

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

*Daniel L. Simmons*  
Telephone: (510) 987-0711  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: [Daniel.Simmons@ucop.edu](mailto:Daniel.Simmons@ucop.edu)

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

June 3, 2011

**PRESIDENT YUDOF  
PROVOST PITTS  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**Re: Metric for funding admissions**

Dear Mark and Larry:

At its meeting on May 25, the Academic Council endorsed a metric developed by BOARS to determine the staffing required to complete review, selection, recruitment, and yield efforts to implement the new freshman eligibility policy (15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention). BOARS developed this funding metric in response to concerns expressed by Regent Island directly to BOARS that the University must be accountable to ensure that application review under the new policy is done fairly and transparently. Since the Senate is responsible for setting admissions standards, BOARS consulted with the admissions directors to assess the resources needed to manage the admissions process. Council requests that you forward BOARS' analysis to the campus executive vice chancellors.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this admissions process metric.

Sincerely,



Daniel L. Simmons, Chair  
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council  
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl.

**BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)**

**Bill Jacob, Chair**

jacob@math.ucsb.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

May 10, 2011

DANIEL SIMMONS, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Re: BOARS Principles and Metric for Admissions Funding**

Dear Dan,

In 2011-12, UC will adopt the “Funding Streams” budget model at the same time that the new freshman eligibility policy takes effect. The new policy is expected to increase the size of the applicant pool significantly, and BOARS is concerned that campus admissions offices may have access to fewer resources under Funding Streams just as they face a much greater workload demand.

BOARS surveyed the nine undergraduate campus admissions offices to gather information about the personnel they require to properly complete review, selection, recruitment, and yield work. This document outlines the resources BOARS has determined are necessary to properly complete this work as the University moves into the 2011-2012 academic year.

BOARS asks the Academic Council to endorse the attached funding metric and forward it to the President and Provost with a request that they forward it to the campus executive vice chancellors.

Sincerely,

Bill Jacob  
BOARS Chair

Encl: Statement and Metric for Admissions Funding

cc: BOARS  
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director

# **BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS**

## **ADMISSIONS FUNDING PRINCIPLES AND METRIC**

**May 2011**

### ***Background:***

In 2011-12, UC will adopt the “Funding Streams” budget model at the same time that the new freshman eligibility policy takes effect. The new policy is expected to increase the size of the applicant pool significantly, and BOARS is concerned that campus admissions offices may have access to fewer resources under Funding Streams just as they face a much greater workload demand. BOARS surveyed the nine undergraduate campus admissions offices to gather information about the personnel they require to properly complete review, selection, recruitment, and yield work. BOARS learned that some admissions offices are involved in a variety of projects not always directly related to admissions, such as managing Visitor Centers and shuttle bus systems, and assisting the Registrar with course and degree validation for current and entering students. These variations make it impossible to make precise comparisons of the work or financial requirements of admissions offices across campuses. Therefore, this document outlines only the resources BOARS has determined are necessary to properly complete work directly related to review, selection, recruitment, and yield as the University moves into the 2011-2012 academic year.

In general, individualized review requires readers to spend 7 to 10 minutes on each freshman application and 15 to 20 minutes on each transfer application. It takes slightly longer to review domestic non-resident applicants and up to an hour to review international applications, which also require specialized staff. Transfer applications take twice as long and cost twice as much to evaluate because transfers typically enroll in multiple community colleges, and the complexity of the information presented makes it impossible to use seasonal staff to evaluate them.

Campuses vary tremendously in the extent to which they review completion of lower division major requirements for transfer admission. On average across the system, about 45% of transfer applications include a major preparation evaluation, although individual campuses range from 0% to 100%. Most transfers who are evaluated for specific pre-major courses are entering STEM disciplines (especially engineering). Until recently, even the more selective campuses were admitting most eligible transfer applicants without a review of major preparation.

It appears that moving to single-score holistic review of freshman applications will not increase average read times significantly. Moreover, campuses that are able to use shared scores from Berkeley or UCLA for some applicants should see a reduction in total read times.

Three campuses reported no difference in the time required for major-based or non major-based transfer reviews, and three estimate a 25-50% increase in time for major-based reviews. All agree that in contrast to freshman reads there is tremendous variation in the read times of transfer applicants, and that this difference has less to do with major-preparation than with the diversity of courses and regulations that need to be considered. BOARS also learned that departments often help design major-based transfer review, but most are reluctant to assist in the actual read process. Admissions offices must have adequate funding for the transfer read process in addition to the freshman read process.

### ***Funding Principles and Metric:***

BOARS intends the following principles to guide admissions directors as they engage their administrations in budget discussions regarding the funding of undergraduate student recruitment, review, selection, and yield.

1. Application fees should be understood as a fee collected for the specific purposes of funding recruitment, review, selection, and yield work with applicants and potential applicants. BOARS rejects efforts to label application fees as a “revenue source,” because this increases the likelihood that the fees will be used for other purposes, and thereby weakens the ability of campus admissions offices to carry out their primary functions.
2. UCOP should notify BOARS and the campuses annually about the funding campuses will receive under Funding Streams per application in the form of total fees received divided by the number of applicants. This will allow each campus to calculate the total fee revenue received based on its applicant numbers, and allow admissions directors to ask their EVCs for these funds as a baseline for review, selection, recruitment, and yield work. Additional duties carried out by admissions offices in service of their campus not directly related to review, selection, recruitment, and yield should receive supplementary funding.
3. Because campus admissions offices carry out a myriad of duties, this metric sets guidelines only for sufficient personnel to carry out review, selection, recruitment, and yield activities. These duties are carried out in different seasons; review and selection in December through April, recruitment between August and November, and yield between February and May. It is typical at all campuses for the same staff to engage in all three activities in addition to helping the Registrar in spring and summer. Full-time staff are necessary for this work and the seasonal distribution of their work carries with it obvious efficiencies.
  - 3A. Many campuses will need to continue the practice of hiring back retirees because the steep learning curve to handle special applications prevents campus admissions directors from using temporary staff for many tasks. UCOP can assist by streamlining the exemption process for recalling experienced retirees during applicant selection season (December through March). This is particularly critical for the fall 2012 admissions cycle, due to the uncertain outcome of the applicant pool increase. Campuses need extra flexibility.
4. In view of the above considerations and data supplied by the campuses, BOARS has determined that the following resources are essential to the proper management of review, selection, recruitment, and yield.
  - A. Campuses should maintain a ratio of approximately one permanent staff member for every three external (non admissions staff) readers to adequately supervise the freshman read processes. Approximately 8 to 10 minutes should be scheduled for each read. While the number of reads per reader will vary, BOARS suggests that the average not exceed 1,000 per reader<sup>1</sup>. If each file is read twice, this means a campus should have a permanent staff member and three external readers for every 2,000 freshman applications

---

<sup>1</sup> Reading 1,000 applications will take a trained external reader close to 200 hours, a considerable effort considering the reads are completed largely in December and January. While admissions staff can likely read more applications, note that as the application cycle moves forward, they also have to read transfer applications.

received. The four campuses using single score individualized review are currently within this range when score sharing is taken into account.

- B. Transfer applications should be read by full-time admissions staff (or other experienced personnel, such as retired admissions staff), as it is too complicated for temporary staff to handle. Approximately 15 to 20 minutes should be scheduled for each transfer application, with major-based and out of state applicants requiring more. Depending upon how other workload is distributed, there should be a dedicated staff member for every 1,000 to 2,000 transfer applications. These staff members usually work on freshman applications earlier in the cycle.