

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF

COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY
Admissions Directors

INSIDE
HIGHER ED

insidehighered.com

KENNETH C. GREEN

SENIOR RESEARCH CONSULTANT

with

SCOTT JASCHIK

&

DOUG LEDERMAN

FOUNDING EDITORS, INSIDE HIGHER ED

SUPPORT FOR THIS PROJECT PROVIDED BY

HOBSONS & SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION

Everyone has a dream worth pursuing.

For millions of students around the world, education opens doors to new possibilities. At SunGard Higher Education, we are committed to helping institutions like yours discover new ways to teach, learn, manage, and connect. Together, we can help every student looking for a better future find it.

SunGard and the SunGard logo are registered trademarks of SunGard Data Systems Inc. © 2011 SunGard

SUNGARD HIGHER EDUCATION

Shape the future of your institution today.

sungardhe.com

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF
COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY
Admissions Directors



insidehighered.com

Introduction	- 4
The Most Important Challenges Ahead	- 6
Recruiting Targets	- 7
Recruitment Strategies	- 8
Rating the Effectiveness of Admissions Resources	- 9
Different Students, Different Admissions Criteria?	- 11
The Continuing Importance of Admissions Tests	- 11
Opinions About Policies and Practices	- 11
Recruiting International Students	- 12
Application and Enrollment Trends	- 13
Issues for Community Colleges	- 13
Data Tables	- 16
Appendix A: Methodology	- 27
Appendix B: About the Authors	- 28

Introduction

Admissions officers track the numbers, deploy new technologies and analytic tools, and also draw on their experience and instincts to navigate the shifting terrain of undergraduate recruitment and admissions. Many also care deeply about finding the best matches for applicants and institutions, about reaching out to disadvantaged populations, and about diversifying their campuses.

Like the athletic coaches at their institutions, admissions personnel can have “winning” and “losing” seasons, based not only on the total number of students who matriculate, but also on the academic profile and other characteristics of the new cohort of students.

Are test scores up? What about the discount rate? Did we recruit significant numbers of minority students? Did our efforts to target veterans yield results? Does the class include more full-pay, low-income, or international students? Which students did we get (or lose) that we really wanted? How did we fare given the economic downturn that is playing havoc with so much of American higher education?

The *Inside Higher Ed* Survey of College and University Admissions Directors addresses key issues that confront leaders in admissions and enrollment management across American higher education. The survey questions address a pressing array of challenges that confront admissions directors at two- and four-year colleges across the United States:

- What are the two most important admissions issues/challenges currently confronting your institution over the next two-three years?
- Has your campus increased its ef-

forts to recruit specific undergraduate populations?

- How important are various strategies as part of the recruitment and admissions activities at your institution?

- How would you rate the effectiveness of various resources that prospective undergraduates often use to inform their admissions activities?

- Does your institution admit some groups of students (such as athletes, alumni children, full-pay students, minority students, veterans, etc.) who, on average, have lower grades and test scores than other applicants? Do you support this institutional practice?

- What's the policy at your institution about using commission-paid agents to recruit international students?

The survey data offer new insights about admissions policies, practices and priorities during (yet another) period marked by significant financial challenges.

The *Inside Higher Ed* Survey of Col-

lege and University Admissions Directors was conducted in August and early September, 2011. The survey involved the use of two questionnaires – one for four-year colleges and universities and a second designed specifically for community colleges (with many questions asked of both groups). An e-mail invitation with a hot-link to an online questionnaire was first sent in mid-August to either the senior enrollment management or senior admissions officer (dean/director) of some 2,040 public and private nonprofit two- and four-year colleges and universities across the United States. Discounting some 200 non-deliverable emails, the actual survey sample included approximately 1,840 two- and four-year colleges and universities that enroll 500 or more students. A total of 462 senior admissions and enrollment management officers completed the survey by September 3, 2011. (Additional information about the survey methodology is presented in Appendix A.)

THE MOST IMPORTANT CHALLENGES AHEAD

The survey began by asking admissions directors to identify the “two most important admissions issues/challenges” confronting their institutions over the next two-three years. As shown in Table 1, there should be little surprise that money issues – concern about tuition and affordability – topped the list at four-year institutions. In contrast, admissions officers at community colleges identified the impact of reduced state funding on the quality and availability of academic programs as their top concern.

Admissions directors at four-year public institutions ranked the impact of reduced state funding on the quality and availability of academic programs second on their list of pressing challenges. Ranked second for community colleges were tuition and affordability issues. Admissions directors at private doctoral universities identified increased competition from similar institutions as their No. 2 challenge.

Table 1
The Two Most Important Admissions Issues/Challenges Confronting My Institution Over the Next Two-Three Years
 (top five items by sector; survey participants chose from a list of 12)

All 4-Year Institutions (n=344)	Community Colleges (n=118)	Public Doctoral (n=45)	Public Master's (n=50)	Public Baccalaureate (n=25)	Private Doctoral (n=29)	Private Master's (n=81)	Private Baccalaureate (n=114)
Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (75.0)	Reduced state funding that affects the quality and availability of academic programs (51.7)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (66.7)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (66.0)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (60.0)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (86.2)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (79.5)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (79.8)
Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.) (23.3)	Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability (49.2)	Reduced state funding that affects the quality and availability of academic programs (40.0)	Reduced state funding that affects the quality and availability of academic programs (52.0)	TIE: Reduced state funding that affects the quality and availability of academic programs (28.0)	Increased competition from other institutions similar to mine (31.0)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (28.4)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (25.4)
Increased competition from other institutions similar to mine (22.1)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.) (34.7)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.) (34.7)	Increased competition from other institutions similar to mine (28.0)	Increased competition from institutions similar to mine (24.0)	Rising family concerns about student debt (24.1)	Student/family concerns about student debt (24.7)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.) (23.7)
Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (20.9)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (16.9)	Increased competition from other institutions similar to mine (24.4)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.) (20.0)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (16.0)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (17.2)	Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.) (23.5)	Student/family concerns about student debt (22.8)
Student/family concerns about student debt (17.7)	Debates over whether higher ed. prepares graduates who can get jobs (16.1)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (11.1)	Increased competition from institutions in other sectors (public vs. private, etc.) (12.0)		Increased commercialization of the admissions process (13.8)	Increased competition from other institutions similar to mine (14.8)	Increased competition from other institutions similar to mine (21.1)

RECRUITING TARGETS

Even as almost all colleges and universities say they have increased their efforts and investments to recruit full-time undergraduates in recent years, the survey data reveal some differences across sectors in the groups that are now the focus of additional attention and effort. In aggregate, transfer students rank second among four-year institutions, followed by out-of-state students, full-pay students, and part-timers (Table 2). At community colleges, the groups benefiting from additional recruitment efforts are first-generation students, adults (over age 24), veterans, and students who can pay full tuition.

