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A. INTRODUCTION

Formation of Committee

The Ad Hoc Committee on Undergraduate Admission Procedures (the "Ad Hoc Committee") was formulated in July 2019 as a sub-committee of UCLA’s Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS). CUARS is the UCLA faculty Senate committee that is responsible for oversight of the policies for undergraduate admissions at UCLA, as mandated in bylaws 40.1 Duties and Powers of the Academic Senate and 65.5 Undergraduate Admissions and Relations With Schools. In this capacity, CUARS tasked the Ad Hoc Committee to examine non-standard, talent-based admission procedures at UCLA and to possibly recommend the need for changes to established policies and procedures.

The motivation for the Ad Hoc Committee started during the 2017-2018 academic year when CUARS began to review procedures in the admission of student athletes at UCLA. Then, in March 2019, the "Varsity Blues" scandal broke. This nationwide scandal involved cheating on standardized tests and fabrication of athletic credentials of student applicants to numerous prominent U.S. universities. University admission via a fabricated athletic résumé was typically accompanied by bribery of university athletic officials (coaches or administrators) to enable "side door" admissions. At UCLA, two employees were allegedly involved; the applications for two students were identified as compromised and one of those two students was admitted. Varsity Blues engendered considerable national attention and media coverage [1] and led to the establishment of two separate audits; one of these was carried out in 2019 by the UC’s Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services, and the other was carried out in 2020 by the California State Auditor.

Following Varsity Blues, UCLA faculty learned of questionable practices involving the past admission of student-athletes to UCLA via two articles published in the Los Angeles Times. In April 2019, the Times published details regarding a 2014 compliance report from UCLA Athletics; the report discussed the admission of (at least) two students with limited athletic qualifications, where the admission was coupled to donations made to UCLA [2]. In June 2019 came the revelation of a number of troubling cases of admission of student-athletes to UCLA over a fifteen-year period [3]. These cases involved the friends and relatives of prominent UCLA coaches.

With this background, CUARS determined in Spring Quarter 2019 that a clear need existed for a faculty committee to work with the administration in order to examine all non-standard admission procedures at UCLA and to determine if those procedures are consistent with faculty-set policies. Specifically, the tasks for the Ad Hoc Committee are to:

- understand current admission procedures within Athletics and within schools requiring supplemental material beyond the standard holistic review,
- consider these procedures in the context of admission policies established by the faculty, and
- produce a report for CUARS that summarizes the findings and possibly recommend changes to admission policies or procedures.

The schools whose admission procedures were studied are the School of the Arts and Architecture (SOAA), the Herb Alpert School of Music (HASOM), and the School of Theater, Film and Television (TFT). Along with Athletics, these three schools encompass all talent-based undergraduate admissions at UCLA.
Composition, Charge and Schedule of Committee

The composition and meeting schedule of the Ad Hoc Committee are documented in Appendix I. The committee is comprised of seven faculty members and has the involvement of guests from Enrollment Management, Academic Planning and Budget, and Athletics. Two additional faculty members participate as guests. Appendix I also lists the members of staff from the various schools who assisted in gathering information and answering questions.

The charge of the committee is documented in Appendix II.

*The committee wishes to express its sincere appreciation for the support it received from many UCLA colleagues during the course of its activities.*

Note on the usage of the word "talent"

In this report, the word “talent” is used on a frequent basis. “Talent” indicates a constellation of skills, aptitudes, resilience, and curiosity that might translate into exceptional artistic or athletic ability when nurtured over time. Talent, therefore, does not designate intrinsic qualities of individuals. Instead, it is a shorthand expression to assess demonstrated potential. Talent is always to be assessed in the context of opportunity including, but not limited to, socio-economic conditions and cultural biases.

Acronyms used in the report

CUARS Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools
HASOM Herb Alpert School of Music
IAC Intercollegiate Athletic Committee
PCRF Priority Coding Request Form
PSA Prospective Student-Athlete
SAAC Student-Athlete Admissions Committee
SIS Student Information System
SOAA School of the Arts and Architecture
TFT School of Theater, Film and Television
UA Undergraduate Admission
B. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The vast majority of undergraduate students admitted to UCLA undergo a comprehensive review process known as holistic review. This review encompasses multiple facets of each student's application, including academic achievement and personal characteristics and accomplishments. The policies underlying holistic review have been established by the faculty and the procedures followed by UCLA Undergraduate Admission (UA) are regularly reviewed by the members of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS), who have consistently affirmed the integrity and robustness of the standard review process.

The Ad Hoc Committee (the "Committee") was formed to review policies and procedures for non-standard undergraduate admission to UCLA, where a supplemental application relating to a student's athletic or artistic abilities is considered as part of the admissions process. The Committee looked closely at admissions in three talent-based schools (Arts and Architecture [SOAA], Music [HASOM], and Theater, Film and Television [TFT]) and the admission of student-athletes [Athletics]. Here we present a summary of the data we collected, the practices and procedures that we studied, and the findings and recommendations that we have made.

Summary of Student-Athlete Admissions

In Athletics, admissions for both scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes follow several steps that include assessing athletic talent and academic qualifications. The mechanism and timeline for processing applications of student-athletes do not adhere to the standard UCLA procedures that use the common UC application and holistic review. Academic information is gathered separately and applications are considered on a rolling basis throughout the academic year (although a high percentage of student-athletes are approved for admission in the Fall Quarter).

Admitted student-athletes have, on average, academic achievement that is below the normative standard for undergraduate admission to UCLA. Most of the applicants who are admitted by exception at UCLA are student-athletes. Here, exception relates to the fact that an applicant does not meet the academic requirements for admission, such as the preparatory course requirements, the minimum GPA, or (until recently) the ACT or SAT component.

The admission of student-athletes follows the following steps. First, candidates may submit an application after they have made contact with program coaches, with official visits to campus occurring in the senior year of high school. Secondly, since January 2020 all prospective student-athletes go through two distinct reviews: (1) the Athletics Qualification Review; and (2) the Academic Qualification Review. Thirdly, those applicants who pass through both of these reviews are then assessed by the Student-Athlete Admissions Committee (SAAC). The SAAC's abiding principle is that student-athletes can only be admitted if they are able to succeed academically at UCLA. The SAAC is chaired by the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and its voting members are constituted from senior UA staff and Senate faculty. A newly developed charter for the SAAC was put in place in Fall Quarter 2020.

Summary of Admissions to SOAA, HASOM, and TFT

Each of these talent-based schools maintains a rigorous admissions process that aims to bring the most talented undergraduate students to the UCLA campus. All three schools use standard holistic review in their evaluations, but also require candidates to submit a detailed supplemental application that attempts to encapsulate their creativity and promise in their
chosen discipline as well as evidence of their personal attributes and their intent to pursue a
degree in the arts at UCLA.

Review of applications is carried out in the given disciplines of each school by groups of faculty
and additionally, in some areas, by advanced degree students and alumni. After initial
selections, a reduced set of applicants participates in an audition or interview process.
Subsequently, the final pool of admitted students is selected, guided in part by enrollment
targets that were previously determined. Each school provides a list of recommended admits to
UA, who provide the final approval for admission. A very small number of students
recommended for admission by one of the schools does not receive approval from UA, usually
due to low scores from holistic review. The average holistic scores for students admitted into
the three talent-based schools are lower, on average, than those for students admitted through
the standard review process. That said, very few of the talent-based students to the arts
schools are admitted by exception (i.e., very few are not eligible for UC admission).

In all of these schools, the admissions process involves systems with checks and balances that
uphold fairness in the assessing of applications. For example, each unit uses an auditable IT
platform that stores materials associated with each applicant, as well as all correspondence
between the school and the applicant and between faculty/staff regarding the applicant's review.
There is no evidence for any communication between the development office and the
admissions office in each unit. In a broader context, each school's admissions review process
attends to concerns that applicants may differ in their access to formal training and preparation
relevant to their chosen areas of study. Each school bears in mind an applicant's Eligibility in the
Local Context (ELC), with the aim to admit a diverse cohort of students who bring an optimal
range of skills and talents to UCLA.

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

The Committee concluded that in each of the units considered, Athletics, HASOM, SOAA, and
TFT, there are rigorous procedures in place, with built-in checks and balances. Some of these
procedures were recently instituted in response to the UC and State audits, which, overall, have
had a beneficial impact on undergraduate admissions procedures at UCLA.

Nonetheless, the Committee found a number of shared challenges among the units involved in
non-standard admissions, including the need to establish and document a common set of
principles and procedures used to maintain a fair and equitable review process across units, the
difficulty in balancing talent versus academic qualifications, common vulnerabilities such as
potential influence from donors, and the need for proper documentation of all admissions
activities. The Committee also notes that there are significant differences in the ways in which
admissions are carried out in Athletics vis-à-vis the talent-based schools that specifically relate
to how applicants are evaluated, whether or not evaluation from the UA holistic review is
considered, and the greater allowances that are made for athletes when the applicants do not
meet the normative academic standards for admission. Thus, particularly important is the
balance that each unit strikes in the admissions process between candidates’ specific talents or
exceptional athletic abilities, on the one hand, and their academic qualifications, on the other
hand.

To address some of the key challenges, the Committee identified a range of best practices that
all UCLA units involved in undergraduate admissions should follow. Such best practices include:
(1) making sure that applications are evaluated by multiple reviewers, (2) ensuring that there is
a documented paper trail for each application, including records of all communications between
the various parties (applicant, reviewers, staff, and faculty) involved in the review process, (3)
having suitable controls in place to prevent donor influence, (4) instituting documented procedures for handling conflicts of interest and adhering to those procedures, and (5) developing initiatives that foster diversity, equity and inclusion. Sharing best practices could be achieved through regular meetings or retreats that bring representatives from each of these units together.

The Committee recommends that periodic review of all units involved in special admission of undergraduates at UCLA be carried out by CUARS. The mechanisms for these reviews can be worked out by CUARS but, as a starting point, we strongly recommend that basic admissions data from SAAC/Athletics and from the admissions offices of each of the talent-based schools be reported on an annual basis to CUARS. It is also imperative that admissions units report any violations of policy to CUARS. The Committee recommends that periodic external reviews of units involved in special admission be carried out to confirm that the procedures put in place to safeguard against donor influence, undue conflicts of interest, and dishonesty are working as expected and that the system has not been compromised. A key requirement for successful external reviews is a suitable platform for storing all documentation and communication related to special admissions.

The Committee finds that the newly written SAAC charter provides a good basis for the motivation, organization and operation of the SAAC. We recommend that the faculty members on the SAAC be chosen by the Senate Committee on Committees. It is also essential that the procedures and classifications used to evaluate the academic qualifications of prospective student-athletes be discussed with, and reviewed by, CUARS, who are responsible for establishing the criteria for the admission of undergraduates to UCLA.

The Committee recommends that the University ensure that the units involved in undergraduate admissions have sufficient resources to maintain rigorous and fair admissions processes, and resources that support UCLA’s commitment to academic excellence, freedom from undue influence, and diversity. A crucial component of such processes concerns staffing, given that a robust admissions process is labor-intensive, requiring substantial time and effort from both staff and faculty. The Committee learned that the Student Information System or SIS (the Legacy IT system used in UA) needs attention in regard to maintaining adequate staffing levels, implementing stronger security measures, and providing quarterly meetings with the newly instituted Joint Senate/Administration Committee on Data, IT, and Privacy (CDITP).

Finally, the Committee agreed that stronger collaboration between the admissions offices and faculty affiliated with SOAA, HASOM, and TFT and the administrators of Athletics, UA and Enrollment Management could support the development and promotion of a diverse applicant pool. Steps need to be taken to ensure that admissions in all of these units make optimal use of online systems that provide accessible data that can be aggregated and analyzed for routine reporting. It also vital that the use of online admissions systems foster equity in the process.
C. STANDARD AND NON-STANDARD ADMISSION PROCEDURES AT UCLA

This section introduces the standard undergraduate admissions review process employed at UCLA, known as holistic review. It then covers the non-standard admission procedures carried out in the three talent-based schools and in Athletics.

C1. HOLISTIC REVIEW, SUPPLEMENTAL APPLICATIONS TO TALENT-BASED SCHOOLS AND ATHLETICS AND ADMIT BY EXCEPTION

Virtually all applications for admission to UCLA undergo comprehensive holistic review. The review encompasses several broad areas, including academic achievement and personal characteristics and accomplishments. Academic achievement covers the number of courses taken and the grades awarded, performance on standardized tests and achievement in academic enrichment programs. The review considers courses that an applicant has taken in addition to the fifteen subject-based preparatory requirements (i.e. the A-G requirements). At the same time, reviewers pay close attention to the availability of such additional courses at an applicant’s high school. Applicants who are California residents, who attend a participating high school, and who rank in the top 9% of their high school class are screened for Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC). ELC designation adds value to admissions review as it helps to identify students who are high achieving relative to their peers with access to the same school-level resources.

Besides the academic record of achievement, the holistic review involves the following areas of merit in an application: personal qualities, potential to contribute to the vitality of the campus, and achievement in such fields as leadership, community service, and artistic or intellectual endeavor. Reviewers focus on the opportunities an applicant has taken to develop in both academic and non-academic contexts. Furthermore, the review looks at challenges that an applicant has faced when preparing for admission to college. Much of the personal characteristics and accomplishments can be discerned from the personal insight questions completed by each applicant. Each application is evaluated by at least two reviewers and holistic rank scores from 1.0 to 5.0 are assigned by each reviewer (1.0 is the highest score in rank and 5.0 is the lowest score in rank). Applicants with average holistic scores of 1.0 to 2.0 are admitted to UCLA. A relatively small percentage of students with average scores of 2.5 or lower in rank are admitted to UCLA.

Apart from Athletics, the talent-based schools require candidates to submit the general UC application that undergoes holistic review. The schools in question—Arts and Architecture, Music, and Theater, Film, and Television—also require supplemental applications. The specific nature of the supplemental materials is given in Section C2 below. Each of these schools follows procedures that necessitate close interaction with UCLA’s Office of Undergraduate Admission (UA). For each school, UA reviews the list of applicants that the schools wish to admit on the basis of special talent. For a small number of prospective admits, UA either questions the recommendations or asks for further information from the school’s review team.

