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Summary

A growing body of evidence strongly suggests that UCLA is cheating on admissions. Specifically, applicants often reveal their own race on the essay part of their application. This allows admissions staff members to learn the race of applicants; then, in violation of Proposition 209, readers use such information to evaluate applicants. To the extent that this happens—an extent which can only be assessed with systematic data on admissions—such practices are de facto implementations of racial preferences.

For the past three years I have been a member of UCLA’s Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS). This is the faculty committee responsible for oversight of undergraduate admissions at UCLA. Since late April, 2008, I have made several requests for data. I wanted to investigate the above, as well as other, suspicions, including possible discrimination based on religion. Without exception, however, my requests for data have been denied.

There is considerable evidence that high-ranking administrators and a controlling block of my committee are engaged in a cover-up—they are preventing me and others from obtaining these data so that the above malfeasance will not be discovered.

Because I cannot properly conduct the duties with which I am charged as a member of CUARS, I am therefore resigning, in protest, from the committee. To do otherwise would condone and make me complicit in what appears to be illegal activity.

Background

On June 3, 2006, the following headline appeared on the front page of the Los Angeles Times: “A Startling Statistic at UCLA.” The statistic was that only 96 African-Americans planned to enroll as freshmen that Fall, a record low and 20 fewer than the year before. As the article noted:

For several years, students, professors and administrators at UCLA have watched with discouragement as the numbers of black students declined. But the new figures, released this week, have shocked many on campus and prompted school leaders to declare the situation a crisis.

... [UCLA sociologist Darnell] Hunt, who heads UCLA’s Bunche Center for African American Studies, and several colleagues have been studying the issue as part of a multiyear research project on the challenges facing black students in California universities.

In a draft report to be released this month, the researchers compared the admissions criteria and processes at UC’s three most competitive campuses: UCLA, UC Berkeley, and UC San Diego. (At the
latter, the incoming black freshmen class stands at 52 students, or 1.1%, even lower than the others.)

The report found that UC San Diego’s admissions process relied most heavily on numbers, while UC Berkeley’s was most “holistic,” allowing a single reader to review all parts of an applicant’s file, including academic and personal achievements or challenges.

At UCLA, in what admissions officials have described as an attempt to increase fairness and objectivity, applicants’ files are divided by academic and personal areas, and read by separate reviewers. The researchers asserted that UC Berkeley’s process may be the fairest, because it allows students’ achievements to be seen in the context of their personal challenges.

When the article appeared, UCLA was using a system where each applicant was judged over three areas: (i) academic achievement, (ii) personal achievement, and (iii) life challenges. “Academic achievement” was based only on things like grade-point averages and SAT scores. Consequently, the rater of academic achievement would not read the personal essays of the applicant. Under the proposed “holistic” system, however, each rater of an applicant would read the personal essays.

That summer, a special CUARS subcommittee, of which I was a member, discussed possible changes to the admissions system, including the possibility of moving to a holistic system. At one of the meetings, I noted a potential problem of the “holistic” system:

Although I think the holistic system may be a good idea in principle, I’m concerned about its opportunities for mischief. Here is an example of what I mean. My daughter happens to be part Scotch-Irish, part Norwegian, part Cherokee Indian, part Choctaw Indian, and part Filipino. Now suppose I was an admissions staff member, and suppose that an applicant mentioned on his or her essay that he or she, like my daughter, was a Scotch-Irish-Norwegian-Cherokee-Chocatw Filipino. I would have a hard time not giving him or her a special advantage. Although that’s a potential problem with any admissions system, it’s an even bigger problem with the holistic system, since all raters of the applicant get to read the personal essays.

Although, on that day I called it “mischief,” a more accurate word for the act that I described is ‘malfeasance,” since the act is a violation of California law, which disallows universities to use race as a factor in admissions.

At the end of that summer, the chair of CUARS called a special meeting. Unprecedented for CUARS, the chancellor of the university, Norm Abrams, asked to address the committee. According to notes that I took, the following were his opening remarks.
First, I want say how much I favor and respect faculty governance. I don’t want to pressure you. But at the same time, we worry about many of the same things. I want to report to you what we are hearing from the outside world. Several constituencies of UCLA are distressed and upset about the very low numbers of African American freshmen. The political angst and concern is enormous. I don’t feel the pressure. I sublimate very well. But there is pressure exerted upon me. The numbers of underrepresented minorities on campus are too small. . .”

I ask that you make the whole admissions process holistic. Not only that, I have a further request: This is that you do it quickly and adopt the exact same process that Berkeley currently uses.

Professor Duncan Lindsay, a member of CUARS, made a formal motion for the Committee to implement the holistic system that Chancellor Abrams advocated. At that meeting, I spoke once again against the holistic system. I was the only person at the meeting to do that. The committee passed the motion. A few days later, the Academic Senate passed the same motion, which made the holistic system the official admissions system at UCLA.

After that meeting, Chancellor Abrams directed Charles Alexander to begin attending CUARS meetings. Alexander is the Associate Vice Provost for Student Diversity at UCLA. At one meeting in the Fall of 2006, the Director of Admissions, Vu Tran, noted that he would soon hire additional staff to read and evaluate the admissions files that would soon arrive. Associate Vice Provost Alexander noted that he was concerned about the racial make-up of the staff, and he encouraged Tran to hire underrepresented minorities.

One or two meetings later, Tran announced that African-Americans were overrepresented among the applications readers whom he had hired, and Asian-Americans were under-represented.

**Results of the Holistic System**

It is obvious that the admissions staff was under intense pressure to admit more African Americans. It was also obvious that the main purpose of holistic system was to facilitate that goal, by allowing all readers to learn the race of applicants who report their race on personal essays. Similar pressure was placed on the superiors of the admissions staff. According to UC Provost Wyatt Hume, “[A number of UC regents] are threatening to fire chancellors if we don’t increase diversity.”

---

New York Times reporter, David Leonhardt, wrote the following ("The New Affirmative Action,"\textsuperscript{2}) on September 30, 2007,\textsuperscript{2}

In the past, the admissions office divided every application between two readers: one evaluated a student’s academic record, the other looked at extracurricular activities and “life challenges.” Berkeley, by contrast, had taken a more holistic approach, with a single reader judging an entire application, and Berkeley was attracting more black students than U.C.L.A. Why? Maybe the holistic approach takes better account of the subtle obstacles that black students face — or maybe the readers, when looking at a full application, ended up practicing a little under-the-table affirmative action.

Last fall, U.C.L.A. made the switch. Two applications readers I interviewed said that they had received clear, written instructions not to consider race and that they hadn’t. (There are 150 readers in all, a mix of university employees and paid outsiders.) On the other hand, applicants seemed to understand that something had changed. Daniel Fogg, a computer programmer in the admissions office and an application reader, told me that he noticed more students mentioning race in their essays this year.

In the same article Leonhardt noted:

A U.C.L.A. graduate named Peter Taylor, a 49-year-old managing director at Lehman Brothers in Los Angeles, remembers picking up The Los Angeles Times outside his house on a Saturday morning in June of last year and reading that piece of news. Taylor, who is black, is a third-generation native of the city and one of U.C.L.A.’s most active alumni. Within days of reading about the latest decline in the number of black students, he began a campaign to reverse it. At a reception to honor U.C.L.A.’s new acting chancellor, a law professor named Norm Abrams, he greeted Abrams with a big smile and said, “Well, Norm, you’re stepping right into it, and you’ve got to deal with it.” Abrams soon named Taylor to lead a task force of students, faculty, alumni and outsiders from places like the Urban League and the First A.M.E. Church. It spent the next year trying to get more black students to apply, more black applicants to be admitted and more black admits to enroll. In essence, Taylor’s group was trying to figure out how to bring a student like Frances Harris to U.C.L.A. without breaking the law — or at least without getting caught. What they have achieved may well show us the future of affirmative action.

Peter Taylor’s office on the 25th floor of the MGM Building in Century City looks out over the Fox movie lot and a golf course; in the distance

\textsuperscript{2} http://www.nytimes.com/2007/09/30/magazine/30affirmative-t.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1
downtown Los Angeles rises. Taylor has lived in an artsy neighborhood of Los Angeles called Silver Lake since he was a child. In the aftermath of the Watts riots, his father, then a school administrator and one of the few black men to hold such a job, became the principal of Locke High School in South-Central Los Angeles. Taylor himself went on from U.C.L.A. to earn a master’s degree in public policy and work for Bill Clinton’s 1992 campaign before joining Lehman Brothers. When we were talking in his office, he apologetically interrupted our conversation and spent 10 minutes on the phone trying to persuade the person on the other end not to make any changes in a coming bond offering. There was, he kept saying, no point in doing something that might upset the market. But Taylor’s cautious, corporate style can be deceiving. He doesn’t mind a good fight. “Prop. 209 has made things more challenging,” he said. “It has created a new paradigm. But there are still things that can be done.” I asked him whether those things might include civil disobedience, and Taylor surprised me by replying: “Exactly when you cross over into civil disobedience is not always clear. And I probably come down on the side of pushing the outer limits. I’m much more of the attitude of, ‘So what if someone sues?’ If you lose, you at least define the line a little more clearly. You say, ‘Mea culpa,’ and you don’t do it anymore.”

Near the end of his article, Leonhardt concluded:

The big question that hangs over U.C.L.A.’s success, of course, is whether the university broke the law. Looking at the numbers, it’s hard not to conclude that race was a factor in this year’s admissions decisions. The average SAT score for admitted African-American students fell 45 points this year, to 1,738. For Asian, Latino and white students, the averages were much more stable. “I’m quite confident that U.C. factors race in, in various ways,” said [Richard] Sander, the U.C.L.A. law professor and affirmative-action critic. “There is no way to explain the disparities otherwise.” He has filed a public-information request that would allow him to examine the data more closely.

As Chancellor Abrams and many others admitted, the main reason for the switch to a holistic system was to increase the number of African American students. Judged by this standard, the switch was successful. In 2006, the last year of the old system, a randomly chosen African-American applicant had an 11.5% probability of being admitted. In 2007, the first year of the holistic system, the probability increased to 16.5%

Meanwhile, the comparable probabilities dropped for other disadvantaged races. Native American students’ chances dropped from 18.6% to 17.4%. Chicano/Latino students’ chance dropped from 18.3% to 16.8%.

The latter statistics pose a difficult puzzle for anyone who adopts the benign view of the holistic system—that it raised the number of admitted African-American students
because it “takes better account of the subtle obstacles that black students face.” If the benign view is true, then why does the holistic system not also take better account of obstacles faced by Native Americans, Chicanos, and Latinos?

Here’s an even bigger puzzle to those who adopt the benign view. In terms of obstacles that can be described in an application, it is not African-Americans students who face the greatest challenges. It is Vietnamese students. For instance, among UCLA applicants, Vietnamese parents, compared to African-American parents, tend to have lower incomes and are less likely to have attended college.

David Leonhardt, the New York Times reporter, noted

> Even as the number of low-income black freshmen soared this year, the overall number of low-income freshmen fell somewhat. The rise in low-income black students was accompanied by a fall in low-income Asian students – not a decline in well-off students. U.C.L.A. administrators say they don’t fully understand why.

The reason—which I believe that UCLA administrators fully understand, but won’t tell reporters—involves Vietnamese students. The holistic system decreased Vietnamese students’ probability of being admitted from 28.6% to 21.4%. Again, if one believes the benign view of the holistic system, then why did the students who tend to face the highest obstacles experience such a significant drop in admissions?

**My Request for Data**

On April 29, 2008, I emailed Vu Tran, the Director of Admissions, asking for a random sample of 1000 applications files: 500 from the first year of the holistic system (which involved students who applied to UCLA in the Fall of 2006, intending to enroll in Fall of 2007) and 500 from the last year of the prior system. My stated purpose was to conduct a study similar to a study by Michael Hout, a Berkeley sociologist, who conducted a study on admissions at UC Berkeley. Like Hout, my intention was to study admissions decisions to improve policies at my university, not to publish the results in an academic journal or book. Had I not been on the CUARS committee, I would never have asked for such data. I cc-ed the chair of my committee, Sylvia Hurtado, a professor at the Education School at UCLA.

Professor Hurtado and two other members of the committee, Professors Jeannie Oaks and Vilma Ortiz, strongly opposed my receiving these data. Oaks, like Hurtado, is a professor in the Education School at UCLA. Ortiz, is an associate professor of sociology at UCLA. She was the vice-chair of the committee.

Since I first made my request for data, several forms of resistance have arisen, ranging from passive to active. Some of the recipients of my request simply refused, sometimes citing privacy concerns for the applicants. Others, however, took positive steps to co-opt,
deflect, or derail my plan to exercise my rights and responsibilities as a faculty member on a university oversight committee.

Professor Hurtado replied to my email, insisting that, indeed, a study should be conducted, but that it should be conducted by the entire CUARS committee. As she mentioned in her email (See Appendix VI for complete copies of this and other emails),

I have been itching to do the evaluation myself (as I am a scholar of higher education and work with data) but the committee needs to plan this out together.

She cc-ed her email to Director Tran, as well as to Oaks and Ortiz. She did not cc it to any other members of the committee. She had never before mentioned a desire for the committee to do such a study. Yet, eighteen hours after my email, she announced that she was very interested.

The committee eventually did begin a process to oversee the study that Hurtado suggested. However, data collection is not scheduled to begin until Spring 2009. Hurtado’s term on the committee expires at the end of August, 2008.

Hurtado’s idea proved helpful to UCLA administrators who likewise wished to restrict release of the data. On May 28, 2008, I emailed Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh, asking him to intervene and direct admissions staff to provide me the data. He refused, and noted that part of his justification is because “I understand that CUARS is now planning to conduct a study about admissions.”

Director of Admissions Vu Tran responded to my data request, and Hurtado’s reply, as follows:

Dear all,

I also think that we should not study or do any analysis of holistic admissions at UCLA until we have at least four or five years of the outcome to avoid normal annual fluctuations. Also like Sylvia stated, I think we should have the study conducted as an official product of CUARS.

Best,

Vu T. Tran, Ed.D.
Director
Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools
UCLA

Professor Jeannie Oaks, wrote:
Hi all:

I’m persuaded by Vu’s concern that we not evaluate until the initial settling period is over. However, if we do proceed, I would very much like to be part of the analysis team. We would want to develop comprehensive approach to the analysis, and, to do that, we should begin by looking at the Hout report to be clear about what he actually did. I’ve attached a copy, and I suggest that we take this up at our BOARS meetings.

Jeannie

Some facts relevant to these communications include:

1) Most students apply to UCLA via the internet; their applications are stored for many years. However, other students send a paper application to UCLA. Of these students who are admitted to UCLA and enroll, UCLA keeps their applications only four years; after which, they are destroyed.

2) The period for which the admissions staff was under the most pressure to admit more black students was Fall 2006 (when staff would make decisions for the 2007 class). For instance, the Summer of 2006 was when Chancellor Abrams addressed the CUARS committee (see above).

