

The Consideration of Race in UCLA Undergraduate Admissions

Richard Sander, UCLA School of Law
October 20, 2012

UCLA adopted a holistic admissions system in 2006 (implemented for the class entering in 2007) that has been widely hailed as a successful strategy for achieving higher African-American enrollment in a race-neutral admissions regime. Under the prompting of UC leaders, other UC campuses are now adopting holistic systems based on the UCLA approach. However, a close analysis of the actual operation and effects of the holistic system – using data provided by UCLA in response to a public records request – shows that UCLA’s holistic admissions are widely misunderstood. Holistic admissions by itself did not add anything to African-American admissions at UCLA; rather, it provided a cover for illegal discrimination by UCLA’s admissions office. The only significant, tangible effect of holistic admissions at UCLA was a reduction in the proportion of academically gifted students – of all races – admitted by the university.

In our recently released book, *Mismatch* (published on October 9th), Stuart Taylor and I devote several chapters to the effects of Proposition 209 (and the subsequent adoption of race-neutrality in admissions) upon the University of California, and in particular upon its African-American and Hispanic students. Chapter 10 of our book examines how “race-neutrality” was watered down over time and, in particular, how many academic programs at the university began to covertly re-introduce race into admissions decisions. Perhaps the most dramatic example of this pattern came in UCLA’s supposedly race-neutral, holistic process; the purpose of this report is to provide detailed background and analysis in support of our findings in the book. Below, I present the statistics behind our analysis, and compare my findings with those of Professor Robert Mare, the distinguished sociologist who was commissioned by UCLA to analyze the effects of the holistic system.

Background: The implementation of Race-Neutrality

In 1995, the University of California (“UC”) Board of Regents adopted a resolution directing university administrators to eliminate the use of race as a factor in determining admissions to UC programs. In 1996, California voters passed an initiative known as Proposition 209 (“Prop 209”), which more broadly prohibited the use of race as a factor in conferring state benefits. Both proposals were extremely controversial and widely opposed among university administrators. A lawsuit challenging the constitutionality of Prop 209 showed some chance of being successful until the spring of 1997, when the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals dismissed the complaint and upheld the proposition as constitutional. In part because of the lawsuit, and partly for logistical reasons, the Regents ultimately delayed implementation of the ban on racial admissions preferences, for UC undergraduate admissions, until the fall of 1998.

For many years before 1998, many UC undergraduate campuses had used very substantial racial preferences. These were particularly large at the two most “selective” UC schools, Berkeley and UCLA, which between them admitted nearly half of all African-Americans that attended any UC school in 1996 and 1997 (as well as a disproportionate number of UC Hispanics). The disparity in the measured levels of academic accomplishment across racial lines was very high at these schools; median SAT scores for African-Americans at these campuses were, for example, more than two hundred points lower than median SAT scores for whites and Asians. Administrators thus anticipated that the implementation of race-neutrality would have particularly sharp effects at Berkeley and UCLA.

If we compare the first three years of “race-neutrality” (the admitted classes of 1998 through 2000) with the last three years of “racial preferences” (1995-97), several patterns stand out clearly for the numbers of entering freshmen:

--Across the UC undergraduate colleges as a whole, admission rates for “under-represented minorities” (i.e., “URMs,” including African-Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans) fell sharply, especially at the most elite colleges.

--Applications from URMs held remarkably steady (especially at the elite colleges and especially when we take into account the sharp declines in acceptance rates), while yield rates (the decision to accept an offer of admission conditional on acceptance) for URMs rose significantly at most campuses (especially when we take into account the higher academic qualifications of those accepted). The findings on yields have been documented by Kate Antonovics and Richard Sander, “Affirmative Action Bans and the ‘Chilling Effect’,” accepted for publication by the *American Law and Economics Review* (2012).

--Overall UC undergraduate enrollment of African-Americans dropped modestly (about 20%) and remained nearly constant for Hispanics. However, the drops in African-American and Hispanic enrollment were concentrated at Berkeley and UCLA. (See Tables 1 and 2)

--Because of the high concentration of African-Americans and Hispanics at Berkeley and UCLA before Prop 209, these students were more evenly distributed across campuses in 1998-2000 than before. The eight UC campuses as a whole thus became more evenly integrated.

