

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (the witness)

Representatives: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (representative 2)

Interviewers: Pranita Raghavan, Compliance Team Attorney
Coleen Chin, Compliance Team Attorney

Dates: October 1, 2009 and January 21, 2010

Re: Princeton University, OCR Case No. 02-08-6002

Location: By telephone, OCR conference room

OCR interviewed the witness in order to obtain her statement regarding the admissions process for the class of 2010. OCR advised the witness that she is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the witness stated that she would like representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR advised the witness that the interviewers would take notes during the interview that would be incorporated into a formal interview statement for the file. OCR advised the witness that the contents of the file are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but that names, telephone numbers, and other personally identifying information would be redacted before the release of any requested documents. OCR advised the witness that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the university for her participation in an investigation. OCR also explained its investigation process, that it is a neutral fact-finder, and that OCR initiated a compliance review into whether the university discriminated against Asians, on the bases of race or national origin, in its admissions process for the class of 2010, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

Background

- The witness confirmed she is a [redacted] (b)(7)(C). For the class of 2010, she served as the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) for the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) region. She is currently the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) for [redacted] (b)(7)(C) and [redacted] (b)(7)(C). For the class of 2010, she also [redacted] (b)(7)(C) as the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(7)(C).
- For the class of 2010, she reported to Janet Rapelye (the Dean of Admission) and Christopher Watson (the Director of Admission). [redacted] (b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(7)(C) reported directly to her.

Review of Admissions Process

- The witness confirmed the steps listed below.
 - Once file is complete, it is assigned to a regional team coordinator.
 - Team coordinator assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on quick read.
 - File then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action.”
 - File then returns to team coordinator, who agrees with, edits, or overrules first reader.
 - All applicant files listed on docket for committee review; team coordinator brings most promising ones to attention of committee – might include handful of students from same school.
 - The dean of admissions or the former associate dean chaired the committees; decision is reached by informal polling.
 - Committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round.
 - Second round of committee review is winnowing down the class and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering/oboe players.

Alumni Interviews

- The witness stated she [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) for the class of [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C). Each alumni regional committee conducts outreach to obtain alumni interviewers. She edited the materials sent to the alumni interviewers.
- The witness stated that the interview is one of many factors considered by the university, and provides applicants the opportunity to ask questions about the university. The alumni interviewers are instructed to serve more as a reporter, and not as a judge. The interviews are often helpful to “flesh out” an applicant’s extracurricular activities.
- The witness stated that the alumni interview is one of the many factors considered by the admission office, and that readers are instructed to take the interview reports “with a grain of salt.” She added that the applicant’s transcript is the most important factor in an applicant’s application.
- The witness stated that sometimes there are no comments in the “ASC” Comments” section if the interview has not been completed or received by the admission office yet. If the interview report arrives later, then the report will be noted during the committee review.
- The witness stated that there are 7,000 active alumni interviewers. They receive no training other than receiving an interviewing packet. The packet consists of interview guidelines. If she is alerted about a concern about an interview, she requests that the alumni committee chair for that region contact the interviewer. The witness stated that she is notified of two to three concerns each admission cycle, and has a record of these concerns.

Training

- The witness stated that there was an annual training held in November 2005, in which they reviewed practice files and an admission manual. There was no specific training for each region.
- She became familiar with the high schools by visiting the schools in the fall and from reading the high school's profile that was included the school's secondary school report submitted to the admission office.
- When asked if she received training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin, the witness stated that race is always part of the discussion, among other diversity factors. There is no specific training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin, or regarding stereotypes. The witness also stated that the admission manual includes statistical breakdowns by race.

Outreach

- The witness stated that tours and information sessions are conducted by the university. In addition, admission staff members visit high schools. She also stated that the university uses a search service that helps it select students to whom the university should mail applications.
- When asked if there are any outreach efforts targeted to Asian students, the witness stated that she does not remember where admission staff travelled for the class of 2010. She stated that different community groups visit the school. When asked, the witness stated that she did not know whether outreach efforts increased the number of Asian applicants. She added that the outreach efforts are not targeted to specific groups, and that if Asian applicants have increased, it is likely that the entire applicant pool has increased.

Use of Race/National Origin

- The admission office does not use the term "national origin."
- Race is one of many factors considered by the university.
- Race is considered throughout the admission process.
- She does not remember if the applicant pool's racial composition is discussed before the second round of committee review.
- When asked how the university defines Asian, she stated that the applicant identifies his/her race for the school. The university does not impute race based on language or country of citizenship.
- The university does not have particular goals regarding race.
- When asked if the university considers any group to be underrepresented, the witness responded that the university does not discuss whether particular groups are underrepresented.
- When asked if there are groups that the university is trying to increase, the witness stated that the university wants a diverse class and does not try to increase one category when compared to another.
- When asked if the university met its diversity goals for the class of 2010, the witness stated that she believed that the class was diverse, but that there was no discussion about it.

- She was not involved in any discussion whether the university met its diversity goals. The Dean of Admission may have participated in a discussion about this.
- There were no admission limits for Asian applicants.
- When asked if there were characteristics common to Asian applicants, the witness stated that there were none and that the university viewed each applicant individually.
- The university did not compare Asian applicants against other Asian applicants. Rather, each applicant is evaluated individually.
- When asked if at the end of the admission cycle, if anyone reviews the process, the witness stated that the Dean will assess the diversity of the class. For example, she will review how many musicians, etc. were admitted. One of the variables she reviews is race, among many other variables.

Specific Comments Made by Witness on Admission Reader Cards Reviewed by OCR

1) ID (b)(7)(C) (Native American applicant): “Performance really [underlined] slows this case, but as Native Amer. merits a discussion.”

- When asked if the university compared Native American applicants with each other, the witness stated that they were not compared to other Native American applicants. All applicants were reviewed individually and in the context of their school and geographical region.
- The witness stated that the university had no goals with respect to Native American applicants. The university had a general goal for a diverse class.
- She stated that this applicant “merits a discussion” because there were a small number of Native American students on campus.

Abbreviations

OCR asked the witness about the following abbreviations, which she explained as noted.

- Min 5 - is a Native American applicant¹
- Min 3 - is a Mexican/Mexican American
- Min 1 - is an African American/Black
- Min 2 - is a Puerto Rican applicant
- Min 4 - is an “Other Latino” applicant
- Min 6 - is an Asian applicant
- The witness stated that she did not know the meaning of the following abbreviations: “Biracial/3”, “White/5”, “Asian – 6”, “White – 3”

International Students

- An applicant is considered to be an international applicant if his/her school is not in the U.S.

¹ The witness stated that the “Min” categories are derived from the computer program used by the admission office before it started using the current PeopleSoft program. The codes were used for the race of U.S. citizens, and some staff still used the codes after the admission office switched to the PeopleSoft program.

- If the applicant is not a U.S. citizen, then the university codes the applicant as “blank” for race/ethnicity in its applicant database. The university does this because it is not required to record the race/ethnicity of non-U.S. citizens.
- International applicants are grouped by country. However, they are still compared to the entire applicant pool.
- There are no admission quotas or goals with respect to international applicants.
- They do not visit all international schools. They learn about international schools through their secondary school reports and websites.
- When asked why the admission rates for applicants from Asian nations are lower than some non-Asian nations, the witness stated that there are no set admission numbers for these nations. She added that many recruited athletes are from Canada, and more alumni children are from Canada and the U.K. Further, there is no SAT in China. She stated that without a SAT or some other standardized test, such as the ACT, the university has one less common factor by which to compare an applicant with other applicants.

Legacies

- The witness stated that an applicant’s legacy status is just one of many factors considered by the admission staff. An applicant’s legacy status is noted on the reader card.

Recruited Athletes

- The witness stated that coaches provide input about the applicants in which they are most interested. The admission staff considers athletic talent like any other factor.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), Admission Officer (the witness)

Representatives: [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (representative 1)
[REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), Esq. (representative 2)

Interviewers: Pranita Raghavan, Compliance Team Attorney
Coleen Chin, Compliance Team Attorney

Dates: March 25, 2010

Re: Princeton University, OCR case no. 02-08-6002

Location: By telephone, OCR conference room

OCR interviewed the witness in order to obtain his statement regarding the admissions process for the class of 2010. OCR advised the witness that he is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the witness stated that he would like representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR advised the witness that the interviewers would take notes during the interview that would be incorporated into a formal interview statement for the file. OCR advised the witness that the contents of the file are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but that names, telephone numbers, and other personally identifying information would be redacted before the release of any requested documents. OCR advised the witness that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for his participation in an investigation. OCR also explained its investigation process, that it is a neutral fact-finder, and that OCR initiated a compliance review into whether the University discriminated against Asians, on the bases of race or national origin, in its admissions process for the class of 2010, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

Background

- The witness served as a first year admission officer at the University from August 2005 until June 2006. He is now a [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), a non-profit organization.
- The witness served as a first reader for the following regions: Northeast, South, and International (primarily Africa and Latin America). He also attended information sessions.
- His direct supervisor was Christopher Watson, the Director of Admissions.
- He did not participate in the second round of committee review. Dean Rapelye, the Director of Admissions, and the Team Leader participated in the second round of committee review.

Review of Admissions Process

- The witness confirmed the steps listed below.
 - Once file is complete, it is assigned to a regional team coordinator.
 - Team coordinator assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on quick read.
 - File then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action.”
 - File then returns to team coordinator, who agrees with, edits, or overrules first reader.
 - All applicant files listed on docket for committee review; team coordinator brings most promising ones to attention of committee – might include handful of students from same school.
 - The dean of admissions or the former associate dean chaired the committees; decision is reached by informal polling.
 - Committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round.
 - Second round of committee review is winnowing down the class and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering/oboe players. He participated in this winnowing process, along with the dean of admissions and director of admissions.

Training

- As for training, he attended a retreat and was assigned a few admission files to prepare. His work was then reviewed by a Team Leader. He did not receive a separate training based on admission region.
- When asked how he became familiar with the schools, he stated that he travelled within the region and referred to a reader manual that included information about the grade structure.

Outreach

- He participated in outreach to schools with both high and low numbers of applicants, to old and new schools, and to programs (such as those targeted to low income students).
- When asked if there are any outreach efforts targeted to Asian students, the witness stated that there were no outreach efforts directed only to Asian students.

Use of Race/National Origin

- When asked in what ways did race and national origin play into the admission process, the witness stated that it was part of the process in that it was noted on the reader card if the applicant self-identified his/her race and national origin.
- When asked if the University defined racial or national origin diversity, the witness stated that the University did not explicitly define this and instead considered numerous diversity factors, including geographic region, etc.
- When asked if the University defined Asian during admission process, the witness stated that it did not and that there was no set definition. Instead, applicants self-identified their race and national origin on their application. The University never

- independently assigned a race or national origin to an applicant and instead only relied on the applicant's self-identification of his/her race and national origin.
- When asked how the goals regarding racial diversity were communicated to him, the witness stated that the University informed him of the goals of the admission process during a retreat, and that racial and ethnic diversity were discussed during a meeting. He was informed that the class should be as diverse as possible in as many aspects as possible. None of this information was written.
 - When asked, the witness stated that he was never informed whether any groups were underrepresented or overrepresented.
 - When asked at what point race and national origin are considered, the witness stated that they are considered throughout the process, and is only used as an affirmative factor.
 - When asked whether in anticipation of second round of committee review, whether he was aware of any discussion regarding diversity as a whole, he stated that was not aware whether this occurred.
 - Supervisors did not give feedback regarding racial diversity; they only gave feedback regarding evaluation techniques.

Treatment of Asian Applications

- There were no target numbers with respect to Asian applicants.
- There were no positive or negative attributes automatically attributed to Asian applicants.
- They did not compare Asian applicants to other Asian applicants, and they were not singled out as a group.
- When asked if it was harder for an Asian applicant to stand out, the witness stated no. Given the nature of the admission process, it was harder for all students to stand out.

International Students

- When asked how the University considered international students, the witness stated that their applications were reviewed by admission staff with expertise in international schools.
- He stated that applicants were not compared within an international region.
- There were no admission goals with respect to international applicants. During the admissions retreat, staff were told that if there were more qualified international applicants one year, then more international applicants would be admitted during that year. During the admissions retreat, staff were also provided with folders regarding the academic system of various countries.

Legacies

- Legacy applicants were considered as part of the general application pool.
- Some legacy applicants did not stand out.

Alumni Interviews

- When asked how much weight is given to alumni interviews, the witness stated that not much weight is given to them, but that they may come into play if staff had doubts about a candidate.
- He was not familiar with the training that alumni interviewers received. The ASC Chair is responsible for recruiting interviewers. The interviewers are told to make the applicant feel as comfortable as possible.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) (the witness)

Representatives: [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), Esq. (representative 1)
[REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (representative 2)

Interviewers: Pranita Raghavan, Compliance Team Attorney
Coleen Chin, Compliance Team Attorney

Dates: October 1, 2009 and January 21, 2010

Re: Princeton University, OCR case no. 02-08-6002

Location: By telephone, OCR conference room

OCR interviewed the witness in order to obtain her statement regarding the admissions process for the class of 2010. OCR advised the witness that she is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the witness stated that she would like representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR advised the witness that the interviewers would take notes during the interview that would be incorporated into a formal interview statement for the file. OCR advised the witness that the contents of the file are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but that names, telephone numbers, and other personally identifying information would be redacted before the release of any requested documents. OCR advised the witness that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the university for her participation in an investigation. OCR also explained its investigation process, that it is a neutral fact-finder, and that OCR initiated a compliance review into whether the university discriminated against Asians, on the bases of race or national origin, in its admissions process for the class of 2010, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

Background

- The witness confirmed she is an [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) For the class of 2010, she served as a [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C)
- In July 2000, she served as an associate director. She held this position for two years, and then left for one year to attend graduate school. In July 2003, she became an [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), and became an [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) in January 2007.
- For the class of 2010, she reported to Janet Rapelye (the Dean of Admission) and Christopher Watson (the Director of Admission).

Review of Admissions Process

- The witness confirmed the steps listed below.

- Once file is complete, it is assigned to a regional team coordinator.
- Team coordinator assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on quick read.
- File then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action.”
- File then returns to team coordinator, who agrees with, edits, or overrules first reader.
- All applicant files listed on docket for committee review; team coordinator brings most promising ones to attention of committee – might include handful of students from same school.
- The dean of admissions or the former associate dean chaired the committees; decision is reached by informal polling.
- Committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round.
- Second round of committee review is winnowing down the class and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering/oboe players.
 - The witness added that the second round of committee review is conducted by the Team Leader, Director of Admission, and Dean of Admission.
 - The “RD Preliminary” notation on the reader card is completed by the second reader. A wait list notation is rarely made here. The “RD Final” notation is the committee decision.
 - There are some years in which a second round of review is not needed.

Alumni Interviews

- Alumni interviews are one more piece of information as part of the university’s holistic review of all of the information in an applicant’s file.
- An applicant is not rejected solely because of an alumni interview.
- When asked how much weight is given to the interview, the witness stated that there is no formula and that the transcript is the most important piece of information.
- The witness stated that sometimes there are no comments in the “ASC” Comments” section if the interview has not been completed or received by the admission office yet. Or, the reader may have forgotten to record the comments. If the interview summary arrives during the committee review, the summary is supposed to be placed before the reader card, and the team leader is supposed to highlight the fact that the university received the summary.
- If there were concerns about an alumni interviewer, the university would address them. She does not remember if there were any concerns about any alumni interviewers for the class of 2010.

Training

- The witness stated that staff are trained at trainings during which staff are given the same files to review, and then discuss their analysis of the files.
- Part of her training to become a team leader included visiting high schools.

Outreach

- Admission staff visit high schools, speak with guidance counselors, and attend college fairs. Sometimes the university hosts evening information sessions at hotels.
- They try to visit a variety of schools, and there are some high schools that they visit every year.
- When asked, the witness stated that she did not know whether outreach efforts increased the number of Asian applicants. She added that the outreach efforts are not targeted to specific groups, and that if Asian applicants have increased, it is likely that the entire applicant pool has increased.

Use of Race/National Origin

- Similar to legacy status, race/national origin is noted on reader card.
- Up to applicant to note race/national origin.
- Race is one of many factors considered by the university.
- Race is considered throughout the admission process.
- When asked if applicant pool's racial composition is discussed before the second round of committee review, she stated that diversity is a general expectation.
- When asked how the university defines Asian, she stated that there has been no conversation about this. They try to create a diverse class. She added that the applicant identifies his/her race for the school.
- The university does not have particular goals regarding race.
- When asked if the university considers any group to be underrepresented, the witness responded that the university does not discuss whether particular groups are underrepresented.
- When asked if there are groups that the university is trying to increase, the witness stated that the university wants a diverse class and does not try to increase one category when compared to another.
- When asked if the university met its diversity goals for the class of 2010, the witness stated that she believed that the class was diverse.
- There were no admission limits for Asian applicants.
- When asked if there were characteristics common to Asian applicants, the witness stated that there were none and that the university viewed each applicant individually.
- The university did not compare Asian applicants against other Asian applicants. Rather, each applicant is evaluated individually.