3) Another manifestation of the pressure occurred a few months earlier, when 200-300 hundred students, many wearing black shirts with “got black students?” printed in white lettering, staged a protest in the hallway outside the chancellor’s office.3

Between my original data request and the June 13 meeting of the committee, Hurtado appointed Oaks to be the chair of a “workgroup” that would oversee the study. I volunteered to be a member of the workgroup. At the June 13 meeting, Professor Oaks explained that the workgroup would not actually conduct the study. Instead, the workgroup would only appoint an “independent researcher,” who would conduct the study. Furthermore, no member of the committee would be allowed to see the data used by the independent expert.

I spoke out at the meeting, noting that “Not only can we not test our own hypotheses, we won’t be allowed to replicate any of the hypotheses of the outside expert.” Oaks responded that she wanted to deny data to committee members because she did “not want some minority report being floated around in the media.” Hurtado and Ortiz agreed with Oaks’ reasons for denying committee members the data.

I made a formal proposal, that, as soon as possible, all members of the workgroup be granted access to a sample of admissions applications. It failed on a 3-3 vote. Professors

Hurtado, Ortiz, and Oaks voted against the motion. Professor Duncan Lindsay, Professor Jenn-Ming Yang, and I voted for it. Three others who attended the meeting but do not have voting rights, have written letters stating that they support my request for data. They are Aaron Israel and Rachel Stauber, the committee’s two student representatives, and Joseph Manson, a professor of anthropology and the Admissions Representative to CUARS from UCLA’s Undergraduate Council. Their letters are listed in Appendix V of this report.

During the Summer of 2008, the workgroup began a series of meetings to choose a person to conduct the study and to propose questions for him or her to investigate. We learned that the study would cost UCLA approximately $100,000. The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Janina Montero, said that her office would fund the study, even at the extraordinary cost.

At the meeting to choose people to conduct the study, I made several nominations, all of which were summarily dismissed by Professors Hurtado, Oaks, and Ortiz. I also nominated myself and offered to conduct the study for free. Once again, however, Hurtado, Oaks, and Ortiz rejected this proposal.

Hurtado, Oaks, and Ortiz, always voting as a block, selected UCLA sociologist Robert Mare to be the independent researcher.

On August 20, 2008, Professor Jeannie Oaks wrote a memo to Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh, Academic Senate Chair Elizabeth Bjork, Vice Chancellor Janina Montero, and Associate General Counsel Kevin Reed. The memo “outlines the study questions, design, timeline, costs, and data access and reporting procedures.” (See Appendix VIII for a copy of the memo.)

Page 2 of the memo notes, “The basic approach of the study will be to use quantitative and qualitative data from the applications for freshman admissions for Fall 2008 to examine readers’ ratings of applicants files.” Despite my repeated urgings (see, for example, Appendix IX, which contains a partial transcript of one of the meetings), the study will not use data from the first year of holistic admissions (applications to the Fall 2007 class), the year the malfeasance is most likely to have occurred.

**Why, Despite the Claims of UCLA Administrators, Privacy Concerns Do Not Imply that I, and other Members of the Committee Should be Denied These Data**

While some participants in the process candidly state that the reason for restricting the release of data is to suppress dissenting opinions (as Professors Oaks, Hurtado, and Ortiz did at the June 13 meeting), others offer a different rationale. Some—including Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh, Vice Chancellor and Associate General Counsel Kevin Reed, and Director Caroline West—allege that provision of the information would violate the privacy of the applicants.
Several facts, however, suggest that such privacy claims are not a legitimate reason to deny me the data.

First, when I requested the data, I explicitly requested that names be redacted from any applications files that I receive.

Second, I have expressed a willingness to sign any form that would restrict me from disclosing personal information of the applicants.

Third, my motivation for requesting these data was to perform my duties as a member of CUARS. It was not for academic research. (Indeed, I have never written an academic book or article on university admissions or on any other education topic; nor do I plan to do so.)

Indeed, if my request for data had been granted, I would have been willing to sign any form that would have restricted me from (i) publishing results of the data analysis in any academic book or journal, (ii) presenting the results in any academic seminar or professional meeting, or (iii) discussing the results in any class, including graduate seminars.

In contrast, UCLA administrators have indicated a willingness to provide such data to Professor Robert Mare, the independent researcher chosen by Professors Oaks, Hurtado, and Ortiz. Professor Mare has not indicated the same willingness to forego publishing his results in academic forums. In fact, in her August 20 memo Professor Oaks notes that:

This project will consume a sizeable portion of Professor Mare’s research time during the next 12 months. Additionally, this study is closely relevant to a variety of issues in applied and basic social science. For these reasons, Professor Mare asks for the opportunity to report the results of his work to academic audiences. It is understood that CUARS is Professor Mare’s client in this research and will receive and review his report(s) prior to disclosure to any other party. Once a timely review has been completed, Professor Mare would be free to use his work on this project in graduate seminars in social science research methodology, present the results to meetings of professional social scientists, and publish the results in academic books or journals.

Fourth, CUARS Bylaw 65.5.A.4 says “The committee participates directly in the admissions process, both at the freshmen and advanced standing levels.” In addition, the following is the first paragraph of the “Committee Charge,” listed on the committee’s web site (www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/cuars ; also see Appendix X):

CUARS advises the Office of Admissions and the Chancellor’s Office on matters pertaining to undergraduate admissions policy and helps formulate guidelines for admission to be used during the admission process. In order
to learn what is involved in making actual admissions decisions, committee members read some student applications during the regular Winter Quarter selection process (my emphasis).

Although, during my term CUARS did not participate in the regular Winter Quarter selection process, prior to my term, CUARS members did participate. Further, according to UCSD Professor Mat McCubbins (see his email that I list in Appendix IV), a similar practice occurred at UCSD, except that the committee would read files after the admissions staff made decisions—the purpose was to check that decisions of the admissions staff were following the intentions of the faculty oversight committee. McCubbins notes that if his committee had been denied data such as those I requested, then “I would have recommended the committee be disbanded and we do away with the concept of faculty governance.”

Fifth, UC faculty, who are not members of the admissions oversight committee, are occasionally given data similar to those I am requesting. One instance is Michael Hout, the UC Berkeley sociologist who, as I mentioned above, wrote a report about UC Berkeley admissions. Another instance is UCLA sociologist Robert Mare (see above). Yet another case is Professor McCubbins. After he finished his term on the UCSD admissions oversight committee, the committee asked him to help with data analysis, which included being allowed to view application files. Professor McCubbins told me that, ironically, even though he is a professor at UCSD, he has been given more access to UCLA data than I have been given. Here is why: It turns out that all campuses of the University of California use the same application form for freshman admissions. If a student wants to apply to more than one campus, he or she simply checks an additional box and pays an additional application fee. As a consequence, Professor McCubbins was able to see files of any of UCLA applicant who happened to apply to UCSD. Further, when he conducted his data analysis, he knew which of these applicants were admitted to UCLA. As he noted in an email to me, this allowed him to “‘take a peek under the curtain’ at the policies at Berkeley and UCLA and to compare them to UC San Diego.”

Conclusion

On August 22, 2008, I sent an email to the following people:

- Chancellor Gene Block
- Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh
- Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Janina Montero
- Vice Chancellor of Student Academic Services Tom Lifka
- Director of Admissions Vu Tran
- Professor Sylvia Hurtado, Chair of CUARS
- Professor Vilma Ortiz, Vice-Chair of CUARS
- Professor Jeannie Oaks, Chair of Summer Workgroup of CUARS
- Professor Elizabeth Bjork, Chair of the UCLA Academic Senate
• Professor Michael Goldstein, Vice-Chair of UCLA Academic Senate
• Professor Vivek Shetty, Immediate Past Chair of UCLA Academic Senate

Attached to the email was an earlier draft of this report. The content of the email was as follows.

Subject: Problems with UCLA Admissions and my Impending Resignation from the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

Attached to this email is a draft of a report that I am writing. It documents problems with UCLA admissions, as well as several stonewalling actions I have encountered when I requested some data about UCLA admissions.

I am proud of the traditions and values—especially those of meritocracy, transparency, and the pursuit of the truth—that have made UCLA one of the best and most admired public universities in the world today. I feel it is my duty—as an official of the university in my role as a member of CUARS—to help protect those traditions and values. Yet, as I document in this report, some individuals at UCLA have taken steps down a path that makes a mockery of those traditions and values. This report is a manifestation of my desire to keep UCLA on a proper path.

If I do not receive the data that I have requested, regrettably, I will have no choice but to resign in protest from CUARS. My duties as a member of CUARS include research and oversight of the admission process. If I am disallowed to do these duties, then not resigning makes me complicit in the problems, some of which may involve illegal activity.

Unless these issues are resolved, I believe that there is a reasonable chance that UCLA will face litigation. The problems that I document are not benign, and I have a real concern that UCLA might face a class-action lawsuit someday.

I therefore request that the relevant university officials be directed not to discard any relevant data—to the extent that these data have not been discarded already. These data include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) All undergraduate applications to UCLA by students applying to be a member of the Fall class of 2005, 2006, or 2007.
2) All decisions of readers of these applications, including the identities of the readers and the scores that they assigned to applications

that they read, as well as the final decision whether the applicant was admitted.

It is my ardent hope, however, that all the issues that I raise will be resolved soon and that they will not need to be resolved through litigation.

As of the date of this report, none of the above individuals have responded to the email.
Appendix I: Why my Resignation is not Purely Symbolic

The date of my resignation is August 28, 2008. The date is three days before my term on CUARS is scheduled to end. Of course, no major decisions will be made by the committee during those three days, so my resignation is largely symbolic. As I mentioned, my resignation is an act of protest. It is a means of stating, in the most forceful way I can, that I do not condone the suspected malfeasance and cover-up that I have described in this report.

Moreover, my resignation not completely symbolic. Each member of the summer workgroup of CUARS has been offered $2000 for their services. As part of my protest, despite fully participating in this workgroup, I have declined the payment.
Appendix II: Why the Issue is about Transparency, not Racial Diversity

Notwithstanding some accusations I may face, I strongly favor racial diversity.

Indeed, in university admissions I favor racial preferences—that is, to adopt policies that would aid racial groups who have faced greater challenges and suffered past discrimination—as long as the preferences are executed transparently and within the limits of the law. It is the latter caveat, I believe, that separates me and the people who have blocked my requests for data.

A sports analogy may be useful to explain these differences. Most athletes adopt the attitude, “Try as hard as possible to win the game, subject to the constraint that you don’t break the rules.” However, a few athletes adopt the counter attitude, “Try as hard as possible not to break the rules, subject to the constraint that you win the game.”

Substitute “diversity” for “win the game,” and the latter sentence describes the attitudes of a sizable fraction of the UCLA faculty, perhaps a majority. I have discussed my suspicions of malfeasance with several friends on the UCLA faculty. The reaction of a non-trivial number is, “But if you stop the malfeasance, that will harm diversity.” Such faculty should recognize that they are like the latter, win-at-all-costs athlete, not the former, win-within-the-rules athlete.

There are many diversity-improving measures that could be implemented at UCLA that, unlike the current system at UCLA, are still consistent with Proposition 209 and do not need to be implemented in a secretive manner.

For instance, one measure, as the old admission system adopted, is explicitly to look for life challenges that a student has faced—including poverty and a poor education background of his or her parents—and use those as an official factor in granting admission.

Another way is a measure that I, along with fellow CUARS member Duncan Lindsey, formally proposed to the committee (but was rejected): Grant automatic admission to any student who finished in the top 1% of his or her high school class. This would help the chances of students who attend schools, often poorly funded, that are populated primarily by students of an underrepresented minority.

Another example, which I openly advocated in my committee, is to increase the number of transfer students who are admitted to UCLA. In a typical year, approximately 30 percent of the newly admitted undergraduate students at UCLA are transfers, not freshmen. I would favor increasing that percentage to 40 or 50 percent, if not higher. Part of the reason is that, as a UCLA teacher, I have found that transfer students are at least as bright and hard-working as the students who were admitted as freshmen.

In addition, increasing the number of transfer students would improve racial diversity at UCLA. For instance, for the Fall 2006 class, a randomly chosen member of a racial
group had the following probability of admission through, respectively, the transfer route and through the freshman route:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>Probability of admission if he or she applied to be a transfer student</th>
<th>Probability of admission if he or she applied to be a freshman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Chicano</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that with transfer admissions underrepresented minorities (Native Americans, African Americans, Latinos, and Chicanos) have a significantly greater chance of being admitted, compared to their chance through the freshman route. Further, compared to the probabilities through the freshman route, their probabilities through the transfer route are much more equitable. (For instance, with freshman admissions an Asian’s probability of being admitted is three times that of an African American. However, with transfer admissions the respective probability is less than one-and-a-half times that of an African American.)

These are examples of policies that I advocate. They would also be advocated by anyone else who strongly favors racial diversity, yet wants it implemented within the bounds of the law and within university rules and norms of transparency.
Appendix III: Why, notwithstanding the commission of an “independent expert” to do a study, UCLA is not acting properly in light of the suspected malfeasance

Although untruthful, a seemingly defensible response to my allegations would be the following:

Our efforts to block Groseclose and other committee members from obtaining data have been entirely proper. Rather than engaging in a cover-up, we have commissioned a study and hired an independent expert to conduct it. The study will examine all of Groseclose’s suspicions. Groseclose’s problem is that he thinks that he is the only person who should be allowed to conduct the study.

Here is why such a response is not truthful.

1) First, it is not my view that I should be the only person allowed conduct such a study. Indeed, here lies the fundamental asymmetry between me and the people preventing me from obtaining data: I want many people to have an opportunity to conduct such a study, including all members of the CUARS and whoever is named to be the independent researcher. The people preventing me from obtaining data want only one person to be allowed to conduct such a study.

In fact, if I had received the data that I requested, I would have insisted—and, indeed, I did insist—that as many people as possible receive the same data, including the independent researcher and my fellow committee members.

2) Second, although UCLA, by hiring an independent investigator, appears to be diligent in investigating suspected malfeasance, there is reason to believe that UCLA would not have hired such an investigator if it weren’t for my protests. Recall, as I mentioned earlier, that Hurtado was the first to suggest such an independent investigator. Before my request for data, she had never mentioned a desire for such a study. Eighteen hours after my request, she became very interested in such a study. Oaks and Ortiz also became very interested in participating only after I made my request for data. Vice Chancellor Montero became interested in providing the funding for the study only after I made my request for data.

Strangely, Hurtado’s tenure on the committee was scheduled to end the last day of August 2008; Oaks plans to leave UCLA in November 2008. Yet, data collection for the study will not begin until Spring of 2009. If Hurtado and Oaks were so interested in participating in the study, why didn’t they suggest such a study earlier—so that it would be conducted while they were members of the committee?

3) Third, several pieces of evidence suggest that the other members of the summer workgroup (Professors Hurtado, Oaks, and Ortiz) are determined to hide any evidence of the malfeasance. They are the ones who chose the independent researcher. They desire, I
believe, to choose an independent researcher who shares their views about not reporting malfeasance.