Race-neutrality also produced an initial decline in the number of admitted African-American and Hispanic transfer students at the various UC campuses. However, these admissions soon began to increase, particularly at the more elite campuses. A plausible explanation is that some of the URM students who ended up at a less elite campuses had improved academic performance (African-American and Hispanic grades broadly rose) and the more successful of these students qualified, in larger numbers than before, for transfer to a more elite campus.

Graduation rates for African-American and Hispanic students rose for students entering in 1998-2000 compared to 1995-97. Research by Peter Arcidiacono and others at Duke

University suggests that these improvements partly reflected the better “matching” of URMs to campuses where they would flourish academically, and partly reflected other secular trends. Other post-209 academic trends for URMs at the UC colleges are discussed in Chapter Nine of *Mismatch*.

2001-2006

In 2001, the UC Regents approved a new admissions process, called “Eligibility in the Local Context” (“ELC”), by which high school students could become UC-eligible. For decades before, the dominant path to UC eligibility for California high school students was to achieve a combination of high school grades and standardized test scores that put them in the top eighth, academically, of California high school seniors. Before Prop 209, various “special admission” programs had augmented the numbers of African-Americans and Hispanics who were considered UC-eligible, but these special admissions had fallen sharply after 1998. ELC specified that students whose UC-adjusted grades put them in the top 4% of their high school classes would be UC-eligible. This was expected to predominantly benefit African-Americans and Hispanics attending segregated schools where few students achieved high test scores. And, although we have not seen a specific analysis of ELC’s impact, the number of African-American and Hispanic freshmen admitted and enrolling at the UC undergraduate campuses rose significantly in subsequent years.

However, the apparent impact of ELC was quite modest at the Berkeley and UCLA campuses. Even though these schools, and others, began to give special consideration to students from academically weak high schools – and even in many cases began to “school-norm” test scores so that students were compared academically to other students from the same high school, these changes did not provide much of a bump to African-American freshman numbers at Berkeley and UCLA. This might be because, in the UC pool of eligibles as a whole, the ELC students tended to have weaker academic credentials, and thus tended to end up at the least elite UC schools.

In 2002, Berkeley decided to implement “holistic” undergraduate admissions. At one time, all UC schools had been mandated by the Regents to base a substantial proportion of admissions decisions on “academic” characteristics alone (these included SAT I scores, high school grades, AP course performance, and the like). Many UC schools developed rival “personal quality” indices to capture such things as socioeconomic status, hardships overcome, writing ability, and extracurricular activities. Such indices would then be weighed against an academic index of some type for some or all candidates. Under a holistic system (as adopted by Berkeley), an admissions file reader produces a single numerical score that is intended to capture all of an applicant’s characteristics. Proponents of this system often contended that a holistic system would produce more minority candidates, because these candidates were often strong on the non-academic side of the ledger; by not privileging the purely academic considerations, admissions officers would end up admitting more African-American and Hispanic applicants. Critics contended that holistic admissions would erode the academic strength of the student body and would allow admissions readers to award strong scores to

applicants who sent signals about their African-American or Hispanic status through their personal essays or other applicant information (post-209, racial category information was redacted from files given to admissions readers).

Berkeley's holistic system went forward, but it is not clear that it had the effects predicted by either its supporters or its critics. African-American and Hispanic freshman admissions did not change much. The school's administration commissioned a report by Berkeley sociologist Michael Hout. Hout found only the smallest of race effects from holistic admissions, after controlling for everything else known about the applicants.

Thus, during this intermediate period, ELC – and what appeared to be growing weight given by many schools to “inverse school quality” and low socioeconomic status – were the most important changes to UC undergraduate admissions.

2007: UCLA's move to holistic admissions

In the fall of 2006, African-American freshman enrollment at UCLA dropped below one hundred, a post-209 low and indeed the lowest level in many years (see Table 3). The low number produced media attention, campus agitation, and pressure on campus administrators to generate higher African-American numbers. A widely-expressed sentiment was that African-Americans were being increasingly left behind at UCLA. Virtually no attention in the discussion was given to other important facts, such as the rising number of African-American transfers to UCLA, the high and resilient numbers of African-Americans receiving B.A.s at UCLA, and the substantial growth in African-American bachelor degrees UC-wide.