In the case of Athletics, the process for admission is different. All applications from both prospective scholarship and non-scholarship student-athletes go through several steps, which take into account an applicant’s athletic ability and academic preparedness for study at UCLA. The admissions process in Athletics relies on coaches to assess athletic potential and to make their recommendations to the Student-Athlete Admissions Committee (SAAC). The SAAC has committee members that include admissions administrators and faculty members drawn from different academic departments across campus. Staff who handle admissions in Athletics also
attend SAAC meetings, although these staff members do not have voting rights. A guiding principle for the SAAC is to admit only student-athletes who can succeed academically at UCLA. Moreover, student-athletes must be certified as eligible with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) before admission is offered. National Letters of Intent or Grant-in-Aid contracts cannot be offered until the SAAC has approved an applicant’s admission.

At UCLA, the Academic Senate’s Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC), which meets twice a quarter, has five faculty voting members, the UCLA Faculty Athletic Representative in a non-voting ex officio capacity, the Associate Athletic Director as a non-voting standing guest, and two student representatives whose votes are recorded separately. The IAC has responsibility for oversight and development of policy recommendations on student-athlete welfare and academic matters relating to the Department of Athletics. Such policy recommendations may relate to admission of student-athletes.

All applicants to UCLA must satisfy three admissions requirements: completion of 15 college-preparatory courses (in categories labeled A-G), with at least 11 finished prior to the beginning of the senior year, an average grade point average (GPA) of 3.0 or better (3.4 or better for non-residents) in these courses, with no grade lower than a C, and completion of the ACT or the SAT by December of the senior year. (Note that the third item will no longer be required starting in 2020). Students who do not satisfy these requirements can be admitted to UCLA only “by exception”. Thus, admit by exception (A/E) describes a different aspect of admissions than non-standard admissions discussed in this report (although there is overlap between the two categories in the case of student-athletes). In the 2019 admissions cycle, there were 122 A/E Freshmen, of which 115 were recruited student-athletes.

C2. NON-STANDARD ADMISSION PROCEDURES IN THREE TALENT-BASED SCHOOLS AND ATHLETICS

This section describes non-standard features of the admissions procedures in these entities at UCLA: the School of the Arts and Architecture, the Herb Alpert School of Music, the School of Theater, Film and Television, and Athletics. In addition to these areas, a supplemental application is required for undergraduate admission in the School of Nursing, which has approximately 50 Freshman admits per year. Supplemental review is carried out in the School of Engineering (approximately 2,500-2,700 admits per year). Both the School of Nursing and the School of Engineering rely heavily on the holistic review scores in their review process. It is also important to point out that the final approval for all admissions decisions at UCLA rests with UA and all official offers of admission are released by UA. Although the admissions activities in Nursing and Engineering were not separately reviewed by this committee, we believe that that findings and recommendations outlined in Sections E and F, respectively, should apply universally to all undergraduate admissions at UCLA.
C2.1 SCHOOL OF THE ARTS AND ARCHITECTURE

Summary of Undergraduate Population

The School of The Arts and Architecture (SOAA) offers five majors: Architectural Studies, Art, Dance, Design/Media Arts, and World Arts And Cultures. The average enrollment in each major is as follows:

- Architectural Studies: 50
- Art: 215
- Dance: 110
- Design/Media Arts: 180
- World Arts and Cultures: 90

The school maintains a steady state of approximately 645 undergraduate students. Each year SOAA offers admission to 180-220 students. Of those, 120-140 are Freshmen and 60-80 are Transfers. Total enrollment in SOAA, including both undergraduate and graduate students, is between 900 and 1000.

For the purposes of their presentation to the Ad Hoc Committee, the SOAA team used data from the Fall 2019 admissions cycle.

The SOAA 2019 Admissions Cycle

There was a total of 2,430 Freshman applications to UCLA that listed a SOAA major as their first choice. The number of applications reviewed by SOAA is smaller than the total number because not all students end up submitting supplemental material. 180 Freshman applicants were offered admission for an admit rate of 7.4%. Table 1 shows the breakdown of the Freshman applications by major. Note that Architectural Studies accepts only transfer applicants. The table also shows the number of Freshman students admitted, the admit rate, the number of students enrolled, and the yield rate for each major. Transfer applications totaled 819, of which 89 were offered admission (admit rate of 10.9%).

Determining Enrollment Targets

In early January, the preparation phase begins: SOAA Student Services provides a list of current enrollments and projected graduations to SOAA Enrollment Management, which then calculates how many new admits are needed. Enrollment Management may make slight adjustments to the targets, taking into consideration current trends within higher education and the arts economy.

In mid-January, SOAA delivers its target recommendations to the individual departments. Consultation takes place, and any needed adjustments are made until mid-February.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>ADMITTED</th>
<th>ADMIT RATE</th>
<th>ENROLLED</th>
<th>YIELD RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Media Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Arts and Cultures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Admission Application Procedure and Timeline

All applicants must complete the general UC application and also submit a supplemental application to their major for direct entry consideration.

On the general UC Application (November 30 deadline), the arts and architecture major must be listed as the applicant’s first choice in order to gain access to the supplemental application.

The supplemental application requires all applicants to submit a questionnaire which determines how the applicant learned about the School of The Arts and Architecture, if the applicant has had any prior contact with faculty, or has taken any classes previously at UCLA. All applicants are also required to submit the following documentation: reporting of current and future coursework, extracurricular activities, honors and/or awards, unofficial transcripts, and UC Personal Insight Questions. For individual department requirements, see below.

The application deadline is December 15 for Dance and World Arts and Cultures. The deadline is January 20 for Architectural Studies, Art, and Design/Media Arts.

In late January, after the UCLA Holistic Review is completed, the individual departments begin their review of supplemental materials. (The Department of Dance begins reviewing files in December, before knowing the holistic review numbers. These numbers are then added to the files in late January). During the third week of February (usually around the 25th), all departments deliver their final admission recommendations, for both Freshmen and Transfers, to UA.

Supplemental Application Requirements and Review Process for Each Major

Architectural Studies

1) Portfolio of Creative Work (3-6 pages PDF)
2) Statement of Intent (500 words): “Please provide a concise statement that describes why you wish to study architecture at UCLA. What interests you in architecture now, and why at UCLA?”

Between 160-180 supplemental applications are reviewed by a committee made of four ladder faculty, split into 2-person teams. Each team reviews half of the applicants, and advances a selected group to a semi-final round. The semi-final and final rounds are then conducted by the entire committee to decide the final list of applicants to be recommended for admission.

Art

1) Portfolio of Creative Work (8-10 images in .jpeg format)
2) Statement of Intent (300 words): “Please provide a concise statement describing your interest, experiences, and influences in art, and your goals for studying art at UCLA.”
3) Optional: Multimedia file

Between 800-900 supplemental applications are reviewed by a committee made of 12 ladder faculty, split into four 3-person teams. Each team reviews one quarter of the applicants, and advances a selected group to a semi-final round. The semi-final and final rounds are then conducted by the entire committee to decide the final list of applicants to be recommended for admission.
Dance

1) Audition (live or video)
2) Statement of Intent (500 words): “The Dance BA integrates composition, training, and improvisation, while challenging students to locate dance politically, culturally, and historically. What experiences or goals do you have that align with this point of view of how art and society intertwine?”
3) Research Paper (6-12 pages, minimum 3 external citations)
4) Optional: Other Evidence of Creativity

Between 180-200 supplemental applications are reviewed by a 10-person committee of ladder faculty, MFA candidates and MFA alumni, split into five 2-person teams. Each team reviews materials and adjudicates auditions (both live and on video) of one-fifth of the applicants, and advances a selected group to a semi-final round. The semi-final and final rounds are then conducted by the entire committee to decide the final list of applicants to be recommended for admission.

Design/Media Arts

1) Self Portrait (1 .jpeg file or 10-second multimedia)
2) Word Project (1 .jpeg file or 10-second multimedia)
3) Creative Influences short response (500 characters of text)
4) Unique Works (5-8 images in .jpeg format)
5) Optional: Multimedia
6) Optional: URL

Between 850-950 supplemental applications are reviewed by 16 faculty, split into 4 four-person teams. All teams review all applications. Any applicant receiving three or more “yes” votes is advanced to a semi-final round. The semi-final and final rounds are then conducted by the entire committee of 16 to decide the final list of applicants to be recommended for admission.

World Arts and Cultures

1) Statement of Intent (500 words): “After reading the department’s mission statement, please explain what makes you an especially well-suited candidate for the BA in World Arts and Cultures. Your response must reflect whether and how you see cultures and arts as tools for expression and social transformation.”
2) Research Paper (6-12 pages, minimum 3 external citations)
3) Optional: Other Evidence of Creativity
4) Optional: Letters of Support (2)

Between 65-85 supplemental applications are reviewed by an 8-person committee of ladder faculty, Ph.D. candidates, and Ph.D. alumni, split into 4 two-person teams. All teams review all applicants. The final list of applicants to be recommended for admission is compiled by the entire committee and the undergraduate review chair.

Determining Factors in Admission Recommendations

The primary factors for the decision to recommend an applicant for admission to the School of the Arts and Architecture are evidence of artistic skill and investment in creative practice. Other factors include an applicant’s curiosity, engagement in active questioning and inquiry, capacity
for reflective analysis, evidence of risk taking, open-mindedness, spontaneity, imagination, intuition, problem-solving, and the ability to accommodate the unexpected.

**Holistic Review**

The average SOAA holistic rank for Freshmen who are recommended for admission is 3.5. Broken down by department, the percentages of applicants recommended for admission who had a holistic score lower than 4.0 are as follows:

- Architectural Studies: N/A (transfers only)
- Art: 55%
- Dance: 59%
- Design/Media Arts: 45%
- World Arts and Cultures: 42%

**Admissions Flags**

Admission flags for domestic freshman applicants are a low GPA (below 3.0 for California residents; below 3.4 for out-of-state or international) and low scores on standardized tests (below 500 SAT subscore, below 20 ACT subscore). For international applicants, a low TOEFL score (below 86) would merit an admissions flag.

Being flagged is not necessarily a disqualifier, but alerts the faculty that there may be additional advocacy required if they are interested in the candidate. If that is the case, the department will contact Enrollment Management who can explore reasonable advocacy options. If a candidate is not able to be admitted by UA, it is typically because of a reason that becomes evident mid-cycle, after the recommendations are sent to UA: for example, an International Baccalaureate student who surfaces with lower scores than predicted, or a transfer student who is missing required academic coursework.

In the 2019-2020 admission cycle, a total of 6 students (3 Freshman and 3 transfers) were proposed for admission by SOAA but not admitted by UA.

**Checks and Balances**

SOAA is intentional about creating a robust admissions process with the highest levels of accountability. The enrollment management staff in SOAA are active in professional development, making consistent and regular efforts to ensure ethical standards in the admissions process. They engage in a yearly feedback and approval loop with UA, and actively apply anti-bias measures to their admissions operations.

**Relationship of Admissions to Donors**

SOAA stated that the admission process, both at the School and Departmental level, has no relation to donor gifts. Development is not involved with admissions in any way. All of the departments and reviewers of undergraduate applicants are reminded of UC Regent Policy 2202. If any individual in the admission process knows of a donor connection regarding any applicant, they are obliged to disclose it.
**Diversity**

Admission to collegiate arts programs is often skewed toward the privileged applicants who have had access to high-level training. Many arts programs across the country, via their portfolio or audition requirements, implicitly require applicants to have had formal arts instruction in order to be competitive candidates for admission. The review process and application requirements at the UCLA School of the Arts and Architecture are designed to be welcoming to students from a wide variety of backgrounds, including those without formal arts training.

**Questions**

The committee had two questions for the SOAA team following their presentation. Those questions, and the responses, are below.

Q1: What systems are used to track applicants and what documentation is kept?

Response: SOAA uses a homegrown system, nicknamed “SAS” (Supplemental Application System) to collect and manage student supplemental material. Having a homegrown system not only allows us to coordinate seamlessly with data downloads from UA, but also ensures comprehensive protection of student data since all of the programming, operations, and customer service are done entirely in-house by SOAA Enrollment Management and IT. The system design is modeled after popular third party software, such as SlideRoom and Acceptd.

SOAA retains student records as well as departmental review content (i.e. faculty scoring and comments (if any), video of live auditions, correspondence between UA and the school/department regarding eligibility, etc.) for at least five years if not in perpetuity. A single email address is used to collect all correspondence with applicants. This correspondence is also archived.

Q2: SOAA currently does not capture donor history, historically there has not been a need to capture the information. The committee asked whether as a best practice SOAA could identify a way to capture and cross check donor history.

Response: In addition to the now-required special talent attestation form that obliges members of SOAA admission committees to formally declare any conflicts of interest and knowledge of donor relationships, SOAA enrollment management will:

1) Continue the practice that reviewers recuse themselves if they know/have knowledge of an applicant and focus the review only on student submitted materials to ensure equity.

2) Separately, coordinate with SOAA development to identify applicants with donor histories and cross-check students recommended for admission/waitlist with faculty attestation information.
C2.2 SCHOOL OF MUSIC

Summary of Undergraduate population

The Herb Alpert School of Music (HASOM), established in 2016, hosts the Department of Music, the Department of Ethnomusicology and the Department of Musicology, as well as an Interdepartmental Program (IDP) in Global Jazz Studies. It is the first school of music to be established in the UC system. Prior to its establishment in 2016, the Departments of Music and Ethnomusicology were housed in The School of the Arts and Architecture, and the Department of Musicology was housed in the Humanities. The IDP in Global Jazz Studies was formed in 2019. A new major in Music History and Industry (MHI) has not yet had its own admissions season, but joined the Department of Musicology this past year.

Current majors

Department of Music: Music Composition, Music Performance (BA and BM), Music Education

Department of Ethnomusicology: Ethnomusicology

Department of Musicology: Musicology, Music History and Industry

IDP Global Jazz Studies: Global Jazz Studies

The past four years have seen significant structural shifts for HASOM as it develops its programs. The Music Performance major is phasing out the Bachelors of Arts (BA) program in favor of a Bachelors of Music (BM), but currently contains both BA and BM students. As mentioned above, the Music History and Industry degree began enrolling students in Fall 2019 and incorporated some Musicology majors who were permitted to shift into the MHI degree. Currently HASOM's three departments house eight, soon to be seven undergraduate majors as listed above.