One piece of this evidence involves Professor Oaks’s memo of August 20, 2008. (See Appendix VIII.) The memo instructs the independent researcher only to use data from 2008 (that is, data from applicants applying to the freshman class of 2008). I have mentioned several times that 2007 is the most likely year that malfeasance occurred. I have also mentioned the importance of the 2006 data. Without these data one cannot compare the holistic system to the former system. For instance, as New York Times reporter David Leonhardt noted in his article, the 2007 class seemed to self-report their race more often on personal essays than the 2006 class did. Without 2006 data this hypotheses is impossible to investigate.

Another piece of evidence involves the requests in an email by Professor Oaks (which I described earlier) to wait four or five years before beginning the study. Recall that UCLA destroys some applications four years after it receives them.

Another piece of evidence involves the June 13 meeting of CUARS. Professor Oaks admitted that she did not want me to obtain the data, because she does not want “some minority report showing up in the media.” Hurtado and Ortiz agreed with Oaks’ justification.

Another piece of evidence occurred at the July 30, 2008 meeting of the summer workgroup. Ortiz, Oaks, Tom Skewes-Cox (a data analyst with the admissions staff) and I had the following exchange. Ortiz admits that, even if the admissions staff is suspected of breaking the law, she would oppose CUARS’s investigating that. (The following, except where I have added some contextual phrases in brackets, follows, word for word, the transcript that Judith Lacertosa made from a recording. Lacertosa is a staff member of the UCLA Academic Senate. The full transcript that Lacertosa wrote is in Appendix IX.)

Groseclose: If you want to find the mischief…see, if I think there was any mischief, that it happened in 2007. That’s the year.

Ortiz: But, see…that’s not…I don’t…

Skewes-Cox: (unintelligible)

Groseclose: It’d be probably less. I think the big…my hunch is that the uh… the uh…

Ortiz: That’s…that’s not the role of the committee. I’m sorry. The role of the committee is not to find mischief, right? It’s…that is a very narrow…like, you know…someone’s…that is really Vu’s job. Really. To make sure that what we’re telling him at…at the level of policy is being done correctly. You know? So, we…
Groseclose: We...differ. We differ on that.

Ortiz: I just felt...

Groseclose: I...I appreciate your frankness in that...

Ortiz: I just... I just...

Skewes-Cox: Well...well the mischief is the race weight, right?

Groseclose: Possibly others. I...I wanted to look at the data...

Skewes-Cox: Oh...in...in the...

Ortiz: Religion, the (unintelligible)...

Skewes-Cox: Religion (unintelligible)... the non-specified factors.

Groseclose: Right.

Skewes-Cox: Is there a positive, significant weight to factors that should not be used in the process?

Groseclose: Right.

[Ortiz mentions that the holistic system was implemented in 2006. This begins a tangential discussion where Skewes-Cox and I reply that we agree, but that we were adopting the convention of the admissions staff—that by “2007 data” we mean the data in which students apply in 2006, seeking admission to the 2007 class.]

Skewes-Cox: We’ve got two years. We can say first year holistic, second year...

Ortiz: Yeah. The readers in the first year [of the holistic system], given the change, were not doing exactly what they were supposed to do. They were motivated by other concerns...

Oakes: Mm-hmm.

Ortiz: They, you know...maybe the training wasn’t as rigorous, right? I mean, it’s...

Oakes: All those T-shirts that said, “Got black students?”
Ortiz: Right, so, whatever. Um.

Groseclose: There was pressure, huh?

Ortiz: But we cannot recreate that. That’s the problem. It it’s really about something that happened at a particular point in time… remember, even if we use the applicants from two thousand…from that first year of holistic, we’re not using…um…well, we have the…the read… the raters…the read…the readers’ ratings that we tried to predict these.

Oakes: Mm.

Skewes-Cox: Well, you’ll have those anyway. You’ll have your study’s…

Oakes: Right.

Skewes-Cox: holistic rankings, and…

Ortiz: And, if it’s happening at the second year and you do it with the second-year data, well…well, but…you want it…in some ways you want to do it with the way it’s going to be in the long run, not with the anomaly of the first year.

Skewes-Cox: Well, a…separate question is, do the weights change from year-to-year?

Oakes: Mm-hmm.

Ortiz: No.

Oakes: Right. Well, that was Vu’s concern, too, about wanting to let the process settle a bit before you…

Skewes-Cox: Yeah.

Oakes: …choose a year to say, this is…uh…what we can expect it will look like in a typical year. That the first year is not likely to be as good a candidate for that as, something like maybe, the third, fourth, or fifth year.

Ortiz: I…I’m really uncomfortable with the…with the idea that we…would be…I don’t know, I want to respect that staff do what they’re supposed to do in…in this University. You know, I want to be respectful of that. I don’t want to say, “You’re not doing the right thing, and this is why it got screwed-up.” You know, so, I’m really uncomfortable with that being the agenda of this study, you know. Find the mischief in the…in the reader, you know, looking at the application…
Skewes-Cox: Well, like, give me…

Ortiz: (unintelligible)

Skewes-Cox: another word besides “mischief.”

Groseclose: Actually, I think that’s a… I’m using a euphemism for “malfeasance.” What I’m calling mischief is actually…

Ortiz: I’m real…

Groseclose: wrong, right? Um, I understand… if you… yeah…

Ortiz: [sarcastically] Let’s write… then let’s write a police report. I’m really… this is really just like… I’m really uncomfortable given the role of this committee. You know, to… if… if people are really not doing their job… for instance, we are not the staff… direct supervisor… it’s not our job, to… you know, we set policy, we… we review what’s going on. If it’s really at that point where things were done in some ways wrong, against the policy, criminal, you know… then…

Skewes-Cox: Well, would that (unintelligible) raise coefficients?

Unknown: Mm-hmm.

[A long conversation ensued about correlation versus causality in statistics, whether statistics can reveal intent, the work of Freakonomics author Steve Levitt, and the role of Congress—vis-à-vis the Executive Branch—in federal investigations.]

Ortiz: … right. But, if that happens… okay… how we deal with that… again… if… that’s… that would be like… okay, this is the finding… it suggests certain kinds of things were happening that were really inappropriate, we will then… we would then have, what I would imagine would be an incredibly serious discussion and refer it to the right bodies to deal with it. Again, it is not… I just… I really feel that we are over-stepping our bound… not simply on our charge on CUARS, but even as members of CUARS.

Oakes: Well, I don’t think we’re gonna go there, Vilma.

Ortiz: Okay. I’m arguing with Tim. Because he’s…
Oakes: I know...I know...

Ortiz: ...pushing it...

Oakes: ...I mean, I think it's a...a fascinating and good conversation, but I think that when [we] get down to the scope of what we're going to do, and being realistic about what the data allow us to do...uh...the... and the...and the charge, we won't go there.

Ortiz: Okay.

Unknown: But...

Groseclose: Would you be in favor of letting me do that study?

Oakes: No.


4) Fourth, suppose the independent researcher investigates all of my suspicions, and suppose that he or she will be just as open as I would be about the findings. An argument could be made that these facts would exonerate of a cover-up all people who have blocked my request for data. However, even if that argument is true, their behavior is still problematic. It has made the admissions process disturbingly secretive and non-transparent.

Although perhaps the main reason I asked for the data was to investigate my suspicions of malfeasance, that was not the only reason. Another reason was to learn what is involved in making actual admissions decisions. I wanted to try to answer questions such as: (i) Do the admissions staff weight SAT scores more or less than grades? (ii) To what extent do admissions staff weight participation in athletics? (iii) If a student is involved politically during high school, does this affect his or her chances of admission? (iv) Does the student’s political views affect his or her chances? (v) Does the student’s religious beliefs seem to affect his or her chances? There are several more questions that I wanted to investigate. Plus, if I were allowed to read the sample of applications that I requested, I am sure I would have thought of several more questions to investigate.

However, the individuals who have blocked my request for data have made it impossible to investigate such questions, and therefore they have made it impossible for me to learn what is involved in making actual admissions decisions.

Here again is the second sentence listed in the section of the “Committee Charge” of CUARS:
In order to learn what is involved in making actual admissions decisions, committee members read some student applications during the Winter Quarter Selection process.

6) Sixth, and related to the prior point, the lack of transparency invites corruption.

After my experiences on CUARS, I now realize that it would be very easy for, say, a person in the upper administration at UCLA to pull strings to admit a son or daughter, a niece or nephew, or, say, the son or daughter of a large donor to UCLA. All he or she would have to do is instruct two admissions readers to rate the applicant very favorably.

If an outsider, such as a member of CUARS, noticed an applicant had curiously low grades and SAT scores, the admissions staff could just explain, “But that’s the whole point of holistic review—to consider such things as grades and SAT scores only in the context of obstacles that the student faced. Trust us, if you saw the student’s essays, you’d see those obstacles.” And if the outsider asked to read the essays, the admissions staff could simply say, “Sorry, for privacy reasons you cannot see the essays.”

For similar reasons, it would be almost as easy for admissions staff to sell spots in the upcoming freshman class.

One might respond, “Oh, no one at UCLA is that corrupt.” However, recently there have been several cases where UCLA employees have been at least that corrupt.

As the Los Angeles Times reported on August 5, 2008, 127 UCLA employees were implicated in peeking at the medical records of celebrities. As the Times reported on April 11, 2008, a former senior UCLA official said, “I knew there were people who were being paid [by tabloids] to look through records.”

On March 9, 2004, the Los Angeles Times reported that police had arrested Henry G. Reid, the director of UCLA’s willed body program. Over the course of six years Reid had illegally sold, for his private gain, 496 cadavers for a total of $704,600.

On November 13, 2007, the Daily Bruin reported that the orthodontics residency program at UCLA’s School of Dentistry was giving favorable treatment to applicants who were relatives of large donors to the School. The article noted that, although the program only has room for six residents each year, over the course of five years, four of the admitted residents were close relatives (a son, daughter, or niece) of a patron who donated or pledged at least $400,000 to the School. The article reported one case where an applicant was told by a member of the admissions board that a $60,000 gift could greatly improve his chances of being admitted.

According to the Daily Bruin, Dr. Thomas Bales helped lead major fundraising campaigns for the School in 2003 and 2005. In 2001, he pledged $500,000 to the School. In 2003 his daughter was admitted to the program. He became a member of the
admission board, and in July, 2006, he wrote an email, obtained by the Daily Bruin, discussing the admittance of a son of a $500,000 donor, Norman Nagel. Bales wrote, “We took Norm Nagel’s son Jeff from (the University of Pacific) this year on my call. ... We just tell him to blame memory loss when/if someone asks him his national board scores!”

The request for a $60,000 gift from an applicant led to an investigation by the office of (then) Chancellor Norm Abrams. But the report found “no credible and convincing evidence that deals were made or understandings reached to admit an applicant in return for donating money to the School.”

“The report did not substantiate any cases of individual wrongdoing. There were no regulations broken,” said Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh to the Daily Bruin. “The investigation did not find any evidence of explicit wrongdoing.”

But, as the Daily Bruin reported,

Some faculty members cried cover-up.

Faculty member John Beumer resigned from his position as chair of the school’s Faculty Executive Committee, in protest of what he called a “mockery of the merit-based traditions and social values that have made the University of California the best and most admired public university system in the world today.”

Beumer announced his resignation in a mass e-mail to all dentistry faculty.

“I find it impossible to remain as FEC chair, for in my mind, doing so would condone and make me complicit to these sordid affairs,” read the email.
Professor Groseclose:

I am happy to share some of my experiences from when I was chair of the Admissions Committee here at UC San Diego during the AY 2003-4. At UC San Diego, and throughout the UC, we take faculty governance seriously. In order to meet that obligation, for faculty to be involved in the governance of the University and its policies, we need complete and timely data. Our Vice Chancellor for Admissions, Mae Brown and her staff, Miky Ramirez and Bill Armstrong, well understood this. We needed the data to check, among other things, if our policies were working in the manner we thought they should be or if some adjustments needed to be made. We also needed the data in order to check to see if the policies of the Academic Senate, as determined and overseen by the admissions committee were being implemented as we expected. How else could we do our job? If we were not provided the data I would have recommended the committee be disbanded and we do away with the concept of faculty governance. Part of this data analysis was in the form of quantitative data, that we could analyze and run simulations against. Part of this was in the form of actually reading and scoring applications. Reading and scoring applications is quite onerous, but the committee each year takes this task quite seriously as part of its oversight function. Where we found discrepancies between our ideas of what policy should be and the way applications were scored or ranked we sought to correct the matter, with the assistance of VC Brown and her staff. This is an ongoing process and I was called upon by latter committees to undertake some data analysis for them well into AY 2004-5. Indeed, somewhat ironically, part of what I did in my analysis was use the common applications and our knowledge of who was admitted to which UC to “take a peek under the curtain” at the policies at Berkeley and UCLA and to compare them to UC San Diego.

I left the committee in the summer of 2004. I later served on CAP and now I am slotted to be the incoming chair of planning and budgeting. I have served on graduate
admissions in the department, of course, for most of my 21 years at UC San Diego and I’ve read several thousand graduate applications, cover to cover, over my career.

The Committee on Admissions is quite challenging and was especially challenging during my tenure as chair as the Regents were questioning admissions policy, although I think Berkeley received most of the heat on this. I wish you luck in your efforts,

Warmest regards,

Mat McCubbins
http://mccubbins.ucsd.edu
http://ssrn.com/author=17402
www.settingtheagenda.com
Appendix V: Letters from members of CUARS, supporting my decision to resign in protest
Aug. 15, 2008

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in support of Prof. Timothy Groseclose’s decision to resign in protest from CUARS. Since Fall 2006, I have served as the Undergraduate Council Admissions Representative to CUARS, and in that role I have participated in the ongoing deliberations about the implementation of the holistic review system. During Spring 2008, Prof. Groseclose requested access to a sample of applications, and their decision outcomes, for the purpose of analyzing whether the holistic review process was accomplishing its stated goals. As a distinguished scholar with expertise in quantitative social science, Prof. Groseclose’s qualifications to conduct such analyses are beyond dispute, and were not, in fact, contested by any CUARS members or guests. However, several CUARS members contended that access to the primary data (application files and admissions decisions) should be restricted to an expert from outside the committee. Neither Prof. Groseclose nor any other participant in the discussion disputed the need for an independent evaluation of holistic review (i.e. an evaluation carried out by someone who had not been involved in creating the holistic review system). However, during over an hour of discussion at the CUARS meeting of June 13, 2008, I did not hear a single convincing argument against Prof. Groseclose’s contention that he should be allowed to conduct a complementary or supplementary set of analyses based on a sample of the primary data. As a matter of general principle, the concept of shared governance seems to me to imply that qualified members of relevant Senate committees should have access to materials necessary to evaluate University policies.

Finally, I was disturbed by the tone of the June 13 CUARS meeting. Heated discussions are to be expected over contentious issues, but although Prof. Groseclose conducted himself courteously and professionally, several of those arguing against him repeatedly deployed derisive laughter, eye-rolling and other dismissive signals.

Thank you for your attention to my comments on this matter.

Yours Sincerely,

[Signature]

Joseph H. Manson
Professor
August 17, 2008

Rachel Staubert
8715 Burton Way, Apt#306
Los Angeles, CA 90048

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Rachel Staubert and I had the honor of serving as one of the two student representatives on the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations to Schools for the 2007-2008 school year. I am writing a letter to let known my dissatisfaction with certain actions of several committee members which have transpired over the past several months.

