

Apps are ↑ systemwide

↑ 1,000 AfAm + Latino
more in 1999 than 1997

Enrollment overall ↑ 100
Latino students, ↓ 160 AfAm

Enrollment ↓ for Latino +
AfAm among top 25 schools
UCBA, Berkeley, SD, Davis

If acceptance rates remained same
from 1997 to 1999 you'd have
5,382 more Latino + AfAm
attending

To: Eddie Corriea
From: Michael Hahn
Re: Admissions to the University of California School System
Date: 2/4/2000

Proposition 209, the California initiative that overturned affirmative action, caused a modest, but not dramatic, decrease in minority admissions and enrollment in the University of California higher education system. The greatest impact was experienced at the system's most prestigious campuses: Berkeley and Los Angeles (UCLA)

Proposition 209 has not had a dramatic affect on university-wide (aggregate of all University of California campuses) minority applications. For example, applications among Latinos dropped from 1,874 in 1997 to 1,788 in 1998 when the admissions policies were changed systemwide. The fact that there was not a large change in the number of applications in 1998 suggests that there might have been a demographic or economic change that caused more minorities to consider going to college, but chose not to apply to University of California schools. This would suggest that the change in policy caused minorities to feel "unwelcomed." Alternatively, the modest decrease in applications among minorities might also mean that traditionally underrepresented groups were not overly discouraged from applying to school in the University of California system.

Minority admissions across all campuses decreased in the wake of Proposition 209, but not to the degree feared by the policy's critics. For example, when admissions policies were changed in 1998, the number of African Americans admitted dropped from 1,556 (1997) to 1,368. This group's admissions rate decreased from 72.0% to 63.6% during the same period. Similarly, the number of Latinos admitted in 1998 dropped from 1,499 in the previous year to 1,348. Their admissions rate university-wide decreased from 80.0% in 1997 to only 75.4% in 1998.

While Proposition 209 did not have a dramatic affect on university-wide admissions, the impact has been more substantial at the system's most prestigious campuses: Berkeley and UCLA. At Berkeley, for example, the number of African Americans admitted dropped from 545 in 1997 to 238 in 1998. Also telling is the decrease in the percentage of African Americans admitted during this same period: 49.6% (1997) to 20.3% (1998). Among Chicanos the number admitted dropped from 1,033 in 1997 to 455 in 1998. Their admission rate also decreased from 52% in 1997 to 20.6% in 1998. Actual enrollment figures among minority groups also reflect the decrease in admissions. Proposition 209 caused a significant, although less dramatic, change at UCLA. In 1997, 455 African Americans were admitted and in the following year when the admissions policy was changed 294 were admitted. Similarly, the admissions rate for this group dropped from 38.6% to 23.6% during this period. Actual enrollment among African Americans decreased from 201 before the law was implemented to 138 after.

The total number of applications, admissions, and enrollment among minority groups has increased modestly in 1999. The number of applications submitted by Latinos and Chicanos university-wide surpassed the pre-Proposition 209 levels (1997). This increase is reflected among all minority groups. Demographic changes and an extensive outreach program run by the university system may be responsible for the recent boost in minority applications.

Similarly, the total number of students admitted from these minority groups is at or above 1997 levels. However, the percentage of traditionally underrepresented minority groups that were admitted university-wide did not change in a statistically significant manner from 1998 to 1999. The discrepancy between the increase in the number of minorities admitted in 1999 and the insignificant change in the admissions rate is explained by two significant factors: the increase in minority applications and the increase in the total number of students admitted among all ethnic groups.

The increase in application, admissions and enrollment during 1999 was also reflected at Berkeley and UCLA. At Berkeley, for example, the number of African Americans admitted increased from 236 to 293 in 1999—a 24.2% increase from the previous year. However, unlike the university-wide admissions rate, which remained constant among African Americans from 1998 to 1999, the Berkeley admissions rate increased from 20.3% to 28.2 % in the past year. Similar increases also corresponded among Latinos and Chicanos at the Berkeley campus. UCLA also experienced an increase in underrepresented groups during 1999. The number admitted relative to the previous year increased by at least 15% among African American, Chicanos and Latinos. However, the admissions rate (i.e. the percentage admitted in an individual year) in 1999 for these groups remained at the previous year's level when the Proposition 209 was implemented.

In conclusion, Proposition 209 has had a significant, but not a dramatic affect on admissions at California's university-wide higher education system. However, there has been a large decrease in admissions and enrollment at the system's most prestigious campuses: Berkeley and UCLA. In the past year there has been an increase in the number of minority applications and the number admitted from the previous year when the admissions policy changed. Still, with the exception of Berkeley, the 1999 admissions rate has remained about constant at the most prestigious campuses.

lexis.com

Change Client Options Feedback Sign Off Help

Search Search Advisor Get a Document Check a Citation ECLIPSE History

View: Cite KWIC Full **2 of 785** Text Only Print Download Fax Email
FOCUS™ - Narrow Results Save As ECLIPSE More Like This More Like Selected Text

Source: All Sources : News : By Individual Publication : L : Los Angeles Times
Terms: "proposition 209" (Edit Search)

Los Angeles Times January 31, 2000, Monday,

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

◆ [View Related Topics](#)

January 31, 2000, Monday, Home Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 5; Op Ed Desk

LENGTH: 747 words

HEADLINE: COMMENTARY;
PERSPECTIVES ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION;
THE REAL NUMBERS OFFER NOTHING TO CHEER ABOUT;
DON'T BE FOOLED BY UC CLAIMS THAT DISCRIMINATORY MEASURES HAVEN'T TAKEN A TOLL ON
ENROLLMENT.

BYLINE: HARRY P. PACHON, Harry P. Pachon is a professor of political studies at Pitzer, College
and Claremont Graduate University and president of the Tomas, Rivera Policy Institute

BODY:

A yearly ritual is taking place since the adoption in 1995 of SP-1 and SP-2--the University of
California regulations banning affirmative action--and the passage in 1996 of **Proposition
209**--the initiative that overturned affirmative action statewide.

UC public relations officials lead a cheer on how many African Americans and Latinos are applying
to each of the UC campuses. Impressive statistics are rolled out. The general public is left with the
impression that anti-affirmative action measures have had no effect on minority enrollments at our
public, tax-supported institutions of higher education.

What these cheerleaders don't tell you, however, is that minority applications provide only a part
of the story of what is happening at UC. In order to show the true impact of SP-1 and SP-2, one
must examine applications, admissions and enrollments. To give the full picture, what UC officials
should be telling the state Legislature and the California public is how admissions and overall
attendance rates have been negatively affected by these regulations.

First, let's get our terms straight. Acceptance rates are the percentage of students who are
admitted from the number who apply. Attendance rates are the percentage of students who
actually enroll out of those who are accepted.

Why is it important to keep these distinctions in mind? If minorities, and Latinos specifically, are an
ever-increasing percentage of California high school graduates, we can naturally assume that
Latino applications will grow. What really matters, then, are the acceptance and enrollment rates.
Yet when you look at the actual number of applications, admissions and enrollments at UC, the
figures tell a drastically different story.

According to an analysis by the Tomas Rivera Policy Institute, acceptance rates for Latinos have dropped since 1997 by 38% at UCLA, nearly 43% at UC San Diego and 38% at UC Berkeley. Only UC Riverside maintained a somewhat level admission rate for Latino students. For African American students, the situation was just as dismal. African American student acceptance rates fell by 37% at UCLA, 43% at Berkeley and an incredible 64% at UC San Diego. Systemwide, the minority acceptance rate dropped 24%.

It is true that there have been modest increases in minority enrollment systemwide. Latino enrollments climbed by 100 students at the eight UC campuses between 1997 and 1999 (although African American student enrollment actually dropped by 160 students for the same time period).

How does one then explain the difference between acceptance rates and minority enrollments? The answer is simple: There are more Latino and African American students applying.

One thousand more African American and Latino students applied for admissions to the UC in 1999 than in 1997. On some campuses, the increase in applications was enough to offset the higher minority rejection rates. In others the higher rejection rates, plus the decision by minority students not to attend that particular campus, saw an actual decline in African American and Latino presence. Half of the UC campuses (Berkeley, Davis, UCLA and San Diego) have fewer Latino freshmen enrolled now than they did two years ago. Five of the eight UC campuses have fewer African American students now than in 1997. According to our institute's analysis, if acceptance rates had remained the same in 1999 as they were in 1997, 5,382 more Latino and African American students would be attending the UC.

It should be troubling to all that an institution devoted to the pursuit of objective knowledge is apparently not facing up to the tremendous impact that the anti-affirmative action regulations have had on their student bodies. Some campuses are doing better at acceptance rates for minorities. What accounts for these differences? What exemplary programs are in place at these campuses that can be duplicated at others? We need to find out.

California is destined to become the first mainland state with a great majority of its population of minority background. In less than a generation, Latinos in California will outnumber white non-Latinos. What does it mean when the state's premier educational institution is not reflecting the state's demographic diversity in preparing the next generation of leaders, scholars and corporate executives? Let's stop the cheerleading and ask the University of California to take an honest look at what SP-1 and SP-2 have wrought.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: (no caption)

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 31, 2000

View: [Cite](#) | [KWIC](#) | [Full](#) | [ECLIPSE](#) 2 of 785 | [Text Only](#) | [Print](#) | [Download](#) | [Fax](#) | [Email](#)
[FOCUS™ - Narrow Results](#) | [Save As ECLIPSE](#) | [More Like This](#) | [More Like Selected Text](#)
Source: [All Sources](#) : [News](#) : [By Individual Publication](#) : [L](#) : [Los Angeles Times](#)
Terms: ["proposition 209"](#) ([Edit Search](#))
View: [Full](#)
Date/Time: Friday, February 4, 2000 - 9:12 AM EST

[Search](#) | [Search Advisor](#) | [Get a Document](#) | [Check a Citation](#)
[ECLIPSE\(TM\)](#) | [History](#) | [Change Client](#) | [Options](#) | [Feedback](#) | [Sign Off](#) | [Help](#)
[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#)

1/27 LA Times: Blacks, Latinos Post Gains in Applying to UC

Blacks, Latinos Post Gains in Applying to UC

By KENNETH R. WEISS, Times Education Writer

For the first time since the ban on affirmative action took effect, the percentage of black and Latino applicants to UC Berkeley, UCLA and UC San Diego has increased faster than the percentage of whites and Asian Americans, officials reported Wednesday.

Indeed, Latino applications to Berkeley have hit an all-time high. That marks a turnaround after a period of worries that the end of affirmative action in 1997 had convinced many minority high school students that they were no longer welcome at the most selective UC campuses.

