

A Review of UIC's Transition Year to the Common Application

Executive Summary

In November 2011, UIC applied for membership in the Common Application consortium; we were accepted in February 2012.

The following are points of major milestone or questions to date with our move to the Common Application.

- The number of freshman applicants to UIC is slightly higher than the number received last year. There were 14,603 Fall 2013 Freshman applicants, compared to 14,387 applicants Fall 2012.
- The word *applicants* represents distinct individuals, while *applications* represents all applications submitted, including those students who have applied to more than one program or college.
- Prior to Fall 2013, the application process allowed for duplicate applications (to more than one program and/or college).
 - ✓ In Fall 2012, there were 532 applicants who had more than 1 application in the system.
 - ✓ The Common App does not allow applicants to submit more than one application to a university, although a small number of applicants did circumvent the system by creating a second account in the Common App.
 - ✓ The decrease in the number of LAS applications should be tempered by the 515 Fall 2012 LAS applications that were also represented in another college.
 - ✓ A redirect effort for Fall 2013 students not admitted to the colleges of Business, Engineering, Education and Applied Health Sciences to LAS to provide some measure of comparability to the duplicate application phenomenon discussed earlier. Over 400 applications were redirected to another program.
- The dramatic increase in the 'unknown' racial/ethnic category confounds the discussion on racial/ethnic composition of the applicant pool. It is also important to note the national trend of students opting to not identify racial/ethnic category.
- Four colleges saw an increase in applications: CBA 22%, EDUC 80%, ENGIN 42%, AHS 38%.
- A & A is even with the Fall 2012 application count.
- LAS experienced increases in applications to all majors other than Undeclared and five 'Teaching of ...' majors.
- The increased level of applications to CBA, EDUC, ENGIN, AHS and the declared majors in LAS are compensated by a decrease in the LAS undeclared category.
- We continue to communicate with key feeder institutions and constituencies about Fall 2013 enrollment and planning for the Fall 2014 application cycle.
- The pool of applicants from outside Illinois, and from other countries has increased substantially. The domestic, non-Illinois resident applications increased 34% from (1816 to 2425). The International applications have increased 69% (from 590 to 999). Thus, the goal of enhancing our geographic diversity appears to be aided by the broader presence found through the CA.
- The academic credentials (based on ACT scores) of the applicant pool was the highest we have ever experienced.
- This translated to a lower deny and a higher admit rate. Yield rates decreased in light of a 13% increase in the number of admits. The ambitious yield events calendar this spring reflected an appreciation that admit-to-enroll efforts needed to be enhanced to attract these more competitive students.

For detailed information on Fall 2013 application cycle, please contact Kevin Browne, UIC Vice Provost for Academic and Enrollment Services, kbrowne@uic.edu, 312-413-3471.

Kevin Browne, Vice Provost for Academic & Enrollment Services
KBrowne@uic.edu

Purpose: This document is an update of UIC's transition year to the Common Application for the Fall 2013 application cycle.

UIC joined the Common Application as the mechanism for submission of student interest, applications, and credentials for the fall 2013 application cycle. The timeline to move to the Common Application was aggressive and the learning has been fast and furious for the staff, students and our educational partners. As we bridge to the admission and yield part of the recruitment and admissions cycle, we take stock of both the process and the application/applicant pool for Fall 2013.

A full description of the Common Application and UIC preparation to transition to the CA is described in Appendix A drawn from various campus documents.

The UIC Fall 2013 Applicant Pool

We learned much from transition year experience with the Common Application. The move to the Common Application certainly influenced aspects of the applicant pool. However, it is important to acknowledge a number of factors as part of the overall transition.

The campus received **14,603** Fall 2013 Freshman **applicants**, compared to **14,387** applicants Fall 2012.

Important to note is that these figures represent applicants (unique individuals) rather than applications. Prior to Fall 2013, the application process allowed for duplicate applications (to more than one program and/or college). In Fall 2012, there were over 500 students who had more than 1 application in the system.

Table 1 below shows the distribution of applications across colleges.