Specific Comments Made by Witness on Admission Reader Cards Reviewed by OCR

- 1) ID (b)(7)(C) (Puerto Rican applicant): “[Candidate] is a straight A student w/ a somewhat challenging courseload. He has pursued AP-level work with some disciplines - but not all. His essays reveal strong writing skills. Rec's are + but don't get impression that they (teachers) know him well. VERY thin ECA profile. Add?? little (actually nothing) said by candidate about his multicultural bkgd. Tough to get excited about him or to put him above others.”

- The applicant’s failure to discuss his multicultural background did not hurt the applicant. Discussing one’s multicultural background may not help, either.
 - Puerto Rican applicants were not compared to other Puerto Rican applicants.
 - There were no admission goals with respect to Puerto Rican applicants.
- 2) ID (b)(7)(C) (Hispanic applicant): “Agree. Tough to see putting her ahead of others. No cultural flavor in app. ATC-DSO”
- “ATC” means all things considered. “DSO” means “doesn’t stand out”.
 - There were no admission goals with respect to Hispanic applicants.
 - When stated “tough to see putting her ahead of others”, she meant all other applicants, not just Hispanic applicants.
 - It appeared that the applicant did not choose to write about his/her cultural background, but it did not necessarily hurt the applicant. If it was discussed, then witness might have noted it.
- 3) ID (b)(7)(C) (Bi-racial or multi-racial applicant): “A good student who has risen to the #1 spot. Many superlatives from teachers, but still don't feel like you truly get to know her; thinnish ECA profile - add?; nice essays, sweet personality; bi - racial but not NHRP and no mention of her bkgrnd in app by anyone. ATC, probably not a S.O.”
- “NHRP” means National Hispanic Recognition Program.
 - It appeared that the applicant did not choose to write about her cultural background, but it did not necessarily hurt the applicant. If it was discussed, then witness might have noted it.
- 4) ID (b)(7)(C) (Native American applicant): “Has a very strong identification and connection to her Native American identity. While her academic record is not as strong as others, she would bring a cultural add to campus. . . . Nicely rounded ECA's. Don't get impression school is particularly competitive. Is she prepared for rigor of work at PU?”
- Native American heritage raised by applicant, is an important part of who she is.
 - There is a small population of Native American students on campus. Adding more Native American students would make the community more multicultural.

International Students

- International applicants are reviewed the same way as other applicants.
- There are no admission quotas or goals with respect to international applicants.
- International applicants are grouped by country. However, they are still compared to the entire applicant pool.

Legacies

- The witness stated that an applicant’s legacy status is just one of many factors considered by the admission staff. An applicant’s legacy status is noted on the reader card.
- Legacies are considered the same way as other applicants.

- Legacy status becomes a plus factor when the applicants are equally strong; it may tip an applicant's candidacy. She stated that admission staff do not have this conversation very often.

Recruited Athletes

- An applicant's recruited athlete status is kept in mind as review a file.
- An applicant's recruited athlete status is part of consideration of what an applicant brings to campus.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (the witness)

Representatives: [redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq. (representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq. (representative 2)

Interviewers: Pranita Raghavan, Compliance Team Attorney
Coleen Chin, Compliance Team Attorney

Dates: March 19, 2010

Re: Princeton University, OCR case no. 02-08-6002

Location: By telephone, OCR conference room

OCR interviewed the witness in order to obtain his statement regarding the admissions process for the class of 2010. OCR advised the witness that he is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the witness stated that he would like representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR advised the witness that the interviewers would take notes during the interview that would be incorporated into a formal interview statement for the file. OCR advised the witness that the contents of the file are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but that names, telephone numbers, and other personally identifying information would be redacted before the release of any requested documents. OCR advised the witness that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for his participation in an investigation. OCR also explained its investigation process, that it is a neutral fact-finder, and that OCR initiated a compliance review into whether the University discriminated against Asians, on the bases of race or national origin, in its admissions process for the class of 2010, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

Background

- The witness confirmed he served the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) until 2006 and is now the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) at [redacted] (b)(7)(C). For the class of 2010, he served as the [redacted] (b)(7)(C)
- For the class of 2010, she reported to Janet Rapelye (the dean of admission) and Christopher Watson (the director of admission).
- His duties included student recruitment, application evaluation, and working on admission publications.
- No staff reported to him.

Review of Admissions Process

- The witness confirmed the steps listed below.
 - Once file is complete, it is assigned to a regional team coordinator.
 - Team coordinator assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on quick read.
 - File then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action.”
 - File then returns to team coordinator, who agrees with, edits, or overrules first reader.
 - All applicant files listed on docket for committee review; team coordinator brings most promising ones to attention of committee – might include handful of students from same school.
 - The dean of admissions or the former associate dean chaired the committees; decision is reached by informal polling.
 - Committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round.
 - Second round of committee review is winnowing down the class and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering/oboe players. He participated in this winnowing process.

Training

- The trainings consisted of a few days of meetings led by senior staff.
- When asked if he received training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin, the witness stated that race is always part of the discussion, among other diversity factors. There is no specific training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin, or regarding stereotypes.

Outreach

- The witness stated that tours and information sessions are conducted by the University. In addition, admission staff members visit high schools.
- When asked if there are any outreach efforts targeted to Asian students, the witness stated that there were no outreach efforts directed to particular groups. In general, he stated that the outreach focused on students who were not as likely to apply to the University.

Use of Race/National Origin

- The University considered many factors during the application process, including non-academic factors such as where the student was raised, the student’s ethnicity, etc. The goal was to enroll an interesting group of undergraduate students.
- The University gave students the opportunity to explain diversity and allows students, including Asian students, the opportunity to tell it about themselves.
- When asked what groups were underrepresented at the University, the witness stated that this was not considered in any formal way. He stated that certain socio-economic groups were considered underrepresented. Also, certain geographic areas were underrepresented; for example, there were not many applicants from North Dakota.

- Also, for example, if there were fewer students in the engineering program, then the University may pay attention to engineering applicants. However, he stressed that there were no quotas.
- He also stated that there was a general awareness that there were fewer African American applicants applying to college.
- Applicants of particular racial/ethnic groups were not compared against other students of the same racial/ethnic group.
- When asked if the University had goals for racial and national origin diversity, the witness stated that no target numbers were conveyed to him.
- The admissions staff did not have a sense of positive or negative characteristics regarding a racial/ethnic group.
- He did not think it was harder to stand out as an Asian applicant.

Treatment of Asian Applications

- When asked if admission staff have a sense of positive characteristics that appear frequently in applications from Asian individuals, the witness stated that the admission staff does not have predetermined ideas about applicants. He also stated that there is an awareness that not all Asian applicants come from similar backgrounds.
- Asian applicants are not compared against other Asian applicants.
- When asked if it is tougher for an Asian applicant to stand out, the witness stated that this is not true.

Specific Comments Made by Witness on Admission Reader Cards Reviewed by OCR

- 1) ID (b)(7)(C) (Asian American applicant): “Bright premed, but like many others”
 - There are lots of students who are pre-med who are accomplished. The University is looking for qualities that stand out from others.
- 2) ID (b)(7)(C) (Asian American applicant): “Given record and nice range of interests, he merits comparison with others in the (b)(7)(C) group. Probably could ask for more (other than higher score.) A choice. Heaviest load and best performance of all? Genuine.”
 - (b)(7)(C) is the applicant’s high school.
 - He clarified that an applicant does not need the heaviest load and best performance of all in order to be admitted. He also clarified that the comment did not mean that the University would only admit one student from the high school.
 - Other students may be stronger in other areas.
- 3) ID (b)(7)(C) (Asian American applicant): “Even with 1/1, it's going to be tough to pluck him (a premed) out of the middle of this hothouse. Should be doing better. Unless at top [underlined] of (b)(7)(C) list, I think we should pass - WL at best (in case orchestra devastated in yield)”
 - “1/1” referred to student’s music rating.
 - (b)(7)(C) is in the Music Department.
 - Need compelling reason to offer admission even with 1/1 music rating.

- 4) ID [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) (Asian American applicant): “Smart but standard pre-med. Needs music boost to make it all the way.”
- When asked what he meant with respect to the “standard premed” reference, he stated that typically, pre-med students have high academic credentials, but not have other strong credentials.
 - When asked why the student needed a “music boost”, he stated that there were many students with the same credentials and the applicant needed other qualities, such as music credentials, to make application stand out.
- 5) ID [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) (Asian American applicant): “A very familiar profile, perfectly able and appealing, but even with a modest background, not a clear SO for us.”
- OCR referred to the first reader’s comments: “Here is a first generation Chinese student whose own life has not been easy trying to make easier the lives of others through her service. In all she does, no matter how hard, everyone remarks on applicant’s incredible positive attitude, her hard work, and brilliant character. Fluent in 3 languages, highly involved in piano, service, [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) winner; deserving and highly considerable. One of the best we’ll ever see from [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) in SF.”
 - OCR asked the witness, considering the first reader’s comments, why did characterize applicant as having a “very familiar profile”, and the witness stated that he agreed with the first reader’s comments, but did not view the applicant’s profile as particularly unusual in the applicant pool.
- 6) ID [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) (Asian American applicant): “Add.”
- When asked why he decided to add the student despite the first reader’s lukewarm assessment, the witness stated that his comment was actually, “Add?”, with a question mark, implying that he questioned whether the applicant should be added.
- 7) ID [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) (Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander applicant): “Were there a touch more cultural flavor I’d be more enthusiastic; as is, he’s not a choice we might not make. Solid student, good athlete, good pqs, let’s check again in larger pool.”
- When asked what he meant by, “cultural flavor”, the witness stated that it would have made the application more multi-layered since otherwise the application was extremely average in academics and non-academics. If the applicant brought more cultural flavor to application, then may have another reason to admit the applicant.

International Students

- The University considers international students in the same way as domestic students.
- There were certain admission staff members who had an understanding of the high school systems of different countries.
- There were no quotas with respect to international students.

Legacies

- The witness stated that an applicant's legacy status is just one of many factors considered by the admission staff. The witness stated that hypothetically, if two applicants are identical in every way, the University would accept the legacy student. However, two applicants are never identical in every way.

Alumni Interviews

- The witness stated alumni interviews were considered with "a grain of salt". The main purpose of the interview is for the applicant to learn more about the University. Alumni interviews had very little impact in the admission decision process.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [redacted] (the witness)
[redacted] Esq. (University Counsel/representative 1)
[redacted] Esq. (Hogan & Hartson/representative 2)

Interviewers: William Poorten, Attorney Advisor
Coleen Chin, Compliance Team Attorney

Date: March 12, 2010

Re: Compliance Review – Title VI Admissions

Location: Interview by Telephone

At the outset of the interview, the witness was informed of her rights to representation, to refuse representation, and to refuse to share the content of the interview with anyone, including the University. The witness chose to have representatives 1 and 2 on the call with her. The witness was also informed of her rights with regard to FOIA, the Privacy Act, and freedom from retaliation or intimidation. OCR reminded the witness of the purposes of OCR's interview and the issue being investigated in this case, and that OCR is a neutral factfinder. The witness did not have any questions about this information.

OCR asked the witness what she had done to prepare for the interview, and she spoke with representatives 1 and 2 and received some reader cards from them for review.

The witness is currently the [redacted] at [redacted] a position she has held for three years. At Princeton, she started in the University's undergraduate admissions office in summer 2000. She was an undergraduate admissions officer and later [redacted]. She verified that she had responsibility for [redacted] admissions, as well as students from the [redacted] for the class of 2010. When asked who she reported to, she said it was a flat organization in which everyone reported to the dean of admissions and the director of admissions, Chris Watson. She added that her mentor was [redacted]. She also said she was a mentor for some younger staff, naming [redacted] and [redacted] (who had been there longer than the others); she said she worked physically near them. She also said she worked with [redacted] as part of a collaborative effort, since she had previously been an international admissions officer. She said she also worked with the outside readers hired by the admissions office to handle the large volume of applications. The witness said she left her position with the University in August 2006 because she was starting graduate school. She said she obtained a master of arts in education, which she described as a "general higher education degree."

OCR reviewed the admissions process with the witness, and confirmed that once a file is complete and prepped (including calculation of GPA, other basic data), it is assigned to a regional team leader, who assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on a quick read. The file then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action,” after which it returns to the team leader or another second reader (not necessarily the team leader, but perhaps a “more seasoned” admissions officer like herself – she said she did some second readings, especially for international applications), who agrees with, edits, or overrules the first reader. The witness confirmed that all applicant files are listed on the docket for committee review; the team leader brings the most promising ones to the attention of the committee, and this could include handful of students from same school. She confirmed that Dean Rapelye or Chris Watson chaired the committees, and that decisions were reached by informal polling. She confirmed that the committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round, as no running tally of admits was kept.

The witness confirmed that the second round of committee review involves winnowing down the class (as there are at this stage too many admits for available seats) and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering. She said that the main reason for this winnowing process was having admitted too many applicants for available seats. She said she was not really part of this winnowing, although for the (b)(7)(C) region the team leader would informally ask folks who had read a lot of applications or served on committee discussions to identify any applicants who had been admitted in the first round but who seemed like a “softer admit.” She could not recall how many “close calls” the winnowing group reviewed, but when OCR proffered that each regional committee was asked to propose cuts of approximately twenty-five applicants, she replied that that amount seemed logical.

When asked what ways the race or national origin of applicants played into the admissions process, the witness said that the basis of the admissions philosophy at the University while she was there was to look at students holistically in reference to their context, and obviously part of each student’s background and profile would include race and other characteristics. She said that to get to know an applicant, admissions officers would look at that aspect and how it played in the life of the student. She said it was difficult to give specific examples, but said that they would look at how race may have played into the context of where a person was born, where they grew up, where they went to school, what kind of classes they took. The witness said that for some applicants race meant more than others because of their context. She said that admissions officers knew about an applicant’s race based on what they shared, whether from checking a box regarding racial/ethnic identity on the application or discussing it in an essay. She added that an applicant’s stating what their first language is, or where they were born, may be used by admissions officers as information regarding their racial identity, but that it all stems from self-identification. “All we can do is focus on the things they choose to share with us, so we go with that,” she said.

When asked about the University’s goals for race and national origin diversity, the witness stated that race and national origin are part of overall diversity, which is a

multifaceted concept, and that the University's overarching goal is to have a diverse and interesting class. She said that this goal was communicated during a staff meeting and retreat, during which new staff were trained, at the beginning of the year.

OCR asked the witness what groups were considered underrepresented at the University. The witness responded that "most of us" who have an interest in higher education are aware of trends of underrepresentation in general. She said there was not any specific instruction or directive to work on certain areas to achieve racial or ethnic diversity, but that you do have to keep larger educational issues in mind as you do your work. She said that broadly, with respect to trends of underrepresentation, there are certain groups broadly – African Americans, Native Americans – that are very underrepresented. She said that she also believes Latino students fit into this category to, depending on the country. The witness said that while not quite connected to race, there are also variations of socioeconomic background in higher education.

OCR asked the witness whether Asians would be considered underrepresented. She responded that Asians are not often mentioned in the same way. She said that there are many different ethnic groups within larger racial categories, and while she could not cite specific research, she was aware of different Asian subgroups, maybe smaller Southeast Asian countries, that were less represented. She said, though, that the discussion in higher education does not focus on Asian students as a group.¹

OCR asked if she discussed these ideas about underrepresentation with other admissions staff at the University. She responded that perhaps she did a little bit, but she thought about it more during grad school, than in every day discussion.

OCR asked the witness what groups were considered overrepresented at the University, and she responded that it was hard to say which groups were sufficiently or well-represented on campus. She said that representation stems from the applications the University receives, and that she did not think it was ever conceived in that way by the University. OCR asked if there were overrepresented groups in terms of national trends in higher education, and she replied that usually discussion and research is not done on overrepresentation; if anything it relates to groups that are underrepresented. She said that Caucasian students are already well-represented, and that she thinks people have argued both that Caucasians are underrepresented and that they are overrepresented in higher education.

OCR asked at what point in the admissions process race/ethnicity is considered, and the witness responded that race and ethnicity is part of the student, from beginning to end. There is no time at which the application is "covered up" to hide that information – it is always part of the profile of the applicant.

¹ It was not clear whether the witness meant that the sense of under-representation is more centered on different minority groups, or that Asians are not considered monolithically for purposes of demographic under-representation.

OCR asked for examples of when race was considered, in any respect. The witness replied that race might play a bigger role when an applicant brings it to the fore, e.g., when their particular activities have revolved around a particular group. She said it was based on the applicant and how they decide to talk about it.

OCR asked whether, in anticipation of or during the second, winnowing round of committee review, she was aware of any discussions regarding the race or national origin diversity of the class. The witness said that at the very end the admissions staff talked through what the class looked like in terms of their numbers. She said she did not recall talking too much about distributions, maybe because she was not involved in that section of the process as much. She said these discussions took place after admissions letters went out.