The increase among blacks and Latinos outpaced an overall surge in applicants. UCLA received 37,460 applications—more than any other college in the nation—for the roughly 4,200 seats in its freshman class.

Berkeley received 32,696 applications for its roughly 4,000 seats, a 5.1% increase and a record for the campus.

Berkeley officials attributed the turnaround to extra efforts the campus has made to recruit underprivileged students, particularly from black and Latino communities in Los Angeles and other urban centers.

"This is a good first step, but we have a lot of hard work to do," said Richard Black, Berkeley's acting assistant vice chancellor for admissions and enrollment. "We have to wait for admissions decisions," he said, which will determine who actually makes the cut for Berkeley. Admissions officers hope to notify all applicants by April 1 about who has been admitted.

UCLA has also been reaching into minority communities to inspire more students to apply to the Westwood campus.

"We have worked very hard at attracting and recruiting these students and will continue to do so," said Thomas E. Lifka, UCLA's assistant vice chancellor for student academic services.

Ward Connerly, the UC regent who orchestrated the end of affirmative action, said the numbers suggest that UC critics who were fearing the resegregation of UC campuses were "crying Chicken Little prematurely."

Still, he cautioned against making too much of year-to-year fluctuations in the numbers. "Only 20 years from now will we really know whether the change in policy has resulted in a different mixture of students who are applying," he said.

Overall, more than 66,000 students applied to become freshmen at one or more of the University of California's nine campuses, an increase of 4.4% over the previous year, according to preliminary

figures released by the university president's office. Officials have expected a steady increase as the children of baby boomers begin to reach college age.

In an ethnic breakdown systemwide, white students continued to dominate, with nearly 14,000 students seeking to join next fall's freshman class. That was a 17% jump in applications over the previous year, according to preliminary figures distributed to the campuses.

Asian American applications were up about 10% systemwide, while blacks were up 4.7% and Chicanos and Latinos roughly 9%, according to the preliminary figures.

At UC Berkeley, applications from Latino students jumped by 20% this year to 3,382. African American applicants were up by 9.7% to 1,245.

By comparison, applications from Asian Americans increased by 7.3%, and whites were up only 0.8%.

Asian Americans made up the biggest group of applicants to Berkeley, with 12,390, followed closely by whites, who filed 11,385 applications.

An additional 2,685 applicants declined to identify their ethnicity.

UCLA posted even more significant increases among African Americans--a 15.7% jump over last year for a total of 1,585 black applicants. Latinos shot up by 13.9%, filing a total of 4,689 applications.

Asian Americans, by comparison, increased by 6.5%, although once again this group has the largest number of applicants: 13,780. Applications from whites increased by 2.7% for a total of 12,207. An additional 2,739 students declined to identify their race or ethnicity.

At UC San Diego, applications from African American surged by 17% and from Latinos by nearly the same rate. Applications from Asian Americans went up 11.3% and white applications increased by only 3.3%.

Overall freshman applications increased by 8.7%.

The exact figures will be released today with the official systemwide numbers.

The University of California promises seats for all California high school graduates who meet its entry requirements. But those students are not guaranteed a spot at the campus of their first choice. Given the popularity of UCLA, Berkeley and UC San Diego, all three campuses have had to turn away far more applicants than they accept.

Copyright 2000 Los Angeles Times

January 28, 2000 LA Times

- At UC Irvine, applications have increased 12% since last year, with those from underrepresented minority groups up even more—20%
- Applications from Asian Americans increased 11% and the number from Filipino Americans grew 7%.
- The number of Chicano students applying to UCI grew 22%, African Americans 19%, Latinos 18%, and whites 10%. The number of American Indians who applied fell 8%.
- **In addition, the systemwide number of applications from Latinos grew 6.4%, Chicanos 6.3%, African Americans 3.6%, Asian Americans 2.6%, and Filipino Americans 2.3%. Applications from American Indians dropped 2.6% and applications from white applicants dropped 0.3%.

March 1998 Enrollment Management Report

- At the UC, a record 76,500 undergraduate applications were received for Fall 1998 at eight UC campuses.
- **Applications among California high school graduates increased by 6.4% systemwide. Increases also occurred among all underrepresented groups, except Latinos. Chicano applications increased by 10.1%; American Indian, 9.3%; African Americans, 3.1%; and Filipino American, 0.5%. The number of Latino applications decreased by 3.1%. Applications from whites/others declined 10%, and applications from Asian Americans declined 1.8%.

May 6, 1998 Sacramento Bee METRO FINAL

- The proposal calls for guaranteeing admission to the top 4 percent of students at each high school, provided they successfully complete college-required courses and meet SAT standards.
- Latest admission figures indicate an overall drop of underrepresented minorities from 17.5 percent of the freshman class in 1997 to 15.6 percent this fall.
- UC Berkley accepted 66 percent fewer African Americans, 58 percent fewer American Indians and 54 percent fewer Latinos for this fall.
- UCLA admitted 43 percent fewer African Americans, 41 percent fewer American Indians and 34 percent fewer Latinos.

- Two of the campuses—Riverside and Santa Cruz—saw small increases in the number of underrepresented minorities admitted.
- Applicants for this fall who declined to indicate race rose by nearly 300 percent.
- The plan also could increase ethnic and geographic diversity by reserving some school-by-school slots rather than looking only at the statewide senior class as a whole.
- UC systemwide admissions

From '97-'98

American Indian	-0.3%
African American	-18%
Latino	-6%

Total Underrep- Resented minorities	-8%
--	-----

Asian Americans	-2.7%
White/Other	-12.6%
Declined to state	+295%
Foreign	+9%

TOTAL:	+2.7%
--------	-------

October 14, 1999 The Ethnic NewsWatch – Black Issues in Higher Education

- UC's 1999 freshman class includes 4,300 students from underrepresented groups--Blacks, Hispanics, and American Indians. That's a 3.7 percent increase over the class of 1998, says admissions director Carla Ferri.

March 22, 1999 National Affairs Inc.- The Public Interest

- If we compare the enrollments of California resident freshman on all eight general campuses over those two transitional years, (1) we find that the total number of black registrants fell from 917 to 739, a decline of 178, or about 19 percent. Among Chicanos, the largest preferred group before Proposition 209, freshman enrollments fell from 2,325 in 1997 to 2,211 in 1998 – a decline of just under 5 percent.
- Total freshman enrollments at all UC campuses rose by 1,195 between 1997 and 1998, but the number of new students in most racial and ethnic groups declined.
- The number of applicants who refused to provide information about their ethnicity- from 774 in 1997 to 3,441 in 1998. That was the year when race would no longer help their chances for admission at the campus of their choice.

- The ratio of enrollments to admissions-is almost exactly the same as it was in 1996 throughout the university.

Copyright 1999 Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

View Related Topics

March 31, 1999, Wednesday, Home Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 2; Metro Desk

LENGTH: 975 words

HEADLINE: EDUCATION;

THE 4% SOLUTION;

THE UC SYSTEM'S NEW RULES FOR FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY, DESIGNED TO SPUR **MINORITY ENROLLMENT**, HAVE RAISED CONCERNS AMONG MANY STUDENTS AND PARENTS. HERE ARE THE ANSWERS TO SOME FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS.

BYLINE: KENNETH R. WEISS, TIMES EDUCATION WRITER

BODY:

When the **University of California** Board of Regents recently decided to guarantee seats for qualified students from the top 4% of their high school class, they touched off a wave of anxiety among many students and parents.

Some worry that the new rules will cut out students with strong qualifications at the best high schools because they don't rank in the top 4% of their class. A few parents have suggested that they might even send their child to a poorly performing high school so they would have an easier time making it into the top ranks.

One group of high school students in wealthy Marin County was so concerned that it sent a petition to the regents urging them to reject the plan because they feared it would kill the students' chances of getting into the prestigious public university.

None of this will happen. Yet despite assurances from UC officials that the new plan will have little effect on admissions and will not take seats away from any students who qualify under the old rules, public confusion continues.

Drawing from UC documents and university officials, here are answers to frequent questions:

Do I have to be in the top 4% of my high school to be eligible for UC admission?

No. The **University of California** is required by law to make freshman seats available to the top 12.5% of all California high school graduates. At some high schools, more than half the graduating class will fall into that group; at others, the percentage will be much lower.

To hit this target group, the university has set minimum eligibility requirements.

These criteria, for now, are a 3.3 grade-point average in high school, satisfactory completion of all required college-prep courses, and taking the SAT and SAT II achievement tests. A student's GPA can dip as low as 2.82, but then that student must have a higher score on the SATs.

But these criteria have brought in only the top 11.1% of high school graduates. So UC officials have come up with the top 4% plan that, by their estimates, will bring in an additional 3,600 students and thus expand the eligible pool to the top 12.5%.

*

If I'm in the top 4%, does that mean I'm guaranteed enrollment at the campus of my choice?

No. Think of UC admissions as a two-step process.

The first step is becoming eligible for admission by meeting the minimum criteria mentioned above.

The second hurdle is being selected by at least one of the UC campuses, at Berkeley, **Davis**, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz or Riverside.

The competition is ferocious at UC Berkeley, UCLA and UC San Diego. It is less competitive at the other campuses, and UC Riverside accepts all eligible students who apply.

Students who squeak by the minimum eligibility requirements are more likely to land seats at the fast-growing campuses--such as UC Riverside or UC Santa Cruz--than at those campuses that turn away thousands of applicants every year.

*

Will the new 4% rule dramatically alter the number of students attending the **University of California**?

University officials estimate that an additional 3,600 students will become eligible under the plan, and only about half will choose to enroll at one of the eight undergraduate campuses. This year's freshman class was 46,000 students.

Officials plan a slight enrollment increase at some campuses to accommodate the additional students.

*

When will the top 4% plan take effect?

It will take effect for students enrolling as freshmen in the fall of 2001. That means the first affected students will be those who are now sophomores in high school.

*

Who will determine the top 4% and how will it be done?

UC officials said they will rank students by compiling their grade-point averages based on 11 college-prep courses completed by the end of the high school junior year.

*

How will students know they are in the top 4%?

UC officials plan to send letters to all students in the top 4% of their high schools, informing them that they are eligible for UC admission. The letters will go out as soon as possible after the end of the junior

year.

*

So once I get the notice that I'm in the top 4%. I can blow off the SAT and classes in my senior year?

No. Students ranked in the top 4% will also be informed that to remain eligible for UC, they must submit an **application**, take the SAT and the SAT II achievement tests and get Cs or better in all remaining college-prep courses required for admission.