As a regularly attending member of the committee, I have had the opportunity to participate in the important discussions involving current issues and policies regarding undergraduate admissions. The theoretical meaning behind these discussions is to ensure that the best admissions practice is carried out at UCLA. This means that the admissions office is following the UC policy to the best of its ability, UCLA is reaching out to local schools, and that the entire admissions system is "fair" in accordance to California law.

One of the wonderful things about the admissions committee is that it was made up of a spectrum of beliefs regarding the way admissions should be carried out. This made discussions lively and whole, allowing issues to be brought up from different perspectives and frequent questions to be raised. As an oversight committee for the admissions office, it is essential that all points of views are heard and respected. How better to analyze and suggest change for current policy than by raising concerns and offering suggestions from all perspectives. Functioning committees composed of respected diversity of opinion keep themselves in balance, as different views provide checks for others to ensure that bias or personal interests are not factored into the overall decision. However, when committees begin to discount some viewpoints in favor of others, it naturally succumbs to a sub-optimal level of functionality.

All of the above taken into account, I believe that the 2007-2008 CUARS committee, particularly near the end of its term, began to show signs of dysfunction, as Professor Tim Groseclose's concerns and questions regarding certain admissions policies and requests for the access of data were shot down in a manner which made me uncomfortable. As a committee dedicated to fair analysis of current policy, would Professor Groseclose's concerns not warrant a more in depth exploration of said concerns rather than the hostile dismissal which transpired? Not only did it show disrespect of one committee member on behalf of others, but it succeeded in obstructing the possible validation that these concerns were warranted, which could have only been determined through an in depth exploration and investigation of said concerns. How can a committee be the most effective possible if everybody cannot achieve the same level of participation and all concerns are not addressed equally? It is obvious to me that these actions are uncalled for and that the committee conducted itself in a sub-optimal way, but anything further as to reasons behind such actions would be speculation.

It is therefore my sincere hope that this situation be resolved both expeditiously and justly, and that future actions of the committee are devoted to effectively achieving its goal of proper and fair oversight.

Sincerely,

Rachel Staubert
UCLA c/o 2008
Undergraduate Student Representative (2007-2008)
Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations to Schools
14 August 2008

Aaron M. Israel
11924 Mayfield Avenue, Apt. 3
Los Angeles, California 90049

To the UCLA Community:

For the 2007-2008 academic year, I served as one of two student representatives to the Academic Senate’s Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools (CUARS). In that role, I attended regular meetings of the committee and presented an undergraduate perspective on policy reviews and proposals. During my term of service, Professor Tim Groseclose requested a sample of prospective and admitted student applications to study an aspect of the admissions process. I was not only surprised but troubled upon learning that he would not be allowed access to data.

In a written statement to the committee, Professor Groseclose provided sound justification for his request and submitted letters from colleagues at UC Los Angeles and sister campuses affirming its appropriateness. While the committee may retain an unaffiliated expert to report on this data, I can find no justification—in CUARS bylaws or elsewhere—to suggest that a concurrent study is inappropriate. An oversight committee becomes ineffectual when its membership is barred access to information controlled by the office it oversees.

As a community-based institution, UCLA relies on the support of Californians to advance its academic mission. In response to public skepticism, the university asserts that its admissions policies are fair and equitable. Yet, when a CUARS member is refused access to information that would affirm this contention, what conclusions can we expect the public to draw? Files necessary to evaluate standing practice on its merits must be provided those we entrust to craft affective public policy. Tim Groseclose’s effort is in this university’s best interest.

Respectfully,

Aaron M. Israel
Undergraduate Student Representative (2007-2008)
Committee on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools
University of California, Los Angeles
Appendix VI: Emails between me and key admissions officials at UCLA

(Note: All of these emails were downloaded from my gmail account. One feature of gmail is that it can “show details” (the date, subject, and recipient of the email) or it can “hide details”. For each of the emails below, I clicked on “show details”. When one does this, gmail shows the details and posts an option “hide details.” In all the emails below, one can see the phrase “hide details.” This does not mean that details are hidden. In contrast, it means that I did not click on the option to hide details.)

Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>  
Tue, Apr 29, 2008 at 1:39 PM

To: "Tran, Vu" <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>  
Cc: Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com>

Dear Vu:

I am thinking about doing a statistical study on UCLA admissions similar to the one that the Berkeley sociologist did on Berkeley admissions. (I forget the sociologist's name. It was the very thorough study that many of us read, and we discussed it at a CUARS meeting in the Spring before we voted on changing to a holistic system.)

Would it be possible for me to do the following?

1) Obtain a random set of 1000 applications such that:
   
   a) 200 are African-American students who applied in Fall 2005
   b) 50 are Chicano students who applied in Fall 2005
   c) 50 are Latino students who applied in Fall 2005
   d) 100 are White students who applied in Fall 2005
   e) 100 are Asian students who applied in Fall 2005
   f) 200 are African-American students who applied in Fall 2006
   g) 50 are Chicano students who applied in Fall 2006
   h) 50 are Latino students who applied in Fall 2006
   i) 100 are White students who applied in Fall 2006
   j) 100 are Asian students who applied in Fall 2006

2) If possible I would like to have electronic files that contain the data we use to for admissions, including grades, SAT scores, and the essays that the applicants write.

3) I would prefer not to know any names of the applicants. Is there a way that any names can be redacted from the data you give me?

4) To select the 1000 files I would like to use a process that no one could accuse as
being the product of cherry-picking. Could we do the following? For each of the
above groups, if I have asked for N files, could you give me the N files which have
the lowest ID numbers and also such that the last two digits of the ID number is
prime?

5) Could I also have the data on result of the review process – specifically whether
the student was admitted or not, as well as the rating we gave the student (e.g. I
believe that in 2006 each applicant got a rating of 1-5, and in 2005 each applicant got
three ratings [an academic score, a life challenge score, and a personal achievement
score]).

6) Could I also have the ratings that separate reviewers gave to each applicant?

7) Could I also have some sort of ID number of the rater?

8) If you need help gathering this data, I’d be happy to walk over to Murphy Hall to
help.

Thanks,
Tim

--

Tim Groseclose
Professor of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095

Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com> Wed, Apr 30, 2008 at 7:47 AM
To: Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
Cc: "Tren, Vu" <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>, "Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>, Jeannie Oakes
<oakes@ucla.edu>

Hi Tim,
The Hout study at Berkeley was initiated by the chair of their Senate admissions committee, with
the assent of the Chancellor when there were criticisms of their holistic review process. The
committee was involved to select a researcher who worked with them to address questions, and
four independent evaluators were selected to review the analysis and results.
What you propose to do is an evaluation of the holistic process and this is something we should discuss in committee. I favor a strong evaluation and we have great expertise on this campus if we want to follow the Hout report model. We should be continually involved in examining the process and I have been itching to do the evaluation myself (as I am a scholar of higher education and work with data) but the committee needs to plan this out together. I am happy to put this on the agenda as part of a plan for evaluation and to determine how to best proceed.

We have made great progress in achieving an incredibly strong, academically talented and diverse class. Any concerns the committee has with the holistic process or these outcomes should be addressed there and in a plan for evaluation. This is an excellent discussion item for our last meetings of the year.

Sylvia

---

Tran, Vu <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>  
Wed, Apr 30, 2008 at 9:38 AM
To: Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com>, Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>  
Cc: "Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>, "Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>

Dear all,

I also think that we should not study or doing any analysis of holistic admissions at UCLA until we have at least four or five years of the outcome to avoid normal annual fluctuations. Also like Sylvia stated, I think we should have the study conducted as an official product of CUARS.

Best,

Vu T. Tran, Ed.D.
Director
Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools
UCLA

---

Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>  
Thu, May 1, 2008 at 7:40 AM
To: "Tran, Vu" <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>  
Cc: Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com>, "Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>, "Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>

Dear Sylvia, Vu, and others:

While I encourage other members of the CUARS committee to conduct analyses of the 2005 and 2006 admissions data, I prefer to conduct at least one analysis on my own. If I write any sort of report, I would prefer its conclusions to represent my views only.

I would like to begin conducting the analysis very soon—within the next few weeks, not several months or several years from now.
So let me make the request a second time: Could you please help me obtain the data that I described in my email of April 29?

Thanks,
Tim

Jeannie Oakes <oakes@ucla.edu>  Thu, May 1, 2008 at 12:11 PM
To: Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>, "Tran, Vu" <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>
Cc: Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com>, "Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>

Hi all:

I'm persuaded by Vu's concern that we not evaluate until the initial settling period is over. However, if we do proceed, I would very much like to be part of the analysis team. We would want to develop a comprehensive approach to the analysis, and to do that, we should begin by looking at the Hout report to be clear about what he actually did. I've attached a copy, and I suggest that we take this up at our BOARS meetings.

Jeannie

Tran, Vu <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>  Thu, May 1, 2008 at 12:20 PM
To: "Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>, Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>,
"Lifka, Tom" <llifka@saonet.ucla.edu>, "Montero, Janina" <jmontero@saonet.ucla.edu>
Cc: Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com>, "Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>

Dear All,

FYI, Fall 05 and Fall 06 were under the old comprehensive admissions policy; we started holistic beginning with fall 2007 cycle. Tim asked for fall 05 and 06 data. To the best of my knowledge, one of reasons for the selection of Hout is that he had no involvement with Berkeley admissions so his analysis could be viewed as "independent" and unbiased. My two cents worth. At this time, I am working with our technical staff on how and when we can provide Tim with the data he requested.

Vu T. Tran, Ed.D.
Director
Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools
UCLA

Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>  Thu, May 1, 2008 at 12:57 PM
To: "Tran, Vu" <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>
Vu,

Sorry, when I wrote the first email I meant to say "for students who APPLIED" in 05 and 06. That is, I want some data from the old system and some data for the new.

Thanks,
Tim

from Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
to "Waugh, Scott L." <swaugh@conet.ucla.edu>
cc Tom Schwartz <tschwartz@polisci.ucla.edu>
date Wed, May 28, 2008 at 7:59 AM
mailed-by gmail.com

Dear Scott,

I am a member the CUARS committee (the faculty oversight committee for freshmen admissions).

Recently, I met with Vu Tran, Caroline West, and Tom Skewes-Cox, three people on the admissions staff, to see if they would give me some data on admissions. They are worried that giving me these data would violate the privacy of applicants. Specifically, I would like to see the entire files of a sample of applicants, including their essays.

Would you be willing to intervene on my behalf? All three said that they would be very willing to give me the data if one their superiors gave them the okay.

I can offer several precedents involving UCLA and other UC schools that suggest that it is entirely appropriate for me to see these data. I have met with the parliamentarian of the faculty senate (Tom Schwartz), who agrees with me and can provide bylaws and precedents that imply that I should have access to these data.
Would you be willing to send an email to Vu, Caroline, and Tom, saying something to the effect, "I believe that it is appropriate for you to give a sample of admissions file to Tim."? (If so, their email addresses are: vtran@saonet.ucla.edu; cwest@ponet.ucla.edu; skewes-cox@saonet.ucla.edu.)

I can assure you that if I am granted access to these data, I will do everything I can to protect the privacy of the applicants.

I am happy to discuss this further, including stopping by your office or talking on the phone (my number is 4-4204).

Thanks,
Tim

--
Tim Groseclose
Professor of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095

from Waugh, Scott L. <swaugh@conet.ucla.edu>

totimgroseclose@gmail.com

cc "Gray, Maryann J." <mgray@conet.ucla.edu>

date Wed, May 28, 2008 at 8:02 AM
subject Re: mailed-byconet.ucla.edu

hide details May 28 Reply

Dear Tim,

Let me look into it to make sure I understand all the wrinkles and then I may want to talk with you about your project before committing one way or another. I'll get back to you in a week or so.

Best wishes,
Scott

from Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
to "Waugh, Scott L." <swaugh@conet.ucla.edu>
cc "Gray, Maryann J." <mgray@conet.ucla.edu>

date Wed, May 28, 2008 at 8:04 AM
subject Re:
mailed-by@gmail.com

hide details May 28 Reply

Thanks! -Tim

from Waugh, Scott L. <swaugh@conet.ucla.edu>
to Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
cc "Gray, Maryann J." <mgray@conet.ucla.edu>,
"Montero, Janina" <jmontero@saonet.ucla.edu>,
"Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>,
"West, Caroline S." <cwest@ponet.ucla.edu>,
"Tran, Vu" <vtran@saonet.ucla.edu>,
"Lifka, Tom" <tlifka@saonet.ucla.edu>

date Wed, Jun 18, 2008 at 2:32 PM
subject Your Recent Data Request
mailed-by conet.ucla.edu

hide details Jun 18 Reply

UCLA Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
June 18, 2008

Dear Tim:

In response to your data request, I have consulted with a number of colleagues. As indicated by Vu Tran and Caroline West, release of full applications poses serious privacy concerns. Additionally, our institutional practice has been to attempt to support the work of Senate committees that are interested in conducting research about admissions for purposes of institutional self-improvement. I understand that CUARS is now planning to conduct a study about admissions. I hope it will address your research questions and prove to be enlightening and useful to us all.

If you would like to discuss this issue further, let’s find some time to talk when I return from my summer travels. I know that you devote considerable time to university service, and I want to express my appreciation for your concern and commitment to the wellbeing of UCLA.

Sincerely,

Scott L. Waugh
Acting Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

from Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
to"Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>,
"Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>

date Tue, Jun 17, 2008 at 9:02 AM
mailed-by gmail.com

hide details Jun 17 Reply

Dear Sylvia and Jeannie:

1) At our last meeting, did I hear Sylvia correctly: She has appointed Jeannie to chair the summer workgroup?
2) Unless I heard wrong, Jeannie said that she wants the workgroup to appoint an unbiased outside expert to write a report on holistic admissions and that while the expert will be granted access to admissions data, we the workgroup will not. But if that is true, I don't see what the function of the workgroup is. It seems our only job is to appoint the outside expert. Am I missing something?

3) Sylvia mentioned that she is trying to arrange a 1/18-salary payment for each of us for our summer work. In my view, that's a non-trivial amount of money. If we are to receive that, shouldn't we be doing more work, like, e.g., helping the outside expert code and analyze data?

Sincerely,
Tim

--
Tim Groseclose
Marvin Hoffenberg Chair of American Politics
Department of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095

from Sylvia Hurtado <sylvia.hurtado@gmail.com>
to Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
cc "Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>, "Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>
date Tue, Jun 17, 2008 at 9:39 AM
subject Re: mailed-by@gmail.com

hide details Jun 17 Reply

Tim,
As incoming chair, Jeannie will serve as the chair of the working group.

The committee voted unanimously to charge the working group to accomplish several tasks:

The working group is charged with beginning as soon as possible to:
Find an independent researcher to conduct an unbiased study of holistic review;

Craft a design for the study, including the review of qualitative information (e.g. essays). (The process of coding of qualitative information in students files for past years or the upcoming year is subject to adherence to FERPA guidelines, and may require signing a confidentiality agreement among members and the independent researcher);

Create a process of oversight for the study to involve the CUARS committee along the way, as well as a selection of outside reviewers to evaluate the study.

