Racial and Ethnic Preferences in Admission at the University of Wisconsin Law School

By Althea K. Nagai, Ph.D. Research Fellow

Embargoed Until September 13, 2011

Center for Equal Opportunity



Linda Chavez, Chairman Roger Clegg, President 7700 Leesburg Pike, Suite 231 Falls Church, VA 22043 Phone 703-442-0066 Fax 703-442-0449 www.ceousa.org

Table of Contents

List of Tables ii List of Figures ii **Executive Summary** 1 Acknowledgments 3 Introduction 4 Applicants and Admittees 6 Racial/Ethnic Composition of the Pool 6 Applicants 6 Admittees 7 7 Admission Rates Overall Group Comparisons of Admittees' Test Scores and Grades 8 Methodology 8 9 Results LSAT Scores 9 Undergraduate GPAs 11 Rejectees versus Admittees 12 Logistic Regression Analysis and Odds Ratios 12 Methodology 12 Results: Relative Odds of Admission, Controlling for Other Factors 15 Probabilities of Admission 15 Appendices 18 Appendix 1. Logistic Regression Equations for UW Law School 18 Appendix 2. Calculating the Probability of Admission for UW Law School 18



List of Tables

- Table 1. Probability of Admission to UW Law School, Controlling for OtherFactors2
- Table 2. Racial/Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Admittees6
- Table 3. Rejectees with LSAT Scores and GPAs Higher than Black AdmitteeMedian12
- Table 4. Odds Ratios of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians Being Admitted over White
Applicants, Controlling for Other Factors15

List of Figures

- Figure 1. University of Wisconsin Law School Admission Rates 7
- Figure 2. LSAT Scores for UW Law School Admittees 9
- Figure 3. Undergraduate GPAs for UW Law School Admittees 11
- Figure 4. Probabilities of Admission by Racial/Ethnic Group, Controlling for Other Factors 16



Executive Summary

The University of Wisconsin Law School awarded an extremely large degree of preference to blacks over whites and Asians, and to a lesser extent to Hispanics and (to a still lesser extent) Asians over whites. These preferences are evidenced in several ways.

Grades and LSATs. In 2005 and 2006:

- Black admittees to UW law school had lower average (median) LSAT scores compared to those of Hispanic, Asian, and white admittees, while the average scores of Hispanic admittees were lower than those of Asians and whites. Asian and white median LSAT scores were roughly the same.
- The average undergraduate GPA of black admittees was also lower than the average of Hispanic, Asian, and white admittees. The average GPA of Hispanic admittees was lower than the GPA of white admittees for both years; it was lower than the Asian median GPA in 2005 but higher in 2006.
- The average GPA of Asian admittees was lower than those of white admittees.

<u>Rejected Applicants</u>. During these years, the law school admitted all but four blacks with higher test scores and grades compared to the black admittee median. In contrast, 18 Hispanics, 123 Asians, and 731 whites were rejected despite scores *and* grades higher than the scores and grades of the average black admittee.

<u>Odds Ratios</u>. Controlling for grades, test scores, residency, and gender, the odds ratio favoring black over white applicants was extremely large (61 to 1), as was the odds ratio favoring Hispanics over whites (14 to 1). UW granted a slight preference to Asians over whites (less than 2 to 1).

<u>Probability of Admission</u>. For an applicant with the academic credentials of the average black admittee, we note that race is given much more weight in admission than is, for example, Wisconsin residency.

	2005		2006	
	In-State	Out-of-State	In-State	Out-of-State
Black	88%	68%	79%	52%
Hispanic	62%	33%	34%	13%
Asian	16%	5%	6%	2%
White	10%	3%	6%	2%

Table 1. Probability of Admission to UW Law School, Controlling for Other Factors

With the same credentials as the average black admittee (see Table 1 above):

- Hispanic, Asian, and white residents would be less likely to be admitted when compared to black residents and even when compared to black *non-residents*.
- Asian and white Wisconsin applicants would likewise be less likely to be admitted compared to Hispanic residents and non-residents alike.
- For example, in 2005, with an LSAT score of 156 and a GPA of 3.33 (the median academic credentials of 2005 black admittees), an out-of-state black applicant would have had a 7 out of 10 chance of admission and an out-of-state Hispanic a 1 out of 3 chance—but an in-state Asian would have had less than a 1 out of 6 chance and an in-state white only a 1 out of 10 chance. In 2006, with a score of 152 and a GPA of 3.38 (the medians for 2006 black admittees), among in-state applicants, a black applicant would have had an 8 out of 10 chance; a Hispanic, 1 in 3; and Asians and whites, only a 1 in 17 chance.