Distribution of Freshman Applications				
Fall 2012 and Fall 2013				
College	F12 Appl	F13 Appl	Diff F13-F12	Change
CBA	1504	1833	329	21.9%
EDUC	291	523	232	79.7%
ENGIN	1785	2525	740	41.5%
A & A	960	964	4	0.4%
LAS	9838	8722	-1116	-11.3%
AHS	537	739	202	37.6%
TOTALS	14915	15306	391	2.6%

Some notes about these numbers:

- The LAS decrease was primarily tied to a decrease in Undeclared Majors.
- It is important to note that the Fall 2012 application count includes 532 duplicate applications. Prior to the Fall 2013 application cycle, students were able to submit multiple applications to UIC.
- The Common App does not allow students to submit multiple applications (although 22 students did circumvent obstacles, and submitted 2 applications to UIC). After January 31, Admissions implemented an institutional 'redirect' program to allow applicant's credentials to be considered by more than one program. Thus, the Fall 2013 numbers reflect 22 students with more than one application, plus over 400 students who have received a redirect offer for consideration in LAS.

Racial/Ethnic Mix

The racial/ethnic mix of the applicant pool is also of significant interest and important to note as we examine the status of the Fall 2013 candidate pool to date. Table 2 below contrasts the Fall 2012 applicant pool racial/ethnic mix.

TABLE 2:

Racial/Ethnic Category	Applicants				Admits			
	F12	F13	Change F13-F12	% Change	F12	F13	Change F13-F12	% Change
AIAN	17	50	33	194%	7	23	16	229%
Asian	2578	2633	55	2%	2045	2229	184	9%
Black/African American	2148	1867	-281	-13%	839	1022	183	22%
Hispanic	4223	3540	-683	-16%	2319	2430	111	5%
International	528	913	385	73%	270	499	229	85%
Multi-Race	433	458	25	6%	295	320	25	8%
NHPI	51	15	-36	-71%	34	8	-26	-76%
Unknown	177	652	474	268%	92	296	204	222%
White	4228	4475	247	6%	3292	3601	309	9%
	14383	14603	219	2%	9193	10428	1235	13%

The dramatic increase in the 'unknown' category continues to stymie the discussion about the racial/ethnic composition of the applicant and admit pool. That said, a number of units participated in a variety of targeted efforts with various constituencies – high school counselors, community groups and prospective students to facilitate the transition to the Common Application. Yield activities were especially critical building the Fall 2013 freshman class. An ambitious and extensive yield calendar of events was implemented in collaboration and participation of all freshman-admitting colleges and many other campus units.

Admissibility

Table 3 below provides a comparison of ACT and High School Percentile Rank (HSPR) of the candidates for admission for Fall 2012 and 2013, showing the proportion of applicants in each ACT/HSPR cell (combination of scores). These particular academic credentials (ACT and HSPR) of the Fall 2013 applicant pool were modestly higher than those of the Fall 2012 applicant pool. [The same table with counts in each cell is found in appendix B, Appendix C provides this detail of African American and Hispanic students].

- Almost one-third of the Fall 2013 applicant pool had ACT scores of 26 and better compared to just over 27% of the Fall 2012 applicant pool.
- The proportion of the applicant pool with ACT scores of 20 and below went from 20% to 15%.
- Changes in the HSPR were modest.

Table 3:

Fall 2012 Applicants - Distribution of Scores								
ACT Groupings	HSPR Groupings							Total
	No HSPR	<50	50-59	60-69	70-74	75-89	>89	
No ACT	5.5%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.1%	7.1%
<20	1.1%	5.1%	2.5%	2.8%	1.6%	5.0%	2.4%	20.3%
20	0.3%	1.5%	0.6%	0.9%	0.5%	1.8%	1.2%	6.9%
21	0.4%	1.6%	0.8%	1.2%	0.8%	2.1%	1.1%	7.9%
22	0.4%	1.5%	0.8%	1.1%	0.7%	2.2%	1.4%	8.0%
23	0.4%	1.2%	0.6%	1.1%	0.7%	2.3%	1.4%	7.8%
24-25	0.8%	1.7%	1.3%	1.7%	1.2%	4.7%	3.0%	14.4%
>25	1.3%	1.5%	1.3%	2.4%	1.7%	9.0%	10.3%	27.5%
Total	10.1%	14.7%	8.1%	11.4%	7.3%	27.5%	21.0%	14373