The economic downturn appears to be having a particular impact on public institutions. Admissions directors across public institutions acknowledge new efforts to recruit full-pay students. “Full-pay” under-

graduates are priority “targets” across all public sector campus but do not make the “top five” lists at private institutions.

Public doctoral universities and master’s institutions are also pursuing out-of-

state students (who also generate additional revenue because of the higher tuition rates they are charged). Public doctoral institutions have also increased their efforts to recruit international students for their undergraduate programs.

At private institutions the top targets for increased attention are transfer students, adults, part-timers, out-of-state residents, and international students.

Less selective institutions also appear to be pursuing “revenue” students. Almost half (48.0 percent) of moderately selective institutions and about a third (31.2 percent) of less selective campuses report enhanced recruiting efforts focused on full-pay students, compared to just a tenth (9.1 percent) of the most selective colleges and universities.

Table 2
Has Your Institution Focused More Attention and Increased Your Recruitment Efforts to Target Specific Groups of Undergraduates in the Past Year?
 (percentages rating group as 6 or 7; scale 1=less attention, 7= more attention)

All 4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Baccalaureate	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Baccalaureate
Full-time undergraduates (60.2)	Full-time undergraduates (44.7)	Full-pay students (51.3)	Full-time undergraduates (55.6)	Full-time undergraduates (68.0)	Full-time undergraduates (59.3)	Full-time undergraduates (62.2)	Full-time undergraduates (62.0)
Transfer students (36.1)	First generation students (42.5)	TIE: Full-time undergraduates; out-of-state students (50.0)	Full-pay students (41.9)	Transfer students (45.8)	Out-of-state Students (57.1)	Transfer students (42.3)	Adult students over 24 (53.9)
Out-of-state students (35.9)	Adult students over age 24 (41.1)	International students (42.2)	Transfer students (40.0)	Full pay students (38.1)	Part-time students (52.4)	Out-of-state students (30.3)	Part-time students (46.9)
Full-pay students (34.3)	Veterans / military personnel (33.9)	Minority students (34.9)	Out-of-state students (37.8)	TIE: First generation, minority; transfer students (37.5)	International students (41.4)	TIE: Full-pay students; adult students over 24 (24.3)	International students (34.3)
Part-time undergraduates (33.5)	Full-pay students (32.3)		Minority students (32.0)		Adult students over age 24 (40.0)		Minority students (31.8)

RECRUITMENT STRATEGIES

Recruitment strategies used by colleges include not only targeting various student populations, but also finding new ways of reaching out to potential students and their families.

In aggregate, survey participants from four-year colleges and universities report that recruiting out-of-state students is an important admissions priority, closely followed by providing adequate financial aid for low- and middle-income students and

maintaining good relationships with high school college counselors.

At community colleges, the top priority is student aid, followed by relationships with high school counselors. Almost twice as many community college

counselors tag student aid as a priority compared to their peers in four-year institutions (66.4 percent at community colleges vs. 36.2 percent at four-year institutions). Similarly, far more community college admissions officers cite good relationships with high school counselors (63.6 percent) as a key campus recruiting strategy than do their peers in four-year institutions (37.8 percent).

Indeed, a recurring theme in the data on institutional strategies is the impor-

Table 3
How Important Are the Following Strategies for Undergraduate Admissions Efforts and Enrollment Targets Over the Next Two-Three Years?
(percentages rating the strategies as 6 or 7; scale 1=not important, 7= very important)

All 4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Baccalaureate	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Baccalaureate
Recruiting more out-of-state (domestic) students (37.6)	Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (66.4)	Recruiting more out-of-state (domestic) students (53.3)	Recruiting more out-of-state (domestic) students (47.9)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (64.0)	Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (48.3)	TIE: Recruiting more of out-of-state students and Using social media (34.2)	Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (39.9)
Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (36.2)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (63.6)	Recruiting more full-pay students (46.5)	Recruiting more full-pay students (44.7)	Recruiting more local students/students who live close to the college (41.7)	Recruiting more international students (42.9)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (26.9)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (34.8)
Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (35.6)	Recruiting more local students - students who live close to the college (62.6)	Recruiting more international students (42.2)	TIE: Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students; using social media (Facebook & Twitter, etc.); (38.8)	Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (28.0)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (34.5)	Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (26.3)	Recruiting more out-of-state (domestic) students (34.5)
Recruiting more full-pay students (31.7)	Using social media (Facebook & Twitter, etc.) as part of our communication strategy with applicants (38.2)	Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students (39.5)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school counselors (37.5)	Using social media (Facebook & Twitter, etc.) (26.1)	Using merit scholarships to enhance the academic profile of our student population (28.0)	Recruiting more local students (23.1)	Recruiting more full-pay students (34.3)
Recruiting more international students (30.3)	Recruiting more full-pay students (34.4)	Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors (35.7)		Recruiting more full-pay students (25.0)	Recruiting more out-of-state students (25.9)		Using merit scholarships to enhance the academic profile of our student population (31.4)

tance of maintaining close relationships with high school guidance counselors (range: 26.9 percent for private master’s institutions to 63.6 percent for those at

community colleges). A second recurring theme across all sectors is the importance of social media, cited as a “very important” strategy by almost a third

(30.2 percent) of the survey participants at four-year institutions and two-fifths (38.3 percent) of admissions directors at community colleges.

RATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ADMISSIONS RESOURCES

If they are fortunate, high school students and their parents have access to a wide array of resources to help them navigate the college search process. But how effective are these resources?

Across all four-year institutions, admissions officers rate college counselors at private high schools as a very effective resource for student applicants

and their parents. In contrast, community college officials place financial aid websites at the top of their list of useful admissions resources (Table 4). Social

media play an important role across almost all sectors, as do financial aid websites and data-driven counseling tools. Guidance counselors at public high schools make the “top five list” in just two sectors: community colleges and public baccalaureate colleges, a reflection, no doubt, of budget cuts that have limited college counseling services at many high schools.