Acknowledgments

On behalf of the Center for Equal Opportunity, I would like to thank the Scale and Effect of Admissions Preferences in Higher Education (SEAPHE) Project for sharing the data analyzed here and obtained originally from the University of Wisconsin Law School.

I would like to thank Linda Chavez and the staff at the Center for Equal Opportunity for giving me the chance to work on another major study of racial and ethnic preferences in university admissions. I especially want to thank Rudy Gersten, who handled numerous tasks related to releasing the report, and Roger Clegg, who provided useful suggestions on the manuscripts.

Introduction

For over thirty years, racial and ethnic preferences have played a key role in how admissions officers at many of the nation's public and private institutions of higher learning have chosen their classes. A system of racial and ethnic preferences in admissions operates by establishing different standards of admission for individuals based upon their racial or ethnic background, with some students held to a higher standard and others admitted at a lower standard. Earlier in this century, some colleges and universities denied admission to Jews, blacks, women, and members of other groups even when their grades, test scores, and other measures of academic achievement surpassed those of white males who were offered an opportunity to enroll. The passage of new civil rights legislation starting in the 1960s made this kind of discrimination illegal.

Since then, however, many colleges, universities, and professional schools have created programs meant to boost the enrollment of students whose race or ethnicity previously had excluded them from pursuing a higher education—especially blacks and, to a lesser extent, Hispanics—by granting them preferences during the admissions process. These policies, when their existence was made public, immediately became controversial, and they remain so today. Defenders of racial and ethnic preferences claim that these policies are not discriminatory and help administrators choose between equally or almost equally qualified students, giving a slight edge to applicants who likely have faced discrimination or have come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Critics of preferences say that these policies are no better than the discriminatory ones they replaced and that, in any event, the advantages they confer upon certain applicants are much greater than supporters are willing to admit.

In the last 15 years or so, public institutions of post-secondary and professional education have seen their ability to use racial and ethnic preferences increasingly restricted. The 1996 enactment of California's Proposition 209 (also known as the California Civil Rights Initiative) forbids discrimination against or granting special treatment to any applicant on the bases of race, ethnicity, or sex in the public programs of the country's most populous state. Large majorities of voters approved similar ballot initiatives in the states of Washington (1998), Michigan (2006), Nebraska (2008), and Arizona (2010). Other states such as Florida and Texas have or had created policies that end explicit preferences and guarantee admission in the state university system to the top graduates of their respective state's high schools regardless of race or ethnicity. Most schools have never used such preferences since most schools are relatively non-selective.

The question of the legality of racial and ethnic preferences in higher education came to a head in 2003, when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in two major cases on the legality of racial preferences in higher education admission. In the first case, *Gratz v. Bollinger*, the

Court found that a point-system of preferences—used by the University of Michigan in its undergraduate admissions—was unconstitutional. In the second case, *Grutter v*. *Bollinger*, the Court upheld a system of preferences used by the University of Michigan law school that it found to be less mechanical.¹

The *Gratz* and *Grutter* decisions make it appropriate to monitor universities' use of racial and ethnic preferences for at least three reasons. First, as the split holdings demonstrate, if race is weighed too heavily or too mechanically, the law is violated. Second, since racial preferences are only allowed but not required under current law, the question remains whether universities *should* use them, even when they are allowed to. This policy question cannot be answered if the decisionmakers—particularly those outside the university admissions office, including, in the case of public universities, the general public—do not have all the facts. Third, at the conclusion of her majority opinion in *Grutter*, Justice Sandra Day O'Connor wrote, "We expect that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary." Accordingly, one would expect to see the use of preferences and the weight afforded them to decline over time (eight years of the grace period Justice O'Connor allowed have now lapsed).