The witness added that she was sure there were discussions on the eve of winnowing, because the University does not keep track of numbers, and that were some stats pulled about how many students chose this or that major, etc. She said that even going through the first round of committee you are “aware of admitting that diverse class. So hopefully you aren’t very far off in terms of a good spread.” She said she was sure there were discussions of that throughout the admissions process, and that the Dean and Director of admissions would be concerned about that, because they are the ones who will be held ultimately accountable for the work of the admissions office. She added that this related to overall diversity, including all aspects, not just race and national origin.

OCR asked whether the University met its goals for diversity for the class of 2010, and if so, how this information was communicated. She said that this is a tough question because diversity is such a broad term. However, she stated that in general, she felt that the overall message she got from the University was that diversity should be considered throughout the process, and “if you follow through” with that, then you should be happy with the resultant class.

OCR asked whether any of the witness’ supervisors gave feedback on her work vis-à-vis the consideration of race or racial diversity at any point. The witness said that she did not receive feedback specific to racial and ethnic diversity. She said she sought and received some feedback during her early years on the job, and every year staff would refresh their training to get on the same page, but could not recall any specific conversations about her performance with regard to diversity.

The witness said she did not have any reason to believe the University had specific targets with respect to the number of Asian or Asian-American applicants to be admitted. She said that applications from Asian candidates were not compared only to applications from other Asian candidates; every student is compared with every other student in the process. She said she did not think that, as a general rule, it is tougher for an Asian applicant to stand out, or distinguish themselves from other applicants. She said individual personalities are part of the process.

OCR asked the witness how legacy applicants are considered in the admissions process. She defined legacy for purposes of admissions as a student whose mother or father attended the University. She said that, like race/ ethnicity, it would be part of the applicant's profile all the way through. She stated, however, that legacy status "plays differently today than in the 50s and 60s," and that because of various changes in population, the number of applications, shift to co-ed status, the nationalization and internationalization of the applicant pool, and greater selectivity, the way legacy plays into the admission process has shifted. She said that admissions officers "do note when the student's mother or father attended the institution." She said it was noted as part of an applicant's basic facts from beginning, and that it might come up more if the applicant talks about it more, in addition to being on the reader card and profile and known throughout. She said that the weight given to legacy status would vary – she said it was a "big thumb on the scale in favor of" the application, but every applicant stands on their own. She said that legacy status "might be a flag for us to be clear" on the admissions decision. She said that the University wants to be confident in the decision because of the greater interest that the family has in admission. She said that there was "more consciousness" when rejecting a legacy applicant, "because of that Princeton tie."

OCR asked how the application process differs for recruited athletes. The witness said that the University is part of the Ivy League; that all requirements of the application are the same, and all decisions are made through the admissions office. She said that there are discussions with coaches as to which students are particularly talented in a sport, and that becomes part of their file. She said that perhaps in a recruited athlete's case, an athletic talent might pop out.

OCR asked the witness how international students are considered in the application process; specifically, whether applications from international candidates were compared with other international candidates. The witness said that in a way, administratively it makes things easier to group international applications together by country. She said that international applications are grouped together for prepping, and she believed they stayed grouped together by country for some of the reading process. OCR asked whether the University looked at international applicants' race/ethnicity or focused on the country they were from. She said that race/ethnicity is part of the consideration if the applicant responds to the question inviting them to identify themselves as such, the same as with any other student. She said that the University looks at native language and primary language spoken at home to shed more light on other aspects of the file. She added that language of instruction at school could be helpful too, because some students may have only learned English in their own spare time, which could impact SAT verbal scores. She said that for international applicants, the University not only looks at birthdate, country of origin and gender, but also pays attention to the cultural context.

OCR asked if there were other ways in which international applicants are looked at differently than domestic applicants. The witness said it was hard to make a blanket statement because each applicant comes from a different context. For example, she stated that international schools vary widely, and that applicants from American schools in other countries need to be assessed differently than applicants from non-American

schools in other countries. She also said that you still go through the application in a similar way regardless of where the applicants come from, but you might need to be more conscious of language instruction. She said that there isn't a remedial English program at the University, so you have to be confident that students are proficient in English, which is why you look at TOEFL scores, verbal sections on the SAT, and sometimes interviews to gauge English language proficiency for international students.

OCR asked what the University's admissions goals were with respect to international applicants, and the witness responded that the government requests that schools report country of citizenship of their students, and so this has become part of the definition of diversity on college campuses, and how the University counts international students. She said she was not aware of any specific goal or directive or assignments given about what countries or areas of the world to focus on, but just that in general the University has an international presence, and wants to have an international presences in its classes.

The witness said that she had her thoughts on the subject of international applications, and that she worked with (b)(7)(C) and (b)(7)(C) as part of the (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C). She said she noted that based on where the University was receiving applications from, certain regions were better represented than others. She said some of this was based on technology and web access, knowledge of the University, as well as the pathway from higher education to job. For this last factor, she explained that, for example, the Bologna Accords process in Europe allows students to transfer credits among schools easier, which makes it more appealing to stay in Europe for higher education.

The witness said that some regions definitely originate more applications than others: Canada and the UK, because of familiarity, proximity and lack of language barrier. She also said Europe is well-represented, because of language facility, and that parts of Asia are beginning to be pretty well-represented in terms of applications. She cited China specifically, saying that the University was starting to see more applications coming from that country and others where there's a longer history of sending scholars abroad, such as (South) Korea.

OCR asked what countries have been historically underrepresented. The witness said it was hard to separate what she knows now versus what was true when she was employed by the University. She said that certain countries have less technology, and are less populated and developed, and thus are less represented in applicant pools. She said that countries with enhanced access to information, through the web and other marketing tools, will have greater number of students studying in the US. She said that there are also cultural reasons why certain countries are more insular, promoting a desire for students to stay home and get married, which enhances the desirability of staying home for college study for those students. Therefore, the University receives less applications from these countries. She also said that higher education systems in Latin America are more of a professional path, and that bachelor study at a place like the University makes less sense from that point of view.

OCR reviewed specific comments on reader cards with the witness. For applicant ID (b)(7)(C), an applicant from Singapore with the first reader comment “Many much stronger apps from Singapore available,” the witness stated that she was not the reader who had written that comment (OCR had recorded the reader as (b)(7)(C)). However, she said that the reader was (b)(7)(C) who was (b)(7)(C)). However, she said she could imagine making same comment that the applicant was not competitive in the Singapore context. She said that with an understanding of the Singapore school system it would make sense to compare the application to other applications from that context. She said she would understand why the reader said the application was not particularly competitive, based on a knowledge of how the junior colleges in Singapore grade. She said that the way schooling is structured in Singapore is quite different from the U.S. – a closer parallel is to the British system of O levels and A levels, i.e., a profile approach up to tenth grade. In that system, achievement at the tenth grade exam period would determine selection for junior college or the next part of one’s education, or give access to certain schools in the country. Thus, the focus is less on marking periods, but achievement on those particular exams. The witness said that it does come back to the individual student, but there is a point where, in determining how competitive the application is, there is some comparison to other applications from the same educational system in Singapore. The witness said that outside the U.S. it is much easier to look at educational standards as being uniform within a country. For example, in addition to the British O and A levels, Germany has national exams, and there are International Baccalaureate programs throughout the world, which provide some overall exam standardization. The educational system in such countries gives some good guidelines as to how a student has fared in comparison to other students from the same system.

At the conclusion of the interview, OCR provided contact information if the witness had anything to add.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University

Interviewees: Janet L. Rapelye, Dean of Admission (the Dean)
[REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), Esq., University Counsel (representative 1)
[REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), Esq., Partner, Hogan & Hartson (representative 2)

Interviewers: Coleen Chin, Pranita Raghavan, James Moser
Compliance Team Attorneys

William Poorten
Attorney Advisor

Date: January 29, 2009

Location: OCR Conference Room

Re: Princeton University (the University)

Rights

OCR reminded the Dean that she is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the Dean confirmed that she selected representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR also reminded the Dean that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for her participation in the interview and investigation.

1. File Intake and Regional Committees

- The Dean informed OCR that she has been employed by the University for the past six years.
- OCR asked the Dean about the admission process for the class of 2010, described in the November 14, 2008 Statement of the University.
- The Dean stated that files are continuously received, and different parts of files arrive at different times. When complete, a “reader card” is generated and the file goes to a “prepper,” who recalculates the “Princeton grade point average” (PGPA), based on Princeton’s criteria, and completes the “transcript” box. The University re-calculates the applicants GPA in order to account for differences in the academic strength of high schools and the rigor of an applicant’s particular

- course load.¹ The Dean stated that the preppers are retired school principals in the Princeton area.
- The Dean stated that the file is then assigned to a Team Coordinator of a regional team. The Dean stated that every year, she and admission office staff look at the size of the pool, and divide the applications into seven geographic regions² (“assignments,” or “AGN”) from which the applications originate: AGN 1- Midwest; AGN 2- International; AGN 3- West; AG 4- Atlantic; AGN 5- South; AGN 6- Northeast; and AGN 7- Central.
 - The Dean stated that for the class of 2010, more than 17,000 applications were assigned to the regional teams. The Dean stated that the admission office tries to allocate admission staff to the regional teams consistent with the volume of applications from each region. The Dean also stated that the admission office hired two additional staff members in January 2006. The Dean explained that the committee members listed on the University’s Reading Assignment chart do not read, at this stage, the applications for the committee for which they are responsible. The Dean explained that the committee members and Team Coordinators/Second Readers have read applications before, are more experienced, and have advanced degrees from elite schools. The committee members sit on the committee that ultimately decides to admit or reject applicants.
 - The Dean stated that the Team Coordinator for each region assigns an academic rating of 1-5, and a non-academic rating of 1-5, based on the University’s criteria reported in the responses to OCR’s data requests. The Dean described the academic and non-academic ratings as a “snapshot” designed to give the first reader guidance as to the amount of time to spend with the file. The Dean stated that the Team Coordinator also completes the “institutional priorities” section of the reader card, based on the applicant’s academic and non-academic ratings, and other information in the file. The Dean stated that the academic or non-academic ratings can be revised at any time in the process, but academic ratings are not very flexible since they depend on objective criteria such as SAT scores, PGPA, and other quantitative factors. However, either academic or non-academic ratings can be revised if the University receives new information about a candidate, such as higher SAT scores.
 - The Dean stated that the University’s admission department strives to keep ratings consistent from year to year. When asked, the Dean stated that an old version of the criteria for academic and non-academic ratings (tab 9 of the November 14, 2008 submission) was *not* used for the class of 2010. The Dean stated that the more recent submissions of unredacted criteria from tab 8 are the applicable versions for the class of 2010.
 - The Dean stated that the SAT score column (tab 8 of the November 14, 2008 submission) means that *each* score must exceed the floor stated in the criteria, *i.e.*, the applicant must have a 740 in all tested areas to qualify for an academic rating of 1; 690 for academic rating of 2, etc.

¹ The Dean also stated that regions vary in academic quality; for example, California high schools have many advanced placement courses and students have very high grade point averages. The Dean implied that grade inflation varies from region to region.

² These regions are determined by the College Board.

- The Dean stated that if any score is below the floor, the applicant's academic rating drops to the next level.

2. The First Reader

- The Dean stated that after the Team Coordinator assigns the academic and non-academic ratings and the institutional priority, the file is provided to the "first reader,"³ who is responsible for documenting the applicant's family background, reviewing the applicant's teacher recommendations, extracurricular activities and other accomplishments, and summarizing the applicant's achievements on the second page of the reader card/evaluation.
- The Dean stated that the first reader's job is to give the file a thorough read, and to highlight and condense the applicant's qualifications for the Team Coordinator/Second Reader and the committee. The Dean described the first reader's job as "very hard."
- The Dean explained that the first reader then completes the boxes at the bottom of the second page, notates a suggested action,⁴ and the file goes to the second reader.

3. The Second Reader/Team Coordinator

- The Dean stated that the second reader (the Team Coordinator) makes notations on the reader card as well, updates the reader card/evaluation with new material or information that the University may have received since the first reader reviewed the file, and critiques and corrects the first reader's "take" on the file, while initialing the corrections.
- The Dean stated that the Team Coordinator can overrule the first reader, and change notations or stress other factors that the first reader may have missed.

4. First Stage of the Committee Review

- The Dean stated that after the second reader has reviewed the file, every applicant goes to the committee in the form of a "docket," organized by regions, and by the city and high school within the region. The docket sheet lists all of the applicants and provides relevant information from their file, such as PGPA, SAT scores, special talents, extracurricular activities, etc. (but not their "Institutional Priority" or first reader's "Suggested Action"). The Dean stated that the committee reviews all applicants from a given high school simultaneously, so that the committee is looking at the candidate in the context of his or her academic setting. The Dean clarified that when she states that "every applicant goes to committee," she means that every applicant is included in the docket sheet reviewed by the committee.
- However, the Team Coordinator, who is responsible for all candidates for that region, brings the files of only the most promising candidates from his/her region

³ The first reader for a file may be a Team Coordinator for a different region.

⁴ "Admit," "Strong Interest," "Only if Room," and "Unlikely"

to the committee. These are the applicants whose candidacies are actually discussed by the committee. In addition, the Dean stated that the committee may review the docket sheet and ask a team's secretary to find the file of an applicant who was not selected by the Team Coordinator. These files are then added to committee's discussions. The Dean explained that even if a candidate was characterized as "refuse" by the second reader, that candidate can be "resurrected" by the committee.

- The Dean explained that certain denotations on the reader cards, such as "swim," and "swim +", mean that the applicant is still under active consideration for admission, or that the University is very interested in the applicant, respectively.
- The Dean stated that no candidates are officially accepted prior to committee review.
- The Dean stated that part of the committee process involves ranking the applicants by the PGPA.
- The Dean stated that the Team Coordinators/Second Readers bring two, four or eight candidates from a particular school, and then "it is a choice."
- The Dean explained that for the class of 2010, more than 6,000 applicants had 700's on both of their SATs, and more than 5,000 applicants had 4.0 grade point averages; accordingly, the Dean conceded that there is a degree of choice involved in the selection among the highly qualified applicants.
- The Dean stated that everyone on the committee reads the first and second readers' comments, and if they refer to some particularly compelling component of the application, the committee may pull that item, e.g. the applicant's essay.
- The committee members review the application, and discuss it; sometimes it takes three minutes to decide, sometimes ten minutes, sometimes almost no time at all.
- The Dean explained that the reading process is as thorough as can be done.
- The Dean described the process of "straw-polling" the committee to decide whether to admit, wait list or reject an applicant; if there are five committee members and three seem inclined to admit the student, the student will be admitted. The Dean stated that sometimes she votes, and sometimes she does not. The review of borderline applicants is sometimes deferred until the end of the day, or at the end of that school group.
- The Dean described the application evaluation process as an "art." The Dean said that the staff does not keep track of every change to a file in the database, which is a PeopleSoft database, and which does not permit the staff to record every revision. The Dean stated that much of what is recorded on the reader card/evaluation reveals the deliberations.
- There are usually two committees running simultaneously every day during the committee review period. She chaired one committee, and Christopher Watson (the Director of Admission) chaired the other committee. Mr. Watson is currently the Dean of Admission at Northwestern University.

5. Second Stage of Committee Review – Winnowing, Engineering, Departmental Needs

- The Dean explained that the University is a "residential college," which has a fixed number of beds, and that therefore it is important to get close to a target

- number of admissions. However, she said that she does not keep track of the number of admitted students during the first stage of the committee review because she does not want to influence the committee's work. After the first stage of review, the committee re-evaluates the applicant pool and winnows with an eye on the target number.
- In order to winnow the class size, the committee re-reviews applicants originally designated as accepted, but who did not receive a unanimous vote. This is the second stage of the committee review.
 - The Dean explained that reaching the target number is "chancey," since they never know how many applicants will accept their admission offers. She stated that their ability to reach the target number is always unclear since it depends on the decision-making of 17 and 18 year olds.
 - The Dean added that the admission staff "overshoots" during the first stage of the committee review by wanting to admit more than the target number because there are so many highly qualified candidates in the applicant pool.
 - The Dean explained that the committee makes the final decision, not the Dean herself. The Dean may vote on a particular candidate if the vote is split (meaning anything other than unanimous).
 - The Dean also explained that the University may decide that it needs to add certain students during this second stage of review. For example, she stated that there must be a certain number of applicants for the University's Bachelor of Science in Engineering (BSE) program, an important part of the University's complement of educational options. Students typically leave the BSE program for the AB program, but not the other way around.
 - The Dean explained that 70% of students change their major during their undergraduate education. The Dean stated that engineering candidates are less variable; if there is a split vote in committee, they may choose to admit an engineering candidate and move a non-engineering candidate back to the waitlist.
 - The Dean stated that (b)(7)(C) (the complainant) was not one of those candidates. The Dean explained that the complainant was waitlisted *ab initio*.
 - The Dean explained that the committee also considers whether it has met the requests of various professors and departments; for example, regarding particular musical instruments, or particular athletic or sports skills. However, she emphasized that the committee only admits qualified students who they feel will be able to handle the coursework. Therefore, a candidate will not be accepted simply because he/she has a skill that a department needs; the candidate must be otherwise qualified to handle the challenges of the University.
 - The Dean explained that with respect to art and athletics, the committee must pay attention to the candidates who have these specialized skills. The Dean stated that particular skills, such as the ability to play lacrosse, cannot be acquired later by other students.
 - There is no record of candidates who were treated as "accept" at the first stage of the committee. Each subsequent decision "wipes out" prior decisions in the database. Therefore, the database only records the final admission decision of the committee.