Table 4
How Effective Are the Following Resources and Services That Students Use in the College Admissions Process?
(percentages rating the resource as 6 or 7; scale 1=not effective, 7= very effective)

All 4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Baccalaureate	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Baccalaureate
College counselors at private high schools (51.8)	Financial aid/scholarship website (FASFA, FastWeb, Finaid.org, etc.) (48.3)	College counselors at private high schools (46.5)	College counselors at private high schools (46.0)	College counselors at private high schools (41.7)	College counselors at private high schools (65.5)	College counselors at private high schools (48.1)	College counselors at private high schools (57.5)
Financial aid/scholarship website (FASFA, FastWeb, Finaid.org, etc.) (28.8)	College counselors at public high schools (45.2)	Financial aid/scholarship website (FASFA, FastWeb, Finaid.org, etc.) (20.0)	College counselors at public high schools (36.0)	Financial aid/scholarship websites (40.0)	Data-drive college counseling tools (Naviance, etc.) (44.8)	Social media sources (24.7)	Financial aid/scholarship websites (35.7)
Social media sources (College Confidential, Facebook, etc.) (24.9)	College counselors at private high schools (31.3)	TIE: College counselors at public high schools; social media sources (15.6)	TIE: Financial aid/scholarship websites; social media sources (31.3)	Social media sources (28.0)	Independent/ private college counselors (27.6)	Independent/private college counselors (22.5)	Independent/private college counselors (31.3)
Independent/private college counselors (22.4)	Social media sources (College Confidential, Facebook, etc.) (29.8)	Data-driven college counseling tools (Naviance, etc.) (11.4)	Independent/ private college counselors (20.4)	College counselors at public high schools (24.0)	TIE: Financial aid/scholarship websites; social media sources (22.2)	Financial aid/scholarship websites (22.2)	Social media sources (26.3)
Data-driven college counseling tools (Naviance, etc.) (19.6)	College counselors at job placement centers (22.3)			Independent/ private college counselors (12.5)		Data-driven college counseling tools (Naviance, etc.) (21.0)	Data-driven college counseling tools (Naviance, etc.) (21.1)

DIFFERENT STUDENTS, DIFFERENT ADMISSIONS CRITERIA?

It's no secret that both public and private four-year institutions admit groups of students whose test scores and grades are, on average, lower than those of other applicants. Table 5 presents data on which groups are the most likely beneficiaries of these policies and practices.

Table 5
Do Students in Selected Groups, on Average,
Have Lower Grades and Test Scores Than Other Applicants?
(percentage reporting "yes")

	All 4-Year Institutions	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Bacc.	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Bacc.
Athletes	28.0	44.4	22.2	18.2	46.4	17.3	28.9
Children of alumni	11.5	6.8	10.2	4.3	10.7	7.4	18.4
Minority students	39.3	44.2	39.6	22.7	57.1	24.7	46.5
Men (for gender balance)	11.1	4.5	6.4	18.2	3.6	13.9	14.0
Women (for gender balance)	2.7	4.5	4.3	4.5	7.1	1.3	0.9
Full-pay students	10.0	7.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	6.3	19.3
International students	9.0	9.3	8.5	4.5	17.9	2.5	12.4
Veterans	15.4	18.2	31.3	13.6	21.4	12.3	8.3

Table 6
Percentage of Respondents Who Agree With the Practice of Admitting Students in
Selected Groups Who May Have Lower Grades and Test Scores Than Other Applicants
(percentage who agree/strongly agree)

	All 4-Year Institutions	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Bacc.	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Bacc.
Athletes	91.8	92.0	89.5	66.6	94.9	85.7	100.0
Children of alumni	91.5	100.0	92.9	60.0	77.8	94.7	94.3
Minority students	99.3	100.0	100.0	84.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
Men (for gender balance)	90.7	100.0	92.3	85.7	71.4	95.0	88.9
Women (for gender balance)	92.0	100.0	91.7	80.0	85.7	94.8	90.0
Full-pay students	92.0	90.9	81.9	100.0	87.5	94.7	94.1
International students	90.6	100.0	78.4	80.0	88.9	94.7	92.3
Veterans	96.9	100.0	100.0	80.0	90.0	100.0	95.8

Table 7
Admissions Standards for Asian-American Students
(percentage reporting "yes")

	All 4-Year Institutions	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Bacc.	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Bacc.
Does your institution require higher grades and test scores for Asian-American students?	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6

Minority students, followed by athletes, are the groups that admissions directors say are most likely to benefit from "differential" admissions policies and practices." In aggregate, veterans rank (a distant) third as a group that benefits from policies and practices to admit students who might have lower grades or test scores. Also not surprising is that admissions directors strongly support current policies and practices at their institutions that benefit some groups over the general population of applicants.

As shown below in Table 6, large — indeed huge — majorities of admissions officials affirm current campus policies and practice in this area.

Many advocates for Asian-American students argue that they are held to higher standards when it comes to test scores and grades in the admissions process. But admissions directors insist that that's not the case. Table 7 reveals that barely 1 percent of officials at the four-year colleges and universities participating in the survey acknowledge that Asian-American students "need significantly higher grades and test scores" than do other applicants to earn admission to their institutions.

In recent years, more and more colleges — especially liberal arts institutions — have expressed concern about the difficulty of attracting male applicants and students. And some college officials have — controversially — suggested admitting male applicants with lower grades or test scores. Just over 11 percent of those at four-year colleges and universities said that was their practice, with the figures highest at baccalaureate institutions. The percentage of four-year colleges reporting that women are admitted with lower grades and test scores is much smaller — under 3 percent.

THE CONTINUING IMPORTANCE OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

Over the past two decades, a small but growing number of both public and private four-year colleges and universities have announced plans to incorporate nontraditional criteria into admissions. Concurrently, a small but burgeoning number of institutions have also announced plans to reduce (or eliminate) the use of college admissions tests – the SAT and the ACT.

As shown in Table 8, the vast majority of four-year institutions require standardized tests; in aggregate, almost 90 percent con-

tinue to require students to submit SAT or ACT scores. A sixth (17.4 percent) that now require tests are reviewing this policy,

while only a tenth (10.7) no longer require tests. Fully two-fifths (40.0 percent) report the expanded use of nontraditional criteria. In contrast, just over a fourth (27.8 percent) of the survey participants in four-year institutions report reducing the role of tests in the admissions review.

Interestingly, only a fifth (19.6 percent) of the survey respondents report that their campus has both expanded the use of nontraditional admissions criteria and concurrently reduced the use of test scores.

Table 8
The Status of Standardized Tests in Undergraduate Admissions
(percentages answering affirmatively)

	All 4-Year Institutions	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Bacc.	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Bacc.
Is your institution giving thought to making standardized tests optional in undergraduate admissions?							
We continue to require standardized tests from undergraduate applicants.	71.7	93.3	82.0	62.5	72.4	64.2	65.8
We continue to require tests but are also reviewing this policy.	16.6	6.7	16.0	12.5	17.2	27.2	14.0
We no longer require tests from undergraduate applicants.	11.7	0.0	2.0	25.0	10.3	8.6	20.0
Do You Agree With the Following Statements About the Role of Standardized Tests in Undergraduate Admissions? (percent who agree/strongly agree)							
We have expanded the use of nontraditional admissions criteria as part of our review process in the past five years.	40.0	42.3	50.0	28.0	41.3	38.2	38.1
We have reduced the role of standardized tests in undergraduate admissions reviews and decisions in the past five years.	27.8	22.2	16.0	25.0	27.6	35.3	31.9
We have expanded the use of nontraditional criteria and also reduced the role of standardized tests.	19.6	17.8	16.0	16.7	20.7	19.8	22.1
Standardized tests (SAT/ACT) should be optional for students who apply to my campus.	24.6	8.9	14.0	37.5	24.1	29.3	29.7

OPINIONS ABOUT POLICIES AND PRACTICES

The *Inside Higher Ed* survey solicited the views of campus admissions directors on a wide range of policies, practices and issues, including families' use of independent counselors, and the role of social media in the admissions process. Among them:

NEED-BLIND ADMISSIONS. Although the data presented elsewhere in this report suggest that many campuses have increased their efforts to recruit "revenue" students, more than three-fourths of the survey participants in four-year institutions disagree that the financial downturn has forced their campuses to pay more attention to an applicant's "ability to pay" when making admissions decisions.