UCLA's interim chancellor, Norm Abrams, visited the Academic Senate committee on undergraduate admissions early in the 2006-07 academic year and urged it to follow Berkeley's example and bring holistic admissions to UCLA. The committee voted to do so, starting with admissions to the fall of 2007 entering class. The university also undertook increased outreach and recruitment efforts, aimed at encouraging more applications from African-American students, and a higher acceptance rate from them. In the fall of 2007, nearly two hundred African-Americans entered UCLA as freshmen, a doubling of the number from 2006. The number faltered slightly in subsequent years, but remained generally above the pre-2007 averages.

As discussed in *Mismatch*, this move was controversial. UCLA political scientist Tim Groseclose, a member of the admissions committee, voiced concerns that holistic admissions would lead to the reintroduction of race in admissions decisions, and sought data on the process that would make it possible to evaluate whether race reentered the process *sub rosa*. When Groseclose was denied this data, he resigned from the committee in protest. In 2008, UCLA commissioned a study of the new admissions system by Robert Mare, a distinguished sociologist on the faculty. Groseclose and I submitted a public records request to the university, which was not acted upon. However, UCLA's vice chancellor for legal affairs (Kevin

Reed) kept lines of communication open, and through a series of follow-up discussions, during which we raised the strong possibility of litigation to secure the records, UCLA provided us (in late 2009, about a year after our initial request), with a significant amount of individual-level data on UCLA admissions during the three years preceding holistic admissions, and the first three years of the holistic system. Mr. Reed deserves considerable credit for negotiating with us in good faith and working to develop a solution that provided some transparency while protecting student anonymity.

My analysis of the UCLA data produced five clear conclusions:

- 1) UCLA did succeed in increasing both the number of African-American applicants (including more academically strong African-American applicants) and the yield rate of African-Americans on offers of admission, in the holistic period. But these shifts cannot explain more than half of the increase in African-American enrollment.
- 2) The holistic scoring process itself did not produce outcomes more favorable to either African-Americans or Hispanics than the pre-holistic system used in earlier years. Indeed, the holistic scores were slightly less favorable to African-Americans than the pre-holistic system.
- 3) The UCLA Admissions Office took race into account in decisions that it made after receiving the holistic scores, which means that African-Americans were dramatically more likely than whites or Asians with a given holistic score to be admitted. African-Americans who attended outreach sessions were particularly likely to receive this post-scoring favoritism, which suggests that admissions staff were giving special treatment to African-Americans they remembered from these sessions.
- 4) My findings are consistent with those of the Mare report, which found that a very substantial portion of African-American admissions during the holistic years it studied (2007 and 2008) could not be explained in non-racial terms.
- 5) Holistic admissions at UCLA tended to reduce the rate at which the most academically qualified students – of all races – were admitted.

A Tabular Overview

The basic shape of what happened in the holistic period can be seen in the attached Tables 4, 5, and 6, which compare African-American, Hispanic, and white & Asian applications, admissions and enrollment in UCLA's pre-holistic (2004-06) and holistic (2007-09) periods. These data are only for admissions to the "Letters and Science" program, which accounts for the bulk of undergraduate admissions. All of the applicants are divided into ten "deciles"

(which we created) based on their high school grades and SAT scores; this provides an easy way to get a sense of how academic preparation, race, and admissions interacted.¹

As Table 6 shows, African-American applications rose substantially (by 31%) from 2004-06 to 2007-09; the increases were particularly large in the highest categories (e.g., the number of African-Americans applying in the highest decile doubled). This means that UCLA's outreach efforts aimed at increasing and strengthening the African-American applicant pool were indeed successful, and this is an impressive achievement. However, note that applications from other groups were rising during this period as well (by over 36% for Hispanics, and by 16% for whites and Asians), and that these applicant groups also grew disproportionately fast in the top deciles. This of course means that admissions became more competitive, and had the only change during this period been the change in applications, we estimate that African-American enrollment would have increased by only around 15%.

Table 6 also shows that African-American yield rates rose in the holistic period, from 44% (in 2004-06) to 50% (in 2007-09). This reflected, at least in part, the university's focused efforts to recruit admitted African-Americans, apparently partly through the use of "off-shore," private scholarship funds that could be race-conscious without violating Prop 209. It is possible that the school also did things in this recruitment realm that did violate Prop 209, but we do not have data bearing on UCLA's financial aid and have not investigated recruitment activities. The important point for us is that the improvements in recruitment, impressive as they are, cannot account for more than a 15% increase in African-American enrollment during the holistic period. (This 15% reflects the improvement in African-American yield net the small decreases in yield for other groups in 2007-09.)