Fall 2013 Applicants (YTD 3-15-13) - Distribution of Scores								
ACT Groupings	HSPR Groupings							Total
	No HSPR	<50	50-59	60-69	70-74	75-89	>89	
No ACT	2.8%	0.8%	0.3%	0.4%	0.3%	1.1%	0.8%	6.5%
<20	0.6%	3.4%	1.9%	2.0%	1.1%	3.7%	2.1%	14.7%
20	0.2%	1.4%	0.6%	1.2%	0.6%	1.8%	0.9%	6.8%
21	0.4%	1.3%	0.8%	1.0%	0.7%	1.9%	1.1%	7.1%
22	0.3%	1.2%	0.7%	1.2%	0.7%	2.6%	1.3%	7.8%
23	0.5%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.9%	2.8%	1.6%	8.5%
24-25	1.2%	1.7%	1.3%	1.9%	1.3%	5.9%	3.4%	16.7%
>25	1.9%	1.7%	1.3%	2.4%	1.9%	10.9%	11.8%	31.9%
Total	7.9%	12.2%	7.8%	11.1%	7.4%	30.6%	22.9%	14603

In attempt to better understand if the Common Application transition influenced application numbers from key feeder institutions, we looked at the high school of enrollment of the applicants. These are imperfect measures, but can provide a general view.

Table 4 below shows the number of applications from select key feeder high schools for F12 contrasting to F13 along with the average ACT composite of each respective group.

High School	F12	ACT Avg	F13	ACT Avg
Adlai E Stevenson High Sch	133	26.9	105	27.1
Curie Metropolitan HS	203	20.1	205	21.0
J S Morton High Sch East	140	20.2	112	20.7
Lake View High Sch	175	19.4	163	20.7
Lane Tech High Sch	384	24.5	454	25.0
Lincoln Park High Sch	121	23.4	167	24.7
Neuqua Valley High Sch	122	27.3	101	27.5
Niles North High Sch	116	23.7	148	24.6
Niles Township West Hs	173	24.0	163	23.9
Prosser Career Academy	108	19.6	91	19.9
Thomas Kelly High Sch	149	20.3	98	19.9
UIC College Prep	155	21.9	119	23.4

In some instances, there are fewer applications from some of the high schools, however, the average ACT of the applicant pool from the high schools is slightly higher in most cases.

LAS Applications and Applicant Pool

The 11% decrease in the number of applications to LAS was examined. It is instructive to disaggregate the LAS applications by curriculum. Table 5 on the following page tallies the applications, admits and enrollment numbers within LAS by major. Total LAS admits increased by 3% while enrollment decreased by 7% from Fall 2012.

Highlights from the table:

- The decrease in number of new freshmen was by far most notably in LAS-Undeclared with a decrease of 350 – a 31% decrease from Fall 2012. As a proportion of the overall LAS freshman class, ‘undeclared’ went from 52% of the class in Fall 2012 to 39% in Fall 2013.
- The application to enroll rate in Fall 2012 of LAS-Undeclared was 22% compared to 35% in Fall 2013. Yield (admit to enroll) increased from 38% to 44%.
- Five of the ‘Teaching of’ majors showed decreases while applications to the College of Education enrollment increased 80%.
- Biological Sciences experienced a 19% increase in new freshmen over 2012; Psychology saw a 7% increase over 2012. For Chemistry and Political Science, the increase was 5% and 85% respectively. Mathematics doubled the number of new freshmen.