This study of the University of Wisconsin (UW) Law School builds on previous work on racial and ethnic preferences in undergraduate, law, and medical school admissions done for the Center for Equal Opportunity and is one of several CEO studies since the *Grutter* decision.² As with CEO's reports on three Virginia public law schools, the University of Michigan law school, the University of Nebraska law school, and the two public law schools in Arizona, CEO received data from UW Law School³ on individual applicants' admission status, matriculation status, racial/ethnic group membership, sex, in-state or out-of-state residency, LSAT scores, and college GPAs.

This CEO study analyzes the data provided by the law school for applicants in 2005 and 2006. Omitted from the data analyses are those cases for which race or ethnicity is listed as "Other," missing, or unknown. American Indians and Native Hawaiians were also omitted because of their small numbers in this context. In addition, cases with missing academic data were dropped from the statistical analyses. Lastly, where instances might lead to the identification of an individual, the law school excluded the data from disclosure.

¹ In response to these decisions, Michigan voters in 2006 passed Proposal 2, banning race, ethnic, and gender preferences in Michigan public contracting, public employment, and public education, including university admissions. A three-judge panel of the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals overturned Proposal 2 on July 1, 2011. See Ryan Brown, "U.S. Appeals Court Overturns Michigan Ban on Affirmative Action at Public Colleges," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 1, 2011, <u>http://chronicle.com/article/US-Appeals-Court-Overturns/128127/?sid=pm&utm_source=pm&utm_medium=en</u>. The litigation in this case is continuing, however.

² The studies are found on CEO's website, <u>www.ceousa.org</u>.

³ The data were originally provided to the SEAPHE project (see "Acknowledgments," *supra*) and subsequently made available to CEO.

Applicants and Admittees

Racial/Ethnic Composition of the Pool

Table 2 displays the racial composition of the law school's pool of applicants and admittees in 2005 and 2006.

		Applicants	Admittees
2005	Black	9%	5%
	Hispanic	8%	4%
	Asian	16%	9%
	White	67%	82%
2006	Black	7%	11%
	Hispanic	7%	10%
	Asian	17%	12%
	White	69%	66%

Table 2. Racial/Ethnic Composition of Applicants and Admittees⁴

Applicants

In 2005, blacks were 9% of applicants; in 2006, it was 7%. Hispanics were 8% of the applicant pool in 2005 and 7% in 2006. Asians were the largest minority, making up 16% of law school applicants in 2005 and 17% in 2006. Whites were the largest racial/ethnic group, making up roughly two-thirds of all applicants in 2005, increasing to 69% in 2006.

⁴ "No Response," "American Indian," "Native Hawaiian," "Alaskan Native," and "Other" were dropped from the analysis. In cases where the information could potentially lead to the identification of an individual student, the law school excluded the data from disclosure. The numbers for statistical analyses are below.

	2005		2006	
	Applicants	Admittees	Applicants	Admittees
Black	172	22	122	52
Hispanic	168	17	119	47
Asian	321	37	311	57
White	1,361	337	1,248	305

Admittees

In 2005, blacks made up 5% of all those admitted to the law school. In 2006, they made up 11%. Hispanics made up 4% in 2005, rising to 10% in 2006. The percentage of admittees who were Asian also rose, but to a lesser extent, from 9% in 2005 to 12% in 2006. In contrast, whites made up 82% of those admitted in 2005 but 66% in 2006.

Admission Rates



Figure 1. University of Wisconsin Law School Admission Rates

In 2005, Wisconsin Law admitted 13% of black applicants; in 2006, the law school more than tripled that percentage, to 43% of black applicants. For Hispanic applicants, the admission rate almost quadrupled, from 10% in 2005 to 39% in 2006. There was also a rise in the admission rate for Asians. In 2005, 12% of Asian applicants were admitted, rising to 18% in 2006.

In contrast, the admission rate for white applicants declined slightly. In 2005, 25% of white applicants were admitted, dropping slightly to 24% in 2006.

Overall Group Comparisons of Admittees' Test Scores and Grades

Methodology

Just as high school seniors seeking college admission take the SAT or the ACT, prospective law school students must take the Law School Admission Test (LSAT), a standardized multiple-choice test consisting of questions that aim to measure analytical reasoning, logical reasoning, and reading comprehension skills. Law school admission offices usually look carefully at the undergraduate grades and LSAT scores of their applicants. LSAT scores range from 120 to 180. The mean score for LSAT test takers is 150. An LSAT score of 160 is at the 84th percentile of all test takers, while a score of 140 is at the 36th percentile. An LSAT score of 170 is at the 98th percentile.