In Fall 2019, enrollments in the majors were as follows:

Music Composition BA, 8; Music Performance, a combination of BA and BM degrees, 184; Music Education BA, 32; Ethnomusicology BA, 56; Musicology BA, 18; Music History and Industry BA, 18; Global Jazz Studies BA, 33.

Total majors (Fall 2019): 349.

UG admission numbers

Undergraduate enrollment for the school has been relatively steady between 2017 and 2019, with an average combined freshmen and transfer enrollments of 99. The anticipated combined enrollment for Fall 2020 is 140, an increase of 41% from the previous years. This planned increase in enrollment for Fall 2020 (possibly complicated due to COVID 19) is a result of renewed resources and a planned expansion for the Ethnomusicology, Global Jazz Studies and Musicology majors.

Table 2 provides quantitative information for the numbers of applicant students, admitted students and enrolled students for each of the majors in HASOM for the 2018-19 admission cycle.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>ADMITTED</th>
<th>ADMIT RATE</th>
<th>ENROLLED</th>
<th>YIELD RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music majors: Freshmen</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music majors: Transfers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Education majors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Ethnomusicology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnomusicology majors: Freshmen</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnomusicology majors: Transfers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Musicology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology majors: Freshmen</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology majors: Transfers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interdepartmental Program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Jazz Studies majors: Freshmen</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Jazz Studies majors: Transfers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Undergraduate Demographic Data (20-21)

See Appendix III.

Admission by Exception

Of the admits listed above, there were 33 first years who were proposed for admission, but who needed further review by UA. Of these, 30 were not accepted, and 3 were admitted by exception.

Similarly, HASOM asked UA to consider 14 transfer applicants whose academic record required further review. None of these students were admitted by exception.

School-wide UG admission application timelines and deadlines

Operating within UCLA’s admissions calendar, applications open on August 31. In early November, the HASOM Office for Student Affairs (OSA) consults with department leadership to finalize enrollment targets, based on prior years’ data analysis and goals for the school. The supplementary application for HASOM, using Acceptd, opens on November 30, the day the UC application closes. With two weeks for students to complete and upload their supplementary information, Acceptd closes on December 12. Students have access to the Supplementary application beginning in August each year. Between December 12 and 19, Department leadership sends their preliminary ranked lists to the OSA. Based on the ranked lists from faculty and department chairs, on December 20, the OSA notifies students via email as to whether they are invited for on-campus auditions. Auditions are scheduled between late January and early February. By mid-February Department leadership, area heads and studio faculty who have participated in auditions send their final ranked list to OSA who in turn submits the list of freshmen and transfers to UA and faculty complete attestation forms. Completing the process, in mid-March first year students receive their decision notifications. Transfer applicants receive their decisions in late April.

Enrollment Targets and Application Review process

Each department has a different review process that reflects the essential objectives associated with each major. One example of the different procedural approaches detailed below are the requirements for references. Programs with foci in musicianship have required as many as three outside evaluations from private or school music instructors.

As HASOM seeks to cohere multiple programs that have previously functioned somewhat independently, it will work towards a more standardized and reduced requirement for references.

In THE DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC, applications are considered for three different majors: Music Performance, Music Composition, and Music Education. Students are initially pre-screened based upon musical talent and a general review of their applications including their personal statements and unofficial transcripts.

For the Music Performance major, once the Chair and Vice-Chair identify enrollment numbers (calculated from the perspective of preferred studio sizes, faculty teaching loads and other resources) studio instructors and area heads begin pre-screening processes. Depending upon students’ concentration (i.e. instrument), the Chair, the area head (i.e. woodwind/brass/percussion, etc.) and (a) studio instructor(s) (a minimum of 3 reviewers per student)
consider the student’s application, either communicating via email or on occasion meeting together. The pre-screening review includes a personal statement, a performance resume, and unofficial transcripts, but most importantly considers uploaded unedited musical performance videos selected by the student from a list of faculty-approved repertoire for specific instruments. Pre-screening video applications also include a presentation of technique in the form of scales, arpeggios and etudes. Students selected from the pre-screening review are then invited to campus for auditions in which they are asked to perform standard repertoire, “pieces generally required by most—if not all—competitive music programs across the country.” All requirements are listed clearly on the application website: https://schoolofmusic.ucla.edu/admissions/undergraduate/music-performance.

Following auditions, the Music Chair and Vice-Chair consider the ranked list of applicants alongside the UCLA holistic review, academic materials, and supplementary application responses in order to make final decisions.

The Music Education major follows the same process as the Music Performance Major, but pre-screening includes the Music department chair, the area head and studio instructors plus two Music Education faculty. Student applications are similar to those of Music Performance applicants however their personal statement requirement is different.

Supplementary materials for the Music Performance BM and Music Education major include:

- Applicant Information
- Application Questions: How did you learn about the program? Schools attended? Courses in progress? Awards/Honors/Internships/Activities/Experience
- Personal Statement
- Unofficial Transcripts
- Performance Resume (Optional)
- 3 Letters of Recommendation (Requirement varies by instrument)
- Pre-screening (repertory requirements vary by instrument)

Determining factors for a successful application in the Music Performance BM and Music Education majors:

- the ideal number of students in a particular area (studio teaching budgets and instrumentation of ensembles)
- the quality of an applicant’s musicianship (i.e. existing “talent” or potentiality)
- ability to access not only the curriculum for the music major, but also School and University requirements.

The Music Composition major requires an interview, but does not require an audition.

Supplementary materials for the Music Composition major include:

- Applicant Information
- Application Questions: How did you learn about the program? Schools attended? Courses in progress? Awards/Honors/Internships/Activities/Experience
- Personal Statement
The DEPARTMENT OF ETHNOMUSICOLOGY’s Ethnomusicology major does not engage in pre-screening. The department chair and the department’s Director of Undergraduate Studies confer about enrollment numbers. All applicants are invited to an in-person interview where a minimum of two faculty members are present. The department strives to have the same two faculty members review files and interviews (by video, or in person) in order to rank applicants, however, it has been the case that interviewers and final reviewers are not always the same. The department strives for consistency regarding reviewers. It is also working on ensuring that evaluation forms are kept and archived. In the final stage of selection, the process is then returned to the Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies to make final decisions alongside the holistic review.

In addition to the UC application, the supplemental materials for the Ethnomusicology major include:

- Applicant Information
- Application Questions: How did you learn about the program? Schools attended? Courses in progress? Awards/Honors/Internships/Activities/Experience
- Personal Statement
- Unofficial Transcripts
- Performance Resume (Optional)

Determining factors for a successful application:

The potential for scholarly study of music. Aptitude on an instrument is not a central concern.

The DEPARTMENT OF MUSICOLOGY’s Musicology major, like Ethnomusicology, does not have an audition. The Department Chair, Vice-Chair, and Director of Undergraduate Studies are consulted regarding enrollment. A pre-screening process undertaken by these three faculty members renders a Yes/No/Maybe list based on the quality of the applicants’ writing, potential scholarship, and academic histories. Those applicants who do not have a majority “no” vote are invited to interview in person. The Chair, Vice-Chair and DUGS interview candidates and together consider their notes alongside the holistic review in order to finalize their decisions.

Determining factors for a successful application:

The potential for scholarly study of music.

Supplemental materials for the Musicology major and History and Industry major include:

- Applicant Information
- Application Questions: How did you learn about the program? Schools attended? Courses in progress? Awards/Honors/Internships/Activities/Experience
- Personal Statement
- Unofficial Transcripts
- Writing sample (Optional)
The IDP **GLOBAL JAZZ STUDIES**’ enrollment numbers are determined by the IDP Chair and the Vice-Chair. All studio instructors, which in documented cases are as many as four instructors, are involved in the pre-screening process which includes student proficiency on their chosen instrument. This culminates in a Yes/No/Maybe list. Applicants who do not have a majority “no” votes are invited to audition in person. A faculty committee (7 persons, last year) review files, auditions and gives recommendations using evaluations. Criteria for evaluation are not listed as objective categories, but based on a review of recent audition forms, faculty reference rhythmic clarity, tone, technique, and improvisational skill among other qualities. The IDP Chair and Vice-Chair make final decisions alongside the holistic review.

**Determining factors for a successful application include:**

- the ideal number of students in a particular area (how many flutists are needed to staff the necessary studios)
- the quality of an applicant’s musicianship (i.e. existing talent or potentiality for gaining musical skill)
- ability to access not only the curriculum for the IDP, but also School and University requirements.

**Supplemental materials for the Global Jazz Studies major includes:**

- Applicant Information
- Application Questions: How did you learn about the program? Schools attended? Courses in progress? Awards/Honors/Internships/Activities/Experience
- Personal Statement
- Unofficial Transcripts
- Performance Resume (Optional)
- 2 Pre-Screening Videos (selected from a list of standards provided; accompaniment preferred)

**Interview Questions for Each Major**

(See Appendix IV).

**Holistic Review**

Holistic scores for enrolled HASOM students averaged 3.4 over the past two years. In the 2019-20 admissions cycle Holistic Score Averaged, by major program:

- Musicology: 3.4
- Music Composition: 2.7
- Music Education: 3.1
- Music Performance: 3.5
- Global Jazz Studies: 3.5
- Ethnomusicology: 3.3
The school looks for students with well-rounded academic abilities and interests in addition to specialized abilities, however it also cautions that the holistic score does not fully address the systemic discrepancies between high school music programs. Nor does it account for the time commitment required of practicing an instrument which can preclude participation in outside activities.

Checks and Balances

Donors

HASOM indicates that there is no interaction with donors with regards to the admissions process. No special treatments have been given, however donor histories are not as yet captured. There has been no donor-related conflict of interest cases known to the current enrollment team.

Documentation

All application information for the supplemental application is housed in Acceptd. HASOM's Enrollment Management were not able to give specific information about documentation, however the school indicates that its archives consist of emails between faculty and applicants as well as hard copies of evaluation forms. Attestation forms indicating a lack of prior relationship with applicants, were begun this past (2019-2020) academic year and are also digitally archived. The school also indicates that important email messages are checked over by undergraduate admissions.

Diversity

In a review of HASOM’s admissions, it was stated, “musical study at the higher education level often necessitates strong musical experience and training. Access to musical study prior to university is not always widespread, and we are aware this means that there is an inherent barrier to musical study at UCLA and any other major institution boasting a competitive music program. Until access to music education is widespread (through funding and curricular reform at the state and federal level) and not a product of more affluent communities across our country, we can never fully erase this systemic issue.”

A young person’s access to the arts, to prior training, and to opportunities for practice is contingent upon many variables during their high school years. Most significant, education and economic security are significant contributors to a teenager’s ability to develop musical proficiency. While formal education strategies are of tremendous importance in young musician’s development, there are also communities where players develop in association with other musicians, and/or are self-taught. Ensuring that these musicians know that it is realistic to continue their development in programs within HASOM is another strategy for building diversity.

Proactive strategies for diversifying HASOM’s student body are needed to ensure that under-represented students have access to music/performance studies. A recruitment plan that will make connections in underserved communities via community colleges and other schools without music programs is already being considered. Requirements for multiple recommendation letters is also being reconsidered, as the gathering of these letters may discourage self-taught musicians and favor more affluent students whose families can afford to attend schools with music programs and/or hire private instructors.
Additionally, HASOM’s expansion of their Global Jazz Studies and Ethnomusicology will challenge a pre-existing emphasis on Euro-American musical performance and composition, which may encourage the development of a more diverse student body.

HASOM’s commitment to hands-on, in-person interviews/auditions allow faculty to consider (legally mandated methods of) diversity in their decision making. In this way, faculty panels (within current legal guidelines) may proactively work to ensure a more diverse student body.

Conclusion

At this point, HASOM, which is now in its fifth year as a school, and approaching a third year with its inaugural dean, is still growing and cohering, shedding old skin and growing new identities.

The school cites its strengths as continuously matriculating a class of talented and bright students, a process entirely protected from donor influence, the use of a strong supplementary application platform Acceptd, and an application process that is fair and positive for all involved.

Areas that the school wishes to develop include a more unified approach to admissions with more standardized evaluations, a better ability to flag academic eligibility issues, better archiving of faculty evaluations and records from reviews and auditions, and better faculty-wide training on admissions processes and procedures.

C2.3 SCHOOL OF THEATER, FILM AND TELEVISION

Summary of Undergraduate Population

Theater, Film and Television (TFT) is a compact school of 350 undergraduates taking classes in two departments. Both the Department of Film, Television and Digital Media (FTVDM) and the Department of Theater offer a major and minor. In the 2019-2020 academic session, FTVDM had 85 students enrolled in the major and 246 students in the minor. By comparison, Theater had 258 majors and 43 minors. FTVDM has 22 faculty members and 101 adjuncts and lecturers. The Department of Theater has 18 faculty members and 83 adjuncts and lecturers.

The 2019 Admissions Cycle

In 2019, TFT received 3,272 Freshman applications to its undergraduate programs. There were 118 admits (a 3.6% admit rate). The number of Freshman applications to TFT has been growing steadily over the past few years. In 2019, 86 Freshmen were enrolled for a yield rate of 72.9%, which is considerably higher than the overall UCLA yield rate of 43%. For the same cycle, TFT received 983 transfer applications. The number of transfer admits was 26 (2.6% admit rate) and 23 transfer students were enrolled (88.5% yield rate). Table 3 shows the breakdown of the Freshman and transfer applications by major for 2019.
Table 3. Admissions statistics by major for the School of Theater, Film and Television (Fall 2019 cycle)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>APPLICANTS</th>
<th>ADMITTED</th>
<th>ADMIT RATE</th>
<th>ENROLLED</th>
<th>YIELD RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Film, Television and Digital Media (FTVDM)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTVDM majors: <strong>Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTVDM majors: <strong>Transfers</strong></td>
<td>680</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Theater</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater majors: <strong>Freshmen</strong></td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater majors: <strong>Transfers</strong></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Determining Enrollment Targets

FTVDM has targets of 15 Freshmen and 15 transfers in its major. By comparison, Theater has targets of 68 Freshmen and 11 transfers in its major. Applicants to Theater must apply to one of four distinct emphases: acting; musical theater; design and production; and integrated studies. The department has rough targets for the numbers of students enrolled in each concentration: 16 in acting; 16 in musical theater; 12-15 in production and design; and the rest in integrated studies. In the School at a whole, the ratio of freshman to transfer students is 86 to 23 (3.7:1.0). In FTVDM, the transfer ratio target is 1 to 1.

