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Objectives

- What do we value in an applicant?
- What constitutes excellence in an institution?
- How can the admissions process support excellence?
- Case studies
“Prediction is very hard, especially about the future.”

--Yogi Berra
What does your institution value in an applicant?
# 10 Characteristics of a Successful Applicant

- Demonstrates a passion for the profession
- Balances multiple priorities
- Has a significant role in a meaningful research project
- Demonstrates strong leadership and initiative
- Demonstrates strong ethical values and professional stature
- Submits strong letters of recommendation
- Is well-acquainted with the admissions process at dental schools being considered
- Knows strengths and fit of institutions
- Demonstrates clear career goals
- Applies early and to more than one school
What constitutes excellence in an institution?
Valuing diversity must be meaningfully integrated into each component of dental education’s tripartite mission.
Diversity and Excellence

In our increasingly pluralistic and interconnected world, diversity is an imperative for achieving excellence.
Why is Diversity Important?

- Better educational experience for all students
- Improved access to care
Studies that Document the Educational Benefits of Diversity


Three Themes From Research on Diversity and Student Learning

Individuals educated in diverse settings are far more likely to work and live in racially and ethnically diverse environments after graduation.

Individuals who study and discuss issues related to race and ethnicity in academic courses and interact with a diverse set of peers are better prepared for life in an increasingly complex and diverse society.

Increasing the compositional diversity of the student body is essential to create an optional learning environment.
“Collections of people with diverse preferences often prove better at problem solving than collections of people who agree.”

Access to Care


ADEA Annual Survey of Dental School Seniors

Distribution of Race Among Professionally Active Dentists, 1996

- White, 86.2%
- Hispanic, 3.4%
- African American, 3.4%
- American Indian, 0.12%
- Asian/Pacific Islander, 6.9%

Source: American Dental Association, 1998
Patients by Race/Ethnicity

White Dentists
- White: 76.60%
- Hispanic: 3.20%
- Black: 10.50%
- Asian: 8.50%

Black Dentists
- White: 27.00%
- Hispanic: 2.30%
- Black: 61.80%
- Asian: 7.90%

Hispanic Dentists
- White: 43.60%
- Hispanic: 45.40%
- Black: 9.80%
- Asian: 3.00%

Asian Dentists
- White: 47.50%
- Hispanic: 11.50%
- Black: 14.50%
- Asian: 25.10%

ADA: 1996
Access and Diversity, Unpacked

- **Diversity**
  - Inward facing
  - Focused on mission-driven educational objectives
  - Multi-dimensional
  - Institutionally measurable

- **Access**
  - Outward facing
  - Driven by institutional goals, but related to broader service aims
  - Multi-dimensional
  - Measurable in some ways

Promoting the development of graduates who...
- Are strong performers in the workforce
- Exhibit commitments to community and society
- Reflect the benefits of expanded opportunity
What employers—including Fortune 500 corporations—have said...

The future of American business and the economy are dependent on diversity-related competencies.

**Benefits associated with diversity—Employees:**
- Work better with others from different backgrounds
- View issues from multiple perspectives
- Respond appropriately to cultural differences of customers, colleagues and employees.

**Business/Private Enterprise**

**Higher Education**
What former military officials—including generals—have said...

Compelling national security interests in a cohesive military require a “diverse officer corps and substantial numbers of officers educated and trained in diverse educational settings”

Diversity is “critical” to national security

Higher Education

Business/Private Enterprise

Military
Federal directives in every recent administration focus on recruiting and retaining diverse workforce.
Research & Experience

- Business/Private Enterprise
- Government/The Public Sector
- Military

Higher Education
Policy and Actions That Influence Diversity in Admissions

Institute of Medicine (IOM) Report, 2002
--Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care

Sullivan Commission Report, 2004
--Missing persons: Minorities in the Health Professions

Institute of Medicine, 2002

Warned of “unequal treatment” minorities face when encountering the health care system.

Showed, through Health Services research, that minority health professionals are more likely to serve minority and medically underserved populations.

Recommended increasing the number of minority health professionals as a key strategy to help eliminate health disparities.
Missing Persons: Minorities in the Health Professions

A Report of the Sullivan Commission on Diversity in the Healthcare Workforce

September 2004
Underrepresented minorities comprise 25% of the U.S. population, but these three groups account for…

- < 9% of nurses
- < 6% of physicians
- < 5% of dentists

The consequences of health disparities are grave and will only be remedied through sustained efforts and a national commitment.
To increase diversity in the health professions, the culture of health professions schools must change.

New and nontraditional paths to the health professions should be explored.

Commitments must be at the highest levels.
4.9 Dental and medical schools should reduce their dependence upon standardized tests in the admissions process, the Dental Admissions Test and the Medical College Admissions Test should be utilized, along with other criteria in the admissions process as diagnostic tools to identify areas where qualified health professions applicants may need academic enrichment and support.