The biggest holistic-era change affecting African-Americans came in admissions rates. The overall admissions rate for African-Americans rose from 14% (2004-06) to 19% (2007-09), while admissions rates for both Hispanics and "whites & Asians" fell (the overall fall occurred because of more applicants for an essentially constant number of spots). This means that, relative to everyone else, African-Americans were nearly half again (about 46%) more likely to be admitted in the holistic period.

If we multiply together these rough estimates: 1.15 (applications) * 1.15 (yield) * 1.46 (admissions), we get the overall increase in African-American enrollment (92%) observed during the holistic period.

Before we turn to regression analysis, a few other points from Tables 4 through 6 are worth noting. One effect of holistic admissions seems to have been a decrease in the proportion of the most academically successful applicants admitted, compared to everyone

¹ Our calculation of "deciles" was hampered by the fact that our data on student high school grades and SAT scores was grouped into intervals (for example, 50-point intervals of SAT scores). This means that when we calculate a weighted combination of high school grades and SAT scores to create our 0-to-1000 academic index, many students have the same index. Thus, for example, many students in our data had an index of "738," and we could not therefore create perfectly even deciles. These are, nonetheless, very close approximations.

else. For all groups (including African-Americans), admissions rates in the holistic period declined sharply for those in the 9th and 10th decile. Overall, students whose academic credentials put them in the top 20% of all applicants were about one-tenth less likely to be admitted under the holistic regime. This is a significant change, and probably was due to the greater fuzziness and subjectivity of the holistic process; students who would be, pre-holistically, almost certain to win admission are, in a system that requires all factors to be weighed simultaneously, more likely to be overlooked.

Note, too, that Hispanic admission rates declined in the holistic period just as much as (and arguably more than) white and Asian rates, even as African-American rates rose sharply. This is an overwhelming clue that it was not the change to holistic admissions, but actual racial discrimination in favor of African-Americans, that drove the rising African-American admissions rates. “Holistic” admissions is thought to help African-Americans because it does a better job of taking into account personal disadvantages. But in California, the Hispanic population is disadvantaged as the African-American population by nearly every measure. If the holistic process simply gives more weight to disadvantage, it would have essentially the same effect on the two groups. But it clearly did not at UCLA.²

Regression analysis

As noted earlier, the point of a holistic system is to weigh all applicant characteristics through a single “holistic” process that results, at UC schools, in a single overall number, ranging from 1 to 5, with “1” being the best obtainable score. At UCLA, special readers were hired and trained to engage in the holistic scoring process. Each applicant file was assigned to two readers. If the two reader scores were close to one another, then the two scores were averaged; if they were far apart, then a third reader read the file.

Our analysis of the admissions data suggests that although the holistic scoring process tended to favor African-Americans and Hispanics compared to other students with the same academic scores, it did not favor them more than the pre-holistic system, which already took substantial account of low socioeconomic status and other personal disadvantages. (In the pre-holistic period, readers created a separate “life challenges” score that was utilized in combination with other measures of personal and academic achievement to arrive at admissions outcomes.) ***We find that administrators in the holistic period simply admitted students with the same holistic score at different rates, depending on the race of the applicant.***

² This analysis implies that, as of the 2007 admissions pool, we should have seen a divergence in African-American academic indices away from the general trend for other races. And in fact, the May 2, 2007, Daily Bruin published an analysis of SAT scores of admitted freshmen. In 2006, Hispanic and African-American scores were nearly identical; but in 2007, African-American scores went down while Hispanic scores (as well as White and Asian scores) went up. The changes that accompanied “holistic” admissions thus aggravated the large academic credentials gap between African-American students and those of other races.

Table 7, Model 3 presents a logistic analysis of admissions outcomes during the holistic period. The outcome variable is whether a student is admitted. The regression controls for a variety of academic and socioeconomic characteristics of the applicants, their race, outreach participation, and *each student's holistic score*. If holistic scores were determining admissions, then all factors other than holistic score should be statistically insignificant in this regression. But they are not. In particular, three factors are playing a large role in admissions decisions after controlling for holistic score: whether a student is African-American, whether a student participated in outreach sessions, and the interaction of these two factors (African-American * outreach). The African-American logistic coefficient, of 2.55, implies that even without considering the additional effect of African-Americans attending outreach sessions, African-Americans were about 60% more likely than comparable “other race” students to be admitted. The Hispanic and SES variables are also significant, but they have lower and less consequential coefficients.