Undergraduate Admission Application Procedure and Timeline

TFT continually posts instructions and guidelines for past applications so prospective students and applicants can view what the School has requested in the past. The School does not change the dates for the following year until a few months before the application period starts.

The School has deadlines for supplemental applications: December 7 for FTVDM Freshmen and January 11 for FTVDM Transfers, and December 7 for both freshmen and transfer applications to Theater. If, in any given year, those dates land on a weekend or holiday, they are moved to the next working day, to ensure that questions and technological problems can be dealt with on the deadline day.

Applications to TFT are reviewed on a rolling basis. There are several stages in the review process in FTVDM and in Theater. These review processes aim to be rigorous, comprehensive, and inclusive. The review processes, however, are different for each department. The specific procedures for each department are given below.
No donor information is requested at this stage of review.

In recent years, TFT has moved from paper supplemental applications to ones submitted through the online Acceptd platform, which is created specifically for arts-based schools. There are, in particular, three functionalities that the Acceptd platform that provide excellent support for TFT’s admissions process. First, Acceptd makes scheduling and interview auditions straightforward, since it places responsibility in the hands of the applicant. Secondly, Acceptd facilitates all messaging to applicants. The platform therefore provides all administrators with the up-to-date information that has been given to applicants. Thirdly, Acceptd’s support team is able to make any custom changes to the system as needed.

Supplemental Application Requirements and Review Process for Each Major

For admission to FTVDM, applicants submit a UC application and a supplementary application. The supplementary application concentrates on an applicant’s storytelling ability. The purpose is to determine an applicant’s artistic merit and ability to work collaboratively in a cohort. Applicants do not submit films, since it is crucial that those students who attend high schools without film programs are not negatively impacted. The supplemental application provides space for students to demonstrate their collaborative skills. In the supplemental applications, freshmen are required to submit three writing samples and transfers four writing samples, in addition to two letters of recommendation and unofficial transcripts.

Freshman applicants to FTVDM are expected to have a minimum 3.0 GPA is they are California residents and a 3.4 GPA if they are non-residents or be an Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) student at the time of application. There are similar expectations for applicants to Theater.

Application Review Process: TFT Stage 1

Stage 1: Once an application is received in TFT, staff members in Student Services check it for completeness, eligibility, and accuracy. If the staff find any information to be missing or in need of clarification, applicants are given the opportunity to correct the application within a given timeframe. Usually, applicants can insert missing information within five business days of notification. If, in light of these discussions, any applicant has not completed the supplemental application, the candidate will not be advanced to the review stage.

Once the staff in TFT Student Services have determined that an application is complete, it moves to Application Review Stage 2 in FTVDM and in Theater. At this initial stage of review, applicants’ names are not listed in advance to the reviewers.

Application Review Process: FTVDM Stages 2, 3, 4 and 5

In FTVDM, stage 2 of the process involves Department alumni and current PhD candidates reviewing applications. At this initial stage, FTVDM requires at least two reviewers. The names of applicants to FTVDM are not shown in searches or on top of the sheet of the Acceptd application. By removing the name at the top for reviewers, they cannot easily search or identify a student initially. Names, however, can be located inside. The two reviewers provide a star rating (5 is highest, 1 is lowest) to each application. Each reviewer cannot see the other reviewer’s rating. The most highly rated applications move to stage 3.

Stage 3 is a faculty review of the most highly rated applications. This review of the top applications focuses on selecting those candidates who have demonstrated evidence of a
diversity of interests and life experiences. Approximately double the number of the enrollment target are selected for stage 4—the interview stage. In 2019, 35 applicants were offered interviews for the 15 places available.

At stage 4, the applicants are interviewed by two faculty members and one of the application readers. Interviews are conducted through Skype. Holistic scores are at this point added to freshmen applications.

All of the applicants who have been interviewed at stage 4 are forwarded for stage 5 review by FTVDM’s Undergraduate Admission Sub-Committee. The members of the sub-committee include the Vice-Chair of Undergraduate Studies, faculty from the department’s Undergraduate Committee, and reviewers of the applications. The decisions are then forwarded the Chair of FTVDM for review and approval. Thereafter, the list of admits and waitlisted students are submitted to UA by the specified deadline.

If the Office determines that any of the applicants do not meet the University of California’s standards for entry, the departmental sub-committee will decide whether to argue in favor of the applicant or move to a waitlisted candidate. Once these discussions are completed, the confirmed lists of admits and waitlisted students is submitted to UA. TFT confirms the final lists. UA then informs all applicants of their status.

Application Review Process: Theater Stages 2, 3, and 4

In Theater, stage 2 involves offering in-person interviews and auditions. There is a ceiling of 800 spots. The Department of Theater is mindful that it can only admit transfer students to the emphases in acting and in musical theater if there has been any attrition from the freshmen previously enrolled in these areas. When offering interviews and auditions, the department gives priority to applicants with the highest GPAs. Test scores are then given consideration, together with relevant coursework materials. All eligible ELC applicants are invited to interview. In January and February, interviews are held at four different locations: Los Angeles; San Francisco; Chicago; and New York City. If an applicant lives more than 200 miles from the closest interview location, the applicant can request either to submit a video audition or have an online interview and audition.

Stage 3 is the interview stage. A faculty member asks each applicant four to five questions that have been agreed upon by the Vice-Chair of Undergraduate Studies and the tenured and tenure-track faculty members. Applicants are scored from 1 to 4, with 4 the highest score. Applicants to each of the four emphases in the department have to complete specific activities.

Acting applicants complete three exercises with a faculty member in acting: (1) a five-minute interview, (2) two monologues (each 90 seconds or less) including a piece in verse and a piece from a contemporary play, and (3) a guided movement exercise. The faculty member completes the evaluation at the time of the interview and audition. The movement exercise provides applicants with the opportunity to receive additional points.

Musical theater applicants complete four exercises with faculty members in this area: (1) a five-minute interview, (2) two monologues (same as those for acting applicants), (3) a dance combination taught by a professional choreographer, which is performed in front of a panel of 3-5 faculty members, and (4) a singing audition that includes 16-32 bars from an up-tempo song from the musical theater canon and 16 bars from a musical theater ballad.
For design and production, a faculty member reviews and discusses an applicant’s portfolio for fifteen minutes. By comparison, applicants to integrated studies discuss their goals and aspirations as a student learning about theater in a university setting. This interview lasts for fifteen minutes.

Stage 4 of the application process involves faculty reviewing the results of the interviews and auditions. Applications are ranked in order by each emphasis of study. Faculty take into consideration different factors, including UC ranking, grades in arts and humanities courses, SAT/ACT scores, GPA, and holistic scores. Once the faculty has made its decisions, the list of admits and waitlisted applicants is submitted to the Vice-Chair of Undergraduate Studies. The process that follows is the same as in FTVDM.

Holistic Review

The average holistic score for 2019 admits was 3.48. This score is weighted heavily on standardized tests and GPA, although artistic merit and creativity are also considered vital to students joining TFT.

Checks and Balances

Most years, UA raises concerns that relate to a handful of the applicants that TFT wishes to admit to its programs. In Fall 2019, three students recommended by TFT were ultimately not offered admission due to review by UA.

At present, no donor information is requested or added to any of the processes or systems. TFT also ensures that the School’s Development Office has no involvement in the admissions process. If a member of TFT’s leadership asks about an applicant, Student Services only discloses whether a student has or has not applied.

Possible Developments in TFT Admissions

The School of Theater, Film and Television remains committed to diversity, equity, and inclusion in the admissions process. Particularly significant is the attention paid to ensuring that interviews are offered to ELC (Eligible in the Local Context) applicants. In FTVDM, the supplemental application includes a life challenge question. The Department of Theater is considering moving away from in-person interviews and auditions to reduce access barriers. TFT wishes to expand its recruitment and outreach plans by focusing on community colleges and public K-12 magnet schools in California.

C2.4 ATHLETICS

Summary of Athletics Department, Programs, and Size

The UCLA Athletics Department has 21 varsity athletics programs, including 9 men’s sports and 12 women’s sports. In academic year 2019-20, 547 student athletes were listed on the rosters of these 21 teams. Individual programs range in size from 9 (Women’s Tennis and Golf) to 117 (Football) with an average roster size of 27.3 student-athletes. Upper limits on roster size are determined by the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) by sport. The number of scholarships that NCAA Division I members may award in each sport is also regulated by the NCAA. Student-athletes matriculate into any number of academic units and programs on campus.
Athletics Admissions Statistics

Varsity student-athletes are admitted to UCLA in a variety of ways including as recruited athletes, with and without scholarships, and through regular admissions channels through the College or Schools. Admissions data described in this report generally reflect recruited athletes who go through the Athletics admissions process, but data are not disaggregated by scholarship and non-scholarship recruited student-athletes. Overall, recruited athletes make up the vast majority of student-athlete admissions (97% and 93% in 2017 and 2018, respectively). Enrollment targets were not discussed by the Athletics Department in describing the athletics admissions process. Information on roster management may be useful to understand how admissions numbers are determined year-to-year and across sports programs.

Count data on student-athlete admissions by sport are presented in Table 4 based on data provided for 2017 and 2018. First, data were drawn from source documents 2-10 through 2-13 describing approval decisions of the Student Athlete Admissions Committee (SAAC) of prospective student athletes presented to the committee. These documents show that 281 and 299 prospects were approved for admission by SAAC in 2017 and 2018, respectively. Virtually all prospective student-athletes presented to the SAAC are admitted. Specifically, 281 (97.9%) of the 287 prospective student-athletes presented to SAAC in 2017 were approved for admission. In 2018, 299 (97.7%) of the 306 prospective student-athletes were approved for admission. The Senior Associate Athletics Director explained to CUARS and the Ad Hoc Committee that prospective student-athletes are vetted by athletics staff prior to presentation at SAAC to include only those prospects who they believe are prepared academically for the rigors of UCLA academics. Data are not available on the numbers of prospective student-athletes who were advanced by coaches for potential consideration by SAAC. We requested data on official and unofficial visits of prospective student-athletes in an attempt to understand the broader pool of recruits considered in these years. In 2017-18, there were 257 official and 343 unofficial visits arranged for prospects. In 2018-19, there were 315 official and 124 unofficial visits facilitated. However, it is doubtful that these figures offer a reasonable proxy for the pool of prospects advanced by coaches in these years.

Second, data from UA were provided in source documents 2-43 and 2-44. These data reveal that 178 and 214 student-athletes were subsequently offered admission to UCLA in 2017 and 2018, respectively. Based on these tables, 92% of 178 student-athletes were admitted as freshmen in 2017, and 89% of 214 student-athletes admitted in 2018 were freshman. As such, transfer student-athletes represented between 8 and 11% of athletics admissions in these years. Comparing across the two data sources from SAAC and UA, it is apparent that not all student athletes approved for admission by SAAC are subsequently offered official admission to UCLA. This attrition is likely accounted for by the student athletes approved for admission by SAAC who subsequently declare their intent to commit to another institution before a formal offer of admission is made. In 2017, 178 out of the 281 prospective student athletes approved by the SAAC were offered admission. In 2018, 214 out of the 299 prospective student athletes approved by the SAAC were offered admission.

Finally, it is possible to enumerate the numbers of students who ultimately enrolled at UCLA. In 2017, of the 178 prospective student-athletes offered admission, 171 were ultimately enrolled. In 2018, 214 prospective student-athletes were offered admission and 207 enrolled.
Table 4. Student-athlete admissions summary by sport, 2017 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19-20 Roster Count&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAAC&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>UA&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Baseball</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Men's Basketball</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Women's Basketball</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Football</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Men's Golf</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Women's Golf</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Men's Soccer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Women's Soccer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Men's Tennis</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Women's Tennis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Men's Track &amp; Field/X-Ctry</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Women's Track &amp; Field/X-Ctry</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Men's Volleyball</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Women's Volleyball</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Men's Water Polo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Women's Water Polo</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Women's Beach Volleyball</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Women's Gymnastics</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Women's Rowing</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Softball</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Women's Swimming &amp; Diving</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>547</strong></td>
<td><strong>281</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAAC Approval Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>281/287 (97.9%)</th>
<th>299/306 (97.7%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Yield of Approved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>171/281 (60.9%)</th>
<th>207/299 (69.2%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Yield of Admitted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>171/178 (96.1%)</th>
<th>207/214 (96.7%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> From team rosters available at uclabruins.com, extracted on 05/29/20.

<sup>b</sup> From SAAC 2017 and 2018 Data Tables 2-10 through 2-13.

<sup>c</sup> From Undergraduate Admission 2017 and 2018 Data Tables 2-43 and 2-44 FR Athletes by Sport (these tables aggregate counts across Men’s and Women’s programs; Women’s Beach Volleyball admit and enrolled counts were combined with Volleyball; counts in this table aggregate across Freshman and Transfer, Admitted by Exception and Regular Admit).
As noted in the description of the Academic Qualification Review below, prospective student-athletes include those who are UC-eligible for admission and Admit by Exception (not UC-eligible). Information was provided on the numbers of students reviewed by SAAC and admitted by UA by UC-eligible versus Admit by Exception status. In 2017, SAAC approved 131 (46.6%) UC-eligible and 150 (53.4%) Admit by Exception prospective student-athletes, and in 2018, SAAC approved 101 (33.8%) UC-eligible and 198 (66.2%) Admit by Exception prospective student-athletes. In 2017, admission was offered to 74 (41.6%) UC-eligible and 104 (58.4%) Admit by Exception prospective student-athletes, and in 2018, admission was offered to 78 (36.4%) UC-eligible and 136 (63.6%) Admit by Exception student-athletes.

Among prospective student-athletes, their qualifications indicate varying levels of academic risk (minimal risk [P1], low risk [P2], some risk [P3], and high risk [P4], see below for details). Data are not available on rates of SAAC approval as a function of levels of academic risk. However, data were provided for the evaluation categories of admitted student-athletes in 2017 and 2018 (see Table 5). These data indicate that 31%-35% of admitted students were UC-eligible [P1], 39-43% were evaluated as low risk [P2], 6-9% were evaluated as having some risk [P3], 6% were evaluated as high risk academically [P4], and 11-13% of student athletes were transfer students from 2-year or 4-year colleges. Note that Table 5 does not include a small number of student-athletes (5 in 2017 and 16 in 2018) who were admitted through the standard holistic review process and not through the SAAC review.