To accomplish these before the fall, the following should occur:
- Identifying and recruiting an impartial researcher who can plan to allocate their time to the evaluation project work with CUARS, including coordination of release time or pay from the administration in advance of the start of Fall courses if necessary.
- Making a decision about retrospective analysis, as electronic files would have to be requested from systemwide administration (all paper files are shredded at the end of the review process). A prospective analysis would require designating admissions staff and perhaps hiring additional readers to code a sample of cases from the 2008-09 applicants. This additional workload would have to be negotiated with the administration and planned before the onslaught of the normal workload of evaluating over 55 thousand student files.
- Requesting additional data runs and tables from UARS to help set the context for better understanding the results from existing quantitative data and how the qualitative information gleaned through coding will add to the analysis. Learning more about the process for tie-breaking decisions and decisions from augmented review from UARS is also necessary before an evaluation can model these processes.
- Working with an impartial researcher to help determine the best method for coding non-quantitative data, and the many elements that readers take into account in their ratings of applicants.
- The Director of UARS has also asked to work with the group over the summer to help determine changes in the rating system (at the lower levels of reader ratings) that will make it more useful to three other UC campuses that are interested in using our review process to cut the time spent on applications this upcoming year. He has stated that this will require changing reader training materials that need to be in place before the Fall. (This will cut costs elsewhere in the system, and does not affect our own selection process, but indicates to systemwide UCLA's willingness to take on this task on behalf of other campuses).

I expect the working group will determine how much of these tasks can be met. If no pay is evident, fewer meetings will result and less will be accomplished I suspect before the Fall.

Sylvia
- Show quoted text -
On Tue, Jun 17, 2008 at 9:02 AM, Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Sylvia and Jeannie:

1) At our last meeting, did I hear Sylvia correctly: She has appointed Jeannie to chair the summer workgroup?

2) Unless I heard wrong, Jeannie said that she wants the workgroup to appoint an unbiased outside expert to write a report on holistic admissions and that while the expert will be granted access to admissions data, we the workgroup will not. But if that is true, I don't see what the function of the workgroup is. It seems our only job is to appoint the outside expert. Am I missing something?

3) Sylvia mentioned that she is trying to arrange a 1/18-salary payment for each of us for our summer work. In my view, that's a non-trivial amount of money. If we are to receive that, shouldn't we be doing more work, like, e.g., helping the outside expert code and analyze data?

Sincerely,
Tim

--

Tim Groseclose
Marvin Hoffenberg Chair of American Politics
Department of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095

--

Sylvia Hurtado
Professor
3005 Moore Hall, 405 Hilgard Ave.
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521
(310) 825-1925

from Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>
to "Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>,
Dear Sylvia, Jeannie, and Vilma,

Please forgive me as I try, one more time, to persuade you that I (and the rest of our workgroup) should have access to admissions data, including essays of the applicants, and that we should be allowed to conduct our own data analysis.

During our last meeting, I must say, I was surprised to hear Jeannie explain that she only wants the disinterested outside expert to have access to the data. When I agreed to join the workgroup, I thought that all of us would have access to the data. I was also surprised to see Vilma and Sylvia support Jeannie's decision. At one level I can understand the concern that Jeannie voiced in the meeting. Namely, that she does not want some minority report being floated around in the media. However, I still believe, as I mentioned at the meeting, that our decision to outsource all data analysis to an outside expert is a very artificial way to achieve consensus. If, as Sylvia claimed, we should try to produce a "strong" report, then we should allow the possibility of a minority report. I believe that the strongest report would be one where any of us has the opportunity to write such a report but chooses not to do so.

Further, I still believe that my response at the meeting is accurate: Your decision is analogous to a case where a congressional committee has been disallowed to write a bill, and instead that task is outsourced to staff members. Further, just as our workgroup will not be allowed to amend the report of the disinterested expert, it is as if members of Congress are not allowed to amend the bill that the staff members write. Worst of all, our lack of access to the data is as if a congressional committee has been disallowed to attend fact-finding hearings for a bill.

Notwithstanding Vilma's response that it is "stupid" to compare our function to Congress, I think the purpose of our committee is indeed very similar to that of a congressional committee. Much of the function of a congressional committee is oversight of the executive branch. I feel that our committee has outsourced much, if not all, of our oversight function. Not only will we not be able to contribute our own analysis to the report, we will not be allowed to try to replicate the analysis of the disinterested expert.

In 1995, just after Republicans gained a majority in the House, Newt Gingrich created several "task forces," which Gingrich intended to be substitutes for committees. The task forces were composed almost entirely of Republicans, with maybe a few token
Democrats from the conservative wing of the party. The task forces eviscerated the function of committees, and Democrats understandably were quite angry at Gingrich.

Before we outsource our oversight function, could you consider one thing: Do you really want to adopt tactics similar to the ones of Newt Gingrich?

Sincerely,
Tim

--
Tim Groseclose
Marvin Hoffenberg Chair of American Politics
Department of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095

fromOrtiz, Vilma <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>
toTim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>,
"Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>,
"Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>

dateThu, Jun 19, 2008 at 10:07 AM
subjectRe: One more attempt at gentle persuasion
mailed-bysoc.ucla.edu

hide details Jun 19 Reply

I do not take this as "gentle". Moreover, I still find the analogy without merit.

Vilma

fromJeannie Oakes <oakes@ucla.edu>
toTim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>,
"Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>,
"Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>
Hello Tim:

With all due respect, CUARS deliberated and decided these issues at our meeting.

Jeannie

---

Dear Scott, Janina, Tom, and Chancellor Block:
As some of you know, I am on the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (the faculty oversight committee for undergraduate admissions).

For several weeks, I have been trying to obtain some data from the admissions staff. Yet my efforts have been met with great resistance.

Caroline West and Scott have mentioned that a concern for the privacy of the applicants is the main reason that I am being denied the data.

However, I have discussed this with several lawyers, including two UCLA law professors, as well as Tom Brown of Brown Gitt Law Group, who has offered to represent and advise me on this matter. All are skeptical that privacy concerns really imply that I should be denied these data.

Could you please direct me to any written documents, including UCLA policies, that imply that I should be denied these data? More specific, I would be very grateful if I could see any written policies that answer questions such as: (i) Why are admissions staff members given more rights to admissions data than members of the faculty oversight committee? (ii) Why, with PhD admissions, are faculty members given full access to applications of students who have applied to their department? (iii) Why are UC faculty members, who are not even members of the admissions oversight committee, occasionally given data similar to those that I am requesting?

For your convenience, I have attached the original email that I sent to Vu Tran, the Director of UCLA admissions. I also include follow-up emails that help clarify the data that I seek. (I've included a text and an html version.)

Sincerely,
Tim Groseclose

--

Tim Groseclose
Marvin Hoffenberg Chair of American Politics
Department of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095

from Lacertosa, Judith <jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu>
Good morning, everyone,

Attached is a transcription of the discussion about admissions staff from the July 30, 2008 CUARS Summer Workgroup meeting requested by Tim.

Best,
Judith

Judith Lacertos
Principal Policy Analyst
UCLA Academic Senate
jlacertos@senate.ucla.edu

---

from Tim Groseclose <timgroseclose@gmail.com>  
to "Lacertos, Judith" <jlacertos@senate.ucla.edu>  
cc "Oakes, Jeannie L." <oakes@ucla.edu>,  
"Hurtado, Sylvia" <shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu>,  
"Ortiz, Vilma" <vilma@soc.ucla.edu>,  
"Groseclose, Timothy" <timg@polisci.ucla.edu>,  
"Skewes-Cox, Tom" <skewes-cox@saonet.ucla.edu>,  
Tom Brown <tbrown@browngitt.com>,  
Elizabeth Ligon Bjork <elbjork@psych.ucla.edu>  

date Thu, Aug 14, 2008 at 1:57 PM  
subject Re: CUAR Summer Workgroup Transcription mailed-bygmail.com

hide details Aug 14 (13 days ago) Reply
Judith,

Thanks very much!

I have one more request: I think there is a reasonable chance that some of the issues that I am raising will be litigated in a court someday. It is my ardent hope that they will not, but nevertheless, I think there is a reasonable chance.

I therefore request that you do not discard the tape from which you made the transcript.

Please accept my apology if this causes you any inconvenience.

Sincerely,

Tim

- Show quoted text -

On Thu, Aug 14, 2008 at 9:02 AM, Lacertosa, Judith <jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu> wrote:

Good morning, everyone,

Attached is a transcription of the discussion about admissions staff from the July 30, 2008 CUARS Summer Workgroup meeting requested by Tim.

Best,

Judith

Judith Lacertosa
Principal Policy Analyst
UCLA Academic Senate
jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu
310.825.1194

--

Tim Groseclose
Marvin Hoffenberg Chair of American Politics
Department of Political Science
UCLA
Los Angeles, CA 90095
From: Tim Groseclose [mailto:timgroseclose@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, August 22, 2008 4:41 PM

To: chancellor@ucla.edu; swaugh@conet.ucla.edu; jmontero@saonet.ucla.edu;
tlifka@saonet.ucla.edu; vtran@saonet.ucla.edu; elbjork@psych.ucla.edu;
msgoldst@ucla.edu; shetty@senate.ucla.edu; shurtado@gseis.ucla.edu;
vilma@soc.ucla.edu; oakes@ucla.edu
Cc: kreed@conet.ucla.edu; Tom Brown
Subject:

Memorandum

To: Chancellor Gene Block
    Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh
    Associate Vice Chancellor Janina Montero
    Associate Vice Chancellor Tom Lifka
    Director of Admissions Vu Tran
    Professor Elizabeth Bjork, Chair of UCLA Academic Senate
    Professor Michael Goldstein, Vice-Chair of UCLA Academic Senate
    Professor Vivek Shetty, Immediate Past Chair of UCLA Academic Senate
    Professor Sylvia Hurtado, Chair of CUARS
    Professor Vilma Ortiz, Vice-Chair of CUARS
    Professor Jeannie Oaks, Chair of Summer Workgroup of CUARS

From: Tim Groseclose

Subject: Problems with UCLA Admissions and my Impending Resignation from the
Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

Attached to this email is a draft of a report that I am writing. It documents problems with
UCLA admissions, as well as several stonewalling actions I have encountered when I
requested some data about UCLA admissions.

I am proud of the traditions and values—especially those of meritocracy, transparency,
and the pursuit of the truth—that have made UCLA one of the best and most admired
public universities in the world today. I feel it is my duty—as an official of the university
in my role as a member of CUARS—to help protect those traditions and values. Yet, as I
document in this report, some individuals at UCLA have taken steps down a path that makes a mockery of those traditions and values. This report is a manifestation of my desire to keep UCLA on a proper path.

If I do not receive the data that I have requested, regrettably, I will have no choice but to resign in protest from CUARS. My duties as a member of CUARS include research and oversight of the admission process. If I am disallowed to do these duties, then not resigning makes me complicit in the problems, some of which may involve illegal activity.

Unless these issues are resolved, I believe that there is a reasonable chance that UCLA will face litigation. The problems that I document are not benign, and I have a real concern that UCLA might face a class-action lawsuit someday.

I therefore request that the relevant university officials be directed not to discard any relevant data—to the extent that these data have not been discarded already. These data include, but are not limited to, the following:

1) All undergraduate applications to UCLA by students applying to be a member of the Fall class of 2005, 2006, or 2007.
2) All decisions of readers of these applications, including the identities of the readers and the scores that they assigned to applications that they read, as well as the final decision whether the applicant was admitted.

It is my ardent hope, however, that all the issues that I raise will be resolved soon and that they will not need to be resolved through litigation.

cc: Kevin Reed, Vice Chancellor Legal Affairs and Associate General Counsel, UCLA
    Tom Brown, Attorney, Brown Gitt Law Group
Appendix VII: Letter from Kevin Reed, Vice Chancellor, Legal Affairs and Associate General Counsel
Dr. Timothy Groseclose  
Marvin Hoffenberg Chair of American Politics  
UCLA Department of Political Science  
4289 Bunche Hall  
Campus

Re: Your Email Request for Admission Data

Dear Dr. Groseclose:

Your July 15 email to Scott Waugh, Janina Montero, Tom Lifka and Chancellor Block has been forwarded to me for response.

In your email you assert skepticism that privacy concerns have driven the decision to not give you the data you have requested in the form you have requested them. As the person who has advised Vice Chancellor Montero and the admissions group on the requirements of the law, I want to assure you that your request for access to the complete application files for 1,000 students and prospective students has been denied purely for reasons related to UC policies and state and federal laws governing the confidentiality of student and applicant information. The information you have requested would contain personally identifiable data. It is not realistically possible to redact names from the admissions packet and, even if names were redacted from the files, other personally identifiable information would be within the files. The University cannot release that information to an independent researcher consistent with policy and law.

It is my understanding that Tom Lifka and Vu Tran have offered to work with you to find ways for you to access meaningful data to undertake a study. Indeed, from the descriptions I have received, I can state that the admissions team here is going well beyond what would be required by the California Public Records Act in trying to accommodate your request. I am also confident, from my personal review of their proposals, that the restrictions Tom and Vu propose on the data they will provide you are designed only to protect the privacy of our students and applicants. I recommend that you continue to work with them for access to data.
You raise some specific questions in your email that I will attempt to respond to below:


2) You ask why admissions staff members are given more rights to admission data than members of the faculty oversight committee. While UC Policy 130.70 will give you a more detailed answer, the core reason is that the admissions staff members must have access to the data, on behalf of the University, in order to fulfill their roles as admissions staff members. The policy and privacy laws at issue recognize that the University is the custodian of the private data as well as the guarantor of its confidentiality. The University may (must, actually) allow those with a need to know access private data and may itself use those data for legitimate University purposes. You have made clear that you do not want access to confidential data on behalf of the University or the CUARS committee. Your May 1, 2008 email to Vu Tran indicates that you "prefer to conduct at least one analysis on [your] own." UCLA is thus required to respond to your request as it would to a request from any independent researcher (i.e., a researcher not undertaking an analysis at the behest of UCLA or one of its component bodies) and withhold data that would reveal personally identifiable information.

3) You ask why faculty members making decisions on graduate student admissions are given full access to applications for admission to their department. I refer you to statement 2, above. Faculty in that position are working on behalf of the University and are in a need to know position with respect to the confidential information in applications. They function as the University in the context you describe. See, e.g., UC Policy 130.721(a.) (disclosures of personally identifiable information allowable to "University officials who have been determined to have a legitimate educational interest in the records . . . ".)
4) Finally, you ask why UC faculty members, who are not members of an admissions oversight committee, are occasionally given data similar to those you are requesting. In answer, we are unaware of any faculty member outside of the admissions staff themselves having access to the type of data you are requesting in the form you are requesting them. Other researchers have been provided data summaries, tables of data by various categories, and summative reports that do not have personally identifiable information. The accumulated decades of experience at UCLA have not revealed a single time when a researcher has been given entire admissions files, including essays and other entries students have made.

I hope you find the foregoing answers to your questions illuminating. While it is UCLA's conclusion that it cannot give you access to the entire application file of 1,000 applicants for undergraduate admission, the admissions office staff remains ready to work with you to provide summary reports and tables that can provide you with the kind of information you need to conduct the analysis you seek to undertake.