INDEPENDENT ADMISSIONS COUNSELORS.

Despite the growing number of independent college counselors who help students and their families navigate the admissions process, survey participants report that these individuals do not significantly enhance their clients' prospects for admission.

SOCIAL MEDIA. Paper, while not dead, is dying, and social media (Facebook and Twitter, among others) are emerging as key recruiting resources for college admissions officers.

SELF-CONFIDENCE. Things are improv-

ing: almost three-fourths (73.6 percent) of survey respondents in four-year institutions report “feeling more confident about [my institution’s] admissions efforts than I was in fall 2009.”

DISCOUNT RATES. The costs and consequences of using institutional scholarships (i.e., the discount rate) are rising, particularly in private institutions.

PLAGIARISM VS. PARENTS. A fourth (25.5 percent) of survey participants report that plagiarism is a problem in student essays. In contrast, fully half (53.5 percent) report that “coaching by parents or college counselors [makes] it more difficult to really learn about applicants.”

ADMISSIONS COUNSELORS LIKE ESSAYS. Students (and their parents) may hate the tra-

ditional admissions essay, but two-thirds of the survey participants in four-year colleges and universities say they believe essays “convey important information about applicants.”

THE PRESSURE TO ADMIT. A significant minority of survey participants report having experienced pressure from senior administrators, trustees or donors to admit some applicants.

Table 9
Opinions About Admissions Policies and Practices
(percentage who agree/strongly agree)

	All 4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Bacc.	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Bacc.
The financial downturn has forced us to pay more attention to an applicants' ability to pay when we make admissions decisions.	22.0	n/a	13.0	12.2	16.6	20.5	22.5	31.0
Students who use independent college admissions counselors usually enhance their prospects for admission.	11.5	n/a	4.7	2.0	12.5	6.9	16.3	15.9
Social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) play an important role in our outreach efforts to prospective students.	74.2	77.1	73.3	69.4	72.0	65.5	71.3	81.4
Merit scholarships are an appropriate use of institutional financial resources as part of campus efforts to improve the academic profile of our student population.	88.3	70.1	95.5	84.0	87.5	75.9	83.9	86.7
I'm feeling more confident about our admissions efforts and enrollment prospects than I was two years ago (fall 2009).	73.6	65.8	75.0	72.0	91.7	78.3	67.9	72.3
We have increased our discount rate in order to enroll more students.	36.4	n/a	30.2	15.5	13.0	34.5	51.3	41.9
The rate of increase in our discount rate is not sustainable.	34.5	n/a	12.5	15.5	14.3	34.5	46.2	46.3
Our increases in the discount rate have not affected our net tuition revenue.	40.2	n/a	50.0	28.6	31.6	34.5	42.7	40.7
Plagiarism is a serious problem with student admissions essays.	25.5	n/a	22.2	21.3	15.0	24.1	30.1	27.8
Coaching by parents or college counselors is making it more difficult to really learn about applicants.	53.5	n/a	34.5	38.8	36.4	55.2	45.0	52.3
Application essays convey important information about applicants.	67.2	n/a	66.6	56.3	42.9	75.9	71.8	71.2
I have experienced pressure from senior level administrators to admit some applicants.	27.8	15.8	27.3	34.7	22.7	34.4	24.7	26.5
I have experienced pressure from trustees/board members to admit some applicants.	23.6	9.7	25.1	22.4	13.7	37.9	21.0	23.9
I have experienced pressure from the development office and big donors to admit some applicants.	23.6	n/a	25.0	30.6	9.1	44.9	21.0	23.9

RECRUITING INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

International students have become an important constituency for a growing number of campuses. Yet the quest to enroll international students is not without controversy. Some public institutions face criticism that international students “take seats” from deserving, qualified state residents. Also at issue is the growing use of commission-paid agents – both by students seeking admission and by institutions recruiting international students.

Table 10 reveals that just under one-fourth (22.0 percent) of the four-year colleges and universities that participated in the survey currently use agents who receive some commission-based compensation to recruit international students; another third (32.5 percent) are considering using agents but do not do so now. At the same time, two-thirds (65.4 percent) of respon-

dents at four-year institutions support a proposed NACAC policy (since placed on hold) that would bar colleges from employing agents paid with commissions for

international recruiting.

Although only a fifth (18.2 percent) of the admissions officers at four-year institutions report a problem with fabricated

admissions applications from international applicants, almost half (46.5 percent) believe that agents often help their clients fabricate information on their applications.

Table 10
Recruiting International Students
(percentages reporting "yes")

	All 4-Year Institutions	Public Doctoral	Public Master's	Public Bacc.	Private Doctoral	Private Master's	Private Bacc.
Does your institution retain agents (paid in full or in part on commission) to recruit international undergraduates?	22.0	24.4	22.2	16.0	17.2	31.3	16.8
Is your institution considering the use of such agents for international recruiting?	32.5	26.2	48.9	32.0	24.1	39.0	26.1
The NACAC draft policy on international recruiting suggests that the same standards that apply to domestic recruiting (no payment based on commission) should apply to international recruiting. Do you agree with the draft NACAC policy?	65.4	72.7	61.7	65.2	69.0	57.0	61.8
Are you experiencing a continuing problem with fabrications on international applications?	18.2	27.3	11.4	16.7	31.0	15.2	16.5
Do you believe that paid agents often play a direct role in helping international applicants fabricate information on their applications?	46.5	48.8	50.0	31.8	46.4	39.0	52.9

APPLICATION AND ENROLLMENT TRENDS

Admissions directors track the numbers. Key metrics for first-year applications and enrollments comparing fall 2011 with 2008 and 2010 suggest that the numbers have improved for most institutions over the past three years.

Table 11 (on following page) reveals that fall 2011 application numbers are “much higher” for key student populations compared to fall 2008 and somewhat better than even for fall 2010. For example, almost three-fourths (72.1 percent) of four-year institutions and fully half (52.9 percent) of community colleges report total first-year applications in fall 2011 to be “much high-

er” than in fall 2008. Across all categories shown in Table 11, few institutions report “much lower” applications when they compared the numbers for 2011 with either 2008 or 2010. In some categories, more than a third or even half of four-year colleges and community colleges also report that the numbers of applications are much higher (e.g., full-time students, low-income

students, minority students, and veterans).