*

What happens if I attend a private high school?

The same rules will apply. Even though the program was set up for California's 863 public high schools, UC officials said they will make the top 4% plan available to private schools.

*

Why is the university doing this?

UC officials want to attract more students from inner-city and rural high schools, which historically send few students to UC. Although it will bring only a slight increase in blacks and Latinos, UC officials hope it will inspire more of these minority students to view UC as within reach. Furthermore, they hope the plan will stimulate lagging high schools to improve their programs for university-bound students.

*

Are there other changes in the works?

Yes. UC will be adding a class in visual or performing arts to its list of required college-prep courses, which include four years of English, three years of math, two years of laboratory science, two years of history/social science and two years of a foreign language. The change will first apply to today's high school freshmen, who will be entering college in the fall of 2003.

In addition, UC officials are considering cutting in half the extra grade points awarded to advanced-placement and honors courses. They also want to establish minimum SAT scores for all students, even for those with GPAs of 3.3 or above.

GRAPHIC: PHOTO: The **University of California** Board of Regents is trying to reach out to a more diverse student body as it tinkers with its eligibility requirements. **PHOTOGRAPHER:** Los Angeles Times **PHOTO:** No Caption **PHOTOGRAPHER:** **University of California**

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: March 31, 1999

FOCUSTM**Search: General News;University of California and minority enrollment and...**

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS*Example: House of Representatives*

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [What's New](#)
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 1998 LRP Publications
Enrollment Management Report

March, 1998

SECTION: Vol. 1, No. 12

LENGTH: 1044 words

HEADLINE: Minority Enrollment Climbs as Texas, California Try Innovative Programs

BODY:

Admissions offices in California and Texas are using innovative recruiting and outreach programs to increase diversity on campus despite the dismantling of affirmative action programs.

The rise in minority applicants for fall 1998 reverses a two-year decline following the ban on using race as a factor in admissions and recruiting, as mandated by the California Board of Regents in 1995 and the Hopwood v. Texas federal court ruling in 1996.

At the **University of California**, a record 76,500 undergraduate **applications** were received for fall 1998 at eight UC campuses, according to Carla Ferri, UC director of undergraduate admissions. **Applications** among California high school graduates increased by 6.4 percent systemwide.

Increases also occurred among all underrepresented groups, except Latinos. Chicano **applications** increased by 10.1 percent; American Indian, 9.3 percent; African-American, 3.1 percent; and Filipino American, 0.5 percent. The number of Latino **applications** decreased by 3.1 percent. **Applications** from whites/others declined 10 percent, and **applications** from Asian Americans declined 1.8 percent.

Meanwhile, the University of Texas reported an increase in the number of minorities accepted at its four medical schools. UT medical schools extended offers of admission to 50 African-Americans in January 1998, up from 29 in January 1997. The number of Mexican-Americans who have received offers for admission increased from 108 to 142.

Number of High School Graduates up 5 Percent

Ferri attributed the applicant increase to a 5-percent statewide growth in high school graduates and intensified outreach efforts by the office of UC President Richard C. Atkinson, and UC campuses.

The UC system approved more than 100,000 for campuses to focus on informational outreach, according to Margaret Heisel, director of University Outreach and Student Affairs for the UC Office of the President.

Heisel said that the additional funding was divided among UC campuses systemwide for special recruitment efforts created by the individual campuses. For example, she said, UC-Santa Cruz created "Leading with Culture," a program featuring Chicano dance groups and African-American cultural groups. The program showcased the cultural dimension offered at the school. UC-Davis received a portion of the special funding to place radio spots on Sacramento stations encouraging students to apply.

UC also organized a speaker's bureau of minority alumni who made presentations about their college experience to students in their local community, according to Heisel. She said this was an especially strong outreach effort because the alumni were "authentic voices" for UC and role models for the students.

UC mailed out a personal letter and accompanying brochure from Atkinson to more than 13,000

academically promising students from underrepresented groups and under-served areas of the state encouraging them to apply to several UC campuses.

Ferri said that the decrease in whites/others and Asian American **applications** might be attributed in part to the 200 percent rise in applicants who chose not to state their ethnicity. Ferri said that the fall 1998 **application** form was the first to include optional questions seeking data on ethnicity and gender. That information is compiled only for statistical purposes.

Pool of Applicants Becomes More Diverse

The University of Texas medical schools have gained a more diverse pool of applicants by becoming more liberal in the process used to grant students an interview, thus opening the door to those who may not have had that opportunity in the past.

This new approach has not lowered the quality of applicants. The grade point average for UT medical students was 3.66 in 1997, and 3.64 for the 1998 group. Medical College Admissions Test scores averaged 30.1 points for the 1997 class, and 29.7 for 1998. A perfect score is 45.

A supplemental data sheet has been added to the UT medical/dental school **application** to broaden the scope of the admissions process, according to Dr. David Jones, professor of anesthesiology and chair of the Medical School Admissions Committee at UT's Health Science Center in San Antonio.

The data collected includes information about the applicant's parents' education, socioeconomic factors about the family, work-study/employment experience and whether English is the primary language spoken at home.

"We chose to make a commitment to look very carefully at these aspects of an applicant's background and other factors," Jones said. "This has enabled us to have a more balanced view when also looking at a student's GPA and MCAT scores."

Some of the other factors considered by the admissions committee include leadership ability, communications skills and service to the community.

"We also look at the kind of personal qualifications that any business or profession would look for, including accepting responsibilities, maturity, motivation and decision-making skills," Jones said. "By examining all of these criteria, we have been able to broaden the scope of our interview process."

Jones said that UTHSC at San Antonio received 3,000 **applications** for the January 1998 class and interviewed 1,000 students. He noted that two members of the admissions committee conduct the interviews without having seen the applicant's GPA or MCAT scores. However, Jones said that as an overall policy, the admissions committee considers some aspects of the MCAT to be very important in determining success in medical school.

"If you have a five or less in the verbal score, the judgment is that you won't have the reading and reading comprehension skills to handle the volume of material in medical school," Jones said.

All of the policies and procedures followed by the admissions committee were established to meet the needs of the counties in Texas that have been determined to be "medically underserved."

"The mission of our medical school addresses the health education and health care needs of all of the people of Texas, especially South Texas, which includes a large percentage of Mexican-Americans," Jones said. "Our admissions policy benefits all of the residents of South Texas."

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 1, 1998

FOCUSTM

Search: General News;University of California and minority enrollment and...

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

Example: House of Representatives

[About LEXIS-NEXIS](#) | [Terms and Conditions](#) | [What's New](#)
Copyright © 2000 LEXIS-NEXIS Group. All rights reserved.

Copyright 2000 Bell & Howell Information and Learning
Business Dateline
(Copyright 2000, The Times Mirror Company; Los Angeles Times
The Los Angeles Times; Record edition

January 31, 2000

SECTION: Pg. B-5; ISSN: 04583035

B&H-ACC-NO: 48640386

DOC-REF-NO: ANGE-3162-159

LENGTH: 772 words

HEADLINE: Commentary; PERSPECTIVES ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION; The Real Numbers Offer Nothing to Cheer About; Don't be fooled by UC claims that discriminatory measures haven't taken a toll on enrollment.;
[Home Edition]

BODY:

A yearly ritual is taking place since the adoption in 1995 of SP- 1 and SP-2--the **University of California** regulations banning affirmative action--and the passage in 1996 of Proposition 209--the initiative that overturned affirmative action statewide.

UC public relations officials lead a cheer on how many African Americans and Latinos are applying to each of the UC campuses. Impressive statistics are rolled out. The general public is left with the impression that anti-affirmative action measures have had no effect on **minority enrollments** at our public, tax-supported institutions of higher education.

What these cheerleaders don't tell you, however, is that minority **applications** provide only a part of the story of what is happening at UC. In order to show the true impact of SP-1 and SP-2, one must examine **applications**, admissions and enrollments. To give the full picture, what UC officials should be telling the state Legislature and the California public is how admissions and overall attendance rates have been negatively affected by these regulations.

First, let's get our terms straight. Acceptance rates are the percentage of students who are admitted from the number who apply. Attendance rates are the percentage of students who actually enroll out of those who are accepted.

Why is it important to keep these distinctions in mind? If minorities, and Latinos specifically, are an ever-increasing percentage of California high school graduates, we can naturally assume that Latino **applications** will grow. What really matters, then, are the acceptance and enrollment rates. Yet when you look at the actual number of **applications**, admissions and enrollments at UC, the figures tell a drastically different story.

According to an analysis by the Tomas Rivera Policy Institute, acceptance rates for Latinos have dropped since 1997 by 38% at UCLA, nearly 43% at UC San Diego and 38% at UC Berkeley. Only UC Riverside maintained a somewhat level admission rate for Latino students. For African American students, the situation was just as dismal. African American student acceptance rates fell by 37% at UCLA, 43% at Berkeley and an incredible 64% at UC San Diego. Systemwide, the minority acceptance rate dropped 24%.

It is true that there have been modest increases in **minority enrollment** systemwide. Latino enrollments climbed by 100 students at the eight UC campuses between 1997 and 1999 (although African American student enrollment actually dropped by 160 students for the same time period).

How does one then explain the difference between acceptance rates and **minority enrollments**? The answer is simple: There are more Latino and African American students applying.

One thousand more African American and Latino students applied for admissions to the UC in 1999 than in 1997. On some campuses, the increase in **applications** was enough to offset the higher minority rejection rates. In others the higher rejection rates, plus the decision by minority students not to attend that particular campus, saw an actual decline in African American and Latino presence. Half of the UC campuses (Berkeley, Davis, UCLA and San Diego) have fewer Latino freshmen enrolled now than they did two years ago. Five of the eight UC campuses have fewer African American students now than in 1997. According to our institute's analysis, if acceptance rates had remained the same in 1999 as they were in 1997, 5,382 more Latino and African American students would be attending the UC.

It should be troubling to all that an institution devoted to the pursuit of objective knowledge is apparently not facing up to the tremendous impact that the anti-affirmative action regulations have had on their student bodies. Some campuses are doing better at acceptance rates for minorities. What accounts for these differences? What exemplary programs are in place at these campuses that can be duplicated at others? We need to find out.

California is destined to become the first mainland state with a great majority of its population of minority background. In less than a generation, Latinos in California will outnumber white non- Latinos. What does it mean when the state's premier educational institution is not reflecting the state's demographic diversity in preparing the next generation of leaders, scholars and corporate executives? Let's stop the cheerleading and ask the **University of California** to take an honest look at what SP-1 and SP-2 have wrought. Credit: Harry P. Pachon is a professor of political studies at Pitzer College and Claremont Graduate University and president of the Tomas Rivera Policy Institute

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: February 16, 2000

FOCUSTM

Search: General News;University of California and minority enrollment and...