Sincerely,

Kevin S. Reed
Vice Chancellor, Legal Affairs and Associate General Counsel

cc: Chancellor Block
    Associate Vice Chancellor Thomas Lifka
    Vice Chancellor Janina Montero
    Acting Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh
    Director Vu Tran
4) Finally, you ask why UC faculty members, who are not members of an admissions oversight committee, are occasionally given data similar to those you are requesting. In answer, we are unaware of any faculty member outside of the admissions staff themselves having access to the type of data you are requesting in the form you are requesting them. Other researchers have been provided data summaries, tables of data by various categories, and summative reports that do not have personally identifiable information. The accumulated decades of experience at UCLA have not revealed a single time when a researcher has been given entire admissions files, including essays and other entries students have made.

I hope you find the foregoing answers to your questions illuminating. While it is UCLA’s conclusion that it cannot give you access to the entire application file of 1,000 applicants for undergraduate admission, the admissions office staff remains ready to work with you to provide summary reports and tables that can provide you with the kind of information you need to conduct the analysis you seek to undertake.

Sincerely,

Kevin S. Reed
Vice Chancellor, Legal Affairs and
Associate General Counsel

cc: Chancellor Block
Associate Vice Chancellor Thomas Lifka
Vice Chancellor Janina Montero
Acting Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh
Director Vu Tran

bcc: Assistant Chancellor Antoinette Mongelli
Assistant Provost Maryann Gray
Director Caroline West
Appendix VIII: Memo from Professor Jeannie Oaks, Chair of CUARS Summer Workgroup

(The Memo Names Professor of Sociology Robert Mare as the independent Researcher. It also outlines the study that Professor Mare is expected to conduct.)

UCLA Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

August 20, 2008

To: Executive Vice Chancellor Scott Waugh, Academic Senate Chair Elizabeth Bjork; Vice Chancellor Janina Montero; General Counsel Kevin Reed

Cc: Professor Sylvia Hurtado, Professor Vilma Ortiz, Professor Tim Groseclose, Professor Robert Mare; Judith Lacertosa; Maryann Gray, Thomas Lifka; Vu Tran

From: Professor Jeannie Oaks, Chair CUARS Summer Workgroup

Re: CUARS-Sponsored Independent Study of UCLA Admissions

At the direction of CUARS, a faculty workgroup met four times in Summer 2008 to launch a rigorous study evaluating the holistic review process used in UCLA' freshman admissions. Professors Hurtado, Ortiz, and Groseclose served on the Workgroup, which I chaired. CUARS charged the workgroup with three tasks:

- Find an independent researcher to conduct an unbiased study of holistic review;
- Craft a design for the study;
- Create a process of oversight for the study to involve the CUARS committee along the way, as well as a selection of outside reviewers to evaluate the study.

These have now been completed. UCLA Professor of Sociology Robert Mare had agreed to lead the study and together with the CUARS workgroup, Professors Jan de Leeuw (UCLA Department of Statistics) and Michael Hout (UC Berkeley, Department of Sociology) have agreed to serve as outside reviewers. This memo outlines the study questions, design, timeline, costs, and data access and reporting procedures.

As agreed in our earlier conversations, I am submitting the plan as a basis for requesting the resources the study will require. Although, as noted below, we have not yet determined the exact number of experienced readers (and the associated costs) the study will require, that will occur in the next few weeks. However, we want to secure a commitment for the costs associated with Professor Mare's release time and the GSR now, before plans for the academic year are set.

Research Questions and Design

The workgroup and Professor Mare have agreed on 5 research questions that will guide the study. Both the questions and the design build on and extend the study conducted by Professor Michael Hout of UC Berkeley's holistic review process in
1) How are the various factors—both recorded and previously unrecorded—that are intended to contribute to the rankings and admissions decision actually weighted in the review process?

2) Are there factors not intended to contribute to the rankings and admissions decisions that actually do contribute (e.g., race, religion, political orientation, other)? If so, how much do these unintended factors influence the process, over and above the intended factors?

3) To what extent and in what way does variability among readers affect the review process outcomes (rater bias)?

4) To what extent does variability in the weighting of particular variables affect the review process (capriciousness)?

5) How might the composition of the admitted class be different under different review schemes: 1) holistic review; 2) comprehensive review post SP 1 and 209; and 3) comprehensive review prior to SP 1 and 209)?

The basic approach of the study will be to use quantitative and qualitative data from the applications for freshman admissions for Fall 2008 to examine readers' rating of applicant files. Following Hout's method, the study will model readers ratings based on over 100 pieces of information collect from a re-reading of several thousand student applications, including many previously unrecorded variables (PUVs) that were gleaned from a re-reading of each case coded instead of assigning a single score. The PUVs cover academics, extracurricular activities, work experience, obstacles to achievement, and the contents of the personal essay and statement of purpose. Readers recorded most PUVs by counting items listed in the application; others required them to synthesize information or make a judgment. Additional analyses will be conducted about the entire population of applicants, based on the already recorded quantitative data on the applications. Statistical analyses will be used determine the relative weight of all factors (including race and gender though considered irrelevant to admissions) and answer all of the research questions.

Timeline

Fall 2008 & Winter 2009 – Preparation and analysis of quantititative data about the entire population of applicant for Fall 2008.

Spring 2009 – Training of readers and data collection from re-reading a sample of files.

Summer 2009 – Data analysis and report writing.

Costs

1 49% GSR for 12 months;
1 course release for Professor Mare, Winter 2009;
2 summer 9ths for Professor Mare, Summer 2009;
Application readers @ $20-25 per hour for training and re-reading files and coding data.  
(Note: The exact number of readers and hours will be determined as study design is refined. Readers can be expected to read and code 4 files per hour; Hout's UC Berkeley required readers for 8000 files. We anticipate that the UCLA study will require a sample of 8000 applications or more.)

Possible Ancillary Studies

This document summarizes the goals and design of the proposed admissions study based on CUARS' and Professor Mare's current understanding of the issues. It is possible that, as the study goes forward, additional research questions and modifications in research design may
prove desirable. For example, CUARS and Professor Mare have already discussed the possibility of a tighter comparison between admissions processes at Berkeley and UCLA, of an analysis of the impact of UCLA’s holistic review on admissions and enrollments at other UC campuses, and the effects of applicant characteristics used in holistic review on student performance at UCLA. These topics are not currently part of the proposed study. If CUARS subsequently decides that these or other related research issues should be investigated, this will be subject to further discussion about additional time and resources that would be needed to do the work.

Data Access and Reporting

To carry out this research, Professor Mare and his graduate assistant require access to application files, including quantitative, computer readable data and paper admissions files on individual students. The paper files will be used in their usual storage facility. Professor Mare and his graduate assistant will require access to computer readable files that they can analyze in their UCLA offices. Appropriate arrangements can be made to ensure that these offices are secure and that the computers that hold the data are off-line (unconnected to any computer network). The data that Professor Mare and his graduate assistant work with should not contain the names or Social Security Numbers of applicants. However, they should contain unique numerical identifiers so that they can, for analytic purposes, be linked back to their paper admissions files. Professor Mare’s access to all admissions data will end once this project is completed.

This project will consume a sizeable portion of Professor Mare’s research time during the next 12 months. Additionally, this study is closely relevant to a variety of issues in applied and basic social science. For these reasons, Professor Mare asks for the opportunity to report the results of his work to academic audiences. It is understood that CUARS is Professor Mare’s client in this research and will receive and review his report(s) prior to disclosure to any other party. Once a timely review has been completed, Professor Mare would be free to use his work on this project in graduate seminars in social science research methodology, present the results to meetings of professional social scientists, and publish the results in academic books or journals. The exact form of these publications may differ from the final report to CUARS. However, any such documents would be appendices to Professor Mare’s main report to CUARS.

In using UCLA Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools data for research purposes, Professor Mare’s research – but not his work for CUARS – will require approval by UCLA’s IRB. Professor Mare will seek IRB approval once other aspects of this proposal are approved.

Legal Issues

The workgroup expressed concerns about the possible legal implications for the data and documents generated by Professor Mare’s research. The workgroup suggested that UCLA Legal Council might be consulted and asked to consider and render an opinion on the following:

- Should the data and documents be destroyed after the study is completed?
- What data/documents are subject to subpoena and what should be retained to support the study?
- Should all persons who have access to the data and documents be asked to sign a disclosure/confidentiality agreement?

I look forward to hearing from you soon.
Appendix IX: Partial Transcript of the CUARS Summer Workgroup Meeting on July 30, 2008
CUARS SUMMER WORKGROUP

July 30, 2008 Meeting

Elapsed time: 24:36

T. Skewes-Cox: Well, what that speaks to is...what I’m looking at is the 59 Previously Unrecorded Variable, the PUVs.

J. Oakes: Those are not...those aren’t found empirically, those are what the readers...

T. S-C.: Those came out of focus groups.

J.O.: Yes, the focus groups, what they said what they were reading for. You want to know, “what are the weights being placed on the things people say they are reading for?” Then, “are there unintended variables that are being weighted in ways that are either unknown or distorting or...

T. S-C.: Well...I mean...religion [unreadable], you know...political affiliation...

J. Oakes: Yeah.

T. S-C.: I do not believe...as well as the unrecorded...was one of the areas that they looked at...

J. O.: No...

T. S-C.: So, in terms of the design, you’re going to come up with a list of...

J. O.: With a list of suspect variables...

T. S-C.: Well, yeah...variables that may influence the process...but not by design.

J. O.: Um-hmm...

T. S-C.: That’s...like you say, that’s a tricky thing. You’d have to read a bunch of [unreadable]...

T. Groseclose: Yeah...yeah, and, I agree. But how...

J. O.: Well, you know...

T. G.: But, Hout...Hout picked...picked additional ones.

J. O.: Uh-huh...

T. G.: [unreadable]

J. O.: Uh-huh...

T. S-C.: Yeah, I’d be surprised that after he was done he didn’t have a few ideas about other things he’d had...were important.
T. G.: Yeah...yeah.

J. O.: We could always ask him that.

Vilma Ortiz: Well...[unintelligible]...some of the things we're supposed to do as part of the admissions process...so, um, well...if they were supposed to consider the academic, you know, ability of the student...

J. O.: Um-hmm...

V. O.: Or also...so...we're also supposed to consider disadvantaged background, and we're also supposed to consider life challenges...those...those...those three components are clearly laid out in the policy...

J. O.: Um-hmm...um-hmm...

V. O.: So I think we want to know, how are those working...

J. O.: Yup...

V. O.: and affecting, how readers judge...with, uh...applicants...and, then are there other things that policy says we're not supposed to use...that are not clearly laid out in the policy that are affecting how readers make judgments...so that...and, that gets at some of the things Tim is...so, its, um...a lot of the critiques...I was looking at some of the stuff that people have...that...that led to the Hout study...some of the criticisms of the admissions process, and it's a...it's a very simplistic thing. Like, you know, a 1000 students with an SAT score of a...of above a 1000 didn't get admitted. Why didn't that student get admitted? Well, that's not how we do admissions. We do admissions by looking at the SATs, grades, how difficult their...it's...you know, it's only one very small piece of the whole academic packaging...then...putting aside any of these other issues. What where their grades? How...how difficult were their courses? Well, did they maintain that over time?

J. O.: Um-hm...

V. O.: Did they...

T. S-C.: Well, that's one of the PUVs that's evidence of increasing performance...[unintelligible]...

V. O.: Right, I know, it...it's...it's in here...it's in the Hout study, but...what...what...it isn't in the critiques. When people say simplistic...simplistic statements like, "why isn't a student with a 1200 SAT getting in or a 4.0 getting in?"...they're not telling us anything else, and, that's not how admissions works. So, we need to try to, kind of, address the issues that are...really are supposed to do. This is what admissions is supposed to do...so, take into consideration all these things. The...their difficult program, the...how they increased the difficulty of a program over time. How they've shown out...in their class, you know...how challenged they...how challenged themselves...
J. O.: Yeah...yeah...

V. O.: And, then...and, then...you know...
J. O.: Um-hmm...

V. O.: ...and, all those things should matter...
J. O.: And, then you look to see if there’s things over-and-above...

V. O.: Right...absol...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: And, I think that’s kind of the main...question...
J. O.: Um-hmm...

V. O.: Right? That’s the...you know...how are the things that we’re supposed to look at affecting the process and how are things that we’re not supposed to look at affect the process?

J. O.: Um-hmm...so, that other...the other...so, then he also...then looking at what maybe...um, sort of systemic... or, systematic...systematic reader variability and how that may be affecting the process...uh, what do you call it? The capriciousness, right?...variability around the weighting that may affect the process. And, then his comparison question is, “What would the admit pool look like under different types of review?”...and then he posed, holistic, comprehensive and the third would be pre-209 SV-192 after we went into pre-comprehensive, so you could look at...

V. O.: You know, I don’t know what I would...if we need...

J. O.: ...aren’t interested in that?

V. O.: I don’t know, I don’t know. Do we...do we really want to compare it to comprehensive?

J. O.: I don’t know. I mean, Sylvia was very, very strong in saying that there is just no point in doing that because we’re not going to go back. What we need to do is to do an analysis that will improve the system we now have.

V. O.: Um-hmm.

J. O.: I mean, she was very...

V. O.: Right.

J. O: firm about that.

V. O.: Um-hmm.
J. O.: …so, I think that’s something…and, she’ll be back next week, so hopefully, her relatives will not be in town.

V. O.: Well, but that takes care of this last, “how has this changed as a result of holistic?”

J. O.: Um-hmm.

V. O.: We’re not going to do that then.

J. O.: Um-hmm.

T. G.: If I could speak up. I was, I think…it might be on this…at least [unintelligible] the other way.

V. O.: Okay, because?

T. G.: Yeah, I wanted a comparison…that was originally…when I…

V. O.: To compare holistic to comprehensive?

T. G.: When I…I mean, I wanted data on before and after.

V. O.: How come? I mean, what, what…

T. G.: Yeah, I wanted…I, uh…I suspect, uh, some mischief is going on.

V. O.: In what way?

T. G.: Uh, I think people may have been using the essays, to, uh…uh…in learning race, possibly religion…uh, possibly others, and, uh…in violation of law. And, uh…I wanted, uh…a comparison with, uh…the…the prior year.

V. O.: But…

J. O.: But it wouldn’t…

V. O.: But why would…

J. O.: Because it’s such a completely different system you couldn’t attribute the racial differences to simply the…I mean…how would you know whether it was somebody using race or whether the variables that are being used under this system may have a racial impact without any sort of racial intent or not…not using any direct…I mean, not having any direct affect of race. I don’t…I don’t know how we could ever figure that one out.

T. G.: Uh…I think there…there are ways. Uh…uh…in…I’m not sure I can spell them out exactly on the…on the spot. But…uh…uh…
T. S-C.: Was mischief possible under the old system?

T. G.: I think so, yes.

V. O.: That’s my...that was going to be my question. What is it about...cuz’ in the old system reviewers...readers read the essay. So, the essay has been read, you know, and...and...for a long time. So, what is it about the new system that makes reading the essay different, a qualitatively different thing that would increase the role of, let’s say, race or religion.