Similarly, Table 12 reveals the fall 2011 enrollment numbers to be “much higher” for key student populations compared to fall 2008 and somewhat better than for fall 2010. In general, comparatively few institutions report enrollment declines for key populations. Moreover, fully half (51.5 percent) of four-year institutions and a fourth (25.7 percent) of community colleges report total first year enrollment in fall 2011 to be “much higher” than in 2008. The “much higher” numbers fall a bit for fall 2011 vs. 2010, but still reflect gains for many campuses.

ISSUES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

As noted above, the *Inside Higher Ed* survey of admissions directors was actually two separate surveys – one for four-year institutions and a second for community colleges. The community college survey included several items, discussed below, that were not on the questionnaire for four-year institutions.

Conventional wisdom suggests that during times of economic difficulty, traditional-age undergraduates may be more likely than at other times to consider attending community colleges.

As shown in Table 13 (on Page 15), the conventional wisdom appears to be true.

Table 11
First-Year APPLICATION Trends, Fall 2011 vs. 2008 and 2010
 (percentages)

First-Year Applications	FALL 2011 VS. 2008		FALL 2011 VS. 2010	
	4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges	4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges
Total first-year applications				
Much lower	4.8	1.9	7.7	2.7
About the same	23.2	45.2	33.5	46.4
Much higher	72.1	52.9	58.8	50.9
Full-time students				
Much lower	4.8	7.8	6.9	7.2
About the same	29.1	48.7	37.4	55.0
Much higher	66.1	43.5	55.8	37.8
Part-time students				
Much lower	8.4	3.5	7.7	3.6
About the same	78.1	41.7	78.5	46.0
Much higher	13.4	54.8	13.8	50.5
Low-income students				
Much lower	3.3	0.9	4.7	1.8
About the same	61.4	42.0	63.8	50.5
Much higher	35.3	57.1	31.5	47.8
Middle-income students				
Much lower	2.1	0.9	2.5	2.7
About the same	71.5	63.4	73.2	64.6
Much higher	26.4	35.7	24.3	32.7
“Full-pay” students				
Much lower	9.3	11.7	10.2	8.1
About the same	75.0	74.8	74.9	74.8
Much higher	15.7	13.5	14.9	17.1
Minority students				
Much lower	0.9	1.8	2.8	1.8
About the same	46.5	66.4	53.9	69.6
Much higher	52.6	31.9	43.3	28.6
Older/returning students				
Much lower	10.2	3.5	7.6	2.7
About the same	73.2	57.0	78.7	61.8
Much higher	16.6	39.5	13.7	35.5
Veterans/military personnel				
Much lower	1.5	0.9	2.2	0.9
About the same	61.7	38.6	67.9	44.4
Much higher	36.8	60.5	29.8	54.6

Table 12
First-Year ENROLLMENT Trends, Fall 2011 vs. 2008 and 2010
 (percentages)

First-Year Enrollment	FALL 2011 VS. 2008		FALL 2011 VS. 2010	
	4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges	4-Year Institutions	Community Colleges
Total first-year enrollment				
Much lower	6.1	8.3	9.8	9.1
About the same	42.4	66.1	50.0	71.8
Much higher	51.5	25.7	40.2	19.1
Full-time students				
Much lower	6.4	14.3	9.3	14.3
About the same	45.3	66.1	52.7	72.3
Much higher	48.3	19.6	37.9	13.4
Part-time students				
Much lower	4.8	5.4	5.9	3.6
About the same	88.0	58.9	87.5	62.5
Much higher	7.3	35.7	6.6	33.9
Low-income students				
Much lower	2.8	1.8	5.2	2.7
About the same	75.3	63.7	76.0	69.1
Much higher	21.9	34.5	18.8	28.2
Middle-income students				
Much lower	2.2	5.4	3.9	4.5
About the same	78.6	78.6	80.6	83.8
Much higher	19.3	16.1	15.5	11.7
“Full-pay” students				
Much lower	5.9	9.9	6.6	9.9
About the same	81.3	82.9	83.2	84.7
Much higher	12.8	7.2	10.2	5.4
Minority students				
Much lower	1.9	1.8	3.2	2.7
About the same	64.9	83.2	69.1	79.5
Much higher	33.2	15.0	27.7	17.9
Older/returning students				
Much lower	4.4	1.8	5.2	1.8
About the same	85.6	77.7	86.0	74.3
Much higher	10.0	20.5	8.8	23.9
Veterans/military personnel				
Much lower	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.7
About the same	77.0	59.3	76.8	60.9
Much higher	21.5	38.9	21.2	36.4

The vast majority of community colleges report that their enrollments of “traditional” undergraduates have increased during the current economic downturn. Just over a sixth (18 percent) of public two-year

institutions report either a slight decline or no real change in the number of traditional students since fall 2008. In contrast, almost a third (29.9 percent) report gains of upwards of 5 percent in the number

of traditional students, almost two-fifths (37.6 percent) report modest gains (5-15 percent), and an eighth confirm a major increase (16-25 percent) in the numbers of traditional students since 2008.

Table 13
Are “Traditional Students” Enrolling in Community Colleges?

	Percentages
A decline in the number of traditional students at my campus since 2008	2.6
No real change in the numbers of traditional students enrolled at my campus in the past three years	15.4
A slight increase (under 5 percent) in the numbers of traditional students	29.9
A modest increase (5-15 percent) in the numbers of traditional students	37.6
A major increase (16-25 percent) increase in the numbers of traditional students	12.0
A dramatic increase (over 25 percent) in the numbers of traditional students	2.6

Table 14
How Would You Describe the Competition for Students with For-Profit Colleges Now Compared to Fall 2008?

	Percentages
Not really an issue for my institution; little competition from for-profits	36.4
Some additional competition compared to fall 2008, but nothing we cannot handle	34.8
Significant competition for students in selected programs (e.g., health care, information systems)	22.0
Significant competition for students across all fields and programs	6.8

Even as community college enrollments are rising, more than three-fifths (63.6 percent) of community college admissions directors acknowledge increased competition from for-profit institutions. However, as shown in Table 14, less than a third (28.6 percent) view for-profit colleges as significant competition for students, while more than a third (34.8 percent) report that the additional competition is “nothing we cannot handle.”

Online education has been an important factor in the enrollment gains post-

ed by many community colleges since 2008. *Inside Higher Ed’s* 2011 Presidential Perspectives report, released earlier this year, revealed that a large majority of community college presidents, like their peers in other sectors, saw online education as a way to serve more learners (89.4 percent) and also increase net tuition revenue (76.5 percent).

A third (33.9 percent) of community college admissions directors report that online programs (full programs leading to a degree or certificate that can be com-

pleted online) are a “rising and increasingly important component” of total institutional enrollment; another fourth (25.2 percent) categorize online programs as a “small but generally rising component of our enrollment.” In contrast, two-fifths (40.9 percent) report that enrollments in online programs are either not significant (13.9 percent) or that their institutions offer individual online courses but not complete online programs.