TABLE 5:

LAS Fall 2012 and Fall 2013						
Major	Fall 2012			Fall 2013		
	Appl	Admit	Enroll	Appl	Admit	Enroll
African American Studies	6	3	0	11	3	1
Anthropology	54	37	11	83	58	15
Biochemistry	470	364	123	624	487	151
Biological Sciences	1678	1325	405	2282	1815	483
Chemistry	385	293	129	568	461	135
Criminology, Law & Justice			1			
Classical Studies	10	6	2	26	14	2
Earth & Environmental Sciences	54	39	11	81	56	7
Economics	82	51	12	174	122	29
English	147	105	25	207	150	39
French and Francophone Studies	13	10	5	15	9	2
Gender and Women's Studies	13	5	2	17	6	1
Germanic Studies	7	4	1	7	3	0
History	76	55	11	125	88	16
Latin Amer and Latino Studies	9	6	1	8	6	0
Liberal Arts - Undeclared	5219	3000	1145	2298	1808	795
Math & Computer Science	46	21	11	44	31	8
Mathematics	95	59	13	125	95	27
Neuroscience			1			
Philosophy	15	8	5	29	16	4
Physics	51	33	16	96	62	23
Polish	2	2	1	3	2	0
Political Science	178	122	26	346	233	48
Psychology	940	585	189	1170	773	203
Russian	4	2	1	6	4	1
Sociology	121	67	23	210	121	32
Spanish	27	21	5	32	23	9
Stats & Operations Res	10	6	3	12	10	1
Teaching of Chemistry	7	5	1	6	4	1
Teaching of English	64	37	12	35	21	3
Teaching of French	3	1		2	2	1
Teaching of German	1	0		1	0	0
Teaching of History	58	36	7	24	11	1
Teaching of Physics	3	2	1	4	4	0
Teaching of Spanish	23	16	3	15	9	2
	9871	6326	2202	8686	6507	2040

Similar to the comparison of the number of new freshmen from key feeder high schools discussed earlier (Table 4), table 6 below shows the number of students from select key **LAS** feeder high schools for F12 contrasting to F13 to date along with the average ACT composite of each respective group.

High School	F12	ACT Avg	F13	ACT Avg
Adlai E Stevenson High Sch	22	24.9	15	27.9
Curie Metropolitan HS	43	21.3	38	22.6
J S Morton High Sch East	39	21.5	16	22.0
Lake View High Sch	25	20.2	30	21.3
Lane Tech High Sch	88	24.3	94	24.8
Lincoln Park High Sch	20	24.1	28	25.2
Neuqua Valley High Sch	30	26.9	15	27.6
Niles North High Sch	26	24.0	30	24.6
Niles Township West Hs	45	23.7	47	23.4
Prosser Career Academy	13	21.6	11	20.6
Thomas Kelly High Sch	38	21.5	18	21.8
UIC College Prep	27	22.3	19	22.8

Table 7 below provides a comparison of the new students based on the ACT composite scores.

	F12		F13	
<20	181	8%	95	5%
20-22	710	32%	616	30%
23-25	690	31%	679	33%
26-27	288	13%	272	13%
>27	339	15%	378	19%

Sixty-five percent of the Fall 2013 LAS freshmen have an ACT composite of 23 or greater. This figure was 59% for the Fall 2012 class.

Lessons Learned

The transition was been hectic, informative, and enlightening. The examination of data and effort to better understand the context of our admissions cycle has informed Admissions, the colleges and the campus overall. Some comments, lessons and thoughts moving forward:

- The increased use of a duplicate application by students to leverage opportunity for admission has grown over the years. Table 8 below details the comparison of applicants and applications since Fall 2005. This phenomenon, while known and acknowledged, the full understanding of the role it played, particularly for LAS, was not fully taken into account in the implementation of the CA.