T. G.: Well, under the old system, half of your score came from a rater who...who didn’t read the essays. That’s the point of holistic system, is that every rater gets the whole file. In...in the old system, that wasn’t true.

V. O.: Well, the fact that it was...

T. S-C.: The half [unintelligible]...

T. G.: Yeah, we had three aspects, right?

T. S-C.: Right.

T. G.: Uh...Academic Achievement; Personal Achievement...


T. G.: ...and, Life Challenges. Uh...

T. S-C.: I...uh...I’m sorry, is the coefficient the half point?

T. G.: Right, I’m getting to that. Um...the...uh...my understanding was that...uh...the, uh...quality of lot...excuse me, of life challenges and the uh...uh...personal achievements were judged on a...a 1 to 5 scale, okay? Um...in the...prep [unintelligible] uniform...um, well, uniform, I don’t know uniform...

J. O.: Evenly rated.

T. G.: Yeah, evenly rated, from 1 to 5, okay? Uh...the Academic Achievement was on a 1 to 10 scale. Okay? And, again, almost uniform, well not quite but there’s...there’s a similar distribution, just stretched out by two. From 1 to 10.

J. O.: Um-hmm.

T. G.: So, in effect, and...anyone would add them up...it wasn’t the case that you would divide the Academic Achievement...
T. S-C.: And the numbers were just added up?

T. G.: Well, no.

V. O.: I’m not sure that’s the way it works.

T. G.: No, it was not added up, yeah, we were given a matrix. But, but...uh...but, it had...

V. O.: I think the issue you’re raising, even though I don’t want to be speaking for you, Tim, is that the...the reader who looked at...who gave the academic rank...ranking did not do the reading of the Life Challenges. It was done separately.

T. S-C.: Did not...did not see the essay.

V. O.: I think that’s the issue...

T. S-C.: At least part of it...

V. O.: So...

T. S-C [unintelligible] did not influence your admissions.

V. O.: So, the...right. So, there’s one...one part of the ...the rating...of the...of the reading of the student...applicant that was just looking at the academics.

J. O.: So, it was completely color blind.

V. O.: That piece, right. That was...

J. O.: Do you know...would they know...see, I was...I wasn’t part of this. I don’t know. Did they know the...um...the quality of the school that the student came from?

V. O.: That could be indirect things that they would know.

J. O.: Yeah.

V. O.: Like where schools...[unintelligible] schools.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] high schools...

V. O.: Yeah...

T. S-C.: So, they saw all these students from high school ‘A’...

V. O.: Right.
T. S-C.: So, they’d get a sense of GPA distributions, other courses distributions and what not.

V. O.: Right.

J. O.: Um-hmm.

V. O.: So, they could figure out...they probably can’t...couldn’t figure out who black students were, but, say, they could probably figure out who minority students were, you know.

J. O.: There are a bunch of high schools in L.A. that are largely...

V. O.: That have almost no [unintelligible] students, so on that basis...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: Hmm? So...so that would influence the academic rating by...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

T. G.: I’m not...I’m not sure if they use [unintelligible]...cuz I remember...I seem to remember that uh...the quality of your high school was part of Life Challenge...

J. O.: Ohh...

T. G.: So I don’t think they were double counting that.

J. O.: So they couldn’t have seen academic achievement in the context of the high school...

T. G.: Yeah, yeah, that was the whole point of the...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] things they have changed...I have been in Admissions for a while. You got students from a high school for just that reason...

J. O.: Um-hmm.

T. S-C.: so you’re ...you’re reading within the context of just that high school. They knew who was near the top of the high school and who was near the [unintelligible] or whatever. So, my understanding was that you knew where all these students were from. And, you might even have known that it was high school “X”.

V. O.: You...you might have known the name of the high school. See, that’s...

J. O.: [unintelligible] you’d certainly know...

V. O.: Yeah, you might have of, even though you weren’t...
T. S-C.: [unintelligible] if you’d been there th... 

V. O.: Right, right. I don’t know...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] 

V. O.: This is...this is really unfair to be doing this...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] 

V. O.: ...from memory, right? It’s really not...we shouldn’t be really trying to...

T. S-C.: Oh, but I...it’s fair to say that the essay could have more of an influence...

V. O.: Right.

T. S-C.: ...on the final score than previously. Which is your concern about it. There was mischief before...it’s been magnified [unintelligible]...

T. G.: Yeah, yeah.

T. S-C.: But that’s a question that can be answered if...at least with the current cycle...with the current process. Is, what is the magnitude of the influence...

V. O.: Right, right.

J. O.: [unintelligible] right.

V. O.: Uh...part of it...part of it...part of the change is a bigger emphasis on disadvantage status today...on the holistic. Uh...which wasn’t a change in policy, but was a real change in emphasis, I think, in going to holistic. I could be wrong cuz I wasn’t here, actually, as it was...as it was implemented. And, that is not mischief. That is allowed.

T. G.: I’m...I’m not certain that that is true, actually.

V. O.: What is true?

T. G.: That...uh...there’s more emphasis put on...uh...on uh... 

T. S-C.: Less put on academics.

T. G.: Uh...maybe so...uh...

T. S-C.: Which is sort of...

T. G.: [unintelligible]
T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: I’m not... I’m not understanding what you’re saying.

T.G.: The... that... I’m not sure that it’s the case. That... um... if you measured uh... [unintelligible] tried... measured life challenges somehow, uh... and then tried to assess the weight. I’m... I’m not sure that you’re going to get a higher emphasis. The... the New York Times article about our admissions even mentioned that. Said that... uh... the... uh...

V. O.: It said the opposite. It said that we are doing... that we are like one of the best at...

T. G.: Right...

V. O.: competitive...

T. G.: Right... right... but it also...

V. O.: ... in terms of bringing disadvantaged students.

T. G.: Let’s talk about the level not the change, okay? And, he did say that there was a decrease in low-income students. And, he did say...

J. O.: Well...

V. O.: Oh...

J. O.: That’s an empirical question we can figure out pretty easily.

V. O.: Yeah...

T. S-C.: The percentage of low-income students went down.

V. O.: When?

T. S-C.: When you moved to holistic.

V. O.: Really? By how much?

T. S-C.: I... will not attempt to put [unintelligible] on it. The percentage of low-income... the percentage of admits that were low-income went down. The first year on holistic. And, this was similar to the experience that Berkeley had.

J. O.: Right...

V. O.: Huh...
J. O.: And...and according to Vu it didn’t bump-up all that much the second year. Little, tiny bump...

T. S-C.: No, it did not change.

V. O.: Low...just upped the income.

J. O.: Mm-hmm.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] in particular...

V. O.: The income measure. Like income under $40,000.


V. O.: Hm. I...actually, I didn’t know this cuz I wasn’t on the committee the first year [unintelligible]. So, okay, that’s interest...that’s an interesting point...

T. G.: I remember...I remember the Life Challenge index the...uh...the race that was helped most...

J. O.: Asian.


J. O.: And there was a big drop that first year in...

V. O.: See, but Vietnamese is an interesting group because they are more...um...economically disadvantaged than other Asian groups. So you would expect...uh...if...if...uh...I mean this is...not knowing the income thing that you just said, but if...if...if you are looking...if you are...if you are really giving a lot of weight to economic status, disadvantaged...

J. O.: Yep, yep.

V. O.: ...class background, the Vietnamese would be a group that is advantaged in the...

T. G.: Disadvantaged.

V. O.: Would be advantaged by the...

J. O.: Advantaged by the life challenges.

V. O.: Right.

J. O.: Because a lot of them tend to be valedictorians, I mean, they’re a very small percentage at, like, many of these schools that are predominantly or almost all Latino and African American. But often they’re the valedictorians.
V. O.: It...high achieving, and from relatively disadvantaged class backgrounds.

J. O.: Mm-hmm.

V. O.: They...they would...that would...it helped them to have...

J. O.: Mm-hmm.

V. O.: ...a system that would, kind of, you know, [unintelligible] about those things.

J. O.: Yep.

V. O.: So...that doesn’t fit the pattern of, kind of, class being devalued. It would actually be consistent with a pattern of class being...being used more in the admissions process. Now...now the fact that...

T. G.: I’m...I’m not following that.

V. O.: If you’re giving more weight to disadvantaged background, you would see the admissions of a group like the Vietnamese increase. They are...

T. G.: Yeah...

V. O.: ...unusually...

T. G.: Yeah...

V. O.: ...disadvantaged.

T. G.: Alright.

V. O.: You know, in comparison to other Asian...

T. G.: Yeah.

V. O.: ...groups.

T. G.: And, we saw the opposite happen the first year of holistic.

J. O.: Yeah.

V. O.: Oh, then...they were...they were...

J. O.: Yeah, they went down.
V. O.: They went down?

J. O.: Yeah.

T. G.: They were the ones.

V. O.: Oh, I'm sorry. I misunderstand. I'm sorry, I take it all back. You're right. You're right. You're right.

J. O.: They were the one group that...

V. O.: [unintelligible]...you're right. You're right. Okay, you're right. You're right.

J. O.: Yeah.

V.O.: Well, you know, if we go through this...we will go through this and we will...

T. G.: But...

V. O.: [unintelligible]...be able to...

T. G.: [unintelligible]...but my point...is it possible...reason to look at the prior year's data too?

J. O.: Well...now, the prior year's data...

T. S-C.: You mean prior process?

J. O.: Prior process.

V. O.: Prior process.

T. G.: Well...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

J. O.: Right.

T. S-C.: The old...you want to compare the old process and new process.

J. O.: Right.

V. O.: [unintelligible]

J. O.: [unintelligible]...it would be the simulated...

V. O.: It's not even clear we have all the data to go back and....
J. O.: Yeah...yeah...

V. O.: ...to do it on both applications from three years ago.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]...year's ago?

J. O.: [unintelligible]...the simulation.

V. O.: Simulation, right.

T. G.: That...but the problem is that the, uh...paper applications are destroyed...at some point, right?

J. O.: Um-hmm.

T. S-C: Yes.

J. O.: After one year.

T. G.: One...one year is the...the...

T. S-C.: Yes.

J. O.: Of the ones who are not admitted.

T. S-C: [unintelligible]

J. O.: To be admitted...

T. S-C.: Pardon me...

J. O.: No...uh...who don't come...

T. S-C.: Enrolled...

J. O.: Enrolled...

T. S-C.: ...students' applications are kept right here.

J. O.: Right.

T. S-C.: All other applications are destroyed.

J. O.: Right.

T. G.: After one year.
T. S-C.: In October.

T. G.: Yeah.

T. S-C.: Basically one year after they’ve applied.

T. G.: Okay.

V. O.: Barely a year after they’ve applied, if you do it in October. So…

T. S-C.: Right.

T. G.: Okay.

V. O.: …so, we really couldn’t do this with the applicants from three years ago. We would do this with last year’s applicants by, you know, examining them twice through two different admission processes.

T. G.: You…you could still use electronic data…it…right? Most of the files…

V. O.: But, is the essay electronically reported?

J. O.: No.

V. O.: [unintelligible]

T. G.: So they do it [unintelligible]…

J. O.: Only…only the ones who…

T. S-C.: That’s open and whether or not UCOP keeps the open ones and whether or not they can make them available. Vu’s looking into this, and…

J. O.: Yeah.

T. S-C.: …I…I don’t believe he has an answer yet.

J. O.: Yeah.

T. S-C.: About whether OP will release them.

J. O.: And we’d have to then do a lot of…to figure out what the bias is, and who submits electronically and who doesn’t.

T. S-C.: Right.
J. O.: And once...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: [unintelligible]

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] goes lower as you go back.

V. O.: Yeah, it goes lower as you go back.

T. S-C.: Correct.

J. O.: I actually kind of like...[unintelligible]

V. O.: [unintelligible] to compare...if...if the applicant pool is changing in any way over time...

J. O.: Mm-hmm.

V. O.: ...better then comparing an applicant pool now to an applicant pool back then, let’s compare the applicant pool now, you know, under two different processes.

J. O.: Yes...yeah.

V. O.: You know...

J. O.: Does that...does that sound good to you?

T. G.: If you want to find the mischief...see, if I think there was any mischief, that it happened in 2007. That’s the year.

V. O.: But, see...that’s not...I don’t...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

T. G.: It’d be probably less. I think the big...my hunch is that the...uh...the...uh...

V. O.: That’s...that’s not the role of the committee. I’m sorry. The role of the committee is not to find mischief, right? It’s...that is a very, narrow...like, you know...someone’s...that is really Vu’s job. Really. To make sure that what we’re telling him at...at the level of policy is being done correctly. You know? So, we...

T. G.: We...we differ. We differ on that.

V. O.: I just felt...
T. G.: I...I appreciate your frankness in...that...

V. O.: I just...I just...

T. S-C.: Well...well the mischief is the race weight, right?

T. G.: Possibly others. I...I wanted to look at the data...

T. S-C.: Oh...in ...in the...

V. O.: Religion, the [unintelligible]...

T. S-C.: Religion [unintelligible]...the non-specified factors.

T. G.: Right.

T. S-C.: Is there a positive, significant weight to factors that should not be used in the process.

T. G.: Right.

V. O.: But you could...I mean...but you can do that...look, if we only have 2008 data, why wouldn’t we do it...I mean 2007 data, why couldn’t we answer this question with 2007 data?

T. G.: [unintelligible]...well [unintelligible]...

V. O.: You can...you cannot recreate the mindset of readers in 2006, when holistic was implemented. Suppose...

T. S-C.: Right, 2007...

V. O.: ...7...

T. S-C.: ...just to be [unintelligible] ...

V. O.: ...no, no, no, the first would have been two years ago.

T. G.: No [unintelligible]

V. O.: I mean...so, the incoming class of 2007. You’re right...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

T. G.: [unintelligible]
V. O.: ...you’re right, yeah, you’re right, you’re right, two years ago. You’re right, I’m sorry. Okay. If the mischief has to do with it being...you think it happened the first year and not the sec...and less the second. If it has to do with...

J. O.: Or did you think it happens the second more than the first?

T. G.: My...my hunch is that...that the greatest would have been 2007.

V. O.: Because it’s a new...because it’s a new process? [unintelligible]

J. O.: You mean the...the people applying...

T. G.: No...

J. O.: ...for 2007?

T. G.: ...no, no, no.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]...the first year of holistic.

T. G.: Yeah.

V. O.: The...the readers in the first year...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

T. S-C.: We’ve got two years. We can say first year holistic, second year...

V. O.: Yeah.

V. O.: The readers in the first year, given the change, were not doing exactly what they were supposed to do. They were motivated by other concerns...

J. O.: Mm-hmm.

V. O.: they, you know...maybe the training wasn’t as rigorous, right? I mean, it’s...

J. O.: All those T-shirts that said, “Got black students?”

V. O.: Right, so, whatever. Um...

T. G.: There was pressure, huh?

V. O.: But, we cannot recreate that. That’s the problem. If it’s really about something that happened at a particular point in time...remember, even if we use the applicants from two thousand...from that first year of holistic, we’re not using...um...well, we have the...the read...the raters...the read...the readers ratings that we tried to predict those.
J. O.: Mm.