The fourth survey item unique to community colleges addresses competitive admissions within individual certificate and degree programs. Although community colleges are typically open-admission institutions, the survey respondents representing two-year public institutions acknowledge that admission into specific programs at their institutions may be competitive or selective. For example, more than two-fifths report that students must “achieve certain grades in prerequisite courses” to gain admission into some programs. More than a fifth (22.2 percent) report that some programs admit more than a fourth but less than half of applicants, while 20 percent state that some programs at their institutions admit less than a fourth of all applicants.

THE PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

The survey data warrant a short comment about the demographic profile of the survey participants across sectors. The median age and average number of years as the chief admissions director were identical in four-year and two-year institutions. However three-fifths (59.9 percent) of the senior admissions or enrollment management officers in four-year colleges and universities were male; in contrast, two-thirds (67.8 percent) of the community college survey participants were female.

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF
COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY
Admissions Directors
DATA TABLES

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
Number of institutions	344	118	45	50	25	29	81	114	14	86	241

As you think about the future, which of the following are the TWO most important admissions issues/challenges confronting your institution over the next two-three years? (Please select TWO items from the list below.)

Increased competition from other institutions that are similar to your institution	22.1	8.5	24.4	28.0	24.0	31.0	14.8	21.1	28.6	26.7	19.9
Increased competition from institutions in different sectors (public vs. private, two-year vs. four-year, for-profit vs. nonprofit).	20.9	16.9	11.1	12.0	16.0	17.2	28.4	25.4	7.1	18.6	22.4
Rising concerns from families about tuition and affordability	75.0	49.2	66.7	66.0	60.0	86.2	79.0	79.8	64.3	82.6	73.9
Student/family concerns about student debt	17.7	5.1	4.4	6.0	12.0	24.1	24.7	22.8	0.0	22.1	17.0
Debates over whether higher education produces graduates who can get jobs	4.9	16.1	4.4	4.0	4.0	6.9	2.5	7.0	21.4	4.7	4.1
Increased commercialization of the admissions process	4.1	2.5	4.4	2.0	0.0	13.8	2.5	4.4	21.4	5.8	2.5
Difficulty of attracting a diverse student body	3.2	2.5	2.2	2.0	4.0	6.9	6.2	0.9	14.3	3.5	2.5
Reduced state funding that affects the quality and availability of academic programs	14.8	51.7	40.0	52.0	28.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	15.1	14.9
Enrollment caps on undergraduate admissions	1.2	0.8	0.0	4.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.2
Potential cuts in federal student aid programs (Pell Grants, etc.)	23.3	34.7	31.1	20.0	28.0	10.3	23.5	23.7	7.1	14.0	27.8
Potential cuts in state student aid programs	8.1	7.6	8.9	4.0	8.0	3.4	11.1	8.8	14.3	3.5	8.7
Potential cuts in the federal student loan program	4.7	1.7	2.2	0.0	8.0	0.0	7.4	6.1	7.1	2.3	5.0

As you think about the various populations of undergraduates at your institution, have you focused more attention and increased your recruitment efforts to target some of the groups listed below in the last year than in prior recent years? Percent reporting more attention (score= 6/7; scale 1=less attention; 7=more attention)

Full-time undergraduates	60.2	44.7	50.0	55.6	68.0	59.3	63.3	62.0	46.2	57.0	62.0
Part-time undergraduates	33.5	27.8	34.5	21.1	17.4	52.4	19.7	46.9	54.5	47.8	26.8
Home-schooled students	19.6	21.1	21.2	17.9	13.6	30.8	15.3	21.2	16.7	25.4	18.0
International students	29.3	28.3	42.2	21.7	17.4	41.4	17.8	34.3	23.1	35.0	27.9
Transfer students	36.1	27.7	27.9	40.0	45.8	27.6	42.3	33.3	23.1	28.8	38.5
Minority students	30.4	31.8	34.9	32.0	37.5	38.5	19.7	31.8	28.6	34.6	29.4
First-generation college students	17.8	42.5	10.5	17.4	37.5	20.0	14.7	17.8	14.3	21.5	16.9
Out-of-state students	35.9	25.0	50.0	37.8	27.3	57.1	30.3	29.6	25.0	42.0	34.4
Full-pay students	34.2	32.3	51.3	41.9	38.1	28.0	24.3	32.4	9.1	48.0	31.2
Adult students (over age 24)	32.4	41.1	14.7	19.5	17.4	40.0	24.3	53.3	54.5	42.9	28.5
Veterans/military personnel	24.1	33.9	19.5	18.8	29.2	20.0	23.4	28.7	28.6	23.7	24.2

3. How important are the following strategies for the undergraduate admissions efforts (and enrollment targets) at your institution over the next two-three years?

Percent reporting very important (score= 6/7; scale 1=not important; 7=very important)

Recruiting more "local" students (students who live closer to the college)	25.2	62.6	18.9	31.7	41.7	4.2	23.1	27.5	30.0	19.7	27.0
Recruiting more out-of-state students (domestic)	37.6	26.3	53.3	47.9	26.1	25.9	34.2	34.5	9.1	28.9	42.4
Recruiting more international students	30.3	21.2	42.2	31.9	18.2	42.9	21.8	29.9	33.3	32.1	29.7
Recruiting more "full-pay" students	31.7	34.4	46.5	44.7	25.0	11.1	20.8	34.3	0.0	33.3	32.9
Using social media (Facebook, Twitter, etc.) as part of our communication strategy with applicants	30.2	38.3	22.0	38.8	26.1	24.1	34.2	29.1	28.6	33.3	28.8
Using merit scholarships to enhance the academic profile of our student population	28.3	24.5	19.0	31.9	21.7	28.0	28.8	31.4	27.3	32.1	27.0
Maintaining close relationships and communications with high school guidance counselors	35.6	63.6	35.7	37.5	64.0	34.5	26.9	34.8	38.5	33.3	36.3
Maintaining close relationships and communications with independent/private college counselors	17.6	24.2	8.1	18.2	22.7	16.7	17.3	20.2	10.0	18.2	17.6
Enhancing our standing in the <i>US News</i> ratings and similar college guides	13.3	n/a	7.7	22.0	14.3	15.4	10.4	12.9	30.0	15.3	11.3
Providing adequate student aid for low- and middle-income students	36.2	66.4	39.5	38.8	28.0	48.3	26.3	39.6	42.9	45.2	32.6

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants

How would you rate the effectiveness of various resources and services that students (and parents) often use in the college application/admissions process in terms of helping students find an institution that will be a good fit? Percent reporting very effective (score= 6/7; scale 1=not effective; 7=very effective)