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

FOCUS

Example: House of Representatives

Copyright 2000 Times Mirror Company
Los Angeles Times

View Related Topics

January 28, 2000, Friday, Orange County Edition

SECTION: Metro; Part B; Page 3; Metro Desk

LENGTH: 594 words

HEADLINE: UCI SEES INCREASE IN **APPLICATIONS** FROM MINORITIES;
OVERALL, 29,435 ARE SEEKING ADMISSION THIS FALL, THE HIGHEST NUMBER EVER
FOR THE CAMPUS.

BYLINE: JEFF GOTTLIEB, TIMES STAFF WRITER

BODY:

Applications to UC Irvine have increased 12% since last year, with those from underrepresented minority groups up even more--20%.

The growth in **applications** from blacks, Chicanos and Latinos is an indication that despite the ban in affirmative action, efforts to increase minorities on campus have been successful.

"We are elated that indeed the applicant pool is reflective of that kind of diversity," said Manuel N. Gomez, vice chancellor of student affairs.

Applications from Asian Americans increased 11%, and the number from Filipino Americans grew 7%.

The **University of California** does not consider those two groups underrepresented. At UCI, Asian and Filipino Americans make up 56.4% of the undergraduate population.

The number of Chicano students applying to UCI grew 22%, African Americans 19%, Latinos 18% and whites 10%. The number of American Indians who applied fell 8%.

UCI's numbers bettered the combined figures for the nine UC campuses. The number of **applications** to the UC system rose 2.5%--less than a fourth of the growth shown at the Orange County campus.

In addition, the systemwide number of **applications** from Latinos grew 6.4%, Chicanos 6.3%, African Americans 3.6%, Asian Americans 2.6%, and Filipino Americans 2.3%. **Applications** from American Indians dropped 2.6% and **applications** from white applicants dropped 0.3%.

UCI's Gomez said that efforts to target students from low-income schools in the Anaheim, Long Beach and Compton school districts have been successful. UCI has been sending students to high schools to act as tutors, he said, and has been discussing with teachers ways to strengthen the curriculum.

Several programs with community colleges also have helped increase the number of transfer applicants. They include having UCI admissions counselors working more closely with the two-year schools and bringing more potential transfer students onto campus during the summer to give them a taste of college life.

Another reason for the rise is the increasing numbers of students applying to several UC campuses. The average student applies to 3.3 campuses, more than ever before.

UCI received 29,435 **applications** for admission in fall 2000, the most ever. Because of a growing

number of students reaching college age, UCI plans to increase its student population by 5% a year. But because of the increased number of applicants, UCI will tell 7,000 students who meet the entrance requirements for UC that there is no space for them at Irvine.

About 3,800 freshmen and 1,100 transfer students will be admitted to UCI in the fall.

"We do know we'll be turning away the largest number of students ever," Gomez said. "That's the downside of reaching this milestone."

More than 66,000 students applied to become freshmen at a **University of California** campus next fall, an increase of 4.4% from last year, according to preliminary figures released by the president's office.

(BEGIN TEXT OF INFOBOX / INFOGRAPHIC)

UCI Enrollment

The number of students applying to UC Irvine rose 12% over last year and included increases for nearly every ethnic group except for American Indians. Students applying to UCI for fall enrollment:

Ethnicity	Number	% change
African American	736	19 %
Asian American	10,126	11
Chicanos	2,475	22
Filipino American	1,577	7
Latino	781	18
White/other	6,318	10
American Indian	103	-8
Decline to state	1,591	22

Source: UC Irvine

GRAPHIC: GRAPHIC-TABLE: UCI Enrollment, Los Angeles Times

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 28, 2000

FOCUSTM

Search: General News;University of California and minority enrollment and...

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

Example: House of Representatives

Copyright 1999 Information Access Company,
a Thomson Corporation Company;
ASAP
Copyright 1999 National Affairs Inc.
The Public Interest

March 22, 1999

SECTION: No. 135; Pg. 64; ISSN: 0033-3557

IAC-ACC-NO: 54348519

LENGTH: 8670 words

HEADLINE: California after racial preferences; college admissions based on race

BYLINE: Trow, Martin

BODY:

In his 1995 opinion in *Miller v. Johnson*, Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that "at the heart of the Constitution's guarantee of equal protection lies the simple command that the Government must treat citizens as individuals, not as simple components of a racial, religious, sexual or national class." William C. Bowen and Derek Bok place themselves squarely against that principle, as they try in their book, *The Shape of the River*, to justify admitting students to colleges and universities, both public and private, on the basis of their membership in a racial or national class.

The book, as I think the authors would agree, is as much a lawyer's brief aimed at future court decisions on "affirmative action" as it is a piece of social-science research. That is a perfectly legitimate use of social science, especially since, as in the case of Bowen and Bok's book, the advocacy role is not hidden. But it does complicate the work of a critical reading, which certainly does not include a New York Times editorial that praised the book. Such a reading neither makes its assumptions clear nor draws attention to negative evidence, as disinterested research must. Therefore, in this article, I can do no more than draw attention to some of the unexamined assumptions on which Bowen and Bok form their analysis, and then consider some of the unintended, and often undesired, consequences of race preferences - especially in a large, racially and ethnically diverse public university such as the **University of California system** (UC). In a sense, I will attempt to assess some of the (mostly non-money) costs of race preferences overlooked or neglected by Bowen and Bok in their defense of such policies.

The view from the ivy tower

My first impression on reading the book was how parochial it is, how clearly it reveals its origins east of the Hudson. Bowen and Bok do not address the problems with the academic preparation and performance of black Americans taken as a group, which affect their distribution among our 3,700 colleges and universities. They take, more or less as given, the number of motivated black high-school graduates who are prepared for college at various levels and then argue that elite institutions should be able to take their color into account in their admissions policies.

But it slowly dawned on me that, apart from its farreaching constitutional implications, this really is a tempest in a teapot. The book is inordinately concerned with a small number of able and talented black students who attend a small number of very selective colleges and universities - and by no means all of them. These students attend fairly prestigious colleges and universities and contribute to society in a variety of ways that will depend more on their own talents, energies, and unique qualities than on their alma mater. This may be heretical to presidents and former presidents of Ivy League universities, but perhaps not so heretical to those less concerned with the status attached to being a graduate of Yale or Princeton, and rather more concerned with what efforts and energies a student puts into his studies, and with what success he discovers where his genius lies.

Indeed, I find it mildly embarrassing to see how intensely Bowen and Bok focus on a small number of elite universities to demonstrate that a small number of academically talented black students benefit from racial preferences. These students, they report, make friends with people of other races, do not resent having benefited from preferences, and go on to achieve professional and financial success. This may all be true, but it does not prove that these benefits, for a handful of very gifted students, are not offset by larger and costlier harms for higher education and society as a whole.

The authors have less concern for the stock of well-educated black people in our population, or the welfare of the society in which those people take their place, than for their own institutional pride, and the prestige attached in some circles to the numbers of trophy minority students they can enroll. Inevitably, whatever disclaimers they make, Bowen and Bok strongly suggest that black students who do not go to the most selective institutions, or would not be admitted under a race-neutral regime, would be greatly disadvantaged thereby.

They do not make that case, and I don't believe it for a second. Nowhere can they demonstrate, in their piles of survey data, that a black student who is admitted on his own merits to UC Riverside, or even to CSU San Diego, is significantly disadvantaged in relation to an affirmative-action admit to Princeton or Harvard. More importantly, the book does not persuade me that blacks who do not attend a Harvard or a Yale are harmed as a result. The notion that you have to go to one of the most selective universities to fulfill your potential, or to become a leader in America, betrays an elitist conception of American life that ignores how widely dispersed power and influence are, how diverse the origins of our institutional leaders are. I accept that these selective institutions give their graduates advantages simply by virtue of their reputation as elite universities. That kind of advantage is built into the status system of our society, and minorities who are admitted to those institutions have as much right to that advantage as anybody else. But it is simply a fact that, now and in the future, the overwhelming majority of black leaders will come from other institutions - ones they enter without racial preferences. And the costs to blacks, and to American society as a whole, of the racial and ethnic preferences defended by Bowen and Bok, far outweigh the marginal advantage to the small number of highly qualified black students who are assured entry to any number of first-rate colleges and universities without racial preferences.

Cascading choices

Moreover, the book simply finesses a whole set of questions that must be asked of race- and ethnic-preference policies when examined from beyond the Hudson and through the perspective of a wider range of colleges and universities. This bears on the especially contentious issue of "cascading" - what would happen if the most selective universities were to practice a race-neutral admissions policy. "Cascading" refers to the pattern of choices made by students who are refused entry to highly selective institutions, and are then admitted to somewhat less selective institutions. (In California, we are also seeing "cascading" upwards from UC campuses without race preferences to more selective private colleges and universities that offer race and ethnic preferences.)

Bowen and Bok's discussion of this matter is confusing. Does anyone doubt that those students not admitted to the most selective Ivy League universities would certainly be admitted somewhere else - perhaps to a slightly less selective Ivy League school or even to another still less selective institution? Is there any question that they would go somewhere? And what evidence is there that they would not fare well in such places or make useful and important contributions to American life?

California, and especially the **University of California system**, can prove helpful in answering these questions. We have at the UC a mini-laboratory of the cascading effect. In 1995, the UC Board of Regents voted to abolish racial preferences in admissions; and, in 1996, California voters confirmed this decision by approving Proposition 209, which abolished all racial and ethnic preferences in state institutions. These changes were implemented on UC campuses in 1997 for graduate and professional schools, and in 1998 for undergraduate admissions.

A

If we compare the enrollments of California resident freshmen on all eight general campuses over those two transitional years,(1) we find that the total number of black registrants fell from 917 to 739, a

decline of 178, or about 19 percent. Among Chicanos, the largest preferred group before Proposition 209, freshmen enrollments fell from 2,325 in 1997 to 2,211 in 1998 - a decline of just under 5 percent. ("Chicano" is the University of California's category for Hispanics of Mexican origin. Other Hispanics are registered as "Latinos" regardless of origin.)