- The Dean mentioned that generally after the admission offers have been made, the Admission Office goes back and evaluates the characteristics of the admission pool, to see if the sought-after characteristics were achieved.

6. Race and Ethnicity

- OCR asked the Dean how the University considered applicants' race and/or national origin for the class of 2010. The Dean stated that race/ethnicity is one of many factors the University considers; every student is evaluated individually, and there is no automatic "plus" factor for race or national origin.
- OCR asked if race or ethnicity plays a factor in "winnowing" the numbers of admitted students during the second stage of the committee review. The Dean stated that race or ethnicity is just one consideration in the winnowing process, and that it is not determinative, but informative.
- The Dean stated that diversity is an objective. OCR asked if the numbers of students of a particular background get too low, would the University go back and change the number admitted, and the Dean responded that "there is no set number." She added that the ability to build a diverse class is based on the diversity of the applicant pool. The Dean stated that if the number of diverse students was low for a particular year, then that means that there was a low number of diverse applicants in the applicant pool.
- Representative 1 stated that the Dean has had discussions with the University president about the breakdown of the class. The Dean agreed, and said that the goal is to build a multicultural community, to reach out to students of every background, from every country and all around the world.
- OCR asked if the University had a list of the categories of applicants it considers to be "underrepresented." The Dean stated that the University did not have such a list or designations.
- OCR asked whether the University believed that it achieved its diversity goals with the class of 2010. The Dean explained that the class of 2010 was the most diverse class in the University's history; that 37% of students were persons of color. OCR asked who the University considered to be "persons of color," and the Dean replied that the category included African American students, Asian American students, Hispanic students, and Native American students.
- The Dean stated the University's designations of applicants' race and ethnicity are only based upon the applicants' self-identification in the application and College Board materials. The Dean stated that the University tries to honor how students see themselves.

7. Legacy Applicants

- The Dean explained that ("all else being equal," although it "never is") legacy applicants are noted and given an extra look during the admission process for several reasons:
 - 1) The University's legacies are generally more qualified on average than the class and some legacies with 800 SAT scores are rejected;

- 2) Alumni want their children to attend their alma mater because the students frequently have better grades and scores than their parents did;
- 3) The legacy students who the University admits are “the best.” The Dean also stated that with the steady increase in diversity, the number of legacies of different backgrounds has increased.
- 4) Development is also an important goal. Representative 1 stated that being an alumnus of the University is like a “cult,” and that 70% of alumni give to the University.

8. Applicants whose Parent is a Faculty Member/Employee

- The Dean stated that children of faculty members or employees are also noted during the application process because “we note when there are ties to the University.”
- Representative 2 stated that these could be the children of “janitors” as easily as sons or daughters of faculty members.
- The Dean stated that such applicants are evaluated in the same way as other applicants. The Dean explained that, for purposes of both legacy applications and University employee relationship applications, only children count – grandchildren do not.

9. Recruited Athletes

- The Dean stated that the University does not offer athletic scholarships; there are no music, athletic, or merit scholarships offered by the University.
- The Dean stated that the University sponsors 38 Division I teams, and that it, like all other Division I teams, must recruit athletes. All Ivy League schools recruit athletes. She added that that the Ivy League was originally, and continues to be, an athletic convention.
- The Dean stated that pursuant to the Ivy League convention, all recruited athletes must be within two standard deviations of the admitted applicant pool’s academic achievements.
- The Dean stated that the University still had early admission for the class of 2010; they no longer offer early admission. The Dean explained that this poses problems for the recruitment of student-athletes because such students must wait until April, along with everyone else, to learn if they will be admitted.
- The Dean stated that she sends recruited athletes, whose applications have been preliminarily reviewed and deemed acceptable, a “likely” letter. The Dean stated that recruited athletes must be academically qualified for the University.
- The Dean stated that the “likely” letter, which she issues, states that it is “likely” that the recruited student-athlete will be admitted based on [his or her] continued good performance in school.
- The Dean stated that the recruited student-athletes go through the same process, with the notation that they are recruited student-athletes. However, if the student-athlete does not continue to perform well academically, or the University receives other information that weakens the applicant’s candidacy, the likely letter will be “pulled.” The Dean explained that this consists of sending another letter advising

the student-athlete that they will not likely be accepted, based on changed circumstances.

**Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)**

Interviewee: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(7)(C)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq. (University Counsel/representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq. (Hogan & Hartson/representative 2)

Interviewers: William Poorten, Attorney Advisor
James Moser, Compliance Team Attorney

Date: October 1, 2009

Re: Compliance Review – Title VI Admissions

Location: OCR conference room (Interview by Telephone)

Rights

OCR interviewed the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) regarding the admissions process for the class of 2010. OCR advised the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) that he is entitled to representation during the interview as well as entitled to decline representation, and the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) stated that he would like representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR also informed the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) that he had the right to refuse to share the content of the interview with anyone. OCR advised the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) that the interviewers would take notes during the interview that would be incorporated into a formal interview statement for the file. OCR advised the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) that the contents of the file are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but that names, telephone numbers, and other personally identifying information would be redacted before the release of any requested documents. OCR advised the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for his participation in an interview or investigation. OCR also explained its investigation process, explained that it is a neutral fact-finder, and that OCR initiated a compliance review into whether the University discriminated against Asians, on the bases of race or national origin, in its admissions process for the class of 2010, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000d et seq., and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

Background

What is your title, your duties and responsibilities, and for how long have you had these duties? What were your duties with respect to the admissions process for the class of 2010?

- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] confirmed his current title, explained that he was recently promoted, and described his current duties to include serving as a first reader and a Team Leader/2nd Reader for certain regions, including [redacted (b)(7)(C)] and [redacted (b)(7)(C)].
- He is the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] and supervises “travel weekends” for low income students who visit the University.
- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that for the class of 2010, he served as a [redacted (b)(7)(C)] [redacted (b)(7)(C)], which he “shared” with [redacted (b)(7)(C)] and served as [redacted (b)(7)(C)]. When asked, the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that it was “hard to say” whether he served as a reader for the “international” ‘region’ for the class of 2010.
- When asked, the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that in his capacity as Team Leader/2nd Reader, he report to Janet Rapeleye (the dean of admissions). For the class of 2010, he reported to the dean of admissions and Chris Watson (the former director). The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] could not recall all of the admissions staff who constituted his “direct reports” for the class of 2010.

Review of Admissions Process

What are the steps of the admissions process at the University? OCR reviewed the process to determine if it had a complete picture of the University’s admissions process.

- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] confirmed the steps listed below, but added an additional step he described as “prepping” the file, highlighted below in red.
 - The file is “prepped” by an admissions staff member, who records the number of A’s, B’s and C’s the student earned up to the point of the application; the student’s grade point average; and other information that is recorded on the front of the reader card.
 - Once file is complete, it is assigned to regional team coordinator.
 - Team coordinator assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on quick read.
 - File then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action.”
 - File then returns to team coordinator, who agrees with, edits, or overrules first reader.
 - All applicant files listed on docket for committee review; team coordinator brings most promising ones to attention of committee – might include handful of students from same school.
 - The dean of admissions or the former associate dean chaired the committees; decision is reached by informal polling.

- Committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round. (The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] added that the committee does not keep a running tally of admits as it goes along.)
- Second round of committee review is winnowing down the class and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering/oboe players.
- When asked, the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] explained that the winnowing process was not just to fill certain departments, such as the orchestra, but related that there may simply be too many prospective class members.
- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that he was on the 1st round committee as a team leader, and participated in 1st round committees for other regions for which he was a first reader instead of a Team Leader. The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that at least two 1st round committees met daily.
- The 2nd round committee, which “winnows” the applicants when too many are slated for admission in the 1st round committees, was not really a “committee.” The dean, the former director, the applicable team leaders and a few other people participated in the “winnowing” process; not the entire admissions office staff or even necessarily all the people who sat on the 1st round committee. The total number admitted was “winnowed” to reduce the class size to fit the number of available seats.

OCR asked the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] approximately how many applicants were reviewed by this “winnowing committee?” Hundreds? Less than a hundred?

- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] could not recall the exact number, and stated that “its unfair for me to say specifically.” He stated that “anyone” can be re-reviewed; but generally the winnowing committee reviewed candidates who were “close calls,” but were provisionally admitted. When asked, the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that more than 100, but fewer than 500 total applicants were re-reviewed during “winnowing.” Representative 1 clarified that this is a total number; and the [redacted (b)(7)(C)] agreed, stating that each regional committee was asked to propose cuts of a “two dozen” or so.

Alumni Interviews

- **How are alumni interviews used in the admissions process?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that the University has a very active alumni association; the alumni want to contribute and remain part of the University community; the interview is one of many factors considered by the University.
- **How much weight is given to alumni interviews?**

- It depends on the information conveyed in the interview. He reiterated that it is “one of many factors.”
- **If alumni comments appear on the reader card under “ASC Comments,” was more weight given to those comments (as opposed to when the section is blank but the ASC interview is in the applicant’s file)?**
 - The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) said “it’s tough to say.” He said that the comments are “sometimes helpful.” He said that sometimes the alumni interview isn’t reflected on the reader card because the interview hasn’t been completed or received by the admission office yet. Sometimes the Team Leader finds the interview in the file, and comments haven’t been transcribed onto the reader card.
- **What type of training, if any, do alumni receive before conducting applicant interviews?**
 - The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) replied that he doesn’t know. He said that [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) would have more information about this. He stated that the admissions office “shares guidance” with alumni; when asked how the alumni interviewers are selected, he stated that they are members of a voluntary alumni association that wants to “give back” to the University, and they want to get to know the candidates. When asked if he knew of any problems with the alumni interview process, the [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) stated that if he were to see something “inappropriate” in the write-up he would mention it to the alumni interviewer, but that he did not know of any specific instances of this happening.

Training

- **What training did you receive for reviewing applicant files?**
 - The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) said that there are a lot of opportunities throughout the year to learn about the admissions process. He stated that new employees do a few practice readings of sample files, but that most experience is gained “hands-on” along the way. He said that new admissions officers receive feedback from more senior officers along the way.
- **How did you get trained for each region? How did you become familiar with the high schools and populations in your region(s)?**
 - The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) described newly available data produced by the College Board that deals with specific high schools. However, he stated that this was not available for the class of 2010. He said that instead, a lot of the information employees gained about each region was learned from colleagues, or personal experience.

- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that he became familiar with the high schools and populations in the region he handled for the class of 2010 mostly from previous years' experience.
- **Did you receive training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin? Racial/national origin stereotypes? If so, please describe.**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that part of the conversation within the admissions department is to “talk about [the University’s] desire to have diversity in all senses, including race, national origin, and socioeconomic status. Diversity takes many forms, and the University wants diversity on campus. The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] added that there is a combination of formal and informal training on diversity (but did not elaborate).

Outreach

- **Did you participate in any of the University’s outreach efforts (to prospective students)? If so, describe.**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] replied that he and all other admissions office staff were involved in a variety of outreach efforts. The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] said that these included visits to high schools or to any group or secondary school that expresses interest in the University.
- **Are any outreach efforts designed to target Asian students? If so, describe.**
 - Outreach by definition “casts a wide net,” and if that means more talented Asians in the applicant pool, “that’s great,” but that outreach efforts were not focused on Asian students particularly. The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that the University solicits interest in the University by sending mailings to every high school in different areas, and to anyone who expresses interest in the University.

Use of Race/National Origin

- **How did Princeton consider race in the admissions process?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] response was that race is one of many things that could be considered in the admission process.
- **How did it consider national origin?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] response was that national origin is one of many things that is considered in the admissions process.

- **At what point(s) in the process, is race considered? At what points(s) in the process is national origin considered? (Initial review; first committee review; second committee review)**
 - The applicant's race and national origin is often listed on the first page of the application. The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) said "it's one part of the applicant's story," but added there's more than just that one part of the story.
- **Give some specific examples when it was considered, in any respect. (Any examples of Asian being a plus?)**
 - It is hard to recall, for the class of 2010. It was one of many things that could be considered at any point in the process.
- **After the first round of committee review, were you aware of any discussions regarding the racial and/or national origin diversity of the class? (involving the dean of admissions, admissions staff, others?)**
 - The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) could not recall any specific conversations after the "first pass" (of committee review) along those lines.
- **How did Princeton define racial diversity? How did it define national origin diversity?**
 - The definition is broad, and encompasses many things. It takes "many shapes and forms." The criteria are not explicitly defined in advance.
- **How does Princeton define "Asian"? What factors does it look at? Just at how the applicant self-identified his/herself, or also at native language and/or country of citizenship?**
 - The definition generally comes from how the applicant identified him or herself. It might include native language and/or country of citizenship too. These are all parts of the applicant's "story," and play into the "story" of creating a diverse class.
- **Is the diversity of admits intended to mirror diversity of applicants, or does Princeton seek to create a class that is more diverse than its applicant pool?**
 - The [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) replied that "this wouldn't be a goal stated to me." The mission is to admit the best people from the pool of applicants. This includes many variables in terms of students' backgrounds.
- **Are any racial/national origin groups considered underrepresented at Princeton?**

- The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that “really we’re trying to admit the best and brightest” , and most compelling applicants through a “holistic review process.”
- **Did Princeton meet its goals for diversity? How was this information communicated to you? Who communicated this information to you?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that OCR would have to ask the dean of admissions.
 - **At the end of the process, did Princeton review your work and evaluate whether it met its goals for diversity?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that OCR would have to ask the dean of admissions.
 - **Do you have any information suggesting that Princeton had limits or numerical restrictions with respect to Asian or Asian-American applicants?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] said that he did not.
 - **Is there a sense, when going through the admissions process, of characteristics (positive or negative) common to Asian applications?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] replied that one wants to be open-minded throughout the process and treat each file individually; everyone has his or her own “story,” and the admissions officer is supposed to be “receptive.”
 - **Were applications from Asian candidates compared with applications from other Asian candidates?**
 - The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] stated that they were not.

Specific Comments

- **From our random file review, we pulled a sample of reader cards that you contributed to and would like to ask you questions about certain abbreviations and comments in the reader card to get a better overall picture of the process.**

1) ID [redacted (b)(7)(C)]; [redacted (b)(7)(C)]; [redacted (b)(7)(C)] (Native American applicants)

- The abbreviation ORFF refers to the engineering program. ATC means “all things considered.”
- Min 5 means Native American; Min 1 means African American; Min 6 means Asian American. The [redacted (b)(7)(C)] said he doesn’t know how the numbers were picked; they may have come from the

application form or some other document, or may have been picked in some other way.

For applicant ID [REDACTED] in the 2nd reader box, you state “not many native Americans with scores like this. What did you mean by this comment?”

- The [REDACTED] said it’s hard to “put myself back into my ‘head’ three years ago when I completed these.” In the committee, I wanted to try and make mention of this; that there are not many native Americans with scores like this nationally. The [REDACTED] said that the applicant had other pluses he wanted the committee to discuss, such as leadership, [REDACTED].
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] He said that during committee review, the entire reader card and application file would be available for consideration.

For applicant ID [REDACTED] in the 2nd reader box, you again state “not many native Americans with scores like this.” What did you mean?

- The [REDACTED] said he was thinking about the national setting for native American applicants. The [REDACTED] stated that the applicant had other pluses that he wanted to discuss in committee, such as being [REDACTED].
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] The [REDACTED] also cited the applicant’s interesting essay. When asked about the notation in the first readers’ box that there was “no mention of heritage,” OCR asked if a discussion of the applicant’s heritage by the applicant was what the admissions office was really looking for. The [REDACTED] replied that he can’t say.

For applicant ID [REDACTED] in the first reader box [the associate dean was the 2nd reader], the first reader states that the only place [the applicant] mentions his native American heritage is in a check box, and calls himself a “white boy,” while the 2nd reader box reads “native American heritage is appealing, let’s discuss.”

- The [REDACTED] said the reader card is a snapshot of the file; in this applicant’s case, the applicant participated in boy’s state and governor’s school, founded clubs, and had other outstanding qualities, yet he was still not admitted.

Were applications from Native Americans candidates compared with applications from other Native American candidates?

- The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) said that they were not.

What were Princeton’s admissions goals with respect to Native American applicants? Who articulated these goals to you? Were these goals different than admissions goals regarding other racial/ethnic groups? If so, how so?

- The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) said he did not know of “goals” for any group.

2) ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (African American/Black applicant)

For applicant ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C), in the 2nd reader box, you stated “very few African Americans with verbal scores like this – this is reason to talk about [applicant].” What did you mean?