College counselors at public high schools	18.1	45.2	15.6	36.0	24.0	10.3	9.9	17.7	0.0	16.3	20.0
College counselors at private high schools	51.8	31.3	46.7	46.0	41.7	65.5	48.1	57.5	50.0	61.6	49.0
College counselors at job placement centers	n/a	22.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Independent/private college counselors	22.4	8.0	4.4	20.4	12.5	27.6	22.5	31.3	7.1	26.5	22.2
College guides (Peterson's, Princeton Review, etc.)	4.4	3.5	2.2	6.3	4.0	0.0	2.5	7.1	7.7	4.7	4.2
College rankings (e.g., <i>US News</i>)	6.2	n/a	4.7	8.3	8.3	3.4	3.8	8.0	0.0	10.7	5.1
Data-driven college counseling tools (Naviance, etc.)	19.6	6.3	11.4	12.5	8.0	44.8	21.0	21.1	23.1	25.9	17.5
Social media sources (College Confidential, Facebook, etc.)	24.9	29.8	15.6	31.3	28.0	20.7	24.7	26.3	15.4	32.9	22.8
Financial aid/scholarship websites (FAFSA, FastWeb, Finaid.org, etc.)	28.8	48.3	20.0	31.3	40.0	20.7	22.2	35.7	23.1	35.7	27.1
College Navigator (US Dept. of Education)	10.0	14.3	9.1	12.5	8.0	0.0	9.9	12.3	0.0	10.6	10.4
College information sites supported by individual states	9.1	16.4	6.7	16.7	12.0	3.4	6.2	9.7	0.0	13.1	7.9
Mainstream press coverage of admissions	7.6	17.7	6.7	12.5	4.0	0.0	8.6	8.0	0.0	8.2	7.5

Many institutions admit some applicants who apply with lower grades and test scores than those typically admitted. For the groups below, do your admitted applicants, on average, in fact have lower grades and test scores than do other applicants? If you answered Yes to the first part of the question, do you agree or disagree with your institutional practice on this aspect of admissions practices and procedures?

Percent that yes in general, these students have lower grades/test scores

Athletes	28.0	n/a	44.4	22.4	18.2	46.4	17.3	28.9	61.5	36.0	23.6
Children of alumni	11.5	n/a	6.8	10.2	4.3	10.7	7.4	18.4	23.1	15.3	9.7
Minority students	39.3	n/a	44.2	39.6	22.7	57.1	24.7	46.5	61.5	45.2	36.4
Men (for gender balance)	11.1	n/a	4.5	6.4	18.2	3.6	13.9	14.0	0.0	14.3	10.7
Women (for gender balance)	2.7	n/a	4.5	4.3	4.5	7.1	1.3	0.9	0.0	3.6	2.6
Full-pay students	10.0	n/a	7.0	0.0	0.0	10.7	6.3	19.3	0.0	15.7	8.6
International students	9.0	n/a	9.3	8.5	4.5	17.9	2.5	12.4	15.4	8.3	9.0
Veterans	15.4	n/a	18.2	31.3	13.6	21.4	12.3	8.3	23.1	18.1	14.2

Agree/disagree with this practice

Athletes

Strongly disagree	2.2	n/a	4.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	2.7	2.3
Disagree	6.0	n/a	4.0	5.3	33.3	7.1	10.7	0.0	0.0	2.7	8.0
Agree	66.4	n/a	52.0	73.7	33.3	78.6	64.3	73.8	44.4	81.1	62.5
Strongly agree	25.4	n/a	40.0	15.8	33.3	14.3	21.4	26.2	55.6	13.5	27.3

Children of alumni

Strongly disagree	2.1	n/a	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	1.6
Disagree	6.4	n/a	0.0	7.1	20.0	22.2	0.0	5.7	0.0	7.4	6.5
Agree	64.9	n/a	58.3	71.4	20.0	77.8	73.7	62.9	40.0	77.8	61.3
Strongly agree	26.6	n/a	41.7	21.4	40.0	0.0	21.1	31.4	40.0	14.8	30.7

Minority students

Strongly disagree	0.0	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree	0.7	n/a	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Agree	59.9	n/a	57.1	59.1	66.7	47.1	75.0	56.9	30.0	59.5	63.0
Strongly agree	39.5	n/a	42.9	40.9	16.7	52.9	25.0	43.1	70.0	40.5	36.0

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
Men (for gender balance)											
Strongly disagree	1.2	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.0	1.7
Disagree	8.1	n/a	0.0	7.7	14.3	28.6	5.0	7.4	0.0	16.7	5.1
Agree	61.6	n/a	50.0	76.9	57.1	57.1	75.0	51.9	33.3	58.3	64.4
Strongly agree	29.1	n/a	50.0	15.4	28.6	14.3	20.0	37.0	66.7	25.0	28.8
Women (for gender balance)											
Strongly disagree	1.3	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	1.9
Disagree	6.7	n/a	0.0	8.3	20.0	14.3	5.3	5.0	0.0	15.0	3.9
Agree	62.7	n/a	50.0	66.7	40.0	85.7	73.7	55.0	33.3	70.0	61.5
Strongly agree	29.3	n/a	50.0	25.0	40.0	0.0	21.1	35.0	66.7	15.0	32.7
Full-pay students											
Strongly disagree	3.5	n/a	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	5.3	2.9	0.0	11.5	0.0
Disagree	4.6	n/a	9.1	9.1	0.0	12.5	0.0	2.9	0.0	3.9	5.2
Agree	62.1	n/a	54.6	54.6	50.0	87.5	68.4	58.8	33.3	73.1	58.6
Strongly agree	29.9	n/a	36.4	27.3	50.0	0.0	26.3	35.3	66.7	11.5	36.2
International students											
Strongly disagree	3.5	n/a	0.0	7.1	20.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	4.8	3.3
Disagree	5.9	n/a	0.0	14.3	0.0	11.1	0.0	7.7	0.0	9.5	5.0
Agree	64.7	n/a	50.0	57.1	60.0	88.9	73.7	61.5	50.0	71.4	63.3
Strongly agree	25.9	n/a	50.0	21.4	20.0	0.0	21.1	30.8	50.0	14.3	28.3
Veterans											
Strongly disagree	0.0	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Disagree	3.1	n/a	0.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	4.2	16.7	8.3	0.0
Agree	68.8	n/a	53.3	75.0	60.0	90.0	72.7	62.5	50.0	66.7	71.2
Strongly agree	28.1	n/a	46.7	25.0	20.0	0.0	27.3	33.3	33.3	25.0	28.8
Do Asian-American applicants at your institution need significantly higher grades and test scores to gain admission than other applicants?											
Percent reporting yes	0.9	n/a	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.3
Many campuses are reviewing the use of standardized tests in the admissions process. Is your institution giving thought to making standardized tests (ACT/SAT) optional in undergraduate admissions?											
No, we continue to require standardized tests from undergraduate applicants.	71.7	n/a	93.3	82.0	62.5	72.4	64.2	65.8	85.7	73.3	70.0
We continue to require standardized tests but are also currently reviewing this policy.	16.6		6.7	16.0	12.5	17.2	27.2	14.0	7.1	18.6	16.7
We no longer require standardized tests as part of the undergrad admissions application.	11.7		0.0	2.0	25.0	10.3	8.6	20.2	7.1	8.1	13.3
Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:											
We have expanded the use of non-traditional admissions criteria as part of our review process in the past five years.											
Strongly disagree	15.5	n/a	15.6	14.0	20.0	10.3	16.1	15.9	21.4	11.8	16.6
Disagree	44.6		42.2	36.0	52.0	48.3	45.7	46.0	42.9	49.4	43.2
Agree	32.7		35.6	42.0	28.0	24.1	33.3	30.1	28.6	29.4	33.6
Strongly agree	7.3		6.7	8.0	0.0	17.2	4.9	8.0	7.1	9.4	6.6
We have reduced the role of standardized tests in undergraduate admissions reviews and decisions in the past five years.											
Strongly disagree	23.7	n/a	20.0	30.0	29.2	27.6	21.0	22.1	28.6	27.1	22.5
Disagree	48.5		57.8	54.0	45.8	44.8	45.7	46.0	50.0	47.1	48.3
Agree	18.7		20.0	10.0	16.7	6.9	25.9	20.4	14.3	14.1	20.8
Strongly agree	9.1		2.2	6.0	8.3	20.7	7.4	11.5	7.1	11.8	8.3