Term	Applicants	Applications
F05	12682	12920
F06	13001	13441
F07	13594	13895
F08	14288	14531
F09	14665	15045
F10	14904	15344
F11	14570	15196
F12	14387	14976
F13	14603	15306

- Part of the difficulty in students selecting a major is the overly descriptive (to the point of confusing) nomenclature used to describe a program. Rather than listing: *Liberal Arts: Undeclared NONE: Liberal Arts and Sciences* as the major description for undecided students, a simpler classification should be explored (i.e. "Undecided" or "Exploratory"). A change in the listing of majors was implemented for the Fall 2014 application cycle.
- In preparing for the Fall 2014 application cycle, particular attention to clarity of the listing of majors guided all decisions.
- Programs which require gatekeeper coursework (Communications, Criminology, Law & Justice, and Neuroscience) should be listed as options under the major tab menu, even if they are then routed to Undeclared. This issue is addressed in the display of majors in the Fall 2014 application.
- While the CA allows for the extension of a 'cutoff' deadline (the date that controls when application submissions are allowed or restricted), it is inflexible in adjusting the 'published' deadline (the date that is apparent to the applicant on the website). Thus, the *public* configuration or presentation of the UIC application in the Common Application is established on August 1 of the prior year (for the Fall 2013 cycle, established August 1, 2012) and cannot change for the duration of the cycle. Thus, although we extended the UIC Freshman deadline, the CA website continued to appear with a January 15, 2013 deadline. While we worked within the constraints of these policies (e.g., email contact with applicants 'in the pipeline' to encourage submission after the 'published' deadline, the inflexibility was an obstacle to transparency with applicants.

We understood that the 'build' of the applicant pool would be different under the CA. Table 9 below demonstrates the change in flow of applications to the Admissions staff. In the past, applications have been submitted earlier in the cycle and more gradually over the fall months. Just over 35% of the Fall 2013 applications were submitted in January. The adjustment was expected, and the data confirms a very different application submission cycle.

Submit Date	F05	F06	F07	F08	F09	F10	F11	F12	F13
Summ	57	153	232	208	228	183	216	180	15
Sept	517	743	746	767	933	842	706	712	299
Oct	2040	2323	2607	2653	3136	2900	2646	2901	1829
Nov	3243	3440	3223	2979	3282	3373	3579	3436	3084
Dec	3047	2564	2649	3227	3089	3027	2781	3207	3301
Jan	2934	2974	3106	3477	3344	3293	3408	3300	5170
Feb	449	584	867	880	547	866	847	539	577
Mar	252	159	92	68	83	268	336	64	288
Apr	124	34	45	14	8	135	33	24	12
May	14	11	20	9	8	12	12	11	13
June	5	16	7	6	6	5	6	13	11
TOTALS	12682	13001	13594	14288	14664	14904	14570	14387	14603
<i>N.B.: Represents applicants (individuals). Earliest application submission date is used when multiple were presented.</i>									
Fall FR Enr	2776	2852	3291	2964	3147	3204	3115	3123	3104

- Some additional notes about the Fall 2013 applicant pool:
 - ✓ The pool of applicants from outside Illinois, and from other countries has increased substantially. The domestic, non-Illinois resident new freshmen have increased 23% from (from 86 to 106). The International students increased 29% (from 42 to 54). Thus, the goal of enhancing our geographic diversity appears to be aided by the broader presence found through the CA.
 - ✓ The academic credentials (based on ACT scores) of the applicant pool was higher. This translated to a lower deny rate and a higher admit rate.
 - ✓ The admitted student pool appeared more decisive. That is, a larger proportion of the pool clearly indicated their intent to enroll/or declined the offer.
 - ✓ The 'completeness' of the application pool allowed us to make decisions about the applications at a far higher rate. Of the Fall 2012 application pool, 11% were denied because of incomplete credentials. The Deny-Incompletes total 8% of the Fall 2013 application total. Table 10 on the following page provides a Fall 2012/Fall 2013 comparison of application outcomes by college.

Table 10 details the application outcomes by college comparing Fall 2012 and Fall 2013.