- That’s not the only part of the applicant’s profile that was discussed in committee. The associate dean said there was appeal in that the applicant was not from a very “savvy” background, and the applicant was displaced by Hurricane Katrina in the year immediately following that event, when the University was very sensitive to it. The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) said the candidate’s verbal scores were “one point, one of many.” The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) also noted that the candidate did not get in.

3) ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C), [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (Asian applicants)

For applicant ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C), in the 2nd reader box, you referred to the applicant’s “familiar profile,” said he “lacks [a] hook,” and “w[on’t] s[tand] o[ut].” What did you mean by these comments?

- The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) said the statement “familiar profile” can be used to refer to any candidate. He said there are “thousands upon thousands” of applicants, and that the applicant’s “story” was very familiar. OCR asked if this includes a sense of the Asian identity of the applicant. The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) said “he could have put it down for anyone.” The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) stated that the teacher references “checked back” the student, meaning that they did not give him the highest available recommendations, but checked less outstanding ratings, such as VG (very good). He said that the applicant had “very run-of-the-mill credentials” and that he did not see leadership demonstrated in the applicant’s extracurricular activities.

For applicant ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C) your 2nd reader comment also states “very familiar profile.” What did you mean here?

- The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) said that the “S” here denotes “swim.” The [redacted] (b)(7)(C) stated that “very familiar profile” is mentioned by both

the first and second readers. When asked if “profile” refers to the race of the applicant, the (b)(7)(C) said it was not “because of” race; but because many students have similar credentials. The (b)(7)(C) (b)(7)(C) indicated that the applicant was still discussed in committee. The (b)(7)(C) referred to the applicant’s participation in debate club despite a lisp, that he was second in his class, in a high school where only 40% of graduates go to post-secondary schools. OCR asked why the applicant went to committee, and the (b)(7)(C) replied that the student was a 1 academic/ 4 non-academic, but had many pluses, including overcoming a speech impediment.

OCR asked the (b)(7)(C) about the following abbreviations, which he explained as noted.

Abbreviations

- NGB - “nice guy/girl but”
- NHRP Status? - “national Hispanic recognition program”
- NC? - “non-college [background]”
- SW/NC Status? - “Social mobility [thought it was supposed to be M, not W]”/“non-college”
- FN? - “fencing”
- NA? - “non-academic rating” [need context]
- FW? - “fee waiver”
- SM? - “social mobility”
- BWOC? - “big woman on campus”
- ATC? - “all things considered”
- Min 5 - is a Native American applicant
- Min 3 - is a Mexican/Mexican American
- Min 1 - is African American/Black
- “Biracial/3”
- “White/5”
- “Asian – 6”
- “White – 3” - The (b)(7)(C) stated that he wasn’t sure, but believes the second number refers to the minority association.

International Students

- **How did Princeton consider international students? We noticed in the database that Princeton provided us that the ethnicity of all international candidates are coded as “blank.” Do you know if Princeton automatically coded all of these applicants as “blank”? Why?**
 - The (b)(7)(C) said “the race is in the application the international students submit.” He could not offer further information about why the University treats international candidates in this way.

Where are most international applicants from?

- The (b)(7)(C) said it varies from year to year; a lot come from Canada, from China, and from the United Kingdom and other European countries.

Were applications from International candidates compared with applications from other International candidates (i.e. insulated from comparison with whole pool)? Were they separated by country?

- The (b)(7)(C) said the international committee constitutes one committee; accordingly, the region is taken as a whole, just like all of the other regions. For the sake of the process all international candidates are in the same “region.” The region’s dockets are done by school, state, and country in alphabetical order, just as they are done for domestic schools.

Did Princeton take into consideration an International applicant’s race or ethnicity, or was the focus on the country that he/she was from?

- The (b)(7)(C) stated that the student’s country of origin is “part of the applicant’s story,” and is included in the application.
- **Do you have any information suggesting that Princeton had numerical goals with respect to International applicants?**
 - The (b)(7)(C) said that the University’s goals is to have the best students from around the world, and he was unaware of any numerical goals.
- **OCR asked the (b)(7)(C) about the low admission rate for certain Asian countries: The average admission rate for the class of 2010 was 10%. We noticed that the admission rate for certain Asian countries was low. For example, China had 413 applicants, and their admission rate was 7.5%; India had 323 applicants, and their admission rate was 2.8%; and South Korea had 320 applicants, and their admission rate was 6.9%. In contrast, Canada had 389 applicants, and a 10% admission rate. The European county with the most applicants, the UK, had 98 applicants, and a 13% admission rate. Do you know why the admission rate for these Asian countries is low?**
 - The (b)(7)(C) said “it depends on the quality of the candidates.” The University’s curriculum is in English. Canada and the UK are English-speaking countries; the University may receive better quality candidates for its curriculum from those countries.

Legacies

- **How are legacies considered?**

- The (b)(7)(C) said if mom or dad went to the University, it would be one of many things the admissions staff would consider. It would not be determinative; the applicant had better have many other outstanding qualities in order to “get in.”

Recruited Athletes

- **How did the application process differ for recruited athletes?**
- The (b)(7)(C) said the process for athletes is similar to the process for legacies; the University wants a strong athletic program, and an applicant’s strengths in athletics, if desirable to the University, would be part of the applicant’s overall story, in terms of how the admissions office would evaluate the applicant.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (the witness)

Representatives: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (representative 2)

Interviewers: Pranita Raghavan, Compliance Team Attorney
Coleen Chin, Compliance Team Attorney

Dates: May 20, 2010

Re: Princeton University, OCR case no. 02-08-6002

Location: By telephone, OCR conference room

OCR interviewed the witness in order to obtain his statement regarding the admissions process for the class of 2010. OCR advised the witness that he is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the witness stated that he would like representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR advised the witness that the interviewers would take notes during the interview that would be incorporated into a formal interview statement for the file. OCR advised the witness that the contents of the file are subject to the Freedom of Information Act, but that names, telephone numbers, and other personally identifying information would be redacted before the release of any requested documents. OCR advised the witness that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for his participation in an investigation. OCR also explained its investigation process, that it is a neutral fact-finder, and that OCR initiated a compliance review into whether the University discriminated against Asians, on the bases of race or national origin, in its admissions process for the class of 2010, in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, and its implementing regulation at 34 C.F.R. Part 100.

Background

- The witness confirmed that he served as the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) until 2006 and is now the Director of Undergraduate Admissions at [redacted] (b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(7)(C). For the class of 2010, he served as the [redacted] (b)(7)(C) [redacted] (b)(7)(C).
- For the class of 2010, she reported to Janet Rapeleye (the dean of admission) and Christopher Watson (the director of admission).
- His duties included student recruitment, application evaluation, and working on admission publications.
- He did not remember exactly who reported to him. It might have been two staff members.

Review of Admissions Process

- The witness confirmed the steps listed below.
 - Once file is complete, it is assigned to a regional team coordinator.
 - Team coordinator assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on quick read.
 - File then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action.”
 - File then returns to team coordinator, who agrees with, edits, or overrules first reader.
 - All applicant files listed on docket for committee review; team coordinator brings most promising ones to attention of committee – might include handful of students from same school.
 - The dean of admissions or the former associate dean chaired the committees; decision is reached by informal polling.
 - Committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round.
 - Second round of committee review is winnowing down the class and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering/oboe players. He participated in this winnowing process, along with the dean of admissions and director of admissions.

Training

- Much of the training was on-the-job training, including comparing notes for a particular applicant.
- Training was not separated by region.
- When asked if he received training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin, the witness stated that this topic was included in the training. There was a discussion regarding the prohibition against the use of racial/national origin stereotypes.

Outreach

- When asked if there are any outreach efforts targeted to Asian students, the witness stated that there were no outreach efforts directed only to Asian students.

Use of Race/National Origin

- The witness stated that race/national origin mattered to the degree that the applicant discussed it in the application. It would be a part of the admission discussion if raised by the student.
- The University did not define racial/national origin diversity.
- The University did not have any goals with respect to racial/national origin diversity.
- When asked, the witness stated that he was not aware whether there were any discussions regarding racial/national origin diversity during the second round of committee review.

- When asked if the University met its goal for diversity for the class of 2010, the witness stated that during trainings he was informed that diversity was a goal for the University, among other institutional priorities.

Treatment of Asian Applications

- There are no quotas with respect to Asian applicants.
- When asked if admission staff have a sense of positive or negative characteristics that appear frequently in applications from Asian individuals, the witness stated that the admission staff does not have predetermined ideas about applicants.
- Asian applicants are not compared against other Asian applicants.
- When asked, the witness stated that it was not tougher for an Asian applicant to be admitted. It is equally difficult for applicants of all groups to stand out.
- When asked, the witness stated that the University’s approach to applications from Asian applicants did not change after OCR initiated its investigation. There were a few meetings about the case, but the admission work continued as it had operated before.

Specific Comments Made by Witness on Admission Reader Cards Reviewed by OCR

1) ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (Native American applicant): “Nice one for committee; solid academically; according to all and rare cultural add. Not easy to dismiss and a kid you want to root for. More convincing recs would help.”

- When asked why this applicant was a “rare cultural add”, the witness stated that the applicant was a Native American. The applicant discussed cultural identity extensively in application, which was rare.

2) ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (Puerto Rican applicant): “SSR refers to him bringing a stink bomb to class and it being fun. He’s got energy and a bit of a self-starter but I slow to warm to him. Some potential and more competitive than most from PR.”

- Applicants scores were higher than most from Puerto Rico. Witness had familiarity with scores from different regions because prior to working at the University, had worked for [redacted] (b)(7)(C) admission office for 11 years.

3) ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (Bi-racial applicant): “NHRP kid, passionate about research and she attended Korea school. Neat blend but no indication she does anything else. Thoughtful and engaging but not show. Might fit in better at Caltech but grow more here.”

- When asked what he meant when he stated, “Might fit in better at Caltech but grow more here,” the witness stated that the applicant was one dimensional, and only excelled academically. The University would expose the applicant to additional perspectives.

4) ID [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander applicant): “Rare cultural addition for us. Good feel about him as a striver and also quite humble. What resonates is his maturity from start to end. Nice pick up for us.”

- When asked what he meant with respect to “rare cultural addition” and “nice pick up for us” references, he stated that the applicant identified himself as a Native Hawaiian, with an interest in engineering.

International Students

- The University considers international students in the same way as domestic students.
- He stated that the applications were initially separated by country. There are some opportunities not available to international students, so have to see how they otherwise stand out in their learning environment.
- There were no quotas or goals with respect to international students.

Legacies

- The witness stated that an applicant's legacy status is just one of many factors considered by the admission staff. If all things were equal, might give tip to the legacy applicant, but would have to re-read reader card to ensure that caught everything.

Alumni Interviews

- When asked how much weight is given to alumni interviews, the witness stated that no applicant is accepted or rejected because of one element. He added that no quantitative weight is given to the interview.
- When asked what type of training the University provides to alumni interviewers, the witness stated that the University provides them with training manuals.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University

Interviewees: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) Former Admissions Reader (witness)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C) Esq., University Counsel (representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C) Esq., Partner, Hogan & Hartson (representative 2)

Interviewers: James Moser
Compliance Team Attorney

Bill Poorten
Attorney Advisor

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)
OCR Intern

Date: June 3, 2010

Location: Conducted via Telephone

Re: Princeton University (the University)

OCR informed the witness of her rights under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and the Privacy Act, as well as the right to be free from retaliation. In addition, OCR informed the witness of her right to have a representative of her choice present during this interview. OCR reminded the witness that the purpose of the investigation was to determine whether the University was in compliance with laws prohibiting discrimination on basis of race or national origin with respect to Asian applicants for the Class of 2010. OCR explained its role as a neutral factfinder and that the institution, and not individuals, was under investigation. The witness said that she understood these rights and was willing to proceed with representatives 1 and 2 on the call as her representation. The witness stated that she prepared for the interview by having conversations with the representatives, but that she did not review documents.

Background and Bio

The witness informed OCR that she worked in the Princeton Admissions Office, after graduating, beginning in July 2005 and through Spring 2007. The witness stated she then left the Office to work at [redacted] (b)(7)(C) for seven months, after which she returned to the University to help manage a [redacted] (b)(7)(C). In March 2009, the witness began her current position as Program Manager of Major Gifts for [redacted] (b)(7)(C).

As a First Reader, the witness stated that she reported to Chris Watson, Director of Admissions. The witness said she had certain travel regions during her time at the University – in the first

year, she went to the South and Midwest and in the second year she went to the San Francisco area and Atlanta. The witness stated she did not have a mentor, nor was she a mentee to anyone.

Admission Process

OCR reviewed the admissions process with the witness, and confirmed that once a file is complete and prepped (including calculation of GPA, other basic data), it is assigned to a regional team leader, who assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on a quick read. (The witness stated that she never rated applications. She also stated that, as far as she remembers, the University used the PGPA in calculating the academic rating.) The file then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action,” after which it returns to the team leader or another second reader, who agrees with, edits, or overrules the first reader. The witness confirmed that all applicant files are listed on the docket for committee review; the team leader brings the most promising ones to the attention of the committee, and this could include handful of students from same school. She confirmed that Dean Rapelye or Christopher Watson chaired the committees, and that decisions were reached by informal polling.

The witness stated that she served on the committee which reviewed all applicant files listed on the docket for review. She said that first, the Team Leader presented the application, and then the Committee voted. The witness stated that she did not keep a running tally of admits as the process went on. She stated that she assumed keeping count of the number of admits would be part of the Team Leader’s work, but the witness did not know whether tallies were kept on-going or tabulated at the conclusion of the discussion.

At the conclusion of this process, the witness said at times more students were admitted than the University had space for, so as First Readers they were asked to provide a list of prioritized admits. The witness said that Dean Rapelye or Chris Watson would then meet with the team leaders to go over applications and make the final decision. The witness said this was not a second committee process in the same way as the first was. The witness stated she would submit her list based on the voting outcomes from the Committee. The witness said that if there were five people in committee voting, she would recommend those applicants who had received five votes. She stated that she would use her own notes to figure out the voting outcome, and she assumed others in the committee would also take notes on the vote outcome, but she could not name anyone for certain. The witness said that she used no other criteria other than the vote results, but she did not remember if she was asked to do it this way because it was not a big part of her position. She said she just remembers using her vote tally to prioritize her list. After this process, the witness said that her notes containing the vote outcomes would be shredded.

Use of Race/National Origin

The witness stated that race was just one of many factors considered on the whole since applications were reviewed holistically. The witness said that any student could have race be considered a positive trait. She stated that readers would look at how students would contribute to the overall Princeton community. The witness identified an example of race as a positive trait occurring when one Latina student in California, who received a scholarship to a predominantly

white private school, wrote about how she brought her heritage to the school, and exhibited wonderful qualities. The witness stated that anyone could exhibit this.

The witness said that she did not think the University has an official definition of diversity, at least not in Admissions. The witness stated her own perception of diversity was that she understood that Princeton wanted to bring in a great class every year with diversity of thought, intellectual passion, background, and in other different ways. The witness stated that she did not have a sense of what a diverse class would be demographically.

The witness said that she does not know that the University had any goals for racial and national origin diversity. The witness stated that there were not discussions about racial and national origin diversity; she said that you could see on the reader card whether the applicant self-identified.

The witness stated that no groups were considered under-represented at the university. She said that from an admissions viewpoint, there was no definition of underrepresented. The witness stated that now that she works in education there are some groups she believes participate in higher education at greater levels, but when she was in admissions she did not view it that way.

OCR asked if there was any particular time during the application process race was considered. The witness said that race and national origin, as with any factor, were not considered at any specific time during the review process. She stated that every applicant was discussed as an individual compared to the entire applicant pool. The witness said that she could not give a specific example in which race was considered in any respect, but she did state that it could happen for anyone. The witness gave a hypothetical example where a white student in an urban school used that to tell his story. The witness stated that at no point in the process did her supervisors give her feedback on her work regarding the consideration of race or racial diversity.

OCR asked whether the University met its diversity goals for the Class of 2010, and how that information was communicated. The witness responded only that she believes Princeton brought in a great class full of many talented students for the Class of 2010.

Treatment of Asian Applications

The witness stated that she did not believe Princeton had goals with respect to the number of Asian or Asian-American applicants it wanted to admit. She also stated that the admissions staff does not have a sense of positive or negative characteristics that appear frequently in applications from Asian students. The witness did not think it was tougher for Asian applicants to stand out or distinguish themselves. The witness said the Asian candidates were not compared directly with other Asian candidates, instead of with the general applicant pool.

The witness stated that, since the OCR investigation commenced, she did not change her approach with Asian applicants, nor did she have the sense that the University's approach changed.

Legacies

The witness stated that being a legacy is treated the same as anything else; it was one factor of the entire application. The witness stated that she does not know if she would categorize it as an especially careful look, but that they do consider seriously the sons and daughters of alumni.

Recruited Athletes

The witness stated that recruited athletes are treated just like legacies and everyone else – it is one factor among many considered.

International Students

The witness stated that Princeton considered international students in the same way it considered American students. The witness said that international applicants were organized by country. The witness said that she thought the reason for this was because it seems to be efficient. Furthermore, the witness stated that a foreign country usually has a similar educational system across the board. The witness said that different readers are assigned to different countries, and a given country may have more than one reader. The witness remembered that she read applications from the Middle East. The witness said that the admission readers would read all the applications from a country at one time.