Table 7, Model 2 shows the same analysis with holistic scores removed. Strikingly, the African-American and African-American*outreach coefficients in this equation are somewhat **lower** than those in Model 3. This suggests that *the holistic scoring process was not, on net, helping African-Americans when we control for academic and socioeconomic factors*. In other words, admissions officers had to use a larger racial preference to admit their desired number of African-Americans with the holistic system than they would have had to use to achieve the same result without holistic scores – if they instead had relied upon the fairly simple factors in our regression analysis.³

Table 7, Model 1 provides, by way of comparison, a similar analysis for the pre-holistic period. (Here, the three indices used in pre-holistic period – academic rank, personal achievement scores, and “life challenges” scores – take the place of the holistic score.) In the model, the coefficient for “African-American” is precisely 1.00, indicating a neutral effect. There are still some positive interactions between race and outreach, indicating some degree of racial discrimination, but because it appears only through an interaction, it is clearly a much smaller effect.

Table 8 shows a direct cross-tabulation of admissions rates by race and holistic score. The first notable pattern in this table is that, as the above analysis suggests, many African-Americans were admitted with weak (i.e., high) holistic scores. For example, 15% of African-Americans with a 3.5 holistic score were admitted, compared to less than 4% of other students with that score. A second notable pattern is that holistic scores did not rigidly determine admissions for *any* group. Why might this be? One plausible explanation is that admissions officers were trying to admit more African-Americans, but they lacked perfect information for doing so. Very few admissions staff at UCLA had access to information about the reported race

³ Note that the odds-coefficients on SAT scores in Model 2 are very close to 1.0; this might suggest that SAT scores are having no impact upon admissions, but it actually reflects the fact that SAT scores are measured in such fine gradations. The coefficient is measuring the increased odds of admission from a one point increase in an SAT score. The coefficient is very statistically significant, however, and when inflated to reasonable increments (e.g., 50-point increases) has the effect size one might expect a priori.

of individual applicants. Many staff might well know of specific applicants who were African-American through outreach sessions (which would account for the high, positive interaction between being African-American and attending an outreach session). But in other cases admissions staff trying to favor African-Americans would be making imperfect guesses. Therefore, some non-African-Americans with poor holistic scores would also be admitted. Support for this hypothesis comes from a follow-up logistic analysis (not reported among the tables), in which we control for the interaction of holistic scores and “African-American”. In this regression, the “outreach*African-American” variables loses significance – which suggests that the attendance of African-American students at outreach sessions did not itself produce admissions, but rather produced special consideration of African-Americans with poor holistic scores, who were then preferentially admitted.

The Mare Report

As noted earlier, UCLA sociologist Robert Mare was commissioned by UCLA to conduct a study of the holistic admissions system. He was given access to more data than Groseclose and I were – he could, for example, analyze individual years of admissions, and had access to virtually all of the statistical data available to the admissions office or file readers. His analysis focused on the admission years 2007 and 2008. Mare also had extensive discussions with admissions staff; his report reflects a deep knowledge of the admissions process and a sophisticated statistical analysis.

Professor Mare is very circumspect in his description of findings. Based on my reading of his report, I believe his findings are entirely consistent with those I describe here. Professor Mare appears to find, as do I, that the initial assignment of holistic scores by admissions readers did not particularly favor African-Americans, when all the non-academic characteristics of the files are taken into account. But the final admissions decisions did strongly favor African-Americans. Mare writes, “Absent the adjusted disparities estimated in this analysis, 121 fewer African-American applicants would have been admitted, which amounts to more than 33 percent of the number admitted.” (p. 74) This is very similar to my estimate that the race-conscious decisions of admissions officers in the 2007-09 holistic period produced a 46% increase in African-American admissions, relative to admissions rates for other groups. (Mare’s “33% of the total” is equivalent to a 50% increase, and of course we are examining slightly different periods.)