4.10 Diversity should be a core value in the health professions.
5.2 To reduce the debt burden of underrepresented minority students, public and private funding organizations for health professions students should provide scholarships, loan forgiveness programs, and tuition reimbursement strategies to students and institutions in preference to loans.

6.4 Accrediting bodies for programs in medicine and the other health professions should embrace diversity and cultural competency as requirements for accreditation.
Diversity in education is essential to academic excellence. A significant amount of learning occurs through informal interactions among individuals who are of different races, ethnicities, religions, and backgrounds; come from cities, rural areas and from various geographic regions; and have a wide variety of interests, talents, and perspectives. These interactions allow students to directly and indirectly learn from their differences, and to stimulate one another to reexamine even their most deeply held assumptions about themselves and their world. Cultural competence cannot be effectively acquired in a relatively homogeneous environment. Programs must create an environment that ensures an in-depth exchange of ideas and beliefs across gender, racial, ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic lines.
1-4 The dental school must have policies and practices to:

a. achieve appropriate levels of diversity among its students, faculty and staff;

b. engage in ongoing systematic and focused efforts to attract and retain students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds; and

c. systematically evaluate comprehensive strategies to improve the institutional climate for diversity.
Intent:

The dental school should **develop strategies** to address the dimensions of diversity including, structure, curriculum and institutional climate. The dental school should **articulate its expectations** regarding diversity across its academic community in the context of local and national responsibilities, and regularly assess how well such expectations are being achieved. Schools could incorporate elements of diversity in their planning that include, but are not limited to, gender, racial, ethnic, cultural and socioeconomic. **Schools should establish focused, significant, and sustained programs to recruit and retain suitably diverse students, faculty, and staff.**
Dimensions of Diversity

**Structural**
- Also referred to as compositional diversity, focuses on the numerical distribution of students, faculty and staff from diverse backgrounds in a program or institution.

**Curriculum**
- Also referred to as classroom diversity, covers both the diversity-related curricular content that promote shared learning and the integration of skills, insights, and experiences of diverse groups in all academic settings, including distance learning.

**Institutional Climate**
- Also referred to as interactional diversity, focuses on the general environment created in programs and institutions that support diversity as a core value and provide opportunities for informal learning among diverse peers.
All recognize the educational benefits of diversity as a “compelling interest”

1978: Regents of the University of California v. Bakke

2003: Grutter v. Bollinger (University of Michigan)

2007: Seattle and Louisville school district cases
Landmark Decisions: Diversity (and Access)

Three Decades of Admissions-Related U.S. Supreme Court Decisions

**Constitutional**
- Admissions Individualized Review

**Unconstitutional**
- Admissions Point System
- K-12 Student Assignment
- Seattle/Louisville S.D. Plans (2007)
- Admissions Quota System
- Single-Sex Admissions
- VMI Admissions Policy (1996)
Institutional Policy Design: The Michigan Model

Goal ……..

Benefits of Diversity

Compositional Diversity

Learning Outcomes/
Generation of Quality Workforce

Recruitment

Admissions

Financial Aid

Retention

Academic Affairs

Student Affairs

Supporting Evidence

Source: CollegeBoard

AMERICAN DENTAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Public Reaction ► State Policy Change on Race- and Gender-Conscious Preferences

[Map showing state policy changes on race- and gender-conscious preferences in the United States, with different colors indicating various outcomes such as voter initiatives passed, executive orders, and initiatives on ballot failed.]
How can the admissions process support excellence?
What Is Holistic Admissions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexible, highly individualized process</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Balanced consideration is given to the multiple ways in which applicants may prepare for and demonstrate suitability consideration as students-residents and future dentists-specialists</td>
<td>• Institution-specific, broad-based, mission-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Applied equitably across the entire candidate pool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Holistic Perspective

Institution Mission

Applicant
  - Experiences
  - Attributes
  - Metrics

AMERICAN DENTAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
A Holistic Perspective of Applicants

Experiences:
--the road traveled
--educational background
--employment
--research experience
--dentistry-related experiences

Attributes:
--skills and abilities
--personal and professional characteristics
--demographic factors

Metrics:
GPAs and DAT scores
Holistic review must be utilized throughout the admissions process, including initial applicant screening.

Several researched holistic admissions strategies:
- Multiple Mini Interview (MMI)
- ETS-Personal Potential Index (ADEA PASS)
Theory and research behind holistic admissions

--William Sedlacek
Standardized tests are easy to administer, BUT…

- They are only moderately predictive of success.
- They are most predictive of success for those who have a white, middle class, Euro-centric, heterosexual, male experience in the U.S.