The witness said that when reviewing an application the readers are not thinking about diversity, including international students. Rather the witness stated that a reader is more reviewing that individual's application in its entirety – who the student is, what they do outside the classroom. The witness also said that anything that a student brings that is unique to that individual will be considered.

The witness said that the University did not have admissions goals with regard to international students.

Training

The witness stated that there was a review in the beginning of the year of how to look at an application and how to present it to a second reader. The witness said that the review may have been a mix of applications from the previous year and of hypothetical applicants, but she does not remember. She stated that the admissions team did not receive training for each region of high schools. The witness further stated that they did not receive training regarding the consideration of race and/or national origin, nor any training regarding racial/national origin stereotypes.

Outreach

The witness stated that as part of her job she participated in the University's outreach efforts by visiting schools and talking about the Princeton experience, the application process, and financial aid. The witness said that none of these outreach efforts were designed to target Asian students or any other group.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University (the University)

Interviewee: [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) (the witness)
[REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (University Counsel/representative 1)
[REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) Esq. (Hogan & Hartson/representative 2)

Interviewers: William Poorten, Attorney Advisor
James Moser, Compliance Team Attorney

Date: February 25, 2010

Re: Compliance Review – Title VI Admissions

Location: Interview by Telephone

At the outset of the interview, the witness was informed of her rights to representation, to refuse representation, and to refuse to share the content of the interview with anyone, including the University. The witness chose to have representatives 1 and 2 on the call with her. The witness was also informed of her rights with regard to FOIA, the Privacy Act, and freedom from retaliation or intimidation. OCR reminded the witness of the purposes of OCR's interview and the issue being investigated in this case, and that OCR is a neutral factfinder. The witness did not have any questions about this information.

OCR asked the witness what she had done to prepare for the interview, and she replied that she had access to the reader cards we had identified for discussion and spoken with representative 1.

The witness said she is currently an assistant dean for admissions in the undergraduate admissions office of the [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), and that she has held that position since July 2008. She said that she left the University in June 2007 to attend graduate school at [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) from 2007 to 2008.

The witness started working at the University in the fall of 2004 as an admissions officer, and her duties included, in the fall, traveling for recruitment and conducting information sessions at high schools and/or hotels, and in the winter, reading admissions files, and some other low-level responsibilities in connection with April hosting for admitted students. She said that the region she was assigned to was the central/southern California region excluding LA. She said she also read for Utah, Nevada, Delaware or other areas where the need for readers was great. She said it was never clear who she reported to, other than the Dean of Admissions, and that no one reported to her. She said she left because she was going to grad school, and did not see a lot of advancement at the University.

OCR reviewed the admissions process with the witness, and confirmed that once a file is complete and prepped (including calculation of GPA, other basic data), it is assigned to a regional team leader, who assigns academic and non-academic ratings and institutional priority based on a quick read. The file then goes to first reader, who reviews thoroughly and picks a “suggested action,” after which it returns to the team leader, who agrees with, edits, or overrules the first reader. The witness confirmed that all applicant files are listed on the docket for committee review; the team leader brings the most promising ones to the attention of the committee, and this could include handful of students from same school. The witness added that the team leaders have an AGN (region) they work with, but that when first readers are reading files, no one is saying “you must read files from a particular school.” She said that when the files are completed, after having been rated, they are put in file cabinets alphabetically.

The witness said she served on the committee for California, and sat in 3 or 4 different committees. She confirmed that Dean Rapelye or Christopher Watson chaired the committees, and that decisions were reached by informal polling. She confirmed that the committee has no idea how many applicants it has selected for admission in the first round, as no running tally of admits was kept. The witness confirmed that the second round of committee review involves winnowing down the class (as there are at this stage too many admits for available seats) and/or adding to fill certain departments or programs, such as engineering. The witness confirmed that the winnowing process does happen, and added that the example of filling the engineering program (when it is either over- or under-subscribed) is reasonable, but was skeptical that a single characteristic such as being an oboe player would put a student in the class. She said that after [first (based on her lack of knowledge as to who was involved in winnowing below)] committee review the “powers that be” would announce how many admits needed to be cut, and that split votes were the most vulnerable. She said she did not know who was involved in the winnowing decisions, and that there were no other steps in the decision making process to add.

The witness said she was given both formal and informal training for her work. In the fall there was always a week of workshops that the admissions office staff attended together with various constituencies on campus, e.g. LGBT or the engineering school, in order to be accurate and up-to-date. She said that new admissions staff like her were given mock files to read, and to fill out a mock-up of a reader card, which was then reviewed by senior staff. She said there was mentorship training to calibrate the admissions file reading as an office, so there would not be wildly different assessments of applications. She said there was no formal training regarding the consideration of race or national origin, or racial stereotypes. She said, however, that it was made very clear that race, national origin, disability, and gender could only be considered as one piece of a larger puzzle.

When asked what ways the race or national origin of applicants played into the admissions process, the witness repeated that they were only ever considered as one piece of a larger puzzle for any student; it could never be the main element for a student. She

said it absolutely *is* taken into consideration, however; how large a factor it is depends on the student. She said that a person's race or ethnicity is just like any other factor in their life, such as what school they went to or who their parents are, and that you can't make an assessment of a student that strips it away.

The witness said that the University was trying to achieve racial diversity in the admissions process, but said there was no policy about having a certain percentage of students admitted in the regions covered; she said there were no quotas. When asked what groups are considered underrepresented or overrepresented at the University, she said there was no policy relating to that, and that from her perspective as a first reader, she had a "worm's eye" view of the process; she can't tell if there was some overall push towards greater diversity. She stated again that there were no policies regarding race, ethnicity or national origin, and added that the issue of what went on in the admissions office at the University versus what's out there in the world are two different things.

The witness said that consideration of race takes place at all steps in the admissions process; it's always part of a student's file, and always taken into consideration – there's no time when it's at the forefront and then moves to the background.

The witness said she thinks there are lots of instances when having a particular background is a real plus factor. She said that the prevailing view is that we can learn from each other – when students are immersed in their cultures it is a really positive thing. She pointed out that such students would have the ability to answer questions about their backgrounds. She said that this means we can learn from each other in a variety of ways that are connected to our heritage. The witness said this entails teaching one another, making other people think about things they haven't thought about before, but that it can't be defined. She said there is no policy; it just happens, it's organic.

The witness could not recall any discussions regarding the racial and/or national origin diversity of the class in anticipation of or during the second round of committee review. She said she did not know whether the University met its goals for diversity for the class of 2010, adding that we'd have to ask the president and the trustees. She said that the admissions office does not "get together at the end of the year and say 'let's have a party, we have a diverse class.'" She said the diversity element is not what comes to the forefront when the process is complete, it is "gosh, we have a great class" overall. She said there was no review of diversity. She said that if she was missing things, the second readers who supervised her work would go carefully through and point them out, but added that this typically did not happen, since she was pretty proficient as a reader. The witness said that diversity is not a code word for race; the student's ethnicity is on the application – it's not something you miss, because you can see it on the file.

OCR asked whether the admissions staff had a sense of positive or negative characteristics that frequently appear in applications from Asians. The witness responded that the applicant pools for the University are, from the start, virtually all significantly amazing, and that she does not associate positive characteristics with a particular group. She said that there were no negative characteristics generally associated with Asian

groups, and that every reader is trained to look at everyone as an individual, including positive and negative characteristics. She said she did not have a sense that Asian candidates were compared to other Asian candidates, instead of to the general applicant pool. She did not think it is tougher for Asian applicants to stand out/distinguish themselves than other applicants. The witness said she had no idea whether the University's approach to applications from Asian individuals changed in any way after OCR's investigation began; she said her approach to applications from Asian individuals did not change after OCR's investigation began.

With respect to legacies, the witness said that legacy status is just another piece of the puzzle, like anything else. OCR asked if legacy status is considered as a positive piece if it is considered at all, and the witness answered "It's a piece."

With respect to recruited athletes, the witness said only that there was a slightly different timetable, and that she had very little to do with athletics other than reading files.

With respect to alumni interviews, the witness said that they were just one piece of a larger puzzle. She said that it is hard to ascribe significance to an interview; in some cases there were interviews, in other cases there were not. In some cases the alumni interviews came in late in the process, but they were just one piece of a larger whole.

OCR reviewed specific comments on reader cards with the witness. For applicant ID [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) a Native American for whom the witness wrote the first reader comment "Not sure the cultural addition is quite enough," the witness said that the applicant talked quite a lot about his culture in his application – two of the essays talked about it. She said the connection he had to his culture was very attractive, and that it would be "enlightening" to bring something different. However, she was worried about the applicant's academic qualifications, and was not sure if the cultural aspect would be enough to push him to admission. She said that his 11th grade grades did not show a lot of rigor, and noted that his high school does not send a lot of students to college, which made her "a little worried."

For applicant [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), an Asian for whom the witness wrote the first reader comment "Prob[ably] tough to put ahead of others; familiar profile", the witness said that all candidates applying to the University are pretty exceptional, but that exceptional comes to be the norm. She said this was written on many, many files; and that the student was at the top of his class, and pretty involved.

For applicant [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), an Asian for whom the witness wrote the first reader comment "seems to have blossomed despite an early lisp and accent problem (Q1), and has become a high-level debater and a humorous guy, acc. to TR1. Clearly bright, w/ a heck of a program, this aspiring pre-med is also fairly involved. Prob @ top of slate for [high school], but not a lot of pizzaz, familiar profile. Add?", the witness said that this application presented the "exact same circumstances" as the one immediately above. He is a high-flying student, she said, "but for us in our pool, not an unusual student." She said there has to be something beyond that.

At the conclusion of the interview, OCR provided contact information if the witness had anything to add.

(b)(7)(C)

From: OCR
Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2011 9:15 AM
To: (b)(7)(C)@edu
Cc: (b)(7)(C); (b)(7)(C)
Subject: FW: complaint 1 of 2 attached
Attachments: doe1.pdf

Dear (b)(7)(C):

I am writing in response to your email inquiry dated August 12, 2011, to the U.S. Department of Education's (Department) Office for Civil Rights (OCR). You stated that you are filing a complaint with OCR because you believe that your son was denied admission to Princeton University because of his race (Indian American). I am pleased to respond.

OCR enforces several Federal civil rights laws, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in programs and activities receiving financial assistance from the Department.

The OCR New York Office (Office) is responsible for investigating complaints, conducting compliance reviews and providing technical assistance to educational institutions in New Jersey. I am forwarding your email to that Office for further review and appropriate handling. If you wish, you may contact that Office directly at the following mailing address:

Office for Civil Rights, New York Office
U.S. Department of Education
32 Old Slip, 26th Floor
New York, NY 10005-2500
Telephone :646-428-3800
Facsimile :646-428-3843
TDD :877-521-2172
Email: :OCR.NewYork@ed.gov

For your reference, you may wish to review the information on OCR's complaint process available at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/complaintintro.html>. If you have trouble with the website, please contact me at the following email: OCR@ed.gov. or call us at 1-800-421-3481.

OCR is committed to providing the public, including students, parents, educators, representatives of school district, colleges, and universities, and other interested persons, with information about the civil rights laws OCR enforces. In responding to correspondence, OCR provides customers with general, publicly-available information about a wide variety of civil rights issues in the education context. However, OCR does not provide legal or other advice or issue advisory opinions to customers concerning specific factual scenarios. Correspondence issued by OCR in response to an inquiry from the public does not constitute a formal statement of OCR policy and should not be construed as creating or articulating new policy. OCR's formal policy statements are approved by a duly authorized OCR official and made available to the public.

I hope the information provided is of assistance.

Sincerely,

(b)(7)(C)
Customer Service Team
Office for Civil Rights

Cc: OCR, New York Office

-----Original Message-----

From: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) [mailto:[redacted] (b)(7)(C) edu]

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2011 11:12 AM

To: OCR

Subject: complaint 1 of 2 attached

Dear Office of Civil Rights:

Please find attached a complaint letter in accordance with the procedures outlined at:

<http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/howto.html>

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)

Phone: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) Fax: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) Cell/Text: [redacted] (b)(7)(C)

Address:

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[redacted] (b)(7)(C)

August 12, 2011

U.S. Department of Education
Office for Civil Rights
400 Maryland Ave. SW
Washington, DC 20202-1100

Dear Office of Civil Rights:

We are filing a complaint in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Law of 1964.
Our address is as follows:

[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)
[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)
[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)
Phone: [Redacted] (b)(7)(C)
Email: [Redacted] (b)(7)(C).edu

The person that we believe was discriminated against is our son:

[Redacted] (b)(7)(C) (date of birth: [Redacted] (b)(7)(C))

The institution is:

Princeton University
Office of Undergraduate Admissions
110 West College
P.O. Box 430
Princeton, NJ 08542-0430
Phone: (609) 258-3060
Fax: (609) 258-6743
E-mail: uaoffice@princeton.edu

We have attached a file that describes our complaint in detail.

Sincerely,

[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)

[Redacted] (b)(7)(C)

Enclosure

We are filing this complaint with the Department of Education's OCR division because we believe that on March 30, 2011 our son ((b)(7)(C)) herewith referred to as our son) was denied admission to Princeton's Class of 2015 because it places an informal upper limit on the numbers of Indian American) students that are admitted and consequently uses higher objective and subjective standards to evaluate them. We are complaining about the treatment of Indian Americans (and by extension, Asian Americans) compared with Whites, a group not intended to benefit from affirmative action. We are seeking equitable treatment for our son compared to Caucasians/White Americans, regardless of his race/ethnicity.

Specifically we are filing our complaint under **Title VI regulations** issued by the Department of Education, according to which recipients of federal funding may not "utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing the accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respect to individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin." We are charging that Princeton University uses higher objective and subjective standards when evaluating Indian American Students. These admissions practices have an unjustifiable disparate impact on the admission rates of Indian Americans/Asian Americans and thus we are seeking redress through the DOE OCR's regulations designed to implement the purposes of Title VI.

To prove our claim that Princeton University uses disparate admission standards to evaluate Indian Americans compared to Whites thus violating Title VI regulations, we will do the following:

(1) First we provide **specific details of our son's** academic and extracurricular accomplishments. To demonstrate that lower standards are used when evaluating White applicants, we also provide details of information about student/s from his Public high school who were admitted and/or waitlisted to the Class of 2015 by Princeton University.

(2) Second, we provide **supporting evidence** from published research as well as publicly available admissions data to support our complaint of higher objective and subjective standards to evaluate Indian Americans.

(3) Third, we provide evidence from the **media** - both conventional newspaper articles as well as online forums that Indian Americans (and most Asian Americans) are held to higher standards during the Admissions process at elite universities such as Princeton University.

(4) Fourth, we argue that our claim of disparate admissions standards will be proven by **examining group data** across all Indian American and White applicants.

I. Specific Details Relevant to our Complaint

As befitting the published standards of Princeton University, our son had an outstanding academic record along with a significant extracurricular accomplishments, including community service, leadership, and national awards/recognitions. Academically, he had an unweighted GPA of 4.0, a weighted GPA of 4.53, the highest weighted graduating GPA in his public high school of 627 students, the toughest possible curriculum (11 AP classes), all A grades (even as a second semester senior), all SAT scores (including subject tests) at 750 or above, all AP scores at maximum (score of 5). Outside the class room, he was an athlete who played two varsity sports that are not typical of his demographic (how many South Asians play varsity volleyball and basketball?), led the news team (news editing) at the school newspaper that won a national medal, won three national writing awards, and a state award for Mathematics achievement. Outside school, he extensively interned at the local city newspaper, volunteered with homeless

youth, coached physically challenged youth, and worked with other youth organizations in our community. In recognition of these achievements, he received the National Merit Finalist award and several Regents scholarships from (b)(7)(C)

(b)(7)(C)

(b)(7)(C)

From my son's public school ((b)(7)(C)), here are the students* who were admitted at Princeton University as of March 30, 2011:

1. Admitted: White female student (whose Father is White American; grandfather is White American), same graduating GPA at the end of 8 semesters, lower SAT scores, No national awards such as National Merit Finalist or Regents Scholarship
2. Waitlist: White male student (whose Father is White American): significantly lower GPA and class rank, lower SAT scores; few to none AP courses; No national awards such as National Merit Finalist or Regents Scholarship.

II. Supporting Evidence

(1) Published research studies as well as publicly available admissions data support our contention that Princeton University uses higher objective and subjective standards to evaluate individuals of Indian American origin (and most Asian Americans) relative to Caucasian/White Americans. Work by Princeton University researcher Espenshade provides clear documentary evidence that private Universities such as Princeton use higher objective standards for Asian American students; for instance, the mean SAT for admitted Asian Americans is 66 points higher than those for whites, Asians need to score 130 points higher than Whites to have the same chance of admission at prestigious private colleges, and the acceptance rate for Asians with SATs in the 1400-1600 range is only 30% compared to 40% for Whites (Espenshade and Radford, No Longer Separate, Not Yet Equal, 2009).