Student Athlete Admission Process: Timetable, Recruitment and Application Review

**Timetable**

The timeline and process of athletics admissions differs greatly from academic programs in the College and Schools at UCLA. Prospective student-athletes are not required to complete the UC online Fall admissions application by the standard November 30 deadline. Late applications are authorized for those who miss the November Fall application deadline and for Winter and Spring admits. Thus, the Athletics admissions process does not rely on the holistic review scores generated by UA in December-January. Athletics admissions are rolling and the SAAC approval timelines do not conform to the campus timeline for UA. The SAAC appears to make most approvals of admission in the Fall (92.3% in 2017, 92.8% in 2018) but some cases are also approved for admission in the Winter and Spring quarters. For scholarship prospective student-athletes, National Letter of Intent day for most sports involves verbal commitments to the institution in November. However, official admit letters are released according to UCLA’s standard notification timelines (March for freshman, April for transfers). Admitted student-athletes are expected to submit the Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) by the standard deadline in May.

**Recruitment process**

For prospective student-athletes, the timeline for recruitment processes are governed by NCAA regulations. Program coaches may begin identifying prospects even prior to their high school years and attend youth tournaments, competitions and showcases to evaluate student-athletes without contacting them. Unofficial campus visits may be facilitated by coaching staff for high school sophomores. Direct correspondence with prospective student-athletes can commence the summer between the sophomore and junior high school years. For high school juniors, coaching staff can have contact with prospects off-campus (e.g., at their high school competitions), and official campus visits are facilitated. A second official visit can happen during senior year.
Table 5. Admitted student-athletes by academic qualification evaluation category (P1-P4) for Freshmen admits, for 2017 and 2018. Transfer admits are also given (summed over the evaluation categories).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>W/S</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 Admits</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67 35%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 Admits</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74 39%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 Admits</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4 Admits</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11 6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21 11%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The numbers of total admits are slightly higher than Table 4 above. These numbers include graduate student-athlete admits.

**Athletics Admissions Review Process**

The set of procedures described below reflect newly revised protocols established in January 2020 following the recommendations from the UC and State audits triggered by the Varsity Blues admissions scandal. All prospective student-athletes undergo two distinct reviews prior to consideration for approval by the SAAC. Prior to January 2020, most of the Athletics Qualification Review procedures were not in place. The Academic Qualification Review procedures have been largely stable over time, including the SAAC review and approval process.

The **Athletics Qualification Review** includes four steps, all involving the completion of the Priority Coding Request Form (PCRF) which must be completed three weeks prior to a prospective student-athlete being presented to SAAC. The process involves evaluations and confirmation of athletic ability reported on the PCRF by four Athletics Department staff members.

**Step 1: Coach or Team Personnel Submission:** The process is initiated with the submission of the PCRF which summarizes the prospective student-athlete's athletics qualifications, describes the recruiting history, discloses any pre-existing relationships, the student/family’s giving history, and the involvement of third-party contacts, and requires attestation of accuracy of the information provided.

**Step 2: Head Coach Attestation:** The Head Coach must attest to the accuracy of information provided, assert that there has been no discussion of future donations during recruitment, and provide understanding of the minimum participation requirement.

**Step 3: Sport Supervisor Verification & Attestation:** The Sport Supervisor, typically an Associate Athletic Director, must approve the Priority Coding Request Form and independently confirm that the athletic qualifications rise to the team standards.

**Step 4: Athletics Compliance Office Evaluation:** The Athletics Compliance Office must review and independently confirm that the athletic qualifications presented are true and sufficient for
consideration for admission, complete a giving history check with Development, and independently vet pre-existing relationship and third-party contacts.

In summary, the Athletics Qualification Review is done internally within the Department of Athletics.

The **Academic Qualification Review** includes three steps carried out by Athletic Department staff with the final review conducted by a committee of four senior staff.

**Step 1: Academic Records Review:** The Director of Compliance, Admission & Eligibility reviews academic records for UC and NCAA eligibility requirements. Based on the records evaluation, the student is classified as UC-eligible or non-UC-eligible (Admit by Exception).

**Step 2: Academic Meeting:** The prospective student-athlete must participate in a meeting with Academic and Student Services Staff. This meeting is informational for student-athletes who present no academic risk, but it is an academic interview for those who have some academic risk and for international student-athletes from countries where the national language is not English.

**Step 3: Final Academic Qualification Review:** The Senior Associate Athletic Director, Associate Athletic Director for Academic and Student Services, Director of Compliance, Admission & Eligibility, and Director of Student-Athlete Counseling & Peer Learning together review information from the Academic Records Review and the Academic Meeting and determine whether the prospective student-athlete meets the academic qualifications to be considered for admission. This team classifies each prospective student athlete into the following evaluation categories:

- **P1:** Regular Admits (UC-eligible)
  - 3.2+ UC GPA (CA residents), 3.4+ UC GPA (nonresident), 540+ on each SAT section or 21+ on each ACT section, 3 or fewer UC subject omissions, and A/B’s in English. P1 admits meet the minimum requirements for UC-eligibility but do not necessarily meet the normative standard of the campus, as set by UA via the standard holistic review process and discussed in Section C1.

- **P2:** Consent Admits (somewhat below UC-eligible, Admit by Exception)
  - 2.75-3.19 UC GPA (CA residents), 2.75-3.39 UC GPA (nonresident), 490+ on each SAT section or 19/20+ on each ACT section, 3 or fewer UC subject omissions, B average in English, and no more than 1 or 2 C grades.

- **P3:** General Special Action Admit (below UC-eligible, some risk, Admit by Exception)
  - 2.5-2.74 UC GPA, 440+ on each SAT section or 16/17+ on each ACT section, more than 3 UC subject omissions, and multiple C grades in English.

- **P4:** Risk Admit (below UC-eligible, high risk, Admit by Exception)
  - <2.5 UC GPA, <440 on a SAT section or <16 on an ACT section, multiple UC subject omissions, C or D grades in English, and multiple D or F grades.

**SAAC Approval** is the final stage in athletic admissions. Those prospective student-athletes who are ultimately deemed by the Athletics Compliance Office to pass the Athletics Qualification Review and subsequently deemed to pass the Academic Qualifications Review by a committee of senior Athletics staff members are forwarded for consideration by the SAAC.

The formation and history of the SAAC are not well documented. A document dating from ~2010 and authored by Tom Lifka, former Asst. Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Services, briefly describes some of the guiding principles and procedures for the "UCLA Committee on Admission of Student Athletes," presumably an earlier version of the SAAC. Until 2020, no
document existed on how the SAAC members were appointed or how decisions on prospective student athletes were made.

The SAAC is not an Academic Senate Committee governed by the Committee on Committees and has no structural connection to the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) or the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC).

The SAAC typically meets monthly, such that the athletics admissions approvals take place in nine meetings during the academic year. SAAC members receive case materials two business days prior to each meeting. For all cases, materials include the academic evaluation summary spreadsheet (name, sport, school, UC and NCAA GPAs, UC ‘A-G’ courses, NCAA core omissions, test scores, academic comments). For prospective student-athletes with some level of risk (P2, P3, P4), copies of complete transcripts, test score reports, and full evaluations are provided. SAAC approvals are considered provisional, subject to the student-athlete successfully completing high school courses and meeting NCAA eligibility requirements.

The current Chair of the SAAC is Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management Yolanda Copeland-Morgan, and the committee includes the Director of UA, Gary Clark, and a number of faculty members. Senior Athletics staff (i.e., the Senior Associate Athletic Director, Associate Athletic Director for Academic and Student Services, and the Director of Compliance, Admission & Eligibility) present prospective student-athlete cases to the SAAC but do not have a vote in approvals. In September 2020, the Ad Hoc Committee received the draft of a newly-completed charter for the SAAC. This charter is a significant step towards documenting the make up and procedures of the SAAC. The Ad Hoc Committee worked with UA between September and November 2020 to improve the charter. The updated SAAC charter is found in Appendix V.

Checks and Balances in Athletics Admissions

Documentation on Interactions with Prospective Student-Athletes

Compliance with NCAA regulations on official and unofficial visits is monitored by the Athletic Department, using JumpForward, a third-party software program. Each prospective student-athlete (PSA) is entered into that system, which coaches are then required to use to track all formal recruiting opportunities. Visits to high schools and PSA homes are logged, as are in-person contacts and evaluations. Phone calls are no longer logged, as per a change in the NCAA regulations. PSAs are permitted one official visit to campus (two for basketball) and unlimited unofficial visits while they are being recruited. The NCAA requires that each institution create policies to govern such visits. Prospects pay their own way during unofficial visits. The Athletics Department documents the numbers of both official and unofficial visits prospects make to campus, although it notes that the number of unofficial visits is likely inaccurate because of their informal nature (see Tables 6a and 6b). Unofficial campus visits may include activities such as attending practices, touring facilities with coaches and attending UCLA home games.
Verification and Documentation of Admissions Application Materials

As described in the Athletics Admission Review Process above, the athletic and academic credentials of prospective student athletes are separately reviewed. The Athletics Qualification Review is a four-step process centered on the PCRF. This series of checks became effective in January 2020. The Academic Qualification Review includes review of official transcripts and test score reports by Athletics staff and classification of the prospective student into four evaluation categories. Students who pass both of these reviews are then brought for consideration by the SAAC.

The JumpForward platform is used to store all PCRF’s used to document the athletic qualifications and the multi-step verification and approval process. It also stores electronic documents related to the prospect’s academic qualifications. Actual correspondence with prospects, such as emails, phone calls, and text messages, are not stored. Similarly, documentation on conflicts of interest and on SAAC activities and deliberations are not stored in JumpForward.

Management of Conflicts of Interest

Effective January 2020, all prospective student athlete applications are evaluated for potential conflicts of interest involving pre-existing relationships, giving history and third-party contacts. Pre-existing relationships may include, but are not limited to, family members, children, neighbors, friend’s child, siblings of a former or current student-athlete, donor’s children/grandchildren, former teammate’s children and children of alumni. Two questions that appear on the PCRF determine whether there are any pre-existing relationships:

1) Are you aware of any pre-existing relationships between yourself or anyone on your team staff and the prospective student-athlete (PSA) and/or PSA’s family?
2) Are you aware of any pre-existing relationships between any other Athletics staff member and the PSA and/or PSA's family?

Similarly, two additional questions appear on the PCRF to investigate potential conflicts related to giving history:

1) Does this PSA, the PSA’s family or any entity affiliated with the PSA have a history of making financial donations to UCLA?

2) Has this PSA, the PSA’s family or any entity affiliated with the PSA pledged or indicated that they will make financial donations to UCLA?

The Development Office investigates the giving history, using the University’s CRM System. The Vice Provost for Enrollment Management and the Director of UA receive the results of this search prior to the presentation of applications to SAAC. This set of questions and procedures provides the basis for compliance with UC Regents Policy 2202: Financial Considerations:

1) University’s Regents Policy 2202 states that “admissions motivated by concern for financial, political, or other such benefit to the University does not have a place in the admissions process.”

2) No coach or staff member may discuss a family’s ability to donate to UCLA with a prospective student-athlete or his/her family during the recruitment process.

3) No coach or staff member may accept a financial donation or a pledge to donate to UCLA from a PSA, his/her family, or any entity affiliated with the PSA prior to the date when the PSA attends the first day of a regular academic quarter (excludes summer sessions).

4) For every PSA, the Head Coach must be able to articulate a rationale for presenting the PSA for admission. The family’s ability to donate cannot be a determinative factor in the decision.

5) If a UCLA staff member, donor, or other influential individual asks a coach or staff member to assist with admission for a specific PSA for any reason outside of the PSA’s excellent athletics ability, the coach or staff member must immediately report that request to the sport supervisor. The sport supervisor will then report the request to Christina Rivera.

Third-party contacts are also evaluated. Such contacts may include, but are not limited to the following: donors, UCLA staff members, recruiting services, scouting services or college consulting services. These contacts must be disclosed if such a contact first brought the PSA to the attention of the coaching staff or if the third party played any role in the recruitment process at any time.

According to Matt Elliott, Senior Associate Athletic Director, the existence and discovery of a conflict of interest will not automatically disqualify a PSA from admission. But the substance of the conflict (pre-existing relationship, giving history) cannot be used to justify admission in any way. Any such conflicts are evaluated by a three-person committee composed of a compliance staff member, the Associate Athletic Director (Head of Compliance) and the Senior Associate Athletic Director, Internal Operations. If this committee concludes that the PSA in question does not meet athletic qualifications or that some other conflict motivated support for admission, it may refuse to approve the PCF and that ends the process. If the committee decides to support admission, it will disclose the conflicts to the Senior Associate Athletic Director so that this information can be included in the presentation of the PSA’s case to the SAAC. The SAAC will make the final determination about admission.
D. UC-SYSTEM AND CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITS OF UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

This section reviews the results from the UC and State audits carried out in 2019 and 2020, respectively, as a result of the Varsity Blues scandal, along with the management corrective actions (MCA's) that were stipulated by the audits and are being implemented now. Both of the audits involved two distinct phases.

D.1 The University of California System-wide Audit

The UC audit, which came from the system-wide Office of Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services, was announced in late 2018. This audit’s specific objectives included the evaluation of the following: the controls over special talent admissions and admissions by exception, the demographic characteristics of applicants admitted in the areas of athletics and the arts, the controls over access to IT systems in the admissions process, the controls over student-athlete participation, and the effectiveness of the UC annual process to verify undergraduate application information (UC Office of the President only).

The report from first phase of the UC audit was issued in June 2019. The report made a number of recommendations regarding special talent admissions, including:

1. Creation of documentation that clarifies the procedures for approval of applications for admission by exception,
2. Development of documentation of the trusted sources that can be used to verify qualifications or credentials for a specific talent or sport,
3. Implementation of a two-step admissions process for admission on the basis of special talent,
4. Documentation of the procedures for monitoring compliance with system-wide limits on the number of candidates admitted by exception,
5. Documentation of conflict of interest policies and procedures that cover all reviewers of applications,
6. Provision of regular training for all individuals involved in the processes for admissions by exception or on the basis of special talent,
7. Establishment of controls on individuals who conduct outreach after reviewing applications from candidates with whom they have had more than routine contact,
8. Implementation of controls on user access to IT systems utilized in the admissions process, and
9. Limitation of contact between Development staff and UA regarding admissions matters.