UCLA’s official discussion of these findings has taken diplomacy and circumspection into the realm of obfuscation. Clearly, the principal reason for commissioning the Mare report was to determine whether the holistic admissions process was engaging in racial discrimination; both Mare’s report and my analysis find many admissions decisions affecting African-Americans that cannot be explained on non-racial grounds. Yet the official report of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (“CUARS”), a part of the UCLA Academic Senate, never mentions this central finding. Instead, CUARS wrote:

The [Mare] report confirms that the admissions process at UCLA honors academic achievement and prioritizes acceptance to applicants of exceptional academic accomplishment. Further, data suggest a full range of applicant academic and personal achievements are evaluated by the Comprehensive Review [holistic] procedure. Professor Mare concludes that the Comprehensive Review ranking for UCLA freshman admissions functions in the manner intended by the faculty and the University. CUAS ...is satisfied with the quality, focus, and rigor of the study.

Conclusions

I have presented in this report compelling evidence that when UCLA moved to a holistic system of undergraduate admissions in 2006-07, it began to take explicit account of race in admissions decisions. The tabular evidence in Tables 4, 5, and 6 cannot be explained in any other way. The regression analysis of university data in Table 7 shows this as well, as do the cross-tabulations of admissions by holistic score in Table 8. Moreover, the university's own commissioned analyst, Robert Mare, reached essentially the same conclusion, though the report does not state this forcefully. So far as discrimination can ever be shown through statistical analysis, it is shown here.

Perhaps an equally important conclusion from our analysis is that the holistic admissions process itself did not facilitate this discrimination. In the pre-holistic era at UCLA (in our data, the admissions cycles from 2004 through 2006), the university took into account personal experiences and disadvantages through a variety of means, while independently assessing and giving weight to academic achievement. The holistic process combined these factors into a single evaluative process, but if the objective of the process itself was to increase African-American (or even Hispanic) representation, it failed. African-Americans appeared to do slightly worse with holistic scoring than they did under the prior system. The main effect of the holistic system, so far as we have been able to determine with our analysis to date, was to reduce substantially the likelihood that students with the strongest academic credentials would be admitted.

Ironically, the UC system has recently moved towards mandating holistic admissions across all undergraduate campuses, based largely on the putative success of the UCLA experience in producing more freshman African-American enrollment. Our analysis suggests that this is an extremely poor policy move from any rational perspective.

Table 1: UC Enrollments: African-American Freshmen, 1995-2010

Year	Berkeley	UCLA	Other UC Campuses	Total
1995	202	259	484	945
1996	222	230	436	888
1997	252	201	464	917
1998	122	138	479	739
1999	122	147	487	756
2000	143	147	542	832
2001	137	137	582	856
2002	142	161	633	936
2003	141	124	718	983
2004	102	99	612	813
2005	129	118	662	909
2006	148	95	829	1,072
2007	132	190	922	1,244
2008	142	212	1,009	1,363
2009	122	172	926	1,220
2010	110	177	928	1,215

Table 2: UC Enrollments: Hispanic Freshmen, 1995-2010

Year	Berkeley	UCLA	Other UC Campuses	Total
1995	514	790	2,128	3,432
1996	532	695	1,982	3,209
1997	469	565	2,097	3,131
1998	266	434	2,248	2,948
1999	321	488	2,424	3,233
2000	320	520	2,639	3,479
2001	379	574	2,911	3,864
2002	397	612	3,213	4,222
2003	391	633	3,426	4,450
2004	340	506	3,343	4,189
2005	428	637	3,587	4,652
2006	477	645	4,359	5,481
2007	485	633	4,756	5,874
2008	458	736	5,446	6,640
2009	473	746	5,371	6,590
2010	408	732	5,976	7,116

Table 3. African-American and Hispanic Enrollment at UCLA, 1995-2009

Year	African-American Freshmen	African-American Transfers	Hispanic Freshmen	Hispanic Transfers
1995	259	77	790	310
1996	230	62	695	306
1997	201	73	565	322
1998	138	69	434	264
1999	147	66	488	322
2000	147	64	520	362
2001	137	48	574	403
2002	161	78	612	403
2003	124	99	633	537
2004	99	79	506	495
2005	118	85	637	520
2006	95	104	645	520
2007	190	125	633	512
2008	212	92	736	482
2009	172	92	746	514

Table 4. White and Asian Admissions in Pre-Holistic Period (top chart), and in the Holistic Period (bottom chart), by Deciles of Academic Index