Indeed, the numbers more accurately describe not a dramatic decline among minority admissions but a redistribution of these students within the UC system. The numbers of black and Chicano freshmen declined markedly at the most selective campuses, Berkeley and UCLA, but rose at the less selective campuses. The biggest drop in the numbers of Chicanos occurred at UC Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego, which together showed a decline of 383 Chicano freshmen enrolled, most of whom clearly reacted by enrolling at UC Irvine, Davis, Riverside and Santa Barbara, where their numbers grew by 269. Similarly, while black enrollments in 1998 at UC Berkeley and Los Angeles fell by 193 freshmen, these losses were partially offset by increases in black enrollments at the Irvine, Riverside, and Santa Cruz campuses.(2)

I do not believe that these students will receive an inferior undergraduate education because they have not been admitted to a more selective UC campus. And they will know that they owe their position solely to their own merits. They are not "affirmative-action" admits, just new Cal students.

Fewer minority students?

But these figures showing a decline in black and Hispanic enrollments in UC between 1997 and 1998 are subject to one important qualification: Total freshmen enrollments at all UC campuses rose by 1,195 between 1997 and 1998, but the number of new students in most racial and ethnic groups declined. In particular, the number of new students registering as white declined by 1,194. How can that be? The answer, largely neglected in discussions of Proposition 209's impact on the UC, lies in the very large increase between those two years in the number of applicants who refused to provide information about their ethnicity - from 774 in 1997 to 3,441 students in 1998. That was the year when race would no longer help their chances for admission to their campus of choice.

The students who declined to identify themselves by race or ethnicity comprised 14 percent of all new freshmen, making them the third largest group in the university after whites (33 percent) and Asians (28 percent). No one knows the ethnic or racial distribution of these 3,441 students, many of whom said in effect, "Now that this information cannot legally be used in the admissions process, it is none of the university's business what my 'race' or 'ethnicity' is." But whatever that distribution, it does mean that the published figures on enrollments of the racial and ethnic minorities are almost certainly lower than the true figure. For example, the "declared" Chicanos comprise 9 percent of the total enrollment in the university. If only 3 percent of the "refused to answer" were Hispanics, that would add 103 to their total, almost making up for the apparent loss of 114 Chicanos between 1997 and 1998. Similarly, some "blacks" of mixed race might have taken this costless opportunity to refuse to make the painful choice between their racial or ethnic origins, as Tiger Woods has done. Whatever number that might be would reduce the apparent effect of Proposition 209 on the decline in the numbers of declared blacks between 1997 and 1998. (Another 377 enrolled students classified themselves as "Other," also of unknown ancestry.)

There is no doubt that the abolition of racial and ethnic preferences led to a decline in the number and proportion of blacks and Chicanos admitted to the most selective UC campuses, Berkeley and UCLA. However, three other UC campuses - Irvine, Santa Cruz, and Riverside - showed an increase in black enrollments in 1998 over 1997, with little change at UC Davis and San Diego. Blacks could hardly be said to have fled the university, despite fearful (or hopeful?) predictions to the contrary. Indeed, their "take rate" - the ratio of enrollments to admissions - is almost exactly the same as it was in 1996 throughout the university.

But here one would like to see further research on "cascading" in different universities and for different groups. For example, many of the blacks not admitted to Berkeley or UCLA undoubtedly had other options. They might have enrolled at other UC campuses, like many Hispanics who failed to get into Berkeley or UCLA. Alternatively, they may have accepted admissions offers from selective private

universities and colleges, in California or elsewhere, which offered them attractive scholarship packages. I would also be curious whether some went to one of the 22 campuses of the California State University (CSU) system. That system is relatively selective, taking the top one-third of California's high-school graduates; though most of the students who are rejected by Berkeley or UCLA could enter the CSU system almost automatically. If they did, they would profit from a CSU education and discover how easily a CSU graduate, who has been a serious student, can transfer to the University of California or another research university for graduate study, if so inclined.

In any event, the UC provides a natural laboratory for the study of "cascading," and such a study might lead to more modest notions of its effects on life chances. Indeed, contrary to the physical image of "cascading," we might discover that some students, rejected by their UC campus of choice, cascaded "upwards" to more - rather than less - selective institutions that are still applying race and ethnic preferences.

Race in public and private

Bowen and Bok also neglect to ask which groups should be preferred. They cite methodological concerns to justify confining their study to black students, but, by omitting other groups, they also distort our picture of racial preferences. Race in America, despite many who believe otherwise, is not a black-and-white problem; the huge number of racial and ethnic groups in our country greatly complicates any effort to deal with a particular group, as if it alone were the object of preference.

Race-preference policies have broader implications, not least political ones, when the "people of color" admitted make up not 5 percent or 6 percent of the entering class but well over 50 percent of the university. This is true of the University of California, where nearly a quarter of its student body consists of formerly preferred groups, now no longer preferred.⁽³⁾ Proposition 209 expressly applies to public institutions and does not affect the practices of Stanford, USC, Cal Tech, or the many other private colleges and universities in California. Although leading public and private universities have come to resemble one another more in recent decades, private universities remain autonomous and are correspondingly less accountable to the public. By contrast, the UC did not have the freedom to choose which groups in society it would prefer.

Bowen and Bok do not address this fundamental difference between private elite universities and selective public universities. Private universities have an extraordinary degree of autonomy to admit whom they please on whatever grounds they please. That is broadly accepted in this country, despite the inroads on their autonomy by OSHA and other regulatory agencies. Public universities are in this respect quite different; state governments ordinarily have very strong views about the terms of access of their citizens to "their" universities. Even when, as in the case of UC, the government has granted a high measure of autonomy to the state university, it still requires that Public universities make the criteria for admission clear and fair.

Notions of what is fair are contested and change over time, no doubt. But public universities, certainly in California, had taken the questionable step of selecting students on the basis of a racial formula. It is only now, after racial and ethnic preferences have been outlawed, that the university can move to selecting students through a consideration of their whole file. Factors other than test scores and high-school grade-point average can be considered, with the exception of race or ethnicity. And this is a clear improvement, welcomed by all sides of the Proposition 209 debate.

Moreover, even if some groups are to be preferred, how can a public university verify that a student is actually a member of that group? This may not be a problem at Princeton; however, it is a problem at Berkeley or in the UC generally. It is not very difficult to imagine a way to identify "black" students at a small, private institution. For those students who claimed to be black, a small private university can simply apply the "one drop" criterion evidenced by skin color and the correlated features of hair, eyes, and physiognomy once used by the old racist society that we ought to have put behind us. However, that is not so easy at the UC, and at many other large public universities, where applicants are not interviewed, and where the "one drop" criterion cannot be used to check a claim on an application form.

Furthermore, the policy of group preferences forces impossible choices on the rapidly growing number of Americans from multiracial backgrounds. Before racial preferences in public institutions were abolished in California, the university in effect said to applicants of mixed race: "You must choose between your father and your mother in marking the race/ethnicity box on the UC's admissions form. If you choose the preferred race, you are more likely to be admitted to Berkeley and to get additional financial support. If you choose the other race or ethnicity, your chances of admission are simply poorer. If you choose to check the box labeled 'Other' or refuse to choose at all, we will treat you as if you were white, i.e., negatively preferred." It cannot be right for any public institution to force a student whose parents are, say, Asian and Hispanic, to choose between his father and mother in asserting his own ethnic identity. Such students often resist those pressures, asserting with pride the dual or multiple nature of their ethnic roots. But group preferences reward one identity and punish the other. It is indefensible for public policy to force that choice.

The Nuremberg dilemma

To reward a check in a box also invites fraud, especially when it appears to be a victimless crime (the person with the wrong skin color who will be excluded thereby is a very dim figure indeed). In addition, at the UC, there is no way such fraud could be uncovered. When race preferences were being applied on UC campuses, no efforts were ever made to verify the truth of a claim to a preferred race or ethnicity. Indeed, when I asked about this, an official in an admissions office replied indignantly, "We are not in the business of enforcing Nuremberg Laws." Precisely.

The Nazis employed the Nuremberg Laws to define exactly what fraction of "impure" blood would deprive "non-Aryans" of citizenship and, eventually, of life. In California, however different the motives and consequences, any efforts to establish the truth of claims to some preferred category would require, first, that the university or some other agency set forth what fraction of a blood line would qualify, and then define the procedures for testing those claims. In some smaller universities the names of students claiming a preferred origin might be given to a student group on campus to investigate. But, at the UC, students were and are ethnically anonymous if that is their choice. Moreover, on the slight chance that a fraudulent claim to a preference was uncovered, no penalties would have been imposed. Indeed, penalties would have required a formal statement of the conditions of blood and origin that would qualify for the preference, and that would return the university to the Nuremberg dilemma. Wisely, it chose not to do that.

But with neither procedures to confirm a claim to a preferred status nor penalties for fraud, it would be surprising if the amount of fraud did not grow, especially as teachers and guidance counselors realized the advantages a check in the right box would confer upon an applicant's chances of being admitted to Berkeley or another selective UC campus. The frequency of this kind of fraud cannot be known with any accuracy, but one incident will illustrate the form it takes: A university officer, visiting a local high school, observed a student checking the box labeled "Chicano" on his application form.

"Oh, you're Chicano," said the official by way of making friendly conversation.

"No," came the reply. "Actually I'm Iranian, but my teacher told me to check 'Chicano' if I wanted to get into Berkeley."

That was a rather straightforward claim to a fraudulent preference; the manipulation of Spanish surnames was more widespread. Here the confusion about what "Latino" means, whether it includes Portuguese and Brazilians and European Spaniards, invites a very broad interpretation, including the many part-Latinos who did not have Hispanic surnames. Who is a Latino, and how do you know? How much "blood" is required to qualify - both parents, one parent, one grandparent, or simple residence in a country that we call Hispanic? How about European Hispanics? How about the Portuguese, who have recently successfully argued their way onto a government preference list? Stories of questionable claims to a preferred status are known and retailed with a cynical chuckle in universities; before the change of policy in California, they fuelled widespread cynicism about the fairness of all the admissions procedures. These are not "details" but insoluble issues in a country deeply reluctant to probe into ethnic and racial origins.

Finally, on the issue of how long the preferences should stay in place, the authors of *The Shape of the River* are more forthcoming: simply "for the foreseeable future." There may be goals for the application of preferences; there are no goals visible for the ending of preferences. The notion suggested is that one racial group, or more than one, must "for the foreseeable future" be exempt from the American ideal that individuals are judged, assessed, and rewarded for their own achievements. These are big issues of policy and implementation which the book simply avoids in the course of telling us about the mostly successful careers of black students who attended a few prestigious universities.