On November 13, 2019, the report containing the Management Corrective Action (MCA) plan and target dates for UCLA was issued, based on the first phase of the UC audit.

The report for the second phase of the UC audit was issued on November 13, 2019 and presented these further recommendations:

1. Development of a charter for admissions committees that covers key objectives, authority, responsibilities, membership (including voting rights), frequency of meetings, review criteria, and decision-making procedures,
2. Implementation of controls to identify and track applicants for admission by exception or on the basis of special talent in line with the guidance provided by system-wide undergraduate admissions,
(3) evaluation of current retention practices for supporting admissions by exception and special talent,
(4) implementation of controls to ensure accurate classification of all students admitted by exception, including tracking student-athletes and students identified as “disadvantaged” or “other”,
(5) updating of IT user access to ensure it is properly aligned with job responsibilities,
(6) documentation of IT system access to ensure that access rights are consistent with users’ roles and responsibilities,
(7) consideration of using unique user IDs for individuals who complete “batch jobs” when updating admissions decisions in the Student Information System, and
(8) development or amending of local policies and procedures to address requirements for appeals decisions.

On April 10, 2020, the report containing additional MCAs was issued, based on the second phase of the UC audit.

During 2020, the UCLA administration has been working to implement the various MCAs that have been put forward as a result of the UC audit. Referring to the numbered list just above, for (1), UA has developed a “guiding principles” document for the SAAC, for which the current version is provided in Appendix V. The MCA for (2) has involved developing an approval/attestation form for reviewers/staff involved in admissions through special talent. These forms, which became available for the Fall 2020 admissions cycle, have been devised in light of guidelines issued by UCOP in April 2020. In Athletics, the admissions tracking system will, in response to UCOP guidelines, identify students who have been admitted as “Special Admits” and those who have been admitted through the regular process. Regarding the issue of records retention in (4), UA is implementing training in records retention for staff in the talent-based schools. Athletics is undertaking similar training to ensure that the preservation of documentation supporting special talent admissions complies with the UC records retention schedule. For (5), UA recognizes that access to the Student Information System requires new protocols. There are, however, challenges involved in implementing fresh protocols given the age of the legacy system. Moreover, staffing issues arising from the COVID-19 pandemic have slowed down the process of implementing these changes. Similarly, meeting recommendation (6) is slower than desirable because of the ongoing staffing problems. UA, however, has taken steps to ensure that access rights are consistent with users’ rights and responsibilities. Recommendation (7) remains problematic, since the legacy system has limitations regarding the use of unique user IDs, though consultation with Information Technology Services has begun in order to see if there is a way to resolve this problem. For (8), UA already meets one aspect of proposals to strengthen the appeals procedure; the appeals review procedure currently involves at least two staff members. If the final decision overturns the original decision, the rationale has to be documented. Meanwhile, comprehensive documentation of the appeals review procedures is in process. Once again, staffing issues have resulted in a delay. UA nonetheless continues to track all appeals and the staff members who review them. The Director of UA signs off on any appeal that is granted.

Recommendation 7 in Section F below sets out seven points that indicate how the Senior Management Group (SMG) and UA can work together to ensure that the Student Information System (SIS) functions with greater security regarding protocols that will protect data held within an aging legacy platform. It is imperative that IT Services advise both the SMG and UA on the best training methods and technological safeguards that need to be implemented for this purpose.
D.2 The California State Audit

On June 26, 2019, the Joint Legislative Audit Committee approved a State audit of admission policies and practices of the UC, with a special focus on detecting and assessing fraud in the admissions process. Together with UC San Diego and UC Berkeley, UCLA was identified as a campus that should evaluate fraud risks in relation to deceptive practices involving standardized test scores, high school grades, essays, and student-athlete admissions. The State Auditor requested that all three campuses determine the extent to which donations, influence, and legacy factor into the admissions process. Moreover, the State Auditor solicited information about the ways in which each of these campuses evaluates the diversity of admitted students. The State Auditor requested data that identified trends related to the admission of resident and nonresident students since the 2010-2011 academic year.

The State Auditor also asked for data from the past three years that would support the assessment and identification of the categories used for admitting students through the identification of a special talent or achievement. In the case of Athletics, the audit requested information about the procedures for verifying applicants’ eligibility to be admitted by exception or on the basis of special talent. Moreover, the State Auditor wished to receive documentation that showed how the three campuses determined whether student-athletes continued to participate in the sports for which they were admitted.

All ten UC campuses were asked to review and assess admissions policies and practices in relation to interactions with such entities as the College Board, ACT, and private admissions consultants.

The first phase of the California State audit brought attention to three areas where admissions policies and procedures need to be strengthened. The first identified the necessity of having sufficient documentation that clarifies the approval and rationale for admission by exception and on the basis of special talent. The second relates to improved verification protocols in admissions procedures, the need to prevent third parties from influencing admissions decisions, and processes for monitoring student-athletes’ participation in athletics programs. The third focuses attention on strengthening procedures so that (a) no conflicts of interest arise in the admissions process, (b) access to IT systems is consistent with the roles and responsibilities of users, (c) the athletics compliance offices have a modified reporting structure, and (d) staff are appropriately trained in implementing new protocols.

The report from the second phase of the State audit was issued on September 22, 2020 [4]. The recommendations from this audit are in the process of being vetted by UCOP and will be implemented once it is determined the degree to which they are already in place as a result of the UC audit.

The State audit has several key findings, some of which are specific to admissions by exception, while others relate to all admissions to UC. First, it observes that UC campus staff took advantages of weakness in admissions processes that led to the inappropriate admission of sixty-four applicants as favors to donors, families, and friends. (Most of these questionable admissions were at UC Berkeley.) The State audit notes that among the UC campuses it considered, UCLA does not have criteria for selecting applicants for admission and lacks adequate processes for identifying applicants who do not meet eligibility requirements for admission to UC. The State audit expands its criticisms of admissions by exception and by talent to a series of overarching observations that reviewers and faculty members remain inconsistent in their evaluation of all applications to UC. The State audit’s fourth finding is that
the Office of the President has not reviewed each the procedures that each campus follows to prevent inconsistencies and unfairnesses in the admissions process.

The State audit makes six main recommendations. The first (1) is to ensure that admissions officers reviewing applicants to Athletics ensure that both athletic talents and donation records are investigated for signs of inappropriate activity. (2) The State audit stipulates that admissions officers establish criteria for admission. (3) The State audit requires the Office of the President to oversee the admissions procedures at UC Berkeley for at least the 2020-2021 cycle. (4) The State audit wants the Office of the President to require all UC campuses to establish proficiency standards for reviewers of applications. (5) By April 2021, all UC campuses must initiate regular audits of admissions processes. (6) The state audit insists that the Office of the President evaluate the Eligibility in a Local Context program to ensure that an optimal number of high school students can participate.

As discussed in D1 above, the findings of the UC audit have already generated a series of Management Corrective Actions that address many of the State audit recommendations.

In assessing the procedures for admission by exception and by talent, the State audit does not address the requirement of supplemental applications, which all applicants have to complete for admission to UCLA's Schools of Theater, Film, and Television, Music, and Arts and Architecture. The omission from the report is striking, since all three of these schools have procedures in place to ensure that supplemental applications are completed on time and evaluated fairly. Details about the specific requirements for supplemental applications in Arts and Architecture, Music, and Theater, Film and Television are in Section C.
E. FINDINGS

This section summarizes the findings of the Ad Hoc Committee that relate to the committee's charge. The findings pertain to a snapshot of admissions processes, several of which were in transition because of ongoing work to address the state and UC-system audits as well as the requests of this committee. In this sense, responses to the questions of the Ad Hoc Committee not only reflected but also helped to document and formalize admissions systems that were sometimes structured by conventions only recorded via oral memory. All four units were very responsive to the committee’s requests for information, and we acknowledge our findings address the ecosystem for talent-based admissions at a particular moment in time.

Best Practices in Admissions

During the course of the review of current procedures used in the talent-based schools and Athletics, the committee found a number of best practices in admissions. These best practices include:

- having talent evaluated by multiple people (to reduce risk and to promote fairness in the evaluation process),
- having regular dialogue between the entities involved in special admissions (the talent-based schools, Athletics, and UA) and CUARS, the faculty Senate committee responsible for overseeing undergraduate admissions at UCLA,
- ensuring that suitable documentation exists for admissions materials and how admissions decisions are made (in particular, archiving all communications with applicants, all evaluation/conclusions made by reviewers, and all communications between the talent-based schools/Athletics and UA),
- having suitable controls in place on possible donor influence, including tracking of donor history and a firewall between donors and admissions,
- having documented procedures for handling conflicts of interest and adhering to those procedures (a particular case in which procedures did not exist or were not followed is documented in the 2014 compliance report of Athletics, see Section 1),
- requiring suitable attestation forms for faculty/staff involved in applicant review and in making admissions decisions, and
- developing and maintaining best practices that promote the goals of diversity, equity and inclusion in admissions.

Examples in the art schools of practices that relate to diversity, equity and inclusion include: the summer intensive program of the Department of World Arts and Cultures/Dance that serves as a pipeline into the dance major for first generation and under-represented students, the training provided by admissions staff of SOAA to counselors from public high schools, community colleges and community-based organizations on how to support arts students in the college application process, and the use of interviews in TFT to encourage students to express the ways in which they would contribute to UCLA and also the challenges they faced faced in getting to the audition room.

It is important to note that a number of these best practices were established or reinforced at UCLA based on the UC-wide audit that results from the Varsity Blues scandal (see Section 1). Hence all areas (talent-based schools and Athletics) benefited from this audit. However, we point out that some of the forms used for documentation may need updating for the specific use
by the schools; for example, the form used to declare pre-existing relationships to an applicant has a single yes/no selection for disclosing any relationship, which is not suitable for a panel that is reviewing an applicant.

**Variation in talent-based admissions practices across the schools and Athletics**

There are four general differences in how admissions procedures are structured in the talent-based schools and Athletics.

First, the evaluation of talent qualifications in SOAA, HASOM, and TFT is carried out by review of standardized application materials (and in many cases auditions) by faculty and instructors who provide quantitative ratings to permit comparisons across applicants to inform committee decisions on selection. In contrast, talent qualifications of prospective student-athletes are evaluated and then endorsed by program coaches which are then verified by Athletics Department staff. As such, there is more documentation of how specific applicants were selected from a well-defined pool of applicants in the schools versus Athletics.

Second, the review process in the schools includes information from the holistic review, whereas holistic scores are not considered in Athletics admissions. Athletics uses an internal system to classify the academic qualifications of prospective student-athletes (the P1-P4 categories). This system relies largely on GPA, grades and test scores. Holistic scores may be used to eliminate some applicants from consideration for admission to the schools but this is not generally the case in Athletics.

Third, there is a different process by which UA interfaces with talent-based admissions in the schools versus Athletics. UA routinely communicates with each school to let them know when applicants put forward would not be supported for admission based on holistic review. For Athletics, the interaction occurs within the SAAC itself since senior UA leadership are voting members. However, the data indicate that very few prospective student-athletes presented at SAAC are denied admission.

Fourth, the minimum required standards for academic qualifications differ across talent-based admissions through the schools versus Athletics. Over half of admitted student-athletes are classified as non-UC eligible (GPA < 3.0 or 3.4 [CA resident or out-of-state, respectively], SAT test scores < 500 or ACT scores < 20). Students admitted through talent-based admissions in SOAA, HASOM, and TFT have average holistic scores of approximately 3.5, which are lower than holistic scores for students admitted to UCLA as a whole, but very few students flagged as non-UC eligible (e.g. GPA below 3.0 or 3.4, SAT < 500 or ACT <20) are admitted into the schools. Hence it is clear that significant allowances are made for athletes when the applicants do not meet normative UCLA standards for admission. Such exceptions seem to be made very rarely in relation to artists. This finding raises the question of whether there should be an equivalent standard that applies to all non-standard admissions. In other words, should a master violinist be viewed through the same lens as the star quarterback?

**Human Resources for Admissions**

In our studies of supplemental admissions processes, both in the arts schools and in Athletics, the committee noted the tremendous commitments of time and effort made by faculty and staff. In SOAA, TFT and HASOM, faculty review applications, read essays, watch videos, study portfolios, and listen to recordings prior to one-on-one interviews and/or auditions. Working in small groups, faculty evaluate, weigh constellations of attributes, and consult with one another. Art school staff support these processes before, during and following faculty considerations. In
Athletics, the work is undertaken by staff who must track and move through multiple layers of process.

When faculty from SOAA, TFT and HASOM are reviewed for promotion, it should be noted that their efforts in their departmental admissions processes are significant and constitute a major service commitment.

We also note that the number of applications to UCLA and to the art schools has increased significantly over the last few years, placing an increasingly heavy burden on personnel (faculty and staff) to maintain a comprehensive and equitable review process. For the 2020-2021 admissions cycle, the preliminary numbers indicate increases over 2019-2020 in the raw numbers of applications to SOAA, HASOM and TFT of: 22%, 31%, and 23%, respectively, that are comparable to, or exceed, the increase of 22% in Freshman undergraduate applications to UCLA as a whole.

Shared Challenges
In our investigations, we found that the units under consideration shared a number of challenges:

Establishing and maintaining a fair review process
While the units strive for a fair review process, there do not appear to be a set of universally agreed upon principles for, or components of, the conduct of a fair review process. While the existing processes seem well motivated and work well for each unit’s goals, they are not consistently documented, making ongoing evaluation and revision of the processes themselves difficult. These processes are also not consistently shared between units or with UA. For example, only some units investigate the giving history of an applicant to ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

Balance of “talent” vs. academic qualifications
While the methods of evaluation of specific talents (talent in visual arts, abilities at certain aspects of a sport, technical skill on specific instruments, etc.) are as varied as the disciplines themselves, we note that academic qualifications and holistic scores are not considered in the same way across the units. For example, Athletics does not make use of holistic scores at all.

The lower-than-average holistic scores in some of the schools may be a reflection of the time it takes these students to hone their special skills, which might leave them less time to devote to the traditional academic measures weighed heavily by readers in the holistic review process.