White and Asian UCLA Admissions, 2004-06					
Index Range	# Applicants	#Admitted	% Admitted	# Enrolled	% Enrolled
120-698	3,039	92	3%	80	87%
700-738	5,083	212	4%	173	82%
740-768	6,127	345	6%	284	82%
770-794	6,724	485	7%	362	75%
796-820	6,978	601	9%	402	67%
822-846	7,053	801	11%	527	66%
848-872	7,508	1,425	19%	834	59%
874-902	8,210	2,909	35%	1,436	49%
904-934	7,624	5,127	67%	1,878	37%
938-982	7,124	6,509	91%	1,229	19%
Total	65,470	18,506	28%	7,205	39%

White and Asian UCLA Admissions, 2007-09					
Index Range	# Applicants	#Admitted	% Admitted	# Enrolled	% Enrolled
120-690	3,361	94	3%	76	81%
692-738	5,715	174	3%	149	86%
740-768	6,457	224	3%	173	77%
770-796	7,361	335	5%	251	75%
798-822	7,887	495	6%	333	67%
824-850	8,725	806	9%	498	62%
852-876	8,207	1,589	19%	863	54%
878-902	9,103	3,140	34%	1,480	47%
904-932	8,783	4,731	54%	1,718	36%
934-982	10,476	8,413	80%	1,842	22%
Total	76,075	20,001	26%	7,383	37%

Table 5. UCLA Hispanic/Native American Admissions in Pre-Holistic and Holistic Periods

Hispanic and Native Americans Admissions, 2004-06					
Index Range	# Applicants	#Admitted	% Admitted	# Enrolled	% Enrolled
120-698	4,567	52	1%	45	87%
700-738	2,957	226	8%	168	74%
740-768	2,215	368	17%	251	68%
770-794	1,777	446	25%	270	61%
796-820	1,577	510	32%	294	58%
822-846	1,372	494	36%	236	48%
848-872	1,192	495	42%	189	38%
874-902	944	459	49%	165	36%
904-934	582	416	71%	99	24%
938-982	351	303	86%	37	12%
Total	17,534	3,769	21%	1,754	47%

Hispanic and Native American Admissions, 2007-09					
Index Range	# Applicants	#Admitted	% Admitted	# Enrolled	% Enrolled
120-690	6,357	106	2%	93	88%
692-738	4,230	299	7%	221	74%
740-768	2,863	392	14%	265	68%
770-796	2,594	466	18%	291	62%
798-822	2,048	563	27%	314	56%
824-850	1,811	510	28%	245	48%
852-876	1,546	645	42%	260	40%
878-902	1,196	597	50%	188	31%
904-932	734	472	64%	124	26%
934-982	569	469	82%	60	13%
Total	23,948	4,519	19%	2,061	46%

Table 6. UCLA African-American Admissions in the Pre-Holistic and Holistic Periods

African-American Admissions, 2004-06					
Index Range	# Applicants	#Admitted	% Admitted	# Enrolled	% Enrolled
120-698	1,524	63	4%	58	92%
700-738	940	54	6%	34	63%
740-768	584	56	10%	38	68%
770-794	470	80	17%	44	55%
796-820	350	70	20%	40	57%
822-846	304	80	26%	40	50%
848-872	227	61	27%	17	28%
874-902	185	90	49%	20	22%
904-934	121	85	70%	10	12%
938-982	48	41	85%	0	0%
Total	4,753	680	14%	301	44%

African-American Admissions, 2007-09					
Index Range	# Applicants	#Admitted	% Admitted	# Enrolled	% Enrolled
120-690	2,004	119	6%	105	88%
692-738	1,225	140	11%	103	74%
740-768	745	109	15%	70	64%
770-796	570	101	18%	69	68%
798-822	459	123	27%	63	51%
824-850	400	109	27%	54	50%
852-876	308	139	45%	60	43%
878-902	242	121	50%	27	22%
904-932	175	117	67%	22	19%
934-982	97	79	81%	6	8%
Total	6,225	1,157	19%	579	50%