From "Jewish Peril" to "Yellow Peril"

One consequence of "affirmative action," largely neglected in the literature justifying racial preferences, is the exclusion of certain other groups. In the East, where most private elite research universities are located, the excluded are generally white. As the symbolic representatives of the advantaged and repressive groups in American history - never mind who they actually are - they gain little sympathy. And the private universities may choose to prefer only blacks, and thus those who are excluded are not only white but apparently few in number. In California, we did not have that dubious privilege; before Proposition 209, we were required by federal law and regulations to prefer a variety of other racial and ethnic groups, chief among them, Chicanos.

Moreover, in California, those who are disadvantaged by their racial and national origins are more likely to be Asians, who outnumber whites on the most selective UC campuses, Berkeley and UCLA, and currently comprise 37 percent of the new Berkeley freshmen (as compared with about 28 percent white).⁽⁴⁾ These "Asians" include a very wide variety of backgrounds - old and new Chinese, Japanese, Thai, Vietnamese of various kinds, Indonesians, Koreans, and more. (Filipinos and East Indian/Pakistanis are counted separately. They were also formerly preferred.)

Of course, many supporters of "diversity" never acknowledged the wide variety of backgrounds represented by "Asian" students at the UC. On the contrary, the preference policies in California were a way of controlling the numbers of "Asians" in the UC. No one actually said that, except occasional visitors like President Clinton who warned Californians in 1995 of the dangers of abolishing racial preferences. Beware, he said, "there are universities in California that could fill their entire freshman classes with nothing but Asian Americans."

We are reminded of similar concerns about the "Jewish Peril" at elite Eastern private colleges and universities throughout the first half of this century. Quotas were employed to limit their numbers and were only dismantled after World War II, persisting into the 1950s at some universities. Then it was too many smart Jews; today, it's too many smart Asians and not enough room for everybody else.

Few leaders of leading private research universities today would defend their racist exclusionary policies of the past. But these same leaders have no difficulty in defending similar policies that exclude other people, with different "racial" characteristics. The difference presumably lies in the malign motives in the earlier racial exclusions and the benign ones today. But the consequences are remarkably similar. Students who are otherwise fully qualified for entry to a university are excluded because of their skin color or national origins. And a further irony is that some of the "Asians" who suffer this "benign" discrimination are the grandsons and granddaughters of people who were confined to relocation camps during World War II in another, and now widely regretted, expression of public racism in America.

For all these and other reasons the race- and ethnic-preference policy at UC was not only intrinsically unfair but was increasingly seen to be unfair by faculty and students alike, causing growing resentment over race and ethnicity among all groups and dividing the academic community. The more differentiated ethnic and racial groups have become, the more transparent are the injustices and inequities of policies based on group membership. Public policies based on race and ethnicity have a powerful and inherent tendency to reduce people in all their variety and complexity to their membership in a racial category. But higher education aims to further differentiate us, to encourage and educate our qualities of mind and character, to give more varied aspects to our individuality, and to teach us to nurture our unique qualities. Intelligence and creativity, if allowed, burst through the constraints of social origin; nurtured

by our origins, we transcend them through the disciplines and freedoms of scholarship and science. People differ, and must be allowed to differ, in whether, and to what degree they choose to find their identities in their ethnic origins, but that is no business of public policy.

The end of preferences at Boalt

Bowen and Bok also do not tell us how much preference they would defend, beyond defending whatever level was being applied in the institutions over the period they discussed. How much is enough? Here again some evidence from the UC may be enlightening, this time from a professional school.

Before racial and ethnic preferences were abolished in the University of California in 1995, the relevant law was the Supreme Court's decision in the Bakke case of 1978, which outlawed racial quotas but permitted institutions to consider race as "one factor in admissions." But the Court declined to explain how much of a role in admissions race should play. Some institutions interpreted the decision as saying that "other things being equal," race could be a preference at the margin and acted on that principle. Others went much further, giving whatever weight to race and ethnicity in admissions that was necessary to achieve the particular racial mix they were seeking.

An example of this is the recent history of admissions to Berkeley's law school, Boalt Hall. After racial preferences were abolished, it was widely reported by the media in the summer of 1997 that, with the exception of one black student who had been accepted in the previous year but had delayed entry, no new minority students would enroll at Boalt. The figures for Boalt were reported before any other figures for other professional and graduate programs and were taken as representative of the effects of abolishing racial preferences on the graduate programs in the University.

They were not; when those figures were released many months later, it appeared that the proportions of blacks and Hispanics(5) entering Berkeley's graduate programs, apart from Boalt, had changed only slightly. Indeed, Proposition 209 has had little effect upon new students in UC graduate schools (excluding the professional schools). Between 1996 and 1997 - that is, when the new rules applied to UC's graduate schools - the Office of the President reported that "the number of African Americans increased by 2 percent, while the 'other' and 'declined to state' categories increased by 25 percent." Those figures occasioned very little comment in the press.

One might have imagined that the university would want to spread the good news that the abolition of racial and ethnic preferences at the graduate level was having very little negative effect on the numbers of black and Hispanic students. But there were no press conferences or statements by senior administrative officers calling attention to these surprising figures, as they had in connection with the Boalt story. In this case, as in others in recent years, good news was treated by the university and its public relations offices as bad news, whereas what looked like bad news, especially the Boalt story, was trumpeted by university officials. Indeed, some within the university appeared to encourage even worse news to discredit the new race-blind policies. Bowen and Bok quote a director of a black recruitment program at Berkeley as saying, "We told [prospective students] that [Boalt] is a very hostile environment and that we're not welcome here ... we weren't pushing them to come to Cal."

Boalt differed from most other graduate and professional programs in one important respect: It competed for the ablest minority applicants with other leading law schools - especially those at the top research universities - but unfortunately, it was almost always unsuccessful in that competition. Long before the Regents' action or Proposition 209, Boalt was consistently losing all, or almost all, of its highly qualified minority candidates to more prestigious law schools that could offer more financial support, and perhaps more attractive positions upon graduation. The fact that Boalt could not hold its best applicants against the Ivy League law schools is no criticism of Boalt; other law schools are better endowed, even more prestigious, and even better launching pads for highly successful careers. But, in the fall of 1997, when no minority students enrolled in Boalt's entering class, administrators blamed the Regent's abolition of racial preferences for the loss of "diversity" at Boalt.

Boalt was a story of the radical application of preferences, surely beyond what was envisioned in Bakke. The degree of preference in admissions to Boalt was not "race sensitive," but heavily "race

determined."(6) We can see this now because, unlike most other graduate departments and professional schools, admissions to Boalt had been organized around a formula placing applicants into one of four "Ability Ranges," A through D, from the highest scores to the lowest, defined by a combination of the student's undergraduate grade-point average and scores on the LSAT.(7) In 1996, only 855 students were admitted to Boalt out of 4,684 who applied. But the proportions admitted were highly varied among the different ethnic and racial groups and in the different ranges.

For example, 18 applicants from the preferred groups - chiefly blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans - fell into the top two Ability Ranges, and all but one of them were accepted. And that is true for the other two big groups, whites and Asians; almost all applicants from Range A were admitted. However, substantial differences in admission rates begin to appear among applicants from Range B (69 percent and 62 percent for Asians and whites respectively, versus 94 percent for racially preferred groups), and are very large in the lower two Ability Ranges C and D. Of the 124 Asian applicants in Range C, only 24, or 19 percent, were admitted; and, of the 607 whites in that range, 101, or 17 percent, were admitted. But of the 35 members of the preferred groups in that range, 27, or fully 77 percent, were admitted. And, in Ability Range D, only two out of 492 Asian applicants were admitted (.4 percent), as compared with 100 out of 696 (14 percent) preferred applicants. The proportion of whites admitted from that Ability Range, 19 out of 1,223, or 1.5 percent, was almost as low as among the Asians.

When we look at specific ethnic groups, the differences are even more striking. Of applicants in Ability Range C, 10 were students of Japanese origins; an equal number of black applicants were in that same Ability Range. All 10 black applicants in that Range were accepted, but not one of those of Japanese origins. Of the 384 black applicants in Ability Range D, 62 were admitted. By contrast, of the 174 applicants of Chinese origins in that same Ability Range, not one was admitted to Boalt Hall.

When a university starts counting by eye shape or skin color, all notions of "how much" race preference is justifiable collapse; there are no criteria or numbers on which people can agree. And when merely being "race sensitive" is not sufficient to achieve a desired level of "diversity," as at Boalt, then officials are tempted to apply racial criteria as far as necessary to get the numbers right. The end of race preferences dramatically affected Boalt because of how much it had previously compensated for its weakness compared with prestigious Ivy League law schools for the most able minority applicants. When race preferences were abolished, Boalt could no longer admit large numbers of poorly qualified minority students in preference to white and Asian students with higher qualifications. And those less well qualified minority students admitted under the preference system could no longer mask Boalt's inability to compete successfully against Yale, Harvard, and Columbia for the most able minority students. By contrast, the graduate programs in Arts and Letters and the sciences did not experience declines in their minority enrollments because they did not have to change their admissions criteria and practice very much after preferences were abolished.

The illusion of consensus

Much is made by Bowen and Bok of the importance of diversity in a student body - of the value of exposing students to differing perspectives, values, and orientations for education. But, oddly enough, the American Association of Universities (AAU), along with its sister organizations on Dupont Circle, exhibits no diversity on the issue of race and ethnic preferences in higher education. I don't mean a near consensus, but rather, a perfect consensus, as reflected by the signatures of every AAU member, in a full-page advertisement in the New York Times in April 1997, expressing opposition to laws prohibiting race-blind policies.

The AAU, and academic leadership generally, are not typical in this respect; on the contrary, every other group in our society is divided on the wisdom of using race and ethnicity for such decisions, usually pretty evenly, from Congress and the courts, to business and the press, to professors and students, and above all, to the larger society and its voters. People debate these issues among themselves everywhere - except in the organizations of college and university leadership. No arguments there, at least none that anyone can hear. But two well-crafted surveys by the Roper Center of the University of Connecticut - one conducted on the nine UC campuses and another that questioned college and university professors nationwide - found that a majority of academics everywhere oppose preferences, and while different

wordings get different distributions, everywhere there are substantial numbers on both sides.

What explains this curious combination of outward consensus and internal division? UC leaders have created a false illusion of a broad consensus within the university in favor of racial preferences. On these issues, administrators and their staffs presume to speak for the university. And they are the voice of the university. One would never guess from reading their newsletters, campus journals, and alumni magazines that there is substantial opposition to racial preferences within the academic community. In all our institutions, and most certainly in the University of California, the professional affirmative-action community is large, broad, and strongly committed to the policies of group preference. This and the passion they bring to the issue help explain why the opposition, however well represented in the faculty, is nearly voiceless.

