging of their talents and service commitments. Race and ethnic group background should not, must not, and will not determine admissions decision at UCSB.

**Principle Three: It is philosophically contradictory to decry racism and ethnocentrism and then make admissions decisions based upon race and ethnic group membership alone.**

Notwithstanding, the Committee on Admissions and Enrollment recognizes that the true nature of an applicant’s achievements or potentialities can not be fully judged or appreciated without consideration of the context that gave them rise and give them expression.

**Principle Four: A true and complete assessment of every student applicant must consider the student’s developmental context.**

Therefore, we believe that a true and complete assessment of a person’s talents and commitment to serve the commonwealth cannot be fully assessed without considering the background of the candidate. At UC Santa Barbara, we believe that there is value in learning “where a person is coming from”. How does their background inform their values, commitments, and viewpoints, etc.? We believe that the common good is furthered by welcoming into the academy, those individuals who come from backgrounds that caused them to be devalued or allocated less educational and social capital based only on the color of their skin. Much as Martin Luther King had urged, we aim to assess the content of a student’s character.

**Principle Five: The idea that an elite institution cannot select both academically qualified students and students from under-represented groups is a false conundrum and we reject it.**

Not only does UC Santa Barbara data show that this is not true, we believe that holding this view does not advance the mission of the University. The definition of “academic merit” should be reconsidered and refined, continuously, to ensure that the full range of an applicant’s capacity to succeed at UCSB is assessed. “Excellence” is inseparable from “diversity” in that we can not know the full breadth of what can be defined as excellent until we are sensitive to the full range of its expression across the spectrum of applicants. Moreover, we believe that we need to be ever vigilante about how bias is already operating in our admissions decision-making. Indeed, how we operationally define terms like “elite”, “merit”, and “quality” not only reflect our biases but also can perpetuate inequities, however unintentionally. “The design of the slipper determines who it can and will fit”.

**Principle Six: The University of California at Santa Barbara is an institution of international reach and renown with a regional California responsibility.**

The reason that UCSB even exists is because it was clear early in the history of the University that it could best service the needs of California citizens by being optimally accessible to them and address unique regional concerns of the State. Consequently, campuses of the University were distributed across the State and comprise the “multiuniversity” called “The University of California”.

The presence of out-of-state and international students is viewed as one that enriches the intellectual vibrancy of the Campus and provides perspectives that can increase the reach of our education and our students. Nonetheless, we have a responsibility to California citizens, first and foremost, especially those in the Santa Barbara service area.

**Principle Seven: The evaluation of applicants for admissions must, of necessity, be flexible enough to evaluate quantified, quantifiable, and qualitative indices of a candidates talents and potential. Admissions test scores and grade point averages, alone, are insufficient for establishing the worthiness of an applicant for admission.**

It is unconscionable to consider, as well as scientifically unsupported, that quantified characteristics of applicants can tell us all we need to know to predict likely student success once enrolled at the University. Moreover, the greatest proportion of student achievement, even as narrowly defined by the criterion of UC freshman grade point average, is not accounted for by the best set of quantitative predictors (viz., test scores and high school grades) available to us. In addition, we believe that rewarding test performance is not necessarily the same thing as rewarding educational achievement or capacity to serve.

Making admissions decisions is necessarily subjective. However, it need not be, and must not be, arbitrary or beyond accountability. UC Santa Barbara will continue to specify the qualities that it seeks in the successful applicant and the procedures employed to gather and evaluate that information.

**Principle Eight: No admission characteristic of applicants that demonstrates statistically significant socio-demographic differences should be used to admit students into UC Santa Barbara unless that difference is demonstrably critical to achieving the University’s admission goals.**

**Principle Nine: UC Santa Barbara pays fidelity to the longstanding goal of the University of California to achieve a student body of that excels academically and that approximates the socio-demographic composition of California high school graduates.**

**Principle Ten: Given the current limitations on the ability of admissions officers and faculty to accurately predict what student will or won’t succeed at a college/university, we believe that any admissions process that seeks to be efficacious with respect to optimally admitting talented and diverse classes of students must be rigorously studied in the search for best practices.**

How?

Given the stated mission and admission principals, how should UCSB go about making admission decisions?

The Committee does endorse a number of proposals that should be instrumental in moving the Campus forward with respect to the mission and principals, . The Committee issues these proposals, recognizing our fidelity to current Regental and Presidential policies.

**Recommendation 1: A comprehensive evaluation process for admitting an optimally excellent and diverse class of students is strongly endorsed. A truly efficacious comprehensive review process should: 1) consider as many indicators of student achievement and promise as are evident in the application file; 2) require that full review of those achievements and potentialities be considered before any candidate is rejected from consideration; 3) require that those achievement and promise factors be weighted in admissions decision-making to the degree empirically justified, consistent with campus enrollment goals, and consistent with best practices in admitting excellent and diverse classes of students; 4) judge the value of those achievements and potentialities against the context of student opportunities to learn; and 5) require that all candidates be evaluated against all admissions criteria.**

**Recommendation 2: Admissions decisions relying largely or exclusively upon use of quantitative formulas to compare all students, without regarding student challenges or opportunities to learn, are prohibited.**

**Recommendation 3: Quantitative admissions formula, when used, should be justified on the basis of empirical validity and current knowledge of “best practices” in admissions.**

**Recommendation 4: Any test required for admission at UCSB, should have the following qualities: 1) a demonstrable relationship to the UC recommended high school curriculum; 2) a demonstrable relationship to as many indices of UC student achievement as are available and salient; 3) offer additional, independent, and substantive power to predict UC students achievement beyond that already provided by the high school GPA; and 4) any socio-demographic differences on the test should have compelling educational importance/significance with no viable alternative.**

**Recommendation 5: The Committee should study how the fragile nature of the eligibility pool of African American students should be factored in UC Santa Barbara’s admissions and enrollments decisions.**

**Recommendation 6: Continue working with the College of Engineering to design and implement admissions practices that will lead to the selection of academically talented students in a manner more consistent with the previously stated principles and recommendations.**

**Recommendation 7: Experimentally admit up to 4% of students in order to determine the likelihood and**

**cost of denying students admission and to investigate the efficacy of considering various admissions factors (e.g., the efficacy of admitting non-competitive but UC eligible students from very low socioeconomic backgrounds or those who are non-competitive but graduate from UC partner schools).**

A & E holds it to be self-evident that such admissions practices as recommended will lead to the most accurate, consistent, fair and efficacious admissions decisions possible, assure UCSB applicants of full consideration, better justify negative admissions decisions, and help UCSB identify talent in all of its forms, however packaged by student socio-demographic characteristics.

### Concluding Remarks

It is unfortunate, perhaps, that the caliber of education offered at UC Santa Barbara and all of our sister institutions cannot be accessed by everyone who desires or is worthy of it. Current resource limitations and the lack of will do not permit it at this time in our State's history. Consequently, the University must select students for entry and must do so in a way that is justified, equitable, and transparent. Our public expects no less and demands no more.

The vision set forth circumvents the confounding but false conundrum that has pitted the admission of a diverse student body against the admission of one high in academic quality. The needs of the State are paramount: it needs the participation of representatives of all of its citizens. The University of California at Santa Barbara is committed to serving that need.