Common vulnerabilities
The admissions process in each unit studied is vulnerable to conflicts of interest and/or dishonesty. There have been significant changes implemented regarding reporting conflicts of interest (resulting from the recent audits), but how the units are managing these conflicts after they are reported is not fully clear.

Documentation:
In the arts units, documentation of applicant data, evaluation results, and communication with applicants seems to be relatively strong, and the use of Acceptd, an evaluation/communications platform, has made a difference in improving this further. In Athletics, the platform JumpForward is used to log information about visits to homes and schools of prospective student athletes, as
well as evaluations. It also stores the Priority Coding Request Forms and source documents relating to each prospect's academic qualifications.

Impact of Covid-19

The Covid-19 pandemic has had, and continues to have, a major impact on the day-to-day activities of the university, including the undergraduate admissions process. For example, the change to remote auditions or interviews has been beneficial for some students who would otherwise be unable to make a trip to Los Angeles or New York for an in-person interview. Conversely, the change has been detrimental for students who may not have a suitable high-speed internet connection. Another example is the challenge for reviewers in the talent-based schools to properly conduct and evaluate applicants in a remote setting. Given that we are currently in the middle of the pandemic, a detailed appraisal of its impact on undergraduate admissions in athletics and in the talent schools is not presently possible, but we note that such an appraisal should be carried out by the relevant units in the future, with the results reported to CUARS.
F. RECOMMENDATIONS

This section summarizes the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee that relate to the committee’s charge.

Recommendation 1: Periodic Reporting and Review of Special Admissions at UCLA

As discussed in the Findings, the Ad Hoc Committee has identified the importance of good communication between the various entities involved in special admission and the faculty Senate committee CUARS and the beneficial improvements to procedures for special admission that resulted from the recent UC audit.

Accordingly:

- We recommend periodic review by CUARS of all units on campus involved in special admission of undergraduates at UCLA. The details for such reviews can be worked out by CUARS, but annual reporting of basic data and processes would be a worthwhile starting point. For the talent-based schools these data should include the numbers of prospective students at each stage in the process (application, interview/audition, acceptance, and enrollment) for each program in the school, along with other relevant information such as average holistic scores and A/E status. For Athletics, the data should include counts of: prospective student-athletes considered for potential admission, presented to the SAAC, and approved by the SAAC (organized by academic risk category). Note that numbers for the first category were not available to the Ad Hoc Committee, but can presumably be collected moving forward through the use of the PCRFs. Additional data on diversity among admitted student-athletes would be welcomed (e.g., underrepresented groups, sex, first generation, low-income, and CA residency).
- To ensure the integrity of undergraduate admissions, we recommend periodic external review of units involved in special admission. The reviews should capitalize upon routinely captured, transparent documentation to confirm that the procedures put in place to safeguard against donor influence, undue conflicts of interest, and dishonesty are being applied uniformly and without compromise. A key requirement for a successful external review is a suitable platform for storing all documentation and communication regarding special admission (see Recommendation 6, below).

Recommendation 2: Student-Athlete Admissions

The UC and State Audits prompted many beneficial changes to procedures involving the admission of student-athletes to UCLA. Our Ad Hoc Committee provided input to revisions of the guiding document of the SAAC. In addition, we recommend the involvement of faculty in setting the standards for the admission of student-athletes and the adoption of new processes to increase collaboration and accountability between the Athletics Department, the SAAC, and the faculty Senate committees (CUARS and IAC) charged with determining policy for admission and academic matters involving student-athletes.

Specifically:

- Under Bylaw 65.5, faculty are responsible for determining the criteria for admission to UCLA. Currently, Athletics uses an internal system for the evaluation of the academic qualifications of prospective student-athletes that will likely need to be updated given the change in the requirement of standardized test (SAT/ACT) scores.
We recommend that Athletics and UA work with CUARS to establish a suitable framework for the academic review of prospective student-athletes.

- We affirm the value of automated reports recently designed by the IAC to track academic and graduation outcomes of student-athletes at UCLA. We recommend routine annual review of these data jointly by Athletics, SAAC, and IAC to inform continuous quality improvement of academic support services and admissions review practices.

- The Athletics Department and the SAAC should report known violations of university admissions policy to CUARS upon discovery. The Athletics Department should report on systemic concerns regarding student-athlete welfare to the IAC. Increased transparency and collaboration could facilitate improvements to practice, identify the need for revisions in policy, advance the interests of the university community in maintaining public trust.

Regarding the SAAC, we believe that the current charter (Appendix V) provides a reasonable basis for the motivation, organization, and operation of the SAAC. One point that is not addressed is the way in which the faculty members on the SAAC are selected. We recommend that these be chosen by the Senate Committee on Committees. The administration should have the opportunity to propose faculty candidates to the Committee on Committees.

**Recommendation 3: Resources**

The committee recommends that the University make certain that the schools have sufficient resources to ensure rigorous and fair admissions processes, and resources that support UCLA’s commitment to academic excellence, freedom and diversity. A crucial component of such processes concerns staffing. The committee’s work has shown that a robust admissions process is labor intensive, requiring substantial time and effort from both faculty and staff across the schools, as well as in UA. However, staff shortages jeopardize the integrity of the admissions process by leaving too few people to manage it properly. Also threatening admissions is the classification of positions for staff who will be involved in the evaluation of applications. Personnel classifications that are too low – i.e., that are incompatible with the level of necessary expertise – do not attract a sufficiently qualified applicant pool for consideration. It is therefore necessary that the University provide support in this critical area so that admissions processes can be conducted with the necessary scrupulousness and impartiality.

**Recommendation 4: Interaction among Talent-based Schools and with CUARS**

Because each school, HASOM, SOAA and TFT, undertake supplementary talent-based application review in addition to the general UC application and comprehensive review, we recommend that these three schools meet yearly and with a more concentrated retreat every 3-4 years. Annual meetings would allow the schools to share best practices as well as challenges and would ensure that faculty and staff have context and reference points for their particular specialized admission processes.

Additionally, where staff in enrollment/admission/recruitment currently have a dotted line reporting structure to UA/Enrollment Management, a CUARS organized annual meeting would lay the groundwork for Deans and faculty to become more involved in best practices in admission. Historically, all of the arts faculty developed their own supplemental requirements
with little to no oversight from UA, and faculty do not necessarily stay on top of admission trends for the purpose of looking critically at their procedures and criteria.

There are currently new enrollment/admissions staff in TFT and HASOM, and these groups have been meeting monthly with SOAA staff, addressing their combined schedules and sharing resources to cover their events. While yearly meetings combining faculty and staff would create opportunity for the schools to discuss their admissions policies, a more expansive retreat every 3-4 years would give the schools opportunity to reflect on larger issues of diversity recruitment and changes in national admissions procedures among other things. The meeting might also support the development of cross-school resources for artist applicants who may be less competitive in a particular academic category. We suggest that the first retreat be held in 2021 or 2022 and that, in this retreat, the school try to coalesce on principles for a fair admissions process.

**Recommendation 5: Admissions Evaluation and Holistic Rank**

Holistic rank scores for admitted UCLA students are generally very good (i.e. 1.0-2.0); those for arts school students are much different (averaging 3.5 or so), and Athletics does not use holistic scores at all. The intensive supplemental application evaluation process developed by subject matter experts in the arts schools can yield very different appraisals and selection decisions than holistic review. We recommend that the arts schools engage in dialogue with UA about the utility of holistic scores, because it is unclear if these scores, as they are currently generated, provide useful information about prospective arts majors. Perhaps there might be other useful metrics that would enhance the admissions process. For example, an applicant’s background in math beyond the minimum entry requirement for UCLA may not be very important to a student’s overall success if a school does not have math requirements. Moreover, for an arts student, an advanced ballet class or lifelong study of bharatanatyam might be productively viewed as requiring as rigorous study as an AP calculus class (as opposed to being seen as extracurricular).

**Recommendation 6: Documentation and Communications**

TFT, HASOM and SOAA all use auditable platforms for documentation and communications regarding admissions. TFT and HASOM use a third-party system (Acceptd), and the SOAA uses an internally created platform (SAS). These units have adopted policies that all faculty and staff correspondence with applicants, as well as internal communication regarding applicants (including evaluations by raters of supplemental application materials, auditions, and interviews) be done exclusively through these platforms, which are completely customizable for multiple disciplines within units. The units report that use of these platforms creates both efficiency and accountability for their faculty and staff during the admissions process.

Athletics uses the third-party platform JumpForward to store a significant amount of information regarding prospective student athletes. Currently, information about visits is entered, Priority Coding Request Forms are uploaded, and source documents for student-athlete academic qualifications (e.g., transcripts, test score reports) are stored. Not stored, however, are communications (emails, phone calls, text messages, etc.) with prospects and among UCLA staff and faculty concerning the admission of prospective student athletes. Also not stored in JumpForward are materials relating to conflicts of interest and SAAC deliberations.

The committee recommends that all units involved in undergraduate admissions adopt an auditable IT platform, along with a policy that it be used for all correspondence and
documentation regarding applicants to their program. We note, further, that storage of source materials (e.g., PDFs) within a platform are not necessarily easily auditable to oversee compliance with processes compared to systems that require entry of information into validated fields.

**Recommendation 7: Legacy IT System**

We recommend that members of Senior Management Group work closely with UA to ensure that the Student Information System (SIS), which operates with an old platform, receives additional resources so that it can fulfill the following Management Corrections Actions that were identified in March 2020:

1. Maintain an adequate level of staffing in UA in order to manage the SIS legacy system at a time when there has been staff attrition.
2. Ensure that all staff receive comprehensive training to strengthen the security of the SIS.
3. Work with Information Technology Services (ITS) to make sure that staff are notified when any changes have been inputted into the SIS.
4. Consult with ITS about the problems that might arise when the data in the SIS can be accessed from multiple points of entry.
5. Implement safeguards that will prevent tampering with records held in the SIS.
6. Provide visible trails of documentation so that staff can track the progress of each application as it moves from the school to the SIS.
7. Create a schedule so that admissions staff in the schools and staff in UA remain in contact, at least once a quarter, with the new joint Senate/Administration Committee of Data, IT, and Privacy (CDITP).

**Recommendation 8: Supporting Diversity Efforts in Talent-based Admissions**

The commitment of each school, HASOM, SOAA and TFT, to promoting diversity in admissions was evident. There were multiple identified best practices to ensure that demonstrated achievement in the arts were considered in the context of opportunities, and to resist practices that advantage applicants with classical or formal training. However, it was also the case that the schools have limited resources to monitor and improve outcomes of diversity promoting practices. We recommend closer collaboration between the schools and Undergraduate Admission and Enrollment Management to support diversity efforts in the arts schools. First, HASOM, SOAA and TFT would benefit from more integration into K-12 outreach efforts mounted by Enrollment Management. Greater faculty engagement with the school's admissions team will strengthen existing strategies for engaging a more diverse applicant pool. Second, UA could provide assistance in analysis of characteristics of the applicant pool, admitted applicants, and enrolled students in each school to inform targeted efforts in promoting diversity. Data on representation of URM, low-income, first-generation students are either not accessible during application review (race/ethnicity and gender due to state law) or difficult for schools to integrate and analyze at the aggregate-level. The use of online systems for application processing increases the feasibility of detailed analyses for supplemental application review (e.g., audition and interview ratings) to examine equity.
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Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Undergraduate Admission Procedures Ad Hoc Committee, an ad hoc committee of the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools. Specifically, this ad hoc is tasked as follows:

I. Authority

This Committee is an ad hoc committee comprised of members of CUARS and at-large faculty members. The Committee will provide input to the CUARS which will, in turn, advise the Legislative Assembly, Administration (specifically the Vice Provost of Enrollment Management, the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Deans, and Director of Athletics) concerning admissions procedures at UCLA.

II. Appointment

This Committee shall be convened for the 2019-2020 academic year, and may work beyond the 2019-2020 academic year, if needed. Professor Ong will serve as the chair of the Committee for the 2019-20 Academic Year.

III. Charge to the Committee

This Committee is formally charged to:

a. Examine non-standard, talent admissions procedures (i.e. specialized admissions processes that rely, in significant measure, on athletic abilities,
auditions, portfolios, or other information not included as part of the general UC undergraduate admission application, and which go through a special/additional admissions process, as opposed to standard holistic review) at UCLA and other institutions in order to distinguish best practices and identify potential local vulnerabilities.

b. Examine the academic performance (i.e. retention, GPA, and graduation rates) of students admitted through non-standard, talent admissions processes. For students whose talent it directly related to the academic program for which they are applying (i.e. film, theater, music, etc.), performance in their specific major should also be considered.

c. Examine current procedures (created in light of established policies) and recommend to CUARS the need for possible changes, updates, or additions to established policies and procedures.

d. Recommend oversight procedures and annual reporting practices for non-standard, talent admissions processes.

IV. Meeting Frequency

This Committee should meet as frequently as specific tasks require, but no less than once per month. This Committee is empowered to form subcommittees and/or appoint representatives to examine specific issues, meet with faculty groups or their representatives, and to meet with members of the Administration. We respectfully request that, if possible, you submit your recommendations to CUARS by April, 2020.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Renee Rouzan-Kay, the analyst for the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools.

Sincerely,

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools

CC: Michael Cohen, English
Sungtaek Ju, Mechanical Engineering and Bioengineering
Barbara Knowlton, Psychology
Jessica Lynch, Society and Genetics
Daniel Neuhauser, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Majid Sarrafa Zadeh, Computer Science
Richard Weiss, Chemistry and Biochemistry
Rene Ong, Physics and Astronomy, Chair
APPENDIX III
Demographic Data for the Herb Alpert School of Music

HASOM did not ask for first-generation and low-income information in their supplemental application in the 2019-20 cycle, so exact numbers for the auditioning pool are not available.

Table 7. Demographic data for applicants to the School of Music, 2019-20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Audition/Interview</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Resident</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Reported</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Gen</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>Not reported in supplemental</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not First Gen</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>Not reported in supplemental</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>Not reported in supplemental</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Low Income</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>Not reported in supplemental</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV
Interview Questions for the Herb Alpert School of Music

Ethnomusicology:
- What are your reasons for wishing to enroll in this program? What do you expect from the program? What are your professional or career goals?
- Briefly describe your musical background and performance skills. Mention any special interests in particular music traditions, and whether these are through family connections or your own instigation. Music courses you have taken may be included.
- Indicate any special training or experiences that might be relevant to the study of music in a global perspective.