Table 10: Application Outcomes Comparison										
Fall 2012										
College	Appl	Admit	ACT Avg	ITE	Decline	Deny- Incomplete	Enroll	ACT Avg	Admit Rate	Yield
CBA	1504	888	24.3	290	96	218	262	23.6	59%	30%
Educ	291	160	22.4	61	21	37	57	22.3	55%	36%
Engin	1785	992	27.6	346	146	219	327	27.1	56%	33%
A&A	960	577	23.9	188	93	160	177	22.8	60%	31%
LAS	9838	6326	24.6	2395	816	943	2202	23.8	64%	35%
AHS	537	284	24.9	102	31	62	98	24.6	53%	35%
	14915	9227	24.8	3382	1203	1639	3123	24.1	62%	34%
Fall 2013										
College	Appl	Admit	ACT Avg	ITE	Decline	Deny- Incomplete	Enroll	ACT Avg	Admit Rate	Yield
CBA	1833	1316	24.1	383	156	202	341	23.2	72%	26%
Educ	523	241	23.3	69	34	50	64	22.1	46%	27%
Engin	2525	1333	27.9	375	192	235	371	27.3	53%	28%
A&A	964	628	23.9	202	95	108	183	22.8	65%	29%
LAS	8722	6544	25	2252	1109	627	2040	24.3	75%	31%
AHS	739	369	25.1	110	66	39	105	24.9	50%	28%
	15306	10431	25.1	3391	1652	1261	3104	24.4	68%	30%
Change Fall 2013 compared to Fall 2012										
College	Appl	Admit		ITE	Decline	Deny- Incomplete	Enroll	ACT Avg	Admit Rate	Yield
CBA	21.7%	48.2%	-0.8%	32.1%	62.5%	-7.3%	30.2%	-1.7%	21.7%	-12.2%
Educ	79.7%	50.6%	4.0%	13.1%	61.9%	35.1%	12.3%	-0.9%	-16.2%	-25.5%
Engin	41.4%	34.4%	1.1%	8.4%	31.5%	7.3%	13.5%	0.7%	-5.0%	-15.6%
A&A	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	7.4%	2.2%	-32.5%	3.4%	0.0%	8.8%	-5.0%
LAS	-11.4%	3.4%	1.6%	-6.0%	35.9%	-33.5%	-7.4%	2.1%	16.7%	-10.4%
AHS	37.6%	29.9%	0.8%	7.8%	112.9%	-37.1%	7.1%	1.2%	-5.6%	-17.5%
	2.5%	13.0%	1.2%	0.3%	37.3%	-23.1%	-0.6%	1.2%	10.2%	-12.1%

Thoughts/Considerations moving forward for Fall 2014

- A redirect effort for students not admitted to the colleges of Business, Engineering, Education and Applied Health Sciences can provide some measure of comparability to the duplicate application phenomenon discussed earlier. Over 400 applications were 'redirected' during the Fall 2013 application cycle.
- An ambitious calendar of yield events is necessary as the quality of the applicant/admit pool improves.
- Outreach to feeder schools, parents and students served to enhance both the pool of candidates and the yield.
- Planned, intentional and targeted efforts to build relations with key constituent groups including CPS.
- Improving 'branding' of the LAS curricula and majors.
- We continue to consider how to brand LAS - Undeclared as an entry to UIC and encourage students to consider the LAS -undeclared as a path to a UIC degree.

Appendix A: Description of the Common Application Membership

In November 2011, UIC applied for membership in the Common Application consortium; we were accepted in February 2012. The Common Application, a nonprofit organization, is open to universities that take a holistic approach to admitting students — meaning they must consider more than just test scores and high school grade-point averages by looking at factors such as recommendation letters, essays and diversity. Last year, 660,000 people submitted 2.72 million applications through the online Common Application.

The Common Application has, since its founding over 35 years ago, has been committed to providing reliable services that promote equity, access, and integrity in the college application process. They serve students, member institutions, and secondary schools by providing applications that students and school officials may submit to one of nearly 500 members. It is managed by the staff of a not-for-profit membership association (The Common Application, Inc.) and governed by a 13-member volunteer Board of Directors drawn from the ranks of college admission deans and secondary school college guidance counselors.

Member institutions like UIC may also require a "Common App Supplement," and ask additional questions, with only two restrictions: 1) supplement questions may not re-ask questions already asked on the Common Application (except identifying information like name, address, date of birth, etc.), and 2) supplement questions may not ask questions that violate the [NACAC](#) Statement of Principles and Good Practice (such as "please rank order your college choices.").