Table 7. Logistic models of the decision to admit applicants, 2004-2009

Variable	(Model 1) Pre-Holistic Period	(Model 2) Holistic Period, No Holistic Score	(Model 3) Holistic Period, with Holistic Score
Weighted GPA	1.63*** (0.21)	7.20*** (0.078)	1.06 (0.11)
SAT I Math	1.00*** (0.00)	1.00*** (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)
SAT I Reading	1.00*** (0.00)	1.01*** (0.00)	1.00*** (0.00)
SAT I Writing	1.00*** (0.00)	1.00*** (0.00)	1.00*** (0.00)
Academic Rank	0.05*** (0.00)		
Personal Achievement	0.10*** (0.00)		
Life Challenges	0.08*** (0.00)		
Holistic Score			0.01*** (0.00)
African-Americans	1.00 (0.12)	2.47*** (0.31)	2.55*** (0.42)
Hispanics or Native Americans	0.89 (0.12)	1.28*** (0.11)	1.22* (0.14)
Other Asians	0.97 (0.12)	0.94 (0.08)	0.88 (0.09)
Vietnamese or Filipino	0.90 (0.13)	0.90 (0.08)	0.90 (0.10)
International Students	4.37*** (0.99)	0.30*** (0.05)	0.19*** (0.04)
Whites	0.87 (0.11)	0.90 (0.07)	1.00 (0.11)
Parent Education	0.95*** (0.02)	0.92*** (0.01)	0.95*** (0.01)
Family Income	1.02** (0.01)	0.94*** (0.00)	0.95*** (0.01)
CA API	0.90*** (0.01)	0.78*** (0.00)	0.85*** (0.01)
Outreach Participation	1.24 (0.24)	1.95*** (0.26)	1.50** (0.26)
African-Americans*Outreach	1.59 (0.47)	1.56** (0.30)	1.85** (0.45)
Hispanics Native Americans*Outreach	1.73*** (0.36)	1.30* (0.19)	1.28 (0.24)
Other Asians* Outreach	0.90 (0.18)	0.83 (0.12)	0.83 (0.15)
Vietnamese Filipino*Outreach	1.02 (0.23)	0.82 (0.13)	0.84 (0.17)
Internationals* Outreach	0.11*** (0.04)	0.80 (0.22)	0.86 (0.32)
Whites*Outreach	0.66** (0.13)	0.76* (0.11)	0.77 (0.15)

Table 8. Admissions rate by race and holistic score, UCLA, 2007-09
(number admitted in parentheses)

Rank	African-American	Chicano/Latino/ Native Americans	Int'l	Other Asian	Other Race/ Unknown	Vietnamese/ Filipino	Whites	Total % Admitted
1	94% (31)	95% (203)	92% (413)	99% (1,390)	98% (288)	98% (158)	97% (802)	97% (3,285/3,383)
1.5	100% (46)	99% (362)	100% (88)	99% (1,501)	99% (327)	98% (235)	99% (1,214)	99% (3,773/3,803)
2	95% (138)	89% (697)	88% (581)	96% (2,497)	95% (570)	91% (452)	92% (2,268)	93% (7,203/7,750)
2.25	94% (152)	91% (808)	57% (136)	97% (2349)	97% (539)	94% (496)	96% (2468)	95% (6948/7343)
2.5	83% (313)	79% (1,424)	26% (195)	75% (2,832)	70% (568)	79% (858)	72% (3,032)	72% (9,222/12,801)
2.75	33% (86)	30% (442)	15% (26)	17% (466)	14% (91)	21% (177)	11% (356)	17% (1,644/9,445)
3	23% (117)	14% (353)	7% (88)	12% (539)	11% (115)	8% (113)	10% (521)	11% (1,846/166,23)
3.5	15% (106)	8% (269)	3% (6)	2% (108)	2% (25)	3% (44)	3% (172)	4% (730/17,096)
4	6% (153)	3% (332)	2% (36)	2% (230)	4% (97)	2% (71)	3% (463)	3% (1,492/48,839)
4.25	5% (17)	2% (25)	0% (0)	1% (14)	1% (3)	1% (6)	3% (54)	2% (119/6,085)
4.5	3% (32)	1% (37)	1% (37)	1% (23)	2% (10)	0.4% (6)	3% (90)	1% (198/13,593)
4.75	2% (5)	1% (6)	0% (0)	1% (4)	2% (2)	0.5% (1)	4% (22)	1% (40/2,722)
5	1% (20)	0.3% (7)	1% (22)	1% (17)	1% (5)	1% (5)	0.3% (2)	3% (48)

Note: bold represents holistic rank categories where % African Americans admitted is more than ten percentage points higher than % Whites and "Other Asians" admitted.