(2) Next, we compare admissions data from Princeton and UC, Berkeley, one of the premier public institutions in the U.S. According to press release put forth by Princeton University, 22% of the admitted students self-identified as Asian-American and approximately 53% were White (<http://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S30/15/00177/index.xml?section=topstories>). In contrast, according to data published by the University of California, Berkeley, 45.5% (5565 students) of the admitted class was Asian American and 32.8% (4152 students) were white (<http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2011/04/18/freshman-admission-data-2011-12/>). These numbers are significant given that among high school graduates in California for the Class of 2007, there were only 51,800 Asian Americans relative to 136,500 Whites (Note that even in California, where the proportion of Asian Americans is higher relative to the rest of the nation the total number of Asians is still considerably less than the total number of White students) (http://diversity.berkeley.edu/SP_data_expanded). Admissions to UC, Berkeley is regulated by Proposition 209 which prohibits the state from discriminating against or giving preferences to anyone on the basis of "race, sex, color, ethnicity or national origin in the operation of public employment, public education or public contracting." Like Princeton University, UC Berkeley considers academic performance as well as other factors such as leadership, overcoming obstacles, etc (<http://newscenter.berkeley.edu/2011/04/18/campus-releases-2011-12-admissions-data/>.) It is clear that when similar standards are use to evaluate ALL applicants such as at UC, Berkeley, significantly more Asian-American students are admitted compared to White students

* Names withheld to protect privacy of other students; available on request

and also at proportions comparable to their size in the Applicant pool rate than is the case at Princeton University (http://diversity.berkeley.edu/SP_data_expanded). This provides further evidence in support of our contention that Princeton University uses differential subjective and objective standards when evaluating Indian American Students.

III. Evidence from the Media (print and online forums) (please note this is not an exhaustive list but just a selected sample)

1. Daniel Golden author of the book, "The Price of Admission" states that "Asian Americans are the new Jews, inheriting the mantle of the most disenfranchised group in college admissions (p. 199)“..”just as they constrained Jewish enrollment before 1950, [colleges] now set a higher bar for Asian American applicants” (p. 200)
2. Asian: the new White (<http://cornellsun.com/node/24601> - article in the Cornell Sun)
3. Do colleges redline Asian Americans? - Op Ed in the Boston Globe
http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/oped/articles/2010/02/08/do_colleges_redline_asian_americans/
4. Comment by Sally Rubenstone, Admissions Counselor, From
<http://www.usaeducationguides.com/borders/?p=168>

"Sally Rubenstone Says:
April 19th, 2009 at 2:07 pm

Hi Rahul,
Even if youre very disappointed that you havent yet been admitted to Yale, you deserve congratulations for making it to the waitlist in todays highly competitive climate.

Being Indian is probably going to work against you. I know that this sounds blunt and certainly racist, but Im convinced that the bar is set higher for Indian-Americans than for any other population.
sally"

5. www.collegeconfidential.com – check out admissions decisions thread for Princeton University – it is evident that Asian Americans ARE held to higher standards than Whites
6. www.collegeconfidential.com – search for the term “Asian discrimination” – there are many threads on this topic

We fully recognize that the above are not akin to published research, but they clearly attest to the “open secret” that Indian Americans (and most Asian Americans) are held to higher standards during the admissions process.

IV. Examining Group Data

As academics, we have served on numerous evaluation committees and have seen first hand how admission and recruitment committees differentially apply subjective standards to different individuals. Similarly, we contend that Princeton University uses higher subjective standards such as extra curricular achievements and personal essays and other subjective elements of the application that are hard to evaluate by third parties to justify their admissions

decisions. There is documented evidence that Asian American students are stereotyped as model students, and adjectives such as “quiet/shy”, and “hard workers” are often used to describe them (U.S Commission on Civil Rights, Civil Rights Issues Facing Asian Americans in the 1990s, 1992). Similarly we contend that Princeton University uses subjective standards that are considerably higher for Asian American students

While Princeton university might try to hide behind “subjective evaluations” to justify a particular individual decision to admit or deny admission (such as our son), we contend that group data do not lie and examination of group data will reveal the consistently higher standards that are used to evaluate Asian Americans relative to Whites/Caucasians. We request that OCR initiate an investigation of the admissions practices Princeton University, which receives millions of dollars in Federal funding and is therefore subject to Title VI regulations. Specifically, we are asking OCR to obtain the data listed below from Princeton University. We are asking for data on the admit, waitlisting, and denial rates broken down by ethnicity and objective performance (for e.g., the admit rate for a particular group is the number of students of that ethnic group who were admitted divided by the total number of applicants from that group who applied).

1. Admit, waitlisting, and denial rates for all Indian Americans/Asian American applicants relative to all White applicants
2. Admit, waitlisting, and denial rates for Indian Americans/Asian Americans who indicated Economics as a major relative to Whites who indicated Economics as a major (Our son indicated economics as his major)
3. Admit, waitlisting, and denial rates for Indian Americans/Asian Americans and Whites with the following objective profile:
Unweighted GPA 4.0, Class Rank in the top 1%, SAT 2300+, Average AP score of 4.5+

We believe that in all of the 3 cases above, the data will reveal that Princeton University reports consistently higher admit rates for Whites relative to Indian Americans/Asian Americans and higher rates of waitlisting and denial for Indian Americans/Asian Americans relative to Whites. In other words, you will find that Indian American/Asian Americans are not being admitted at the same proportion as their size in the applicant pool but are being admitted at proportions that are significantly less than their size in the applicant pool.

Assuming that subjective accomplishments are equally probable among Whites and Indian Americans/Asian Americans, differential admit, waitlist, and denial rates among students with similar objective profiles will clearly demonstrate that Admissions Committees utilize higher subjective standards to evaluate Indian Americans. We contend that such an admissions practice has a disparate impact on Asian American students’ admissions and is therefore a violation of **Title VI regulations**.

We are asking for the following redress:

1. Reconsideration and reversal of the deny decision of our son’s application for admission to Princeton University.
2. Sanctions against and Federal oversight of Princeton university till such time that they demonstrate that Indian American students are admitted to and enrolled in Princeton University at about the same proportion as their size in the applicant pool
3. As a university receiving Federal funds, and one that states that it does not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, national origin, etc, Princeton university should clearly disseminate admit, waitlist, and denial rates for different racial/ethnic groups including Whites, Indian Americans, and all other ethnic groups.

4. Information about race/ethnicity should not be viewed by Admissions Committees and should not be asked for in the Common App; If Princeton University wishes to collect race/ethnicity information for Federal reporting purposes, they should collect this information in a manner that de links it from the actual application (as is the case of employment applications in the State of California).
5. Princeton University should hire an Indian American/Asian American recruitment coordinator; all members of the admissions committee should be given cultural sensitivity training.

From: ocr_complaint@ed.gov
To: @gmail.com; [OCR New York](#)
Subject: OCR Electronic Complaint Submission
Date: Tuesday, August 01, 2006 9:00:23 PM

PLEASE DO NOT REPLY TO THIS E-MAIL. THIS E-MAIL ADDRESS IS USED BY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AUTOMATED SYSTEMS AND IS NOT MONITORED.

Your complaint with the Office for Civil Rights, a copy of which is reproduced below, has been automatically forwarded to the following office for review:

Office for Civil Rights/ED
New York Office

32 Old Slip, 26th Floor

New York, NY, 10005-2500

So that we can best assist you, we call your attention to the following:

1. If you need to communicate with OCR regarding your complaint before you are contacted directly, please do not reply to this message, which would result in your reply going to a send-only server address. Instead, please direct your correspondence to the above office at OCR.NewYork@ed.gov.
2. If you need to modify or supplement your complaint, please do not use the complaint form to submit another complaint with the new information. Instead, you may simply send an email to the office that has your complaint. Filing duplicative complaints may impede our ability to review your concerns in a timely manner. (If you have a separate complaint involving other matters, you may of course use this form to submit it.)
3. Remember that before OCR can process your complaint it must receive at the above address a signed copy of the Office for Civil Rights Consent Form, which you can obtain at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-consentform.html>.
4. It is recommended that you print a copy of this message and retain it for your records.

The following information has been sent to the specified office:

OCR COMPLAINT FORM

1. Enter information about you.

Your First Name: Your Last Name:

Your Address:

City:

State: Zip Code:

Best Time to Call You: DAY Primary Phone No:

Alternative Phone No:

Your Email Address: @gmail.com

2. Who else can we call if we cannot reach you?

Contact's Name:

Daytime Phone No:

Relationship to you:

3. Who was discriminated against?

(b)(7)(C)

4. What institution discriminated?

Institution Name: Princeton University

Address: PO Box 430, 110 West College

City: Princeton

State: NJ

Zip Code: 08544-0430

School or department involved: Undergraduate Admission Office

5. Have you tried to resolve the complaint through the institution's grievance process, due process hearing, or with another agency?

No

Agency Name:

Date Filed: (mm/dd/yyyy)

Status:

6. Describe the discrimination

OCR enforces regulations that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin; sex; disability; and/or age.

All that apply:

race or color

national origin

Why you believe the discrimination was because of race, sex, disability, or whatever basis you indicated above or why you believe the action was retaliatory.

In December of 2005, as a senior in high school, I applied to Princeton University. In March of 2006, I received a letter from Princeton informing me that I had been put on its wait list. Three months later I received a notice (postmarked June 27, 2006) informing me that I had been rejected.

I believe that Princeton's decision to wait-list and then reject me was the result of discrimination due to race and national origin. As an Asian-American and a native of China, my chances of admission were drastically reduced, as I had to contend with higher standards of admission than applicants from all other demographic groups, including whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics.

This assertion is supported by three pieces of evidence. The first is a summary of my college qualifications, which were contained within my application to Princeton University. The second is the historical and ongoing use of racial preferences at Ivy League institutions, especially Princeton, against specific minority groups. The third is a 2005 study by members of Princeton's own Office of Population Research which demonstrated that racial discrimination against Asian-Americans is a statistical fact.

(((1))) Personal Qualifications.

SAT Scores (2400 total, out of a possible 2400)

- 800 Math
- 800 Verbal
- 800 Writing

SAT II Scores

- 800 Chemistry
- 790 Physics
- 800 Math 2

Grades

- Top 1% GPA in school
- 5 AP classes senior year
- 9 AP tests cumulatively taken by graduation

Academic Honors

- New Jersey Math League (b)(7)(C) Team)
- New Jersey Physics League (b)(7)(C)
- AFS Awards for Excellence Scholar
- Rutgers Academic Challenge (b)(7)(C)
- NAQT National Championship Tournament Qualifier

Extracurricular/Community Service

- Academic Team Captain
- AFS Intercultural (b)(7)(C)
- FBLA (b)(7)(C)
- AFS Costa Rica: 168 service hours
- American Legion (b)(7)(C)

(((2))) Historical racial discrimination

The Ivy League has a long history of racial discrimination against minority groups, the form of which runs the gamut from outright barring of minority applicants, to surreptitious quotas limiting their numbers, to the more sophisticated and less detectable use of racial preferences which is in use today.

In the 19th century, schools such as Princeton were populated almost exclusively by members of the Protestant upper class. However, in the early 1900s, the adoption by many colleges of meritocratic standardized tests such as the SAT led a dramatic rise in the enrollment of Jewish students, who, as a group, had higher scores than their peers. This demographic upheaval was deemed disturbing by members of Ivy league colleges; one college president stated, "The summer hotel that is ruined by admitting Jews meets its fate . . . because they drive away the Gentiles, and then after the Gentiles have left, they leave also." (endnote 1)

To limit the enrollment of Jews, Ivy League administrators decided to put less weight on test scores and adopted a new set of criteria for admission. Subjective and amorphous qualities such as "character" were established, according to sociologist Jerome Karabel, in order to "assess important but subtle indicators of background and breeding such as speech, dress, deportment and physical appearance." Applicants were required to state their race, religious preference, and other questions of ancestry on their application forms. Jewish enrollment, to the satisfaction of Ivy League administrators, promptly declined, leaving us with the set of admissions criteria still in use to this day. (endnote 2)

Though affirmative action has eliminated discrimination against certain minority groups by actually discriminating for them, this applies only to under-represented minorities (those whose proportion in the college is lower than their proportion in the general population) such as African-Americans and Hispanics. Two groups of over-represented minorities are Jews and Asians. Today, Jews are treated neutrally by the admissions process, as demonstrated by a lack of a checkbox for "Jewish" in the "ethnicity" section of the Common Application, which Princeton uses today. However, Asian-Americans are discriminated against, and "Asian American" is in fact a checkbox in the Common Application, which queries "ethnicity," "place of birth," "first language," and "language spoken at home."

Although I left "place of birth" and "ethnicity" blank, and this might be used to argue that I was not discriminated against, this is a specious argument, as there was more than enough information to unequivocally deduce both. I stated my citizenship (Chinese), first language (Chinese), and home language (Chinese). As if to erase any doubts about my place of birth and ethnicity, I was required to give both my parents' names, which, along with my own, are unequivocally Chinese in origin.

(((3))) Study proving Asian-American discrimination at Princeton

In 2005, a study published by Princeton University's own Office of Population Research established definitive statistical evidence for claims of discrimination against Asian Americans by assessing admissions rates for various groups after removing the consideration of race. According to the study, by eliminating the consideration of race, the admission rate of Asian-Americans would increase from 17.6% to 23.4%. "While African-American applicants receive the equivalent of 230 extra SAT points (on a 1600 point scale), and being Hispanic is worth an additional 185 extra SAT points. . . Asian-American applicants face a loss equivalent to 50 SAT points." (endnote 3)

I believe that affirmative actions policies of this type are inherently unconstitutional and discriminatory. They violate the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, made explicit by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination based on "race, color, or national origin in programs or activities receiving federal financial assistance." As John Marshall Harlan, the lone dissenter of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, stated, "our Constitution is color-blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." And even though the Supreme Court has upheld the use of race in admissions, it has forbidden quotas and their equivalent (*Regents v. Bakke*, *Bollinger*). The extraordinary differences in preferences accorded to each race is tantamount to a de facto quota system.

There are two other reasons why the theory of affirmative action is flawed and does not serve the interest of civil rights. To restate the theory: because of past discrimination, minorities are at a socioeconomic disadvantage, and thus at an educational disadvantage, as evidenced by their under-representation in universities. Thus, they deserve preference in order to counter past discrimination.

Firstly, affirmative action policies do not effectively redress former discrimination in their choice of

preferred groups. If they truly did, all minority groups that have been discriminated against would receive preferences, including Jews and Asian-Americans. However, as African-American economist Thomas Sowell notes, only minority groups that are under-represented receive affirmative action, because, of the "tenaciously held [assumption] that great statistical disparities in demographic "representation" could not occur without discrimination." (endnote 4) Thus, affirmative action is not truly about "equality of opportunity," but rather about "equality of outcome."

Secondly, affirmative action policies do not effectively seek to redress former discrimination because their preferences are applied equally to all members of a race, regardless of whether or not that individual has experienced discrimination. Because colleges make little effort to consider socioeconomic status (endnote 2), beneficiaries of affirmative action are usually not poor minorities, but rather upper-class minorities, who have suffered the least under discrimination. In a perverse twist, colleges such as Princeton accord preferred status to "legacy" applicants (endnote 3), who tend to be of the highest socioeconomic strata. Wealthy, "legacy" minority applicants are accepted over equally-qualified but disadvantaged white and Asian applicants.

Even for supporters of affirmative action, it should be noted that traditionally, affirmative action has been envisioned as a system in which white applicants lose preference to minority applicants. In contrast, Princeton's affirmative action program has a neutral effect on whites, while at the same time merely, in effect, moving preference from one minority group (Asian-Americans) to another (African-Americans and Hispanics). Thus, affirmative action fails to increase minority enrollment (if we use the more general sense of the word "minority"). This seems to be a calculated move by a historically white institution to protect its racial identity while at the same time maintaining a facade of progressivism.

End notes

(1) Gladwell, Malcolm. "Getting in: The social logic of Ivy League admissions." The New Yorker. 10 October 2005.

http://www.newyorker.com/critics/atlarge/articles/051010crat_atlarge

(2) Karabel, Jerome. "The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton." Houghton Mifflin. 2005.

(3) Epsenshade, Thomas J. and Chang Y. Chung "Ending affirmative action would devastate most minority college enrollment. Princeton University". 6 June 2005.

<http://www.princeton.edu/main/news/archive/S11/80/77123/index.xml?sectio>

<http://opr.princeton.edu/faculty/Tje/EpsenshadeSSQPtII.pdf>

(4) Sowell, Thomas. "Affirmative Action around the World".

<http://www.hooverdigest.org/044/sowell.html>

7. Your complaint must be filed within 180 days of the discriminatory action

When did the last act of discrimination occur?

Enter the date: 06/27/2006 (mm/dd/yyyy)

Are you requesting a waiver of the 180-day filing time limit for discrimination that occurred more than 180 days before the filing of this complaint?

No.

8. What would you like the institution to do as a result of your complaint û what remedy are you seeking?

I am seeking the suspension of Federal financial assistance from Princeton University until Princeton discontinues discrimination against Asian-Americans.