The goal of using non-cognitive variables is to add some new measures that can expand the potential we can derive from assessment.
Noncognitive:

Variables relating to
- Adjustment
- Motivation
- Student perceptions

Rather than relying solely on the traditional cognitive areas typically measured by standardized tests and grade point averages.
Sedlacek’s Noncognitive Factors

Positive Self Concept

Realistic Self Appraisal

Successfully Handling the System

Preference for Long-Term Goals

Availability of a Strong Support System

Leadership Experience

Community Involvement

Knowledge Acquired in the Field
Resources

- Situational Attitude Scale
- The Noncognitive Questionnaire
- Short Answer Noncognitive Assessment Form
- Interview Questions
- Campus Climate Survey
What is the climate of dental school admissions?
U.S. Dental School Applicant and First-Year Enrollment Trends 1959 - 2010

Source: American Dental Education Association, Applicant Analysis Survey
Native American/Alaska Native (NA/AN) Applicants

Asian/Pacific Islanders

Hispanic/Latino

Black/African American

Native American/Alaskan Native
Percent Distribution of GPA's
2010 Enrollees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Range</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5-2.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75-2.99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0-3.24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.25-3.49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5-3.74</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.75+</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent Distribution of DAT Scores—2010 Enrollees
Cumulative Percent Change in U.S. Public High School Graduates Relative to 2004-2005 by Race/Ethnicity
Number of Bachelor's Degrees Awarded in Biological/life Sciences and Physical Sciences by Race/Ethnicity: 1995-96, 2000-01, and 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>58,532</td>
<td>9,497</td>
<td>4,879</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>54,455</td>
<td>8,911</td>
<td>5,724</td>
<td>3,909</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>59,024</td>
<td>11,390</td>
<td>6,247</td>
<td>4,831</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are admissions committees doing?

– ADEA Admissions Officer Surveys, 2007 and 2010

– What doesn’t work and what does?
## Composition of Admissions Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2010 Response Percent</th>
<th>2007 Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental school faculty only</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental school faculty and others</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical school faculty</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other university faculty</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Minority Affairs officials</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who screens and selects candidates for interview?

Admissions Dean/Director/Admissions Staff = 80%

Admissions Committee Members = 54%

Other:
- Three member screening committee
- Most screened by admissions staff; about 10-15% by Admissions Committee
- Initial screen by director; final selection by admissions committee vote
Factors influencing decision to invite for interview (N = 40)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formula (numeric or otherwise) that includes non-cognitive factors</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA cut-off</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT Academic Average cut-off</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automatically invite everyone above a certain GPA/DAT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of residence</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Factors Affecting Selection of Candidates for Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holistic Review of all applicants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAT cut-off for non-residents only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged background, legacy, advanced degrees, post bac, all parts of DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We don’t use a formula or cut-offs; look at entire application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic/science preparation; trends in grades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to dentistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay and responses to supplemental questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disadvantaged background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active military duty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Screening Cut-offs
(of dental schools reporting cut-offs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Cut-off</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--changes each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--2.75 BCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAT Academic Average Cut-off</th>
<th>Number of Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who Participates in Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>2010 Response Percent</th>
<th>2007 Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean/Director of Admissions</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions committee members</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other faculty who are not admissions committee members</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who are NOT admissions committee members</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who ARE admissions committee members</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni who are NOT admissions committee members</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni who ARE admissions committee members</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity or Minority Affairs officials</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Type of Information Interviewers Have Regarding Applicants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Access</th>
<th>2010 Response Percent</th>
<th>2007 Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewers have full access to applicant file</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewers have access to all aspects of applicant file except grades and test scores</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewers have no access to applicant file</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty have full access; students have only copy of essay, school applicant attends and whether they are a resident.

Interviewers are provided copies of the personal statement and applicant answers to the biographical/extracurricular questions on AADSAS application.

This year we will institute two one-on-one interviews for every candidate. One interview will be closed file with no access to information. The second interview will be the traditional open file with full access to the applicant's file.
### Top 5 factors When Making Final Selection of Candidates for Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biology-Chemistry-Physics (BCP) GPA</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DAT Academic Average score</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Overall GPA</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5-6 (tie)</td>
<td>Total Science DAT score</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dentistry shadowing experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral communication skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rating of Other Factors in Extending Offers of Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Factors</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of community and healthcare issues</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptual Ability DAT score</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works well with others</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical thinking skills including problem solving</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Factors Least Important When Extending Offers of Admission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical reasoning</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to write and express oneself logically</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated ability to overcome challenges</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated ability to multi-task</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Experience</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additional Comments about Making Admissions Decisions

This is a forced listing—our process does not lend itself to a Top 5 list.

Although we marked 5 categories, we do not feel this list accurately reflects our process. We have made significant changes to ensure that we are considering noncognitives in addition to DAT and GPA.