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
Standardized tests (SAT, ACT) should be optional for students who apply to my campus.											
Strongly disagree	26.6	n/a	40.0	32.0	20.8	37.9	20.3	21.6	50.0	27.4	24.9
Disagree	48.8		51.1	54.0	41.7	37.9	50.6	48.7	28.6	51.2	49.0
Agree	16.3		6.7	12.0	20.8	13.8	21.5	18.0	14.3	15.5	16.9
Strongly agree	8.3		2.2	2.0	16.7	10.3	7.6	11.7	7.1	6.0	9.3
The financial downturn has forced us to pay more attention to applicants' ability to pay when we make admissions decisions.											
Strongly disagree	37.5	n/a	51.1	48.0	45.8	24.1	36.3	30.1	42.9	35.3	38.1
Disagree	40.5		35.6	40.0	37.5	55.2	41.3	38.9	35.7	36.5	42.3
Agree	18.8		13.3	10.0	8.3	17.2	20.0	26.6	21.4	24.7	16.3
Strongly agree	3.2		0.0	2.0	8.3	3.5	2.5	4.4	0.0	3.5	3.4
Students who use independent college admissions counselors usually enhance their prospects for admission to my institution.											
Strongly disagree	30.7	n/a	34.9	42.0	50.0	27.6	21.3	27.4	35.7	32.1	30.3
Disagree	57.8		60.5	56.0	37.5	65.5	62.5	56.6	64.3	56.0	57.6
Agree	11.2		4.7	2.0	12.5	6.9	16.3	15.0	0.0	11.9	11.8
Strongly agree	0.3		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.4
Social media (Facebook, Twitter) play an important role in our outreach efforts to prospective students.											
Strongly disagree	3.8	5.1	2.2	6.1	4.0	10.3	5.0	0.9	14.3	1.2	4.2
Disagree	22.0	17.8	24.4	24.5	24.0	24.1	23.8	17.7	42.9	20.2	21.7
Agree	51.3	57.6	53.3	40.8	52.0	44.8	51.3	56.6	28.6	52.4	51.7
Strongly agree	22.9	19.5	20.0	28.6	20.0	20.7	20.0	24.8	14.3	26.2	22.5
Merit scholarships are an appropriate use of institutional financial resources as part of campus efforts to improve the academic profile of our student population.											
Strongly disagree	5.0	9.4	0.0	2.0	8.3	13.8	3.7	6.2	21.4	9.4	2.5
Disagree	6.7	20.5	4.4	14.0	4.2	10.3	2.5	7.1	28.6	10.6	4.2
Agree	61.1	56.4	71.1	48.0	66.7	55.2	66.7	59.3	28.6	52.9	65.4
Strongly agree	27.2	13.7	24.4	36.0	20.8	20.7	27.2	27.4	21.4	27.1	27.9
I'm feeling more confident about our admissions efforts and enrollment prospects than I was two years ago (fall 2009).											
Strongly disagree	4.7	5.1	2.3	4.0	4.2	3.5	4.9	6.3	0.0	6.0	4.6
Disagree	21.8	29.1	22.7	24.0	4.2	17.2	27.2	21.4	14.3	17.9	23.4
Agree	47.1	53.0	38.6	52.0	62.5	51.7	40.7	48.2	64.3	47.6	45.6
Strongly agree	26.5	12.8	36.4	20.0	29.2	27.6	27.2	24.1	21.4	28.6	26.4
We have increased our discount rate in order to enroll more students											
Strongly disagree	20.8	n/a	20.9	28.9	47.8	10.3	16.3	17.9	42.9	22.5	19.2
Disagree	42.8		48.8	55.6	39.1	55.2	32.5	40.2	28.6	48.8	40.9
Agree	29.5		27.9	13.3	13.0	31.0	40.0	32.1	21.4	27.5	31.1
Strongly agree	6.9		2.3	2.2	0.0	3.5	11.3	9.8	7.1	1.3	8.9
The rate of increase in our discount rate is not sustainable.											
Strongly disagree	17.2	n/a	22.5	26.7	38.1	6.9	12.8	13.2	21.4	15.4	17.9
Disagree	48.3		65.0	57.8	47.6	58.6	41.0	40.6	50.0	53.9	46.0
Agree	25.4		10.0	13.3	4.8	31.0	29.5	35.9	28.6	25.6	25.0
Strongly agree	9.1		2.5	2.2	9.5	3.5	16.7	10.4	0.0	5.1	11.2
Our increases in the discount rate have not affected our net tuition revenue.											
Strongly disagree	15.2	n/a	13.2	14.3	31.6	0.0	14.5	18.1	21.4	13.3	15.7
Disagree	44.7		36.8	57.1	36.8	65.5	40.8	41.0	57.1	48.0	43.3
Agree	33.7		44.7	23.8	21.1	31.0	35.5	35.2	21.4	32.0	34.1
Strongly agree	6.5		5.3	4.8	10.5	3.5	9.2	5.7	0.0	6.7	6.9

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
Plagiarism is a serious problem with student admissions essays.											
Strongly disagree	13.7	n/a	22.2	14.9	20.0	10.3	11.3	11.1	7.7	8.6	16.0
Disagree	60.8		55.6	63.8	65.0	65.5	58.8	61.1	69.2	54.3	62.1
Agree	24.3		22.2	21.3	15.0	24.1	28.8	25.0	23.1	35.8	20.7
Strongly agree	1.2		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	2.8	0.0	1.2	1.3
Coaching by parents or college counselors is making it more difficult to really learn about applicants.											
Strongly disagree	6.6	n