T. S-C.: Well, you’ll have those anyway. You’ll have your study’s...

J. O.: Right.

T. S-C.: ...holistic rankings, and...

V. O.: And, if it’s happening at the second year and you do it with the second year data, well...well, but...you want it...in some ways you want to do it with the way it’s going to be in the long-run, not with the anomaly of the first year.

T. S-C.: Well, a...separate question is, do the weights change from year-to-year?

J. O.: Mm-hmm.

V. O.: No.

J. O.: Right. Well, that was Vu’s concern, too, about wanting to let the process settle a bit before you...

T. S-C.: Yeah.

J. O.: ...choose a year to say, this is...uh...what we can expect it will look like in a typical year. That the first year is not likely to be as good a candidate for that as, something like maybe, the third, fourth or fifth year.

V. O.: I...I’m really uncomfortable with the...with the idea that we...would be...I don’t know, I want to respect that staff do what they’re supposed to do in...in this University. You know, I want to be respectful of that. I don’t want to say, “You’re not doing the right thing, and this is why it got screwed-up.” You know, so, I’m really uncomfortable with that being the agenda of this study, you know. Find the mischief in the...in the readers, you know, looking at the application...

T. S-C.: Well, like, give me...

V. O.: [unintelligible]

T. S-C.: ...another word besides “mischief.”

T. G.: Actually, I think that’s a...I’m using a euphemism for “malfeasance.” What I’m calling mischief is actually...

V. O.: I’m real...

T. G.: ...wrong, right? Um, I understand...if you...yeah...
V. O.: Let’s write...then let’s write a police report. I’m really...this is really just like...I’m really uncomfortable given the role of this committee. You know, to...if...if people are really not doing their job...for instance, we are not the staff...direct supervisor...it’s not our job, to...you know, we set policy, we...we review what’s going on. If it’s really at that point where things were done in some ways wrong, against the policy, criminal, you know...then...

T. S-C.: Well, would that [unintelligible] raise coefficients?

Unknown: Mm-hmm.

T. S-C.: Do you have any problems with those?

V. O.: No. Uh...um...um...what do you mean? I mean...

T. S-C.: That...that they were measured. That any attempt to measure...

V. O.: No, not at all.

J. O.: No.

V. O.: No.

T. S-C.: ...that there was...

V. O.: No. No.

T. S-C.: Well...and that’s...[unintelligible] was there a racial effect?

T. G.: No.

T. S-C.: Was there a political effect? Was there religion effect?

V. O.: No...no.

J. O.: No.

T. G.: Well, I...I would like to...

J. O.: He’s interested in intent.

T. G.: I...I’m...

T. S-C.: Oh well, then, you’re not going to get at that.

T. G.: I...I would like to...see...what...what Hout reported was the race people wrote on those surveys. Right? Yeah, I would like it...
J. O.: What surveys?

T. G.: The...well...well...uh...

V. O.: The admissions proc...appli...applications.

T. G.: Right. You...you state...well, they ask you what your race is, right?

T. S-C.: Yeah.

J. O.: Yeah.

T. G.: Okay, and then...that sheet of paper, that information, is not given to the readers.

T. S-C.: Right.

T. G.: Right. Yeah, that...that would be bad, if...if that happened. Uh...but...uh...what I would like to see...and...and we've talked about this, is the recorded variable...race as possibly revealed in the essay.

V. O.: Mm-hmm.

T. G.: Right.

T. S-C.: Not actual race.

T. G.: Right.

V. O.: Not...not recorded, systematic...

T. S-C.: That...that's it...

V. O.: [unintelligible] part of race......but is it...does...does a student reveal it? Is it...does a student talk about their racial background in the...in the essay in any...

T. S-C.: Well, that's...that's the DUV (?) then, you think?

T. G.: Yeah.

V. O.: Yeah, yeah, it could be...that's very...but that's totally doable. I have no problem with measuring that. That's totally doable.

J. O.: But, it doesn't get at the malfeasance question.

V. O.: Yeah...no...and, that's not what I want to do.
T. S-C.: Well, though, I don’t know...

V. O.: People are really...

T. S-C.: Well, I don’t under...I don’t know that you’ll ever be able to answer that.

V. O.: Not at...not at this level of this committee. If people are really screwing-up, somebody else needs to investigate it. That’s not our job. That’s not...not my job.

T. S-C.: Yeah, I don’t...I don’t even know how you...you get at a per...a reader’s intent...when they gave a particular score. Cuz you can ask them, and they’ll explain to you, “Well, this is why I gave it this score.” And, then you’re gonna have to go, “No, that’s not what you did. We think you did this.” So, I’m not sure that a study can address the question of intent on the readers.

T. G.: It might not. But, I think...

V. O.: Look, if you really wanted to investigate that, what would you do? You would...you would set...you would, you know, empower a group of people to interview all of the key play...key players in the process, in, you know, in a very...in a...a somewhat adversarial way, trying to get at...what...what really went on. Were there conversations outside of the...of the...of the training? Did anyone say anything to you that wasn’t written on the forms? You know, when you...when you interview the supervisor...then you interview the...the readers...I mean...and, you might come up with somebody finally confessing to something or...or not. You know, you may not. It’s...that’s...it’s hard to do. And...the right people may be really really clear about what they’re not supposed to say. But, you...maybe...but, that’s a different project. That is not what I want to do sitting on this committee. That is a different project and a different group of people have to do that.

T. G.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: That’s an investigation.

T. G.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: And, you really should bring this up as a...if you really feel that...that’s a...that’s like a charge.

T. G.: Well, you wouldn’t...if you want to make the charge...unless you had...saw some data, I mean...this...you could call this...uh...what do you call it? Dammit. [unintelligible] You have an inquiry first before you do an investigation.

V. O.: But we’re not posing the kind of project that’s really going to allow us to...

T. G.: [unintelligible] But, you know, I think...uh...all the time...uh...Congressional committees...I know you don’t like this analogy...

J. O.: They do more the kind of things she was describing...
T. G.: You know...but this...

J. O.: ...rather than looking at patterns [unintelligible] in a relationship...

T. G.: ...Congressional...

J. O.: ...data.

T. G.: ...Congressional......Congressional committees...uh...Congress...has no authority to arrest someone. Okay? Even when they...when...when...they...they technically, can’t even name a special prosecutor. That has to go through the Executive Branch. That was another Saturday night massacre...

J. O.: But they can subpoena and have contempt of Congress...uh...

T. G.: Uh...

J. O.: ...violation...

T. G.: That’s true. But, the subpoena...that’s all supposed to be for [unintelligible]

J. O.: But...

T. G.: But, that’s...they...they do these...that’s my point. They do these oversight committees. Sometimes, they find out information. And, then, they tell the Executive Branch. “Hey, look, here’s this information we found.” And, I...I think...that’s...that’s the way I...now, I just want...well, I know we disagree...so...but, I look at us as something like...uh...

T. S-C.: The oversight...

T. G.: An oversight committee. Yeah. Yeah. And, it’s almost like it’s sh...shared governance. I look at it very similar...parallel...with Congress and Executive Branch. So...I understand.

V. O.: But, it’s a different process. If we were really gonna do that...we would then...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: ...call in the staff, we would interview them, it would be a...it would be...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: ...a very different...

J. O.: That’s not...that is not the study...
V. O.: ...and that’s...

J. O.: ...as far as voting to do.

V. O.: ...that’s not what we’re talking about. And, I...personally, I don’t want to do that.

J. O.: Well, CUARS gave us a charge...for the kind of study we’re supposed to design. And it was not that. And, we talked about it.

T. G.: But, one...one...

J. O.: And...

T. G.: ...one i...one item on there is to see, just exactly what I said. That...that the variable race...as revealed...

V. O.: Yeah...

T. G.: ...on essays...

V. O.: ...well, sure...

T. G.: ...okay...

V. O.: Absolutely.

T. G.: ...is that?

V. O.: [unintelligible]

J. O.: ...that’s in there...[unintelligible] are in there...yeah...

V. O.: ...nobody...nobody’s argued about that.

T. G.: Okay.

V. O.: Nobody’s argued about that.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] and that variable....

J. O.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: Yeah.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] and the weight...
V. O.: Yeah.

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

J. O.: [unintelligible] and the...if there are patterns it has a weight...it has a weight...

V. O.: Nobody...

J. O.: ...it has a weight over and above everything that you consider legitimate...

V. O.: Right.

J. O.: ...then...you and others can argue about whether that was an unintended or an intended...

V. O.: [Right.

J. O.: ...but that is very separate from what...

V. O.: That's right.

J. O.: ...what our analyses could reveal.

V. O.: Right.

J. O.: And, then, you know, at that point, I suppose, if there are some patterns in the data, and you wanted to push for an inquiry into...

V. O.: Yeah.

J. O.: ... into whether...

V. O.: Yeah.

J. O.: ...whether there was malfeasance...then...

V. O.: You could do it. Absolutely.

J. O.: ...you would have...patterns...that would enable you to do that.

T. G.: Uhh...that’s for intent. I’ll...I’ll...all I’ll say is that I’m an admirer and sometime colleague of Steve Leavitt...that we talked about the other...

J. O.: Mm-hmm, mm-hmm.

T. G.: Uh...read his stuff...
J. O.: Yeah...

T. G.: ...he has ingenious ways...um...uh...

T. S-C.: Of measuring intent?

T. G.: ...yeah...

V. O.: [unintelligible]

J. O.: He impugns intent...

T. S-C.: Economics, right?

T. G.: Economics, right.

J. O.: Right.

T. G.: Uh...

T. S-C.: He's in Chicago?

T. G.: Uh...an economist...superstar, I'll say...

V. O.: In what...what does he study? I mean...what does he...

J. O.: He studies how people use economic analyses to make decisions in other realms of life.

T. G.: Uh...

V. O.: Lay people?

J. O.: He uses economic...analytic strategy to...explain kinds of decisions in non-economic spheres. Is that...

T. G.: Yeah.

J. O.: ...is that fair?


T. S-C.: Legalized abortion and the drop in the crime rate?

T. G.: Uh...that was one.

T. S-C.: That was one.
T. G.: That was one... a big one.

T. S-C.: That was in the book.

V. O.: And, that gives you intent?

T. G.: Oh, no...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

T. G.: [unintelligible] I think more about...

T. S-C.: [unintelligible] a particular...

T. G.: ... I think more about the sumo wrestlers... uh... he found...

V. O.: Oh, that’s relevant. [unintelligible]

T. G.: That’s what I mean, though... but he found... another is... uh... education.

V. O.: What about education?

T. G.: Um... uh... cheating on standardized tests.

V. O.: He found cheating on standardized tests... by... that still doesn’t go to intent. That’s a behavior.

T. G.: Well... well, I’d [unintelligible] that you read *Freakonomics*. I’d... I’d be the same before I’d... I’d heard his study. And, once you realize that... clever data he gets... and now... you know... yeah... definitely, statistics can never reveal causality. Right? It can only show correlations, but... uh... I heard you read that book.

V. O.: Well... that... okay... so another thing that could happen... why... why I’m helping you, I don’t know... another thing that could happen is that there’s a cluster of readers... and this has got... this has got... you know, Rob suggested doing very specifically this analysis... there’s a cluster of readers whose ratings are really different from everybody else’s...

J. O.: Mm-hmm...

V. O.: ...and that would suggest some collusion, some, you know... again...

J. O.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: ... right. But, if that happens... okay... how we deal with that... again... if... that’s... that would be like... okay, this is the finding... it suggests certain kinds of things were happening that were really inappropriate, we will then... we would then have, what I would imagine would be an incredibly
serious discussion and refer it to the right bodies to deal with it. Again, it is not...I just...I really feel
that we are over-stepping our bound...not simply on our charge on CUARS, but even as members of
CUARS.

J. O.: Well, I don’t think we’re gonna go there, Vilma.

V. O.: Okay. I’m arguing with Tim. Because he’s...

J. O.: I know...I know...

V. O.: ...pushing it...

J. O.: ...I mean, I think it’s a...a fascinating and good conversation, but I think that when get down to
the scope of what we’re going to do, and being realistic about what the data allow us to do...uh...the...
and the...and the charge, we won’t go there.

V. O.: Okay.

Unknown: But...

T. G.: Would you be in favor of letting me do that study?

J. O.: No.


J. O.: [unintelligible]

T. S-C.: [unintelligible]

T. G.: [unintelligible]

V. O.: No, no, no, no, wait, wait, wait, wait, no, no, no...

J. O.: I think that...I mean, under the auspices of CUARS. Now, if you use the public information
records act request and get it as an individual...I...

V. O.: But...I...

J. O.: ...I...I defend your right to do whatever you want to do with it. So, it’s...but it’s just as a
CUARS thing...I would not...

T. G.: Well, I understand that...uh...I’m a...a minority. An...I’m sure Sylvia agrees with...with you,
too.

J. O.: Well, we’ll see...
T. G.: I won't say anything more.

J. O.: ...next week.

T. G.: All right.

End transcription: 59:30

Recording end: 1:02:10
Appendix X: “Committee Charge” and Bylaws Associated with CUARS

(from http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/CUARS/)

Committee Charge

CUARS advises the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools and the Chancellor's Office on matters pertaining to undergraduate admissions policy and helps formulate guidelines for admission to be used during the admission process. In order to learn what is involved in making actual admissions decisions, committee members read some sample student applications during the regular fall or winter quarters.

CUARS establishes the comprehensive review parameters for selecting UCLA admittees from the larger pool of those who are UC eligible, while policies concerning admissibility to the University of California are made by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the officers of the University, the Regents, and the voters of the state. Office of Undergraduate Admissions (UAARS) makes the actual decisions with CUARS oversight. In addition, CUARS serves the Admissions Office as a conduit for faculty concerns and a reservoir of classroom experience, advising the Admissions Office about such matters as outreach efforts directed at the high schools and qualifications needed for success in particular disciplines.

(from http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committee/CUARS/bylaws.htm)

CUARS

Bylaws

65.5 Undergraduate Admissions and Relations With Schools

(A) Membership. The committee consists of eight members, one of whom shall be the UCLA member of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. The committee shall have both a chair and a vice chair. Each shall serve for one year with the vice chair normally becoming chair the following year. Persons appointed to the position of vice chair should normally have two years prior experience on the committee.

(B) Duties. The committee

(1) determines specific criteria for admission to oversubscribed programs and admission by special action.

(2) develops and monitors research on admission criteria, including determination of those adverse circumstances that might introduce predictive bias on standard indices for admission.

(3) monitors campus procedures for recruitment, outreach and informational services to schools.

(4) participates directly in the admission process, both at the freshman and advanced standing levels.

(5) maintains liaison with the University Board of Admissions and Relations with schools, the
campus Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations With Schools, the campus Office of Academic Interinstitutional Programs, and the campus Undergraduate Enrollment Committee.

(6) reports to and advises the Academic Senate and the Chancellor on matters involving undergraduate admissions and relations with schools. [Am 19 Nov 85, 23 May 89]