This is a limited list. Screening establishes an applicant’s academic ability. Interviews tell us more about a candidate’s motivation, interests, and ability to work with others.

Academic ability to undertake our rigorous curriculum; and applicants who can use the unique features of our program to optimize their professional development, be it clinical, research, academic, or a combination.
Additional Factors about Making Admissions Decisions

- Interview scores
- MMI results
- Extracurricular activities; contribution to diversity
- Passion/commitment to people, dentistry, community service
- # of hours shadowing not as important as what applicant can articulate about dentistry
- Commitment to community service; history of serving others
What Changes Can Make a Difference?

--What doesn’t work and what does
Some Typical Admissions Issues

Have increased the number of URM and disadvantaged applicants, but they are not being interviewed or admitted.

The URM applicants being admitted do not enroll.

Few or no URM and disadvantaged students involved in the admissions process.
Behind the Issues

- Admissions Committee not focused on mission to increase URM/disadvantaged student enrollment
- Sense among Admissions Committee members that URM students “cannot make it”
- Current and former URM students express the perception of a negative atmosphere and do not feel they are treated favorably
What Does NOT Work

- Recruiting for dentistry only
- Assuming your institution will be the draw
- Having a cut-off for GPAs and DATs
What Does Work

- Support from Dean and Faculty
- Leadership by the Admissions Committee
- Partnership with Medicine and other Health Professions
What Does Work

A working pipeline

Strong summer &/or post-baccalaureate program

Holistic review

Consistent data
Sample Admissions Committee Mission Statement

“To assure high quality and increased access to oral health care in the United States, the Admissions Committee will strive to increase the selection and enrollment of dental students who will be of high quality, diverse, and sensitive to the oral health needs of patients.”
Why Summer & Post-Bac Programs?

- Exposure to professional school environment
- Most URM and disadvantaged students have few role models
- Confidence
- Study skills
- Working in groups
- Help in the admissions process
Evidence: Benefits of Summer and Post-Bac Programs

• Kuh GD, Kinzie J, et al.  
  *Connecting the Dots: Multi-Faceted Analyses of the Relationships between Student Engagement Results from the NSSE, and the Institutional Practices and Conditions that Foster Student Success.* Report of the Lumina Foundation

• Gravely T, McCann A et al.  
  *Enrichment and Recruitment Programs at Dental Schools: Impact on Enrollment of Underrepresented Minority Students.* Journal of Dental Education 2004 68:542-552

• Brody HA, Alexander, CA  

• Grumbach K, Chen E  
  *Effectiveness of University of California Premedical Programs in Increasing Medical School Matriculation for Minority and Disadvantaged Students.* Journal of the American Medical Association 2006 296: 1079-1085.
## RWJF SMDEP Program: Admission to Medical and Dental School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Medical School Enrolled</th>
<th>Dental School Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 Scholars</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Scholars</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Scholars</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Scholars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other areas: Basic Science Graduate School, Basic Science Research, Biomedical Engineering, Business, Psychology, Dental Hygiene, Education, Healthcare Management, Law, Public Health, Nursing, Optometry, Physician Assistant, Pharmacy, Podiatry, Veterinarian Medicine
Let’s consider an applicant for interview

23 year old African American male
• BA Biology from 4-year institution
• 2.75 overall GPA
• 15 DAT average
• First generation college student
Let’s consider an applicant for interview

23 year old African American male
- BA Biology from 4-year institution
- 2.75 overall GPA
- 15 DAT average
- First generation college student

What are your initial thoughts about this candidate?

How do you feel about his GPA and DATs?

What more do you want to know about this candidate?

What would keep you from interviewing him?
Let’s consider an applicant for admission to your institution

30-year old female with two young children

BA in Biological Sciences from a 4-year institution, but took a significant number of courses at a community college

2.90 overall GPA; 17 DAT average

High interview scores
What are your first thoughts about this candidate?

How do you feel about her GPA and DATs?

What more do you want to know about this candidate?

What would keep you from accepting her?
CONCLUSIONS

Institutional excellence must include diversity

Institutional climate for diversity is critical—it’s more than numbers

Admissions process, mission, and goals must be defined and aligned

Holistic review—including applicant screening—is a must
Percentage of First Year Entering URM Students at Schools Where the Admissions Workshop was Presented 2004 - 2007

Institutions

% URM

Workshop Presented
QUESTIONS?

Dr. W. David Brunson  
Associate Director, Center for Equity and Diversity  
American Dental Education Association  
1400 K Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202.289.7201, ext 179  
Email: brunsond@adea.org

Dr. Anne Wells  
Associate Executive Director, and Director, Division of Educational Pathways  
American Dental Education Association  
1400 K Street NW, Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005  
Phone: 202.289.7201, ext 183  
Email: wellsa@adea.org