In response to the charge, individual subcommittee members have analyzed the "Statement on Asian American Admission at Brown University" and have spoken with various members of the Brown community. As a group, we have met with current and former admissions officers, including the Director of Admissions. We have held a total of five meetings. Despite the limited time available, the subcommittee is unanimous in finding that an extremely serious situation exists and that immediate remedial measures are called for. We propose a number of these below.

Our findings, conclusions and recommendations are based in part on the uncontested statistical information contained in the Statement, in part on testimony presented to us by the admission staff, and in part on additional documentary evidence. On the basis of this information, we concur with the thrust of the Statement that Asian American applicants have been treated unfairly in the admission process. While in this report we do not claim intentionally unfair treatment on the part of individuals or in the stated admission policies of the University, the admission practices used to implement these policies have resulted in such unfair treatment. If left unrectified, the combination of policies and practices would make the resulting inequities intentional.

In the following, we identify the three most important ways in which policies have led to unfair treatment. The first of these we
call the "historical benchmark" factor. By this we mean the process by
which a set of enrollment goals is established using as a benchmark
figure the enrollment figures of the previous year's freshmen class.
That is, in practice, the structure of an incoming class, i.e. the
total size and the relative proportion of identifiable subgroups
within it, such as athletes, various minority groups, alumni children
and the like, is mainly determined by numerical comparison with the
structure of the preceding years' entering class. This comparison is
monitored throughout the decision making process and with increasing
frequency towards the end of the admission season. As a consequence,
at any point in the admission process these elements, which include
all minority groups, are deemed to be either "over" (-represented),
"under" (-represented), or "on the numbers." In the specific case of
Asian Americans, this practice has resulted in a limit on the number of
admitted applicants. In other words, when the Asian American admits
closely approximates its historic benchmark number, the admission
process is curtailed without regard to the total number of Asian
American applicants for the current year or their academic
qualifications.

The second we denote the "premed" factor. There are several
aspects to this issue. One is a violation of the policy stated on page
16 of the booklet Brown: Application to the College, viz., "University
policy dictates that no candidate for admission be denied solely on
the basis of the degree program for which he or she seeks con-
sideration." We have heard testimony to the effect that Asian American
applicants are disproportionately interested in pre-med concentration
programs and because of this most are not admitted. Even if this were
to be true, this particular reason for denying admission constitutes the violation of the policy. We do not, however, agree that the number of Asian American pre-med applicants is sufficiently large to be deemed disproportionate, nor is it large enough to justify the disproportionality in the admit rates. This claim results from a reliance on inference and not necessarily on the declared concentration interest of the applicant. While the use of inferential factors may be valid for assessing non-minority applicants, any inferential conclusions are highly subject to cultural biases and stereotypes in the evaluation of minorities and in particular Asian American applicants. All the admission officers confirmed that such biases and stereotypes function negatively in the admission process for Asian Americans, a point we examine more fully below. In addition to this subjective means of characterizing Asian applicants in a negative way, we also have concluded from our investigation that the admission process in reality looks at the number of admitted Asian Americans, not the number of admitted pre-med applicants, when shaping the structure of the class. That is, instead of characterizing the total number of admitted premeds as being "over," it is the number of Asian American admits which is deemed to be "over." While we recognize the legitimate desire to seek a class with balanced academic interest, this must not be achieved at the cost of unfairness to any ethnic group.

The third we label the "personal" factor. This arises from the use of academic and non-academic criteria to judge applicants. Judging the non-academic or personal characteristics of an applicant is at least half of the decision making process. However it was clearly
stated by all the admission staff to whom we spoke that Asian American applicants receive comparatively low non-academic ratings. These unjustified low ratings are due to the cultural biases and stereotypes which prevail in the admission office. Such biases and stereotypes prevent admission officers from appreciating and accurately evaluating the backgrounds and nuances of the Asian American cultural experience. This subcommittee has found a clear need for sensitivity training of the admissions staff to the different experiences not only of Asian Americans but of all minority groups.

On the basis of the preceding findings and conclusions, we present the following recommendations and explanatory comments:

Recommendation 1.

The admit (selection) rate of each minority subgroup of applicants be at least equal to the admit rate of non-minority applicants.

Explanation

The present situation, in particular the basing of the structure of the entering class on the historical benchmark criterion has made it more difficult for Asian Americans than for any other ethnic or racial group to be admitted to Brown. The subcommittee unanimously agrees that the use of the admit rate as a measure of equity is the only means of achieving the equal treatment of all minority subgroups.

Recommendation 2.

An extensive, professionally designed (e.g. by SOAR)
sensitivity training program for all admissions staff should be implemented immediately. Such a training program should occur every year, preferably in the late summer or early fall.

**Recommendation 3.**

The selection of minority applicants so as to achieve the admit rate of recommendation 1 is the responsibility of the (sensitized) admissions office. In the event that this office is unable to select enough qualified applicants to fulfill this admit rate, the Minority Review Committee will then review all non-admitted minority candidates and present to the board of admissions a sufficiently large pool of minority applicants as needed. The board will make its final decision from this pool so as to achieve at least the admit rate.

**Explanation**

Historically there have been more academically qualified candidates in all ethnic categories than have been admitted. We accept the statement of individual MRC members that, when it is necessary, the MRC can provide the desired sensitivity and awareness to discriminate among the non-admitted minority applicants and thus provide guidance on making further selections.

**Recommendation 4.**

In addition to sensitivity training for the entire admission staff, we also recommend that the network of interviewers and recruiters be made aware of these concerns. The National Alumni Schools Program should be charged with organizing a training and consciousness-raising program for this network.


Recommendation 5.

Statistical information concerning admissions and financial aid is to be made available on request to legitimate University groups with an interest in these areas, e.g. the Corporation Committee on Minority Affairs, the Corporation Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, CAFA, Minority Student Organizations, or the Director of the Third World Center and its governing board.

Recommendation 6.

The President of the University should proclaim the above five recommendations as part of the official University policy on admissions.

Recommendation 7.

A task force, which includes MRC members, should be formed immediately with the purpose of revising current admission application forms so that cultural and personal attributes of minority applicants can be brought out in ways that will help evaluate their applications more accurately.
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