This peculiar consensus among university presidents arises out of a mixture of principle and a keen sense of who, on or around campus, can make trouble for them. People opposed to preferences do not make any significant trouble for senior university officers; groups that profit from and administer preference policies can and do. The officials who administer the UC's large affirmative-action bureaucracies have been appointed on the understanding that they support the preference system, or at least will not oppose it. I cannot think of a single senior administrator in the past two decades, either at Berkeley or in the Office of the President, who has openly opposed preferences in admissions; if they had, they would not have been appointed to those jobs - and that includes appointments in the three years since race preferences have been abolished in UC. One result is a consensus on this issue among academic administrators which in no way reflects the diversity of views among the faculty or students.

Another result of this pattern of recruitment and retention of senior administrative staff is that university presidents do not commonly talk about admissions policies with people who oppose the preference system. The people they talk to - their own administrative staffs and senior academic administrators - share their views or keep quiet, as do most academics. One aspect of academic life which no one is inclined to discuss openly is the quiet intimidation of dissenters on this issue. Very few academics wish to offend both the senior administrators who govern their careers and budgets, and the well-organized affirmative-action pressure groups that are not slow to stereotype faculty members as "racists" or, at the very least, "right-wingers."

Consensual coercion

A second pillar of racial and ethnic preference policies is patronage - the jobs associated with the development and implementation of these policies. Jobs are a source of interests, linked in universities no differently than in other areas of life. The passion that lies behind the defense of race and ethnic preferences combines both material interest and feelings of moral superiority. As a result, opponents are demonized and dissent is silenced. While our colleges and universities proclaim their endorsement of diversity, many of them simply do not permit open dissent on the issue of affirmative action. A distinguished federal judge who knows academia well has observed that "groups holding considerable power in the university loathe speech with the wrong content about topics important to them, and ... those who say the wrong things will have little peer or institutional protection ... Many ideas may not be expressed, many subjects may not be discussed, and any discussion on matters of political salience has to avoid offending groups powerful in the university."

Indeed, although faculty members are sharply divided over racial preferences, such differences are expressed only under the security afforded by anonymity. Open meetings of campus senates on all nine UC campuses have passed resolutions by lopsided votes condemning the Regents' decision to abolish racial preferences, but mail ballots at UC San Diego, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara and the system-wide survey by the Roper Center showed the UC faculty to be evenly divided on the issues.(8)

One reason for this dichotomy is that UC scholars and professors are not fearless Green Berets. The University of California, like other universities over the years, developed a strong climate and organizational structure in support of a policy of racial and ethnic preferences in admissions. From the President's Office down, every campus and every college had administrative offices and Academic Senate committees to plan and enforce preferential policies; every department had and has an

"affirmative-action" officer to monitor its behavior. Every chancellor, provost, and dean on every UC campus, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, has supported preferences. Indeed, for many years no chancellor, provost, or dean was appointed in the University of California who shared the views of the current majority of Regents on racial preferences. But there was and is no equivalent organization of people inside the university devoted to criticizing the preference policies or to reforming them. Even tenured professors do not like to run afoul of their deans and provosts, much less their chancellors, all of whom can be very clear about their own preferences, though not always on paper. I must confess that if I were still Director of Berkeley's Center for Studies in Higher Education, I might not be writing in this way.

And, as I have already indicated, critics of racial and ethnic preferences always risk being tarred as racists. No matter how unwarranted and unfair, it is an awful epithet that can damage, even destroy, one's career. Can anyone be surprised if most University of California faculty members who did not share the official doctrines on admissions and appointments kept their views to themselves, at least until they had the protection of anonymity in a survey being conducted from Connecticut or a mail ballot?

The pattern of "consensual coercion" brands some viewpoints as illegitimate and deprives those who hold them of protection. Those who voice objectionable views are stereotyped and labeled as "highly partisan," "right-wingers," or even unwitting "racists." No longer do their arguments have to be read or heard; because their arguments are already known, they can be dismissed without benefit of the doubt. Already discredited, opponents of racial preferences are then demonized; they are not merely mistaken, but evil - and fair game for late-night calls and hate mail. This kind of coercion often does not need to go this far to be effective. That is what is meant when lawyers and others speak of the "chilling effect" of some practice or policy, and it is enough to stifle debate.

What Proposition 209 hath wrought

The Regents' actions and Proposition 209 are slowly liberating UC campuses from these chilling effects. While I believe that the president, chancellors, and their senior staffs have not changed their views, it is now possible, indeed even necessary, for people to talk about how to admit students in ways that might preserve and enhance diversity without specific attention to their skin color or eye shape.

Proposition 209, together with the Regents' actions, forced three important reforms at the University of California. First, it has forced the university to abandon its categorical formulas and to admit students by inspecting their folders rather than simply their scores and race. Some students have always been admitted on the basis of their individual qualities and promise - musicians, athletes, students from abroad - but now, this must be done more broadly. To make a decision about an individual on the basis of that person's own qualities, not of his group membership, is an important step forward.

To support race-blind or race-neutral policies does not mean that one does not take into account the actual nature of American society and its effects on academic performance and life chances. Our admissions officers will be able to take into account an individual's response to disadvantaged circumstances - for example, performing well and taking college preparatory courses in a school where few go on to college. We should reward that kind of initiative and motivation. Similarly, it seems to me sensible to take into account the handicaps on academic performance implicit in growing up in a household where English is the second language. But that is a characteristic of an individual and his situation, and not of an ethnic group, many of whose members come from homes in no way disadvantaged. These suggestions, which are the kinds of ideas that UC committees and admissions officers are currently struggling with, direct our attention to individual qualities rather than supposedly homogeneous racial qualities, and do not therefore negatively stereotype or put in question the student's own personal qualifications.

Another clear gain of Proposition 209 is that all students admitted to the UC can now justifiably feel that they are here on their own individual merits, and are not "affirmative action" admits. Before Proposition 209, no member of a preferred group could be sure whether he was admitted on his own merits or in response to a university policy concerned with competitive numbers. Equally troubling, neither could their family or friends or classmates. Bowen and Bok assert, on the strength of their survey, that

recipients of these preferences did not resent those privileges. I suspect that, had the authors investigated some other social issue, they would doubt any survey's capacity to assess adequately the deep and inevitable ambivalence felt by beneficiaries of racial preferences. Indeed, different research methods would be required; only long, intensive interviews might uncover the complex feelings that Bowen and Bok dismiss so cavalierly.

But Proposition 209's greatest contribution lies elsewhere. With racial preferences abolished, we will have to think more fundamentally about the problem of underrepresentation in higher education - that is, we will have to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. The University of California has begun to do that in a serious way, with the help of a recent grant of \$ 40 million from the California legislature. Each campus has a chance to develop a program for improving the quality of K-12 schooling in the state. That is exactly where our energies ought to be going - to improve the quality of education for all California youth, especially those who most need it. The aim is not to distribute a small number of qualified blacks among a very small number of elite universities; rather, it is to increase the whole number of qualified youth, among them many blacks and Hispanics, who are prepared and motivated to continue their education in colleges and universities that will accept them for their talents and aspirations - not for their skin color or national origins. Race and ethnic preferences mask the inadequacies of our schools and distract us from that overriding obligation.

1 These figures are supplied by the University of California, Office of the President.

2 California's Master Plan guarantees admission to the University of California to the top 12.5 percent of the graduates of California high schools, though not to any specific UC campus. Thus all of the minorities who were eligible for entry to the university in 1997 would also have been eligible in 1998. The effect of Proposition 209 was only on admission to those campuses that were admitting more selectively than required by the Master Plan as a result of the growth of UC-eligible applicants to those campuses beyond the number of places available. That led to a planned cascading within the university from more to less affected campuses, and to some unknown degree, from the UC to other colleges and universities in California and elsewhere.

3 Not including the "refused to answer" category, Chicanos, blacks, American Indians, East Indian/Pakistanis, Latinos, and Filipino Americans add up to 24 percent of the newly enrolled freshmen in UC as a whole in 1998.

4 These, of course, do not include the unknown proportions of Asians who "refused to answer."

5 Graduate and professional schools at the UC essentially set their own criteria for admission. While the University of California counted "Chicanos" and "Latinos" among its undergraduates, Boalt counted "Hispanics."

6 The data referred to here were obtained by Dan Guhr, a graduate student at Oxford University doing his dissertation on comparative patterns of access to higher education in several advanced societies.

7 For example, the chart for California residents defines Range A as including stepped combinations of GPAs from 4.00 to 3.80 and LSATs from 167 to 178. So a GPA of 4.00 and LSATs of 167 to 171 are included, as are a GPA of 3.80 and a LSAT score of 178.

8 The Roper Poll of UC faculty on all nine campuses was designed in consultation with members of the UC faculty, including this writer, and had a response rate of 80 percent. It survived searching criticism on methodological grounds. The Roper Poll asked voting members of the Academic Senate whether they favored granting preferences to women and certain racial and ethnic groups, or whether they favored promoting equal opportunities in these areas without regard to an individual's race, sex, or ethnicity. A wide plurality (48 percent) favored the latter policy; only 31 percent favored the granting of race and ethnic preferences.

These findings are consistent with polls on this issue over the past 20 years, both among academics and in the general population. When the question was put differently in the form, "Do you favor or oppose

using race, religion, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin as a criterion for admission to the University of California," the findings show a bare majority (52 percent) for retaining those as "criteria," and fell below 50 percent when asked about these preferences for appointments to the faculty. When asked in yet another question about their own understanding of the term "affirmative action," given the choice between "granting preferences to women and certain racial and ethnic groups," or "promoting equal opportunities for all individuals without regard to their race, sex, or ethnicity," the faculty sample voted for the second definition over the first, by 43 percent to 37 percent. Another 15 percent accepted neither statement as their own meaning of the term. Indeed, one might note that over the years supporters of race and ethnic preferences have highjacked the term "affirmative action" to refer to their policies, contrary to the views of a plurality of UC faculty who still think it means "promoting equal opportunities."

The Roper Center also conducted a similar survey in October 1996 of academics in colleges and universities all over the country. This found even higher proportions of respondents opposed to racial and ethnic preferences in admissions and appointments than was found in the UC survey.

MARTIN TROW is professor emeritus at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley. He was formerly director, and is now a faculty associate, at the UC Berkeley Center for Studies in Higher Education.

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

IAC-CREATE-DATE: April 12, 1999

LOAD-DATE: April 13, 1999

FOCUSTM

Search: General News; University of California and minority enrollment and...