In addition, I would like Princeton University to commission an independent source to analyze its admission data on a yearly basis to ensure nondiscrimination.

Do you have written information that you think will help us understand your complaint?

Yes

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University

Interviewees: [redacted] (b)(7)(C) (the witness)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq., University Counsel (representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq., Partner, Hogan & Hartson (representative 2)

Interviewers: William Poorten
Attorney Advisor

James Moser
Compliance Team Attorney

Date: March 25, 2010 – 9:30am

Location: OCR Conference Room (via telephone)

Re: Princeton University (the University)

Rights

OCR advised the witness that he is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the witness confirmed that he selected representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR also reminded the witness that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for his participation in the interview and investigation. OCR informed the witness regarding FOIA/privacy, the purpose of the investigation, and that the University is under investigation, not an individual.

The witness told OCR he prepared for the interview by telephone calls with representatives 1 and 2 and reviewing reader cards.

1. Biographical information/Job Title and duties at the University

- The witness informed OCR that he was employed by the University from the summer of 2005 until 2008; he was an associate director until 2006, when he was promoted to an assistant dean. He left because [redacted] (b)(7)(C), and he is now the director of college counseling at [redacted] (b)(7)(C) an all-male boarding school.
- The witness stated that he reported to Janet Rapeleye (the Dean), Chris Watson, and Logan Powell (the current director of admissions). He said [redacted] (b)(7)(C) trained him in reading applicants' files.
- The witness explained that he served as a first reader starting in 2005, and became a second reader in 2006. He oversaw travel, worked with direct mailing, and made school visits.

- He worked in AGN 5 initially, comprising Texas and the plains states. In subsequent years (2006-2008), he oversaw the [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) including [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C) and [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C)
- The witness stated that he mentored new staff members and part-time readers, and provided mentoring/training in file reading.

1. Review of admissions process

- The witness agreed that the files are received, and once complete, they are prepped (including calculation of grade point average and other basic data), and then assigned to a Team Leader of a regional team. The witness concurred that the Team Leader assigns the academic and non-academic ratings, and the institutional priority, based on a quick read; the file goes to a first reader, who reviews it thoroughly and picks a suggested action. The file is then returned to the Team Leader, who agrees with, edits, or overrules the first reader. The files are then listed on the docket for committee review; the team coordinator brings the most promising ones to the attention of the committee, and this might include a handful of students from the same school. The witness sat on a committee in each year he worked at the University.
- The witness stated that he believes that the Dean and Chris Watson chaired the committees, but believes that the vote was formal (“true voting/polling”), not “informal.” The witness said that there were five or six members of each committee plus the Dean or admissions director as chair.
- The witness agreed that no running tally of the number of applicants selected for admission is kept in the first round.
- The witness concurred that “more or less,” the second round of committee review entailed “winnowing down” the class; but stated that it wasn’t necessarily done for his committees in each year. He could not recall if it was done for the class of 2010.
- The witness said that the winnowing group reviews ‘close calls’ – each regional committee was asked to propose cuts of about 25; the number was different each year and could fluctuate. He said that everyone was eligible to be a part of the winnowing process. The winnowing was designed (at least in part) for programs like engineering, but it was not necessarily the case that someone who had been admitted to engineering could not be pulled back during the winnowing process.
- The Witness stated that if any score is below the floor, the applicant’s academic rating drops to the next level.

2. Use of Race/National Origin

- The Witness stated that race or national origin of applicants was “one factor considered in light of many factors.” He stated that race was only used a “positive or neutral factor,” depending on the individual. There is no guidance saying that it is positive for certain race(s) or national origin(s).
- The Witness stated that Princeton did not explicitly define “racial diversity.” He stated that that is a question for “someone else.”

- The University did not have goals for racial diversity, in the Witness' mind. He stated that the admissions staff he worked with would always consider diversity in racial, socioeconomic, cultural, and intellectual background in terms of the "dynamic" they could foster.
- The Witness said that the committee evaluated applicants in terms of their contribution, and considered all factors, including pitfalls, such as being familiar with the applicant's school, if the school grades rigorously, or becoming aware of students limited opportunity to study because of their background.
- The Witness was not sure what groups were considered under-represented at the University. He stated that this was a "loaded" question, and it was not his place to say; it depended on context. He stated that the University was very fortunate to have many applicants from many different backgrounds and races. He stated that while he was never told this by the University, for anyone who works in admissions, his personal take was that some groups don't go to College in large groups (blacks and Hispanics), and some groups do not take certain courses of study (women in engineering). This phenomenon was not specific to the University; it was a national observation. He stated that this does not apply to Asians, who have been going to College in larger numbers than other populations.
- When asked if the admissions group "talked about this observation," he stated that he couldn't claim a conversation never happened between two colleagues, but can't specifically say that they talked about it, although it was known. He said the objective was more on reading the applications they received.
- No group was considered "over-represented," notwithstanding his observation about Asians. The admissions staff looked at applications the same way.
- Race or national origin is not considered at one specific point in the process (e.g., first reading, second reading, etc.); it is considered throughout.
- There were not any discussions by the Dean or admissions staff of racial and/or national origin diversity of the class.
- The Witness feels that he is unsuited to answer whether the University met its goals for diversity for the class of 2010.
- The Witness stated that his work was reviewed every year by Chris Watson, the Director of Admissions, but the consideration of race or diversity did not come up.
- The Witness said that knowledge that an applicant was Asian was based on whether they self-identified as such on the application. In terms of national origin the application has a place to show the home address from a foreign country, and a student has the ability to list other languages spoken. He said the admissions staff never tried to make assumptions about any other information they saw.
- The Witness said there were no targets or goals or quotas or anything along those lines for Asian students or any other students by population.
- The Witness stated that the admissions staff did not have a sense of the positive or negative characteristics that appear frequently in applications from Asian individuals. He stated that the admissions staff are trained just to review each individual as an individual, and he does not know of any stereotypes of Asian applicants, positive or negative, that were discussed. He said that staff were not to make an assumption about an applicant based on anything other than a thorough read of the application.

- The Witness stated that he did not get a sense that applications from Asian applicants were being compared against other Asian applicants, instead of the whole pool. He stated that he felt that applicants were competing against the entire pool.
- The Witness stated that he does not think it is tougher for an Asian applicant than a non-Asian applicant; he or she has every chance that any other student does.
- He does not think that the University's approach or his own approach to applications from Asian applicants changed after OCR's investigation commenced.

3. Specific Comments

- OCR described for the witness the two comments on reader cards. For the Student ID ending in [REDACTED] (b)(7)(C), the first reader denied admission to an Asian applicant and noted that the teacher recommendation stated that the applicant was "reserved", while another teacher recommendation stated that the applicant "blossomed."
- The Witness stated that in the case of the first comment, an observer has to look at the comment by the first reader in the context in which it was made; he does not believe it reveals anti-Asian animus. In the case of the second comment, he thinks the second reader would have come back, and looked at the first reader's comment, and found that the applicant moving to Hong Kong was interesting; but in other respects the applicant's qualifications were not competitive; her nonacademic scores were not strong; and her academic rating was not the highest (1).

4. Legacies

- The Witness stated that being a legacy is a "plus" factor; the admissions staff said "no" and denied admission to more legacies than it admitted.
- Legacies is just one factor. Certainly admissions staff wanted to be conscientious of students who had applied who were sons and daughters of graduates, but they were looked at in the context of overall classroom performance. It's considered, but not to the detriment of other parts of the application. It could be a reason admissions staff make sure they do a thorough read on an applicant, but there is always an individual determination; it is a plus factor, and might result in an applicant getting a thorough review. He could not answer whether a legacy with a 3/3 academic/nonacademic rating would get consideration.

5. Recruited Athletes

- The procedure for recruited athletes was the same as for others; except that if an applicant has an offer from another school, he or she may get a "likely" letter. There is communication with coaches in terms of recruiting.

6. International Applicants

- The witness read some applications from international candidates; most folks in the office did. The Witness also sat on the committee for international applicants. He said the process for admission was exactly the same.
- The international applicants were grouped by the country of origin; he stated that it “made sense” to group them together this way logically and because curriculums might be similar by country; otherwise, the University’s consideration of their qualifications was the same as for domestic applicants – applicants are being compared student-to-student around the world and not within a country grouping. The first reader gets them together; and then it would be up to the team leader to determine if they’re read together; it would depend on when they came in. It makes the process smoother to read them in the context of things the reader is familiar with, e.g., he knows about the French school system. He doesn’t recall if any of the applicants from the French school system were Asian. He remembers a lot of applicants from Cambridge system, in the U.K.
- He does not know what the University’s goals for International applicants were. He believes that having students from around the world is a part of having a diverse class. But there were no specific numerical goals. If an international applicant marked their race on the application, admissions staff would see that.
- He does not recall any training on Asian school systems; but he recalls that the University had a lot of material on many schools systems, and it might have included Asian nations; he did not know who developed those documents.

7. Outreach

- Everyone in the admissions department participated in “outreach” efforts. He travelled regularly as part of the University admissions department’s outreach efforts. He doesn’t recall specific outreach targeted to Asian students.

8. Alumni Interviews

- He does not think more weight was given to alumni comments, when present, than cards with no comments. He doesn’t know what training alumni receive.

Interview Statement
Case No. 02-08-6002
Princeton University

Interviewees: Christopher Watson, former Director of Admission (the Director)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq., Partner, Hogan & Hartson (representative 1)
[redacted] (b)(7)(C), Esq., University Counsel (representative 2)

Interviewers: Coleen Chin, James Moser, Pranita Raghavan,
Compliance Team Attorneys

William Poorten
Attorney Advisor

Date: May 27, 2009

Location: OCR Conference Room

Re: Princeton University (the University)

Rights

OCR reminded the Director that he is entitled to a representative during the interview, and the Director confirmed that he selected representatives 1 and 2 to serve in that capacity. OCR also reminded the Director that its regulations prohibit retaliation by the University for his participation in the investigation.

Employment Background & Job Responsibilities

- The Director is currently the Dean of Undergraduate Admission at [redacted] (b)(7)(C). [redacted] (b)(7)(C) He has held that position for the past year and a half.
- He was previously employed at the University for approximately seven years. He first was the Associate Director for one year, then was Associate Dean for four years, and then was Director of Admission for a little less than two years.
- As Director of Admission, he was responsible for the “day to day” operation of the office. He reported directly to the Dean of Admission, and oversaw a staff of approximately 15-17 people. The regional team leaders reported directly to him and the Dean, depending on the relevant function.
- He explained that the admission officers reported to the Assistant Director, the Assistant Director reported to the Associate Directors, the Associate Directors reported to the Assistant Deans, and the Assistant Deans reported to him.

Admission Process for Class of 2010

- The Director stated that the number and strength of applicants did not change much from year to year.
- He confirmed that once a file is complete, it was assigned to a regional team leader (he used the term “team leader” rather than “team coordinator”). Based on a quick review, the team leader assigned academic and non-academic ratings and an institutional priority. A first reader then read the file thoroughly, completed the relevant sections of the “reader card,” and made a “suggested action” for the second reader. (The Director added that a team leader sometimes conducted the first read of an application early in the admission season, and that by around February, the team leaders switched to doing second reads only and newer staff did first reads from then on) The file then went to the file bin¹, at which point any new information received about the applicant was added.
- The file was then read thoroughly by the team leader, who served as the second reader. The Director said that the team leader adds any comments, writes his or her own summary, and supplies their own suggested action as well.
- The team leader brought the most promising applicant files from his or her region to the admission committee for review. The Director stated that each region was given a target number of files to bring to the committee review. He stated that the target was a percentage of files, and that this percentage was the same every year (he added that this percentage target approach was instituted prior to his becoming the Director and that he was not involved in its formulation). He added that since each region has approximately the same number of applicants, each region brings approximately the same number of applicants to the committee. He agreed that it is fair to state that this is how the first round of applications is so close, i.e., not “hundreds over” the target number, as discussed *infra*.
- The committee also had a docket sheet listing all applicants and a summary of their qualifications. The committee could request to see additional applications based on their review of this docket sheet.
- There were two committees reviewing applications at the same time. He chaired one committee, and the Dean chaired the other. Admission decisions were made by a show of hands. He said he rarely voted (and could not think of an example of his doing so), and it was not typically necessary for him to cast a tie-breaking vote because there were five other people voting on the committee.
- The committees did not keep a running tally of the applicants it selected for admission.
- After the initial committee review, the admission staff would look at the enrollment target to see if the number of (proposed) acceptances were over or under the target; there were inevitably too many applicants for a class (although the number over varied year to year). Accordingly, a second smaller committee comprised of the Director, the Dean, and a team leader was normally conducted within a day of learning that the class selected by the initial committee review was too large.
 - During the second, smaller committee review, the team leader selected the applicants who were “close calls” during the initial committee review,

¹ The Director described the file as being in a “holding pattern” at this point.

usually applicants who received a 3-2 vote. These applicants were often moved to the wait list.

- The Director described the second, smaller committee review as “less structured,” and stated that it was usually conducted by himself, the Dean, and the team leader. He estimated that less than a hundred applications were reviewed during the second committee review. He also stated that he was not sure if there was a record of the change in an applicant’s status between the first and second committee reviews.

Use of Race/National Origin

- When asked how the University considered race in the admission process, the Director responded that race was considered throughout the process, just like any other factor. He stated that, in particular, it was considered if “relevant to the story of the applicant.”
- The Director stated that there were no discussions about the racial and/or national origin diversity of applicants in preparation of the second, smaller committee review, and that the admission office did not calculate the racial/national origin breakdown of the applicants selected by the first committee. The only targets considered during the second committee review were for the engineering and liberal arts departments.
- When asked how the University defined racial diversity, he said it was based on how applicants identify themselves, and what about their experience would contribute to the classroom experience at the University. When asked how the University defined national origin diversity, he initially said he did not know.
- He stated that there were no internal quotas for the number of Asian students admitted.
- The Director added that he was not sure if characteristics such as native language and country of citizenship could have led readers to consider race.
- As for the University’s goals for racial and national origin diversity, the Director stated that there were no quotas or numerical goals, just a goal to have a class with diversity, including diversity in other factors besides race, and that racial and national origin diversity were one of the many factors considered during the admission process, along with academic diversity, economic diversity, and geographic diversity, among other diversity factors. This goal was reviewed with admission staff during training meetings.
 - Part of the training included an emphasis to “look at the student’s story.” The Director stated that sometimes an applicant’s race/ethnicity was part of that “story.”
 - In addition, the training included a discussion of stereotypes (such as a physics major as a nerd), including those based on race/ethnicity, to avoid. This issue was also addressed by a team leader when he/she reviewed the comments made by the first reader.
 - When asked about whether trainings included race or ethnicity, the Director stated that he thinks that they did include training about the “pitfalls” of considering race and ethnicity.

- When asked if any groups were considered underrepresented at the University, the Director responded that the University did not use that term, and that no race was “valued” more than others.
- When asked if the University met its goals for diversity, the Director stated that he did not know. He believed that there probably was some discussion after the fact about whether the University met its goals for diversity, but said that he was not part of that.
- When asked how the University ensured that the class was racially and ethnically diverse, the Director explained that during the committee meetings, the admission staff discussed whether an applicant’s background would contribute to class discussion, and that all races, including white (*e.g.*, an Eastern European immigrant to the U.S. who was the only white student in his high school), were considered as a diversity factor.
- The Director stated that Asian applicants were not compared to other Asian applicants, and were not insulated from the rest of the applicant pool. He said applicants were never grouped by race or national origin. He said that he did not have any information suggesting that the University had any limits or numerical restrictions with respect to Asian or Asian-American applicants. He said no when asked whether there was any sense during the admission process of positive or negative characteristics common to Asian applicants. The Director also stated that the staff never read or reviewed applications “by race” or “by national origin.” There was no discussion of negative or positive stereotypical characteristics allegedly more common to a particular race or national origin.
- The Director also wanted to emphasize that race and ethnicity were only one of the many factors considered when reviewing applications.
- The Director stated that he did not know if the admissions staff ever “looked back” to evaluate its performance in terms of a particular class’s diversity.

Recruited Athletes

- When asked to explain how the admission process was different for recruited athletes, the Director stated that these applicants went through the same process as other applicants. However, their academic credentials were indexed in accordance to a procedure established by Ivy League universities. Admitted recruited athletes must have a minimum index number.
- In addition, the second read of a recruited athlete’s application was conducted by either a team leader or the admission office’s athletic liaison. The athletic liaison is an admission officer who is also responsible for calculating the Ivy League academic index for recruited athletes.
- During the committee review, admission staff considered whether players for certain teams are needed.
- The athletic department may submit applicants it wanted the committee to consider; however, the Director emphasized that these candidates went through the same process as other applicants.

Legacies

- The Director stated if there were two equal applicants, the legacy applicant was supposed to receive a “tip.” However, he said it “didn’t really work that way”]. He said that the legacy tip was not automatic. However, the Director added that applicants were rarely equal, and that there was much diversity within the legacy applicant pool as well.