UIC's move to the Common Application was motivated by the following;

- UIC's prior application system was neither robust nor able to be used in the variety of access devices that current applicants are used to using (smart phones, tablets etc.)
- The cost and time line for a vendor solution has been estimated in years and in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Neither was viewed as viable.
- UIC for the fall 2012 applicant cycle received 25% of its application in paper form, causing large delays in processing and decisions
- The Common Application would high light UIC to students both across the US and globally.
- The advantage of the [Common Application](#) is that it is the same for nearly 500 college and universities and can save time and trouble for a student. While UIC was the first Illinois public to join the Common Application, UIC was the 14th in the state, and the 6th in Chicago.

APPENDIX B

ACT/HSPR Scores Fall 2012 and Fall 2013 – All Applicants

Fall 2012 Applicants - Distribution of Scores								
ACT Groupings	HSPR Groupings							Total
	No HSPR	<50	50-59	60-69	70-74	75-89	>89	
No ACT	788	86	28	30	11	58	21	1022
<20	152	736	355	397	223	717	343	2923
20	44	221	93	130	76	254	178	996
21	56	225	118	167	109	302	158	1135
22	52	216	108	158	100	322	198	1154
23	58	171	89	159	107	334	201	1119
24-25	120	242	189	246	176	672	433	2078
>25	183	221	183	348	244	1294	1483	3956
Total	1453	2118	1163	1635	1046	3953	3015	14383

Fall 2013 Applicants - Distribution of Scores								
ACT Groupings	HSPR Groupings							Total
	No HSPR	<50	50-59	60-69	70-74	75-89	>89	
No ACT	407	119	47	56	45	156	112	942
<20	89	490	276	298	163	533	300	2149
20	35	198	91	169	91	269	135	988
21	54	184	114	143	100	282	166	1043
22	44	169	103	171	98	373	185	1143
23	74	138	119	149	126	404	228	1238
24-25	175	244	196	283	189	861	497	2445
>25	273	241	196	355	271	1592	1726	4654
Total	1151	1783	1142	1624	1083	4470	3349	14602

APPENDIX C

Build of the African American Freshman Applicant Pool Fall 2005 to Fall 2013									
Submit Date	F05	F06	F07	F08	F09	F10	F11	F12	F13
Summ	8	37	52	63	55	41	56	51	2
Sept	40	78	76	88	94	83	93	94	36
Oct	145	200	234	228	340	339	357	380	251
Nov	446	547	444	383	551	557	603	535	443
Dec	492	370	380	612	514	538	431	526	395
Jan	609	542	559	701	602	530	525	419	592
Feb	103	144	234	240	152	210	162	102	97
Mar	71	48	31	19	28	77	87	22	44
Apr	36	13	19	5	3	53	9	12	3
May	4	4	8	3	0	2	4	3	3
June	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	5	1
TOTALS	1954	1983	2038	2342	2341	2430	2329	2149	1867

N.B.: Represents applicants (individuals). Earliest application submission date is used when multiple were presented.

Build of the Latino Freshman Applicant Pool Fall 2005 to Fall 2013									
Submit Date	F05	F06	F07	F08	F09	F10	F11	F12	F13
Summ	9	13	29	13	24	31	30	19	4
Sept	53	57	61	68	97	103	92	137	28
Oct	203	276	271	308	409	479	464	720	368
Nov	481	531	527	446	669	710	947	953	789
Dec	668	502	512	579	678	861	805	1112	828
Jan	775	774	773	871	911	996	1062	1052	1307
Feb	91	167	248	350	171	273	292	212	129
Mar	43	28	16	15	12	62	100	13	80
Apr	29	5	2	2	1	26	3	3	2
May	0	0	1	3	2	4	2	0	3
June	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	2
TOTALS	2352	2354	2440	2656	2974	3545	3800	4223	3540

N.B.: Represents applicants (individuals). Earliest application submission date is used when multiple were presented.