Music Composition & Music Performance:
- Please provide a concise statement that describes why you wish to study music at UCLA.

Music Education:
- What are your reasons for wishing to enroll in this program? What do you expect from the program? What are your professional or career goals?
- Briefly describe your musical background and performance skills. Mention any special interests in particular music traditions, and whether these are through family connections or your own instigation. Music courses you have taken may be included.
- Indicate any special training or experiences that might be relevant to the study of music in a global perspective.

Musicology:
- Tell us, the admissions committee for UCLA Musicology, why you are attracted to our program.
- Tell us what you think the study of musicology will teach you, and how you envision using those skills after college.

Global Jazz Studies:
- What are your reasons for wishing to enroll in the Global Jazz Studies program? What do you expect from the program? What are your professional or career goals?
- Briefly describe your musical background and performance skills as it relates to Jazz. Mention any special interests in particular music traditions, and whether these are through family connections or your own instigation.
- Indicate any special training or experiences that might be relevant to the study of music as it relates to Jazz.
APPENDIX V

Documents on the Student Athlete Admissions Committee (SAAC) and student-athlete admissions
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>Issuing Officer:</td>
<td>Undergraduate Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Dept:</td>
<td>Enrollment Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Date:</td>
<td>September 15, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersedes:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Purpose and Scope

This policy is designed to maintain and protect the integrity of the Undergraduate Admission process for recruiting, admitting and enrolling highly qualified student-athletes to UCLA. This Admission policy supports UCLA's commitment to an admission process that is "conducted with the highest standards of impartiality." The admission process must be free of influence or pressure motivated by "financial, political or other such benefit to the University." UCLA Undergraduate Admission policy confirms that applications for admission to UCLA are evaluated based on faculty approved criteria detailed in the 2007 Comprehensive Review Policy. These criteria are used to evaluate a student's application, including academic, personal and leadership achievements, in the context of their educational opportunities and life experience. UCLA undergraduate Admission policy strictly prohibits any undue pressures from financial, political or other parties seeking to influence the admission process.

a. Charge of the Committee

UCLA is committed to fielding competitive teams in NCAA Division I and the Pac-12 Conference. Prospective student-athletes will only be admitted if, in the judgment of the Student-Athlete Admission Committee (SAAC), the prospective student-athlete has a reasonable chance to succeed academically and graduate from UCLA. This judgment will be based on the Committee's assessment of the prospective student-athlete's level of academic preparation, as well as knowledge of the academic support resources/services that will be provided by Athletics and the campus.

The Student-Athlete Admission Committee and the Academic Senate Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics (IAC) will also monitor the academic performance of each individual program/team through updates provided by Athletics as well as NCAA measures of persistence, graduation and success. These measures will help SAAC verify that individual teams, and the athletics program as a whole, are supporting their student-athletes in achieving academic success. In instances where the overall academic performance of an individual program is below what can be reasonably expected, given the preparation profile of the student-athletes in that program, such unsatisfactory performance will be taken into account as the Committee considers the admission of prospective student-athletes to that...
b. Composition and Structure
- The Student-Athlete Admission Committee is chaired by the Vice Provost for Enrollment Management. The voting members of the committee consist of:
  - Director of Undergraduate Admission
  - 2 senior members of the Office of Undergraduate Admission (Associate level or above)
  - Faculty Athletics Representative to the Chancellor
  - 5 faculty representatives, including:
    - at least one faculty member who has served on IAC, preferably as Chair
    - at least one faculty member who has served on CUARS, preferably as Chair
    - at least two faculty members from the College of Letters and Science
    - at least two faculty members who teach undergraduate courses

If the Chair is unavailable to attend a meeting, the Director of Undergraduate Admission will serve as acting Chair and will not be a voting member for the duration of that meeting.

- Representatives of the faculty will serve a three-year term. A representative of the faculty’s term may be extended by an additional two years (for five years in total) by agreement between the Chair of the committee and the Chair of CUARS. (The Faculty Athletics Representative to the Chancellor is exempt from term limits should the individual serve in this position for longer than five years.)

- A quorum is 50% of voting members, and write-in ballots are acceptable if the voting member is unable to attend in-person. All decisions are made by a simple majority, and the Chair will cast the deciding vote in the case needing a tie-break.

- There are three members of athletics in attendance to present candidates and answer questions from the committee members (typically this consists of the Senior Associate Athletic Director, a compliance representative, and an Academic & Student Services representative). Athletics staff do not have a vote in selection of candidates.

c. Expectations
1. Outside of the three members of Athletics designated to present to SAAC, there should be no contact or discussion between coaches, team personnel, support staff and members of the Committee regarding admission cases unless the Committee requests such contact directly.

2. There should be no contact or discussion between prospective or committed student-athletes and members of the Committee regarding admission cases unless the Committee requests such contact directly.

3. Committee members will not accept any gifts, favors, or any type of quid-pro-quo. Conflicts of interests, perceived or otherwise, must be reported imminently to the Chair.

4. Prior to a prospective student-athlete being presented to the Committee for student-athlete admission consideration, Athletics is responsible for engaging in a multi-step verification process that evaluates and vets the academic and athletic qualifications of a prospect. This process is steered by the guiding principles and procedures outlined by the Committee and the requirements issued by the 2019 University of California Systemwide Audit on Undergraduate Admission.

5. For each prospective student-athlete presented to the Committee, Athletics is responsible for providing documentation that supports the prospect’s academic work, potential NCAA eligibility and potential for success as a UCLA student. This includes records of any high school or college-level academic work and standardized test scores (for freshmen candidates). Athletics is also responsible for collecting (and making available to the committee, if requested) the documentation required to substantiate the prospect’s athletic qualifications. Finally, Athletics is responsible for disclosing any conflicts of interests, including pre-existing relationships, giving history of the prospect and their family, and third-party contacts during the recruitment process. The Committee may require additional documentation or further evaluation for all disclosures prior to evaluating a prospective student-athlete’s case.
6. Prospective student-athletes are presented and approved for a specific term or terms of admission. If a prospective student-athlete requests a different term of admission after approval has been granted, the prospect’s case will need to be presented to the Committee for a re-evaluation.

7. Only prospective student-athletes who project as NCAA qualifiers will be approved for admission. Achieving/maintaining NCAA eligibility is required to maintain offer of admission.

8. No prospective student-athlete will be offered admission, or given any verbal indication of likely admission, prior to review and admission approval by the Committee. National Letters of Intent, Grant-in-Aid Agreements and DIA Statement of Expectations are only issued after a prospective student-athlete has been approved by the Committee. On occasion, permission to issue a National Letter of Intent and Grant-in-Aid Agreement to a prospective student-athlete prior to review by the SAAC may be granted by the Chair (with the authority given to the Chair by the Committee). If the prospective student-athlete signs the National Letter of Intent and Grant-in-Aid offer, the student must still be reviewed and ultimately approved for admission by the SAAC for the offer to remain valid. If the SAAC does not approve the prospective student-athlete for admission to the university, the National Letter of Intent will be declared null and void and the Grant-in-Aid Agreement will be terminated.

9. Prospective student-athletes approved by the Committee are notified of their final admission decision on the same timeline as all other freshman and transfer admits. Admission offers are not final until they have been released by the Office of Undergraduate Admission.

10. No individual program (e.g. women’s soccer, men’s track & field, etc.) will be built relying heavily on academically weak or risky student-athletes. While each program will have student-athletes with a range of academic preparation, the Committee expects that each program must maintain a positive academic environment among its student-athletes. It is assumed that each coach is a consistent and vocal promoter of academic success in his or her program. A positive academic environment is promoted when some members of each team exhibit very strong academic preparation, and ideally, are UC eligible at the time of admission.

11. The Committee convenes approximately once per month to discuss cases that are ready to be reviewed for admission. During peak recruiting seasons, the committee may need to meet more frequently or will deliberate via email in the most urgent cases.

12. Following an approval by the Committee, Athletics assumes responsibility for monitoring each student-athlete’s fulfillment of NCAA academic and amateurism eligibility requirements, and managing the follow-up forms process: National Letter of Intent or Grant-in-Aid Agreement for scholarship prospects and the DIA Statement of Expectations for non-scholarship prospects.

d. Committee Consideration

Every prospective student-athlete is presented and/or is available with the following information (see Appendix A for more details):

- Transcripts – high school and college-level (if applicable)
- SAT/ACT scores
- NCAA eligibility information
- University of California eligibility
- Athletic qualifications
- Scholarship amount
- Staff assessment and/or feedback, including notes for prospects who are mandated to participate in an academic interview (e.g., P3, P4, selected transfer and international prospects)
- If applicable, conflict of interest disclosures, such as pre-existing relationships, giving history and third-party contacts

After the above information is presented/considered, every committee member has the opportunity to offer observations or ask questions. Topics often relate to academic history, personal circumstances,
academic trajectory, and intended area of study, in addition to athletic position, ability, recruiting
competition and disclosures. From time-to-time, prospective student-athletes may be recruited and
admitted where additional academic development might be needed though they are still deemed capable
of succeeding with proper effort and support.

Upon conclusion of each discussion, a vote is taken and documented by both the Chair and a member of
the Athletics department present at the meeting. Meeting minutes are compiled by a member of the
Athletics department and shared electronically with the committee and the liaisons to Athletics from
Undergraduate Admission (UA).

e. Admission Process
Once a prospective student-athlete has been approved for admission by SAAC, and that decision has
been communicated via email to the UA liaison, the admit decision is coded by a member of the
Undergraduate Admission staff. The decision is verified against the official meeting minutes before
being coded into OASIS (see Appendix B for more detail). Admitted recruited student-athletes are
notified of their admission decision on the same timeline as all other freshman (late March) and
transfer (late April) admits. If candidates are approved beyond those dates, decisions are released on
an individual basis.

All student-athlete admission approvals are provisional. The prospective student-athlete must:
- Successfully complete high school courses and graduate (or successfully complete college courses,
  if a transfer prospective student-athlete).
- Meet minimum NCAA academic and amateurism eligibility requirements
- Agree to meet the student-athlete minimum participation requirement

All verification of transcripts and meeting conditions of provisional admission are processed in the same
way for all freshman and transfer applicants. Any student-athletes with any problematic grades that
might impact their provisional admission and/or NCAA eligibility will be brought to the attention of SAAC
for additional consideration.

All admitted recruited student-athletes are provided with an admission contract (see appendix __) that
accompanies their offer of admission. Failure to meet the conditions of this contract could lead to action
from Undergraduate Admission, up to and including cancellation of admission.

f. Minimum Participation Requirement
Prospective student-athletes approved through the student-athlete admission process are required to
fulfill a minimum participation requirement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student-Athlete Minimum Participation Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For 2019 &amp; Prior:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of one (1) full academic year of active athletic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For 2020 &amp; Beyond:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshmen &amp; Freshman-Level Transfers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of two (2) full academic years of active athletic participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Other Transfers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum of one (1) full academic year of active athletic participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Important Note:**
May not convert a student-athlete from active participant to student manager in order to meet the student-athlete minimum participation requirement

Athletics is responsible for monitoring participation and adherence to the minimum participation requirement for each student-athlete. Requests for exceptions to this requirement must be reviewed and approved by the SAAC. Undergraduate Admission may rescind admission for failure to meet the minimum participation requirement.

Exceptions to the minimum participation requirement can be made either by the student-athlete or Head Coach. A student-athlete may request to quit their team prior to the participation requirement being met or a Head Coach may request to dismiss a student-athlete from the team prior to the participation requirement being met. Exceptions from either party must fall within two categories: 1) physical and mental health concern; and 2) conduct issue.

Requests for exception must be done in writing with significant documentation (e.g., medical documentation from team physician or conduct logs) accompanying the request. Requests will be provided to the Senior Associate Athletic Director and presented to the SAAC at the next meeting opportunity. Committee consideration will follow the same protocols as an admission evaluation and decision, and the decision will be reflected in the meeting minutes.

If the Committee were to grant an exception to the minimum participation requirement, the requestor will be informed following the meeting by Athletics and the student-athlete will be removed as an active participant on the roster.

If the Committee were not to grant an exception to the minimum participation requirement, the requestor will be informed following the meeting by Athletics and the student-athlete will be informed of their options: 1) continue to engage in their sport as an active participant; 2) transfer to another institution; or 3) admission to be rescinded. The student-athlete will be provided with five (5) working days to make a final decision on how to best move forward. The final decision will be communicated to the Committee by the Senior Associate Athletic Director.

II. Definitions
For the purposes of this policy the following terms have the following meanings:

**Undergraduate Admission:** The office of Undergraduate Admission at UCLA, under the purview of Enrollment Management, is solely and exclusively responsible for actions and decisions concerning recruiting, admitting and enrolling undergraduate students to UCLA.

**Undergraduate Admission Staff:** Any employee (whether full-time, part-time, volunteer or student employee) serving in the office of Undergraduate Admission in a management, administrative or support capacity in which they supervise, work with or provide services related to students who are prospects for admission to UCLA.

**Athletic Staff:** Any employee (whether full-time, part-time, volunteer or student employee) serving in the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics.
**Student Athlete:** Any student who is recruited to participate in NCAA Division I and the Pac-12 Conference conference.

**III. STATEMENT**

**A. Undergraduate Admission Policy**
UCLA Undergraduate Admission policy strictly prohibits communication regarding admission decisions between any UCLA staff and athletic coaches, development, fundraising or government relations, and Undergraduate Admissions Staff, or Other Department Staff, engaged in the evaluation and admission of applicants to UCLA.

**B. Reporting a Violation**
Any Undergraduate Admission Staff member, or other Department Staff member, engaged in the evaluation and admission of applicants to UCLA, with information suggesting a possible violation of this policy shall promptly report it to the office of Undergraduate Admission.

**C. Disciplinary Action/ Failure to Comply**
Violations of this policy may result in appropriate corrective action, up to and including dismissal, as provided in Personnel Policies for Staff Members (PPSM) 62 – Corrective Action, 64 – Termination and Job Abandonment, and 82 – Conflict of Interest or applicable collective-bargaining agreement.