In the following section, we report group *medians* and related percentiles for LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs of those admitted to the law school rather than reporting group *means*. The median LSAT score (i.e., the score at the 50th percentile) is that score where half the group scored above that number and half scored below it. Similarly, the median undergraduate GPA is that grade-point average where half of those in a particular group had GPAs above it and half below it. Using group medians rather than the means avoids placing greater weight on extreme cases than is warranted.

We also report scores at the 25th and 75th percentiles, again to deal with the problem of extreme cases. While the median represents the middle of the distribution of scores, the 25th and 75th percentile scores taken together represent the actual spread of scores. For example, a GPA of 3.2 at the 25th percentile means that 25 percent of GPAs were below 3.2, while 75 percent of scores were above it. A GPA of 3.9 at the 75th percentile means that 75 percent of scores were below 3.9, while 25 percent were above it.

The next section compares the LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs of admittees by racial and ethnic group. That is, these are the test scores and grades of those admitted to the law school at the 25^{th} , 50^{th} , and 75^{th} percentiles.

Results

LSAT Scores



Figure 2. LSAT Scores for UW Law School Admittees

Figure 2 displays the range of scores of those admitted in 2005 and 2006 for each racial and ethnic group. Black admittees had lower scores in general compared to the other groups in 2005 and 2006.

The median score for black admittees in 2005 (156) was 5 points lower than the median Hispanic score (161), 8 points lower than the median Asian score (164), and 7 points lower than the median score for white admittees (163). Moreover, the score for black admittees at the 75th percentile in 2005 (159) was lower than the Asian and white scores at the 25th percentile (162 and 161, respectively). This means that, in 2005, 75% of blacks admittee had lower scores than roughly 75% of Asian and white admittees.

The gaps were similar for black admittees in 2006 compared to Asian and whites (although a significant drop in Hispanic scores resulted in blacks and Hispanics having similar scores). The black score at the 75th percentile (158) was the same as the Asian score at the 25th percentile and lower than the white admittee score at the 25th percentile (161).

Hispanic scores dropped from 2005 to 2006 and were lower than those of Asian and white admittees. The median score for Hispanics admitted in 2005 was 161, dropping by seven points to 154 in 2006. As a result, the gap between Hispanic admittees and Asians and whites grew from 2005 to 2006. The Hispanic median in 2005 (161) was lower than the Asian and white medians (164 and 163, respectively). In 2006, the Hispanic median (154) was 7 points lower than the Asian median (161) and 9 points lower than the white one (163). Moreover, in 2006, the Hispanic score at the 75th percentile (159) was roughly the same as the Asian score at the 25th percentile (158) and 2 points lower than the white score at the 25th percentile (161). This means that, in 2006, 75% of Hispanic admittees had lower scores than roughly 75% of Asian and white admittees.

Asian median scores also changed significantly from 2005 to 2006. In 2005, the median score for Asians admittees was 164, dropping to 161 in 2006; the median score for white admittees stayed the same in both years (163).

Undergraduate GPAs

Figure 3. Undergraduate GPAs for UW Law School Admittees



Figure 3 displays the spread of undergraduate GPAs of those admitted by UW Law School. The undergraduate GPAs of black admittees were lower than those of Hispanic,

Asian, and white admittees in both years. In 2005, the median undergraduate GPA for black admittees was 3.33, versus 3.48 for Hispanics, 3.60 for Asians, and 3.66 for whites. In 2006, the black admittee GPA was 3.38, compared to 3.58 for Hispanics, 3.50 for Asians, and 3.66 for whites.

The Hispanic undergraduate GPA was likewise lower than the grades of white admittees in 2005 and in 2006. In 2005, the GPA for Hispanic admittees was 3.48, which was lower than the Asian and the white median (3.60 and 3.66, respectively). But the Hispanic median rose from 2005 to 2006, while the Asian median dropped, so the Hispanic median in 2006 (3.58) was higher than the Asian median (3.50), although both were still lower than the median GPA of white admittees (3.66).

