UC Berkeley Undergraduate Student Diversity Project
Admissions Policy and Process Working Group
Recommendations

A. Freshman Admission Policy

A1. Review language of policy to balance emphasis on academic excellence with importance of equity and inclusion; reduce references to selectivity and competition

A2. Change language of reader evaluation ratings from "yes-possible-no" to "strongly recommend-recommend-do not recommend" (or similar)

A3. As part of the larger University conversation about the role and value of standardized admissions tests, consider a pilot project in which a sample of applicants would be reviewed without reference to their test scores
   - Letters and Science only
   - Consistent with University policy on Admission by Exception, restrict total number of applications in pilot to a number estimated to yield no more than 5% of total enrolled freshmen
   - Study outcomes in terms of (a) admission decisions and (b) eventual student success

A4. Establish process and timetable for review of all policy changes

B. Freshman Process and Policy Implementation

B1. Acquire or create additional data on student context to broaden and deepen factors included and provide data for non-California applicants

B2. Revise order in which applicant data is reviewed by readers to ensure contextual information is provided and understood prior to information on academic and other achievements

B3. Study and consider changes designed to increase reader expertise on high schools and use of this information during the evaluation process
   - Additional contextual data (per recommendation above)
   - Assignment of internal staff to specific high schools
   - Organization of reading teams (including the possibility of specific teams reading all students from a specific school and potential elimination/modification of current "by-high-school" quality control review)

B4. Change process for reader notation of "comprehensive review factors" to eliminate binary scoring and permit recognition of particularly strong accomplishments or potential in specific categories

B5. Consistent with the principle of holistic review, assess and revise selection procedures to eliminate formulaic or quantitative approaches and over-reliance on single criterion in decision-making

B6. Conduct an in-depth review and potential overhaul of reader selection, training, and norming
   - Criteria and processes for selecting and evaluating external and internal readers
   - Payment for readers (hourly rate rather than per application)

- Articulation to readers of goals of the admissions process
- Materials provided to readers
- Selection and regular reevaluation of norming applications

B7. Evaluate role and relative weighting of external versus internal readers and consider order and distribution of second reads

B8. Create consistent data set on outcomes of the admission process and on student success and review this data annually when considering potential process or policy changes
- Admission rates for different groups (e.g., race/ethnicity, income, first-generation status, LCFF+ high schools)
- Outcomes by college
- Comparison with other UC campuses
- Student success (e.g., 6-year graduation rates—purpose should be to assess student preparation for graduation within a reasonable time, not to maximize GPA or time-to-degree)

C. Transfer Admission Policy and Process

C1. Conduct a thorough evaluation of current policy and practices and propose amended transfer admission policy
- Necessity, role, and possible simplification of expectations for lower-division preparation
- Potential for adopting/expanding holistic evaluation
- Process for developing, approving, implementing, and reviewing college-level policies and processes
    - Regular updating of college policies and procedures
    - Review and approval by Admissions, Enrollment, and Preparatory Education (AEPE) Committee of the Senate
    - Office of Undergraduate Admission (OUA) review of processes and evaluator training to ensure compliance with standard admissions practices for highly selective public universities
    - Pros and cons of centralizing more evaluation in OUA
    - Analysis of outcomes disaggregated by college
    - Processes for ensuring compliance with college, campus, and UC policies

C2. Examine the role of individual college enrollment targets and individual unit compliance with transfer enrollment targets
- Diversity implications of proposed changes to college targets
- Accountability for meeting enrollment targets