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

Example: House of Representatives

Copyright 1999 SOFTLINE INFORMATION, INC.
The Ethnic NewsWatch
Black Issues In Higher Education

October 14, 1999

SECTION: Vol. 16; No. 17; Pg. 40

LENGTH: 1276 words

HEADLINE: WORKING Recruitment Miracles: Colleges and Universities in California and Texas Regroup, Rethink and Redouble Their Minority Student Recruitment Efforts

BYLINE: Smith, Starita

BODY:

WORKING Recruitment Miracles: Colleges and Universities in California and Texas Regroup, Rethink and Redouble Their Minority Student Recruitment Efforts

HOUSTON -- Graduates of Worthing High School, a predominantly Black school here in the nation's fourth-largest city, have gone on to become everything from Ivy Leaguers to Texas A&M Aggies.

But no one here ever gave much thought to attending the University of Texas-Austin until university officials visited the school last year. "This is the first time that a major predominantly White university has done this," says Worthing's principal, Ronnie C. Evans Sr.

Colleges and universities here in Texas and in California, two state's whose reputations took a bruising because of anti-affirmative action measures, have had to regroup, rethink and redouble their efforts to recruit minority students reluctant to step into what could be perceived as an environment hostile to them.

While the 1998 California voter initiative and 1997 Texas court case that ended the use of race in admissions did cause minority applications and enrollments to plummet, college officials say they've recovered from those setbacks for the most part.

Though several public colleges and universities in those states have seen ripple affects from the anti-affirmative action measures, the struggle to boost minority enrollment has been most pronounced at the biggest, most selective schools.

Larry Burt, the University of Texas-Austin's director of student financial services, says that university officials were able to snag several Worthing students because of the site visits to Houston and a new scholarship fund.

"We got eight students," he says almost boastfully. "The number of Worthing students here at the University of Texas-t Austin went up from zero."

Getting the Numbers Up

In fact, Texas officials say their efforts have been so successful that the freshman class that started in August includes more minority students than at any time before the controversial Hopwood case was even conceived.

At the **University of California system**, where the most selective campuses are located in Berkeley, Los Angeles and San Diego, university administrators say they are pleased with the small increase in minority freshman enrollment this year.

It is because institutions have been so aggressive in finding alternative ways to diversify their student

bodies that backers of affirmative action say they once again are optimistic that more minority students will be on campus.

"I was disturbed by Hopwood but not discouraged," says Evans. "I knew that if people were really colorblind, they were going to find a way to make sure our children were going to get what had been denied them through no fault of their own for so long.

"I'm saying there are some colorblind White brothers and sisters out there who have no qualms about a person's color," Evans adds, "but are just concerned about a person's mind."

Dr. Larry R. Faulkner, president of the University of Texas, has been out stumping for students himself at high schools with large minority populations in San Antonio, Houston and several other cities.

"I am delighted with the diversity of this year's entering class and that we have been successful in returning to pre-Hopwood levels for African American and Hispanic freshmen," Faulkner says.

Texas' 1999 freshman class contains 87 more Black students than did the previous year's class. The total number of African American freshman, 286, represents a 43.7 percent increase over the previous year. The class also includes 159 Hispanic students, for an increase of 12 percent.



Meanwhile, the University of California's 1999 freshman class includes 4,300 students from underrepresented groups -- Blacks, Hispanics and American Indians. That's a 3.7 percent increase over the class of 1998, says admissions director Carla Ferri.

Keeping the Faith

Affirmative action proponents say that those statistics bear out the faith that Evans says he has always harbored that a single court ruling was not enough to halt the progress of diversity in Texas, a state where minorities soon will become the majority.

Although recently enacted rules also have restricted the use of race and ethnicity as criteria for accepting and awarding financial aid at the universities, college officials have sought innovative ways to attract more minorities.

Here in Texas, for instance, a new state law requires the University of Texas to automatically admit any students that graduated in the top 10 percent of their high school class. School officials also have found more scholarship money to help out.

In California, the state Legislature and other sources doubled the budget for a network of partnerships among elementary, middle and high schools, and universities that is designed to improve student preparedness.

Terry Lightfoot, a spokesman for the **University of California system**, says those partnerships were set up mostly with majority African American and Hispanic schools that sent few to no students on to the university system.

The California universities are working with high schools to offer more advanced placement courses and with prospective students and their families, allowing students to take preliminary college entrance exams in the seventh or eighth grade, Lightfoot says.

By taking the exam early -- it normally is administered in the 11th grade -- school officials more easily can gauge what subjects students need to bone up on. It also removes some of the students' anxiety over taking standardized tests, Lightfoot says.

It is too soon to determine how well the expanded version of the partnership program will work but university officials say that previous versions have yielded strong results. Still, Lightfoot says, more must be done.

"One of our challenges is bringing new ways to provide information about college preparedness, financial aid and academic programs to students," he says, "particularly Latino students whose families have had little experience with college."

The University of Texas, too, has stepped up its outreach efforts in secondary schools. In addition, officials there designed a new program to attract students from high schools that were underrepresented in the university's freshman classes.

The high schools are identified through SAT score reports that students can request be sent to colleges and universities. If university officials determine too few score reports have been sent to them by students from a particular high school, they start looking for ways to increase the number of reports and applications from that school.

A Sincere Effort

University of Texas officials also started a scholarship program called the "Longhorn Opportunity Scholarships" that provides \$16,000 over four years for one student at each of 49 underrepresented high schools. Texas has 1,700 high schools.

Burt says that both the Top 10 bill passed by the state Legislature and the Longhorn scholarships offer high school students a chance to qualify for the prestigious university by competing with peers at their home high school rather than students from across the state and the nation.

He believes that sincere interest from university officials combined with lucrative financial aid packages are powerful recruiting tools that have helped the university overcome the stigma it received because of Hopwood.

"I knew we would be able to go into these high schools and say, I'm going to give two scholarships to this high school," he says.

Article copyright Cox, Matthews & Associates, Inc.

ETHNIC-GROUP: African American/Caribbean/African

LANGUAGE: English

LOAD-DATE: January 16, 2000

FOCUSTM

Search: General News; University of California and minority enrollment and...

To narrow this search, please enter a word or phrase:

Example: House of Representatives

Copyright 1998 McClatchy Newspapers, Inc.
Sacramento Bee

View Related Topics

May 6, 1998, METRO FINAL

SECTION: METRO; Pg. B1

LENGTH: 628 words

HEADLINE: NEW UC ADMISSIONS PLAN OUTLINED

BYLINE: M.S. Enkoji, Bee Staff Writer

BODY:

A plan to guarantee enrollment in the University of California for students from each of the state's 858 high schools will go to UC regents at a May 14 meeting, launching an effort to ensure campus diversity.

"It's the most radical change in 30 years," said Keith Widaman, chairman of the regents' faculty committee on admission policies.

Widaman presented the plan Tuesday at a state Senate hearing that examined strategies to overcome drop-offs in some minority enrollments in the **University of California system**.

The proposal calls for guaranteeing admission to the top 4 percent of students at each high school, provided they successfully complete college-required courses and meet Scholastic Assessment Test standards.

Students also would be allowed to apply under existing qualifications for UC, which historically set grade and test-score standards so that about 12 percent of the statewide senior class would meet them.

Minority admissions has been a hot issue this fall because passage of Proposition 209 and adoption of a new policy by UC regents eliminated race as a consideration for admission.

Attracting particular concern is a systemwide drop-off in admissions for African Americans, American Indians and Latinos, who are considered underrepresented in the pool of UC-eligible students.

Latest admission figures indicate an overall drop of underrepresented minorities from 17.5 percent of the freshman class in 1997 to 15.6 percent this fall.

Prompting particular concern are the system's two largest and most selective campuses:

* UC Berkeley accepted 66 percent fewer African Americans, 58 percent fewer American Indians and 54 percent fewer Latinos for this fall.

* UCLA admitted 43 percent fewer African Americans, 41 percent fewer American Indians and 34 percent fewer Latinos.

Two of the UC campuses -- Riverside and Santa Cruz -- saw small increases in the number of underrepresented minorities admitted.

Indicating race on applications is not mandatory, and applicants for this fall who declined to indicate race rose by nearly 300 percent. University officials said Tuesday they could not explain the reasons why.

Isolating the cause of the minority admissions problem systemwide would be difficult, as would developing a simple remedy, university representatives told members of the Senate Select Committees on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach and on Higher Education.

The new proposal could increase eligibility for 3,600 students who are at the top of their high school classes but might not get admitted under the current system, UC officials have said.

The plan also could increase ethnic and geographic diversity by reserving some school-by-school slots rather than looking only at the statewide senior class as a whole.

Disregarding race will send UC's eight undergraduate campuses into a time warp, back to the 1950s, when white, middle-class males largely enrolled, critics say.

Though Berkeley admissions representatives experimented by evaluating applicants' total profiles rather than focusing on scores and grades, it still racked up the largest loss in minority admissions, said Patrick Hayashi, a vice chancellor for admissions and enrollment.

"Much of what we hold dear about Berkeley will be diminished," he told representatives of the two Senate select committees.

The committee members questioned continued emphasis on SAT scores to predict success in college. Some believe that adding UC campuses would increase diversity.

Though the plan to include every high school is designed to boost opportunity for numerous students, some panel members argued that some high schools are more lavishly endowed with advanced classes, which still makes college enrollment unequal.

GRAPHIC: Bee graphic

UC systemwide admissions

(Fall Semester)	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Percent
admitted, of total	admitted, of total	admitted, of total	change		
Ethnicity	fall 1998	admitted	fall 1997	admitted	from '97-98
American Indian	324	0.7%	334	0.7%	-0.3%
African American	1,339	2.9%	1,633	3.6%	-18%
Latino*	5,484	11.9%	5,876	13.1%	-6%
Total Underrepre-					
sented minorities	7,147	15.6%	7,843	17.5%	-8%
Asian Americans	13,014	28.3%	13,360	29.9%	-2.7%
White/other	18,450	40.2%	21,104	47.2%	-12.6%
Declined to state	6,446	14.0%	1,630	3.8%	+295%
Foreign	876	1.9%	803	1.8%	+9%
TOTAL:	45,933	---	44,740	---	+2.7%

* Combined results for Mexican Americans and other Latinos.

Includes 1,571 freshmen whose offers of admissions for the fall semester were announced Tuesday, but not 1,608 freshmen who were offered admission for winter or spring terms.

Source: University of California

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

LOAD-DATE: May 7, 1998

FOCUSTM

Search: General News; University of California and minority enrollment and...