As just noted, the Asian undergraduate GPA dropped from 2005 to 2006. As a result, the gap between GPAs of Asian and white admittees grew in this time frame. In 2005, the median for Asian admittees was 3.60 versus 3.66 for whites. In 2006, it was 3.50 for Asians and 3.66 for whites. Moreover, in 2006, the median Asian GPA was the same as the GPA for white admittees at the 25th percentile. This means that half the Asians admitted had worse test scores than roughly 75% of white admittees in 2006.

Rejectees versus Admittees

Table 3. Rejectees with LSAT Scores and GPAs Higher than Black Admittee Median

	2005	2006	Total
Black	2	2	4
Hispanic	10	8	18
Asian	52	71	123
White	322	409	731

Next we compare the test scores and undergraduate GPAs of Hispanics, Asians, and whites rejected by the law school with the median test scores and GPAs of black admittees. That is, we are looking at applicants who were rejected despite having higher LSAT scores *and* GPAs than the average test scores and grades of black admittees.

As shown in Table 3, Wisconsin rejected a total of 4 blacks compared to a total of 18 Hispanics, 123 Asians, and 731 whites in these two years despite having higher test scores and grades compared to the medians of black admittees. The 322 whites made up 31% of all whites rejected in that year, while the 409 whites rejected with higher test scores and grades were 43% of all whites rejected in 2006.

Logistic Regression Analysis and Odds Ratios

Methodology

Admitting students based on racial and ethnic preferences results in schools accepting preferred minorities with lower test scores and grades than those of nonpreferred minorities and white students at the same school. Admission officers essentially reach down into the applicant pool and pull up certain students, a practice that necessarily results in at least some whites with better credentials than preferred minority admittees being rejected from the same schools, despite their superior qualifications.

Although the data presented thus far provide substantial evidence of the operation of racial and ethnic preferences in admissions at UW's law school, it is possible to make the case even stronger and considerably more precise. The most powerful means of assessing the degree of racial and ethnic preference in admissions is to develop a statistical model that predicts the probability of admission at a school for members of the different ethnic and racial groups, holding constant their qualifications. Computing a multiple logistic regression equation that predicts admission decisions by race and ethnicity and that includes LSAT scores and undergraduate GPAs, among other things, as statistical control variables does this.

Multiple logistic regression analysis was used as the preferred statistical technique because of the nature of the data provided. One way of conventionally expressing a relationship between the independent and dependent variable is by using correlation coefficients. A negative correlation coefficient of -1.0 signifies a perfect negative relationship between the independent (predictor) variable and the dependent (or outcome) variable, whereby an increase in the value of the independent variable yields a decrease in the value of the dependent variable. A positive correlation coefficient of 1.0 signifies a perfect positive relationship between the two variables; as the independent variable increases, so does the dependent variable. Strictly speaking, however, one cannot use correlations to analyze admissions data because correlations and standard multiple regression analysis require a dependent variable that is non-binary in form. In the case of an applicant's admission status, the dependent variable (individual admission status) is a binary dependent variable—reject versus admit. To address this binary-variable problem, we rely on multiple logistic regression equations and their corresponding odds ratios.

The odds ratio is somewhat like a correlation coefficient, except instead of varying from 1.0 to -1.0, it varies between zero and infinity. An odds ratio of 1.0 to 1 means that the odds of admissions for the two groups are equal. It is equivalent to a correlation of zero. An odds ratio greater than 1.0 to 1 means that the relative odds of members of Group A being admitted are greater than those for members of Group B, in precisely the amount



calculated. An odds ratio of less than 1.0 to 1 means the members of Group A are less likely to be admitted than those in Group B. The former is similar to a positive correlation, the latter similar to a negative correlation.

The statistical technique of multiple logistic regression allows us to present admissions data in terms of the relative odds of those in Group A being admitted as compared to Group B while simultaneously controlling for a host of other possibly confounding variables. The value of the odds ratio is that it provides a relatively direct summary measure of the degree of racial or ethnic preference given in the admissions process for a given group at a particular school.

Logistic regression equations predicting the likelihood of admissions were computed for the 2005 and 2006 applicant pools, controlling for LSAT scores, undergraduate grade-point averages, sex, and in-state residency. We were able to derive the odds of admission from these equations for each minority group relative to that of whites, while simultaneously controlling for the effects of these other variables.⁵

Logistic regression analysis also allows us to test for statistical significance. Statistical calculations always include what is called a *p*-value. When results are deemed to be statistically significant, this means that the calculated *p*-value is less than some predetermined cutoff level of significance. The level of significance conventionally is reported in the form of " $p \leq .05$." This value means that, with these data, there is a probability equal to or less than 5 percent that the difference found between one group and another (e.g., blacks versus whites, Hispanics versus whites, or Asians versus whites, since minority groups are being compared to whites) is due to chance. It is a convention in statistical studies to use the 0.05 value. In more stringent analyses, 0.01 (one in 100) or occasionally 0.001 (one in 1,000) or even 0.0001 (one in 10,000) can be used as the cutoff. Any *p* value greater than 0.05 (or the more stringent 0.01, etc.) is rejected, and the results are said to be nonsignificant. A difference that is statistically significant, however, has very little chance of being the result of chance—that is, a statistical fluke.

In the next section, we discuss odds ratios derived from comparing blacks to whites, Hispanics to whites, and Asians to whites in UW's law school admission process. Statistical significance is also noted. The size of the odds ratio reflects the strength of the association between race or ethnicity and admission status. Another way to state this is that the odds ratio measures the magnitude of the preference given relative to a baseline group (here, whites). An odds ratio equal to or greater than 3.0 to 1 is commonly thought to reflect a strong association; an odds ratio less than 3.0 to 1 but greater than 1.5 to 1 reflects a moderate association; while a relative odds ratio of 1.5 or less to 1 indicates a weak association. Of course, an odds ratio of 1.0 to 1 indicates no relationship.⁶ Note that



⁵ For a discussion of logistic regression and a more complete discussion of odds ratios, see Alan Agresti, *Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1996).

⁶ See David E. Lilienfeld and Paul D. Stolley, *Foundations of Epidemiology*, 3rd edition (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994): 200-202.

a *very* strong association might be taken to be the rough equivalent of the relative odds of smokers versus nonsmokers dying from lung cancer, which in one well-known study is calculated as 14 to 1.⁷

Results: Relative Odds of Admission, Controlling for Other Factors

 Table 4. Odds of Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians Being Admitted over White Applicants,

 Controlling for Other Factors

	Odds Ratio
Black over White	61.4***
Hispanic over White	14.2***
Asian over White	1.7**
n~0 001· *n~0 0001	

Table 4 displays the odds ratios of blacks, Hispanics, and Asians being admitted over white applicants with the same test scores and grades, controlling for other factors.

When one controls for the year of admission, LSAT scores, college GPA, gender, and residency, we find that black applicants are heavily favored over white applicants with the same academic qualifications: The black-over-white odds ratio is 61.4 to 1. Hispanic applicants are favored over white applicants, controlling for test scores, grades, and other factors, by a factor of 14.2 to 1. The Asian-over-white odds ratio also shows preference given Asian applicants over white applicants, but by a much more modest 1.7 to 1.

Probabilities of Admission

The meaning of logistic regression equations and their associated odds ratios may be difficult to grasp because the equations are complex and hard to explain without resorting to mathematical formulations. A more intuitive way to grasp the underlying dynamic of preferential admissions is to convert these logistic regression equations into estimates of the probabilities of admission for individuals with different racial/ethnic group membership, given the same particular LSAT scores and grades. In this section, we compare the probabilities of admission for individuals belonging to these different groups, using the logistic regression equation specific to each year. The probability calculations provide an estimate of the admission chances for members of each group, all with the same test scores and grades, residency, and sex.

14

⁷ Taken from a 20-year longitudinal study of British male physicians by R. Doll and R. Peto, as quoted in Agresti, *Introduction to Categorical Data Analysis*, p. 47.

We chose to examine the probabilities for an in-state and out-of-state male applicant with the same LSAT score and undergraduate GPA as the median for black admittees of each year.⁸ The same set of test scores and undergraduate GPAs is entered for blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and whites, and chances of admission were then calculated for black, Hispanic, Asian, and white in-state and out-of-state applicants with those academic qualifications. These calculations do not change the statistical results reported in the earlier section on odds ratios; they simply provide an easier-to-understand interpretation of their meaning.

The differences in odds ratios illuminate large differences in the probability of admission based on an applicant's race. The probability of admission is presented in Figure 4. It shows the probability of admission for blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and whites, for the same test scores and grades in a particular year.



Figure 4. Probabilities of Admission by Racial/Ethnic Group, Controlling for Other Factors*

100%

* Assumes applicant is a male with the same LSAT score and undergraduate GPA as the median for black admittees in each year.

⁸ One can compare probabilities of admission for any combination of academic qualifications, residency, and sex. The equation for calculating probabilities is in Appendix 2.

Figure 4 shows the probability of admission for the four groups, divided into in-state and out-of-state applicants. Applicants were assumed to have an LSAT score and college GPA equal to the median of black admittees in 2005 and 2006, respectively.⁹ The extremely large weight given to race can be particularly appreciated when comparing the likelihood of admission of black, Hispanic, Asian, and white Wisconsin applicants with out-of-state applicants of the same racial and ethnic groups, all with the same academic credentials as the average black admittee. The odds ratios favoring blacks and Hispanics over whites (61.4 to 1 and 14.2 to 1, respectively) are much larger than the 1.4-to-1 odds ratio favoring Wisconsin residents over non-residents.¹⁰

Accordingly, the results are that, with the same credentials as the average black admittee, Hispanic, Asian, and white Wisconsin residents were all less likely to be admitted compared to black residents and even when compared to black *non-residents* in 2005 and 2006.

In 2005, with the same test scores and grades as the average black admittee, a black male from Wisconsin would have a 88% chance of admission, while a black non-resident would have a 68% chance.

Hispanic *in-state* applicants in 2005 with the same test scores and grades as the average black admittee had a 62% chance of admission—a smaller probability of admission compared to black applicants, both in-state and out-of-state (88% and 68%, respectively).

Asian *in-state* applicants in 2005 with the same test scores and grades as the average black admittee had a 16% chance of admission. This was significantly smaller compared to black in-state and out-of-state applicants (again, 88% and 68%, respectively).

White *in-state* applicants in 2005 with the same academic credentials as the average black admittee had the smallest probability of admission among all in-state applicant groups (10%). It is significantly smaller than the 88% chance for black residents, the 62% chance for Hispanic residents, and the 16% chance for Asian residents. Moreover, white in-state applicants in 2005 also had a smaller likelihood of admission compared to *out-of-state* blacks (68%) and *out-of-state* Hispanics (33%).

In 2006, with the same test scores and grades as the average black admittee, a black male from Wisconsin had a 79% chance of admission, while a black non-resident had a 52% chance.



⁹ The median LSAT score for black admittees to UW was 156 in 2005 and 152 in 2006. The median college GPA for UW black admittees was 3.33 in 2005 and 3.38 in 2006.

¹⁰ Gender also gives an applicant a relatively small advantage, with an odds ratio favoring women over men by roughly 1.4 to 1.

In the same year and with the same scores and grades, a Hispanic resident had a 34% chance of admission, a smaller chance of admission compared to the 79% chance for an in-state black and the 52% chance of an *out-of-state* black applicant.

White and Asian residents in 2006 with the same credentials had the smallest admissions probability of all racial and ethnic groups in Wisconsin. White and Asian residents had a 6% chance of admission, compared to a 79% chance for black residents, and a 34% chance for Hispanic residents. White and Asian in-state applicants also had a smaller chance of admission compared to *out-of-state* blacks (52%) and *out-of-state* Hispanics (13%).

17

Appendices

Appendix 1. Logistic Regression Equations for UW Law School

	Unstandardized Regression Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Year	0.483***	1.621
LSAT	0.320***	1.377
GPA	2.695***	14.799
Black	4.118***	61.421
Asian	0.520**	1.681
Hispanic	2.656***	14.240
Female	0.327*	1.387
Resident	1.222***	3.393
Constant	-62.277	

*p<0.001;**p<0.001; ***p<0.0001

Appendix 2. Calculating the Probability of Admission for UW Law School

Probability of Admission to UW Law School = A/(1+A)

A= EXP((0.483*Year) + (0.32*LSAT) + (2.695*CumGPA) + (4.118*Black) + (0.520*Asian) + (2.656*Hispanic) + (0.327*Female) + (1.222*Instate) - 62.277)

18



CENTER FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

The Center for Equal Opportunity (CEO) is a non-profit research institution established under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. CEO sponsors conferences, supports research, and publishes policy briefs and monographs on issues related to race, ethnicity, and public policy.

Linda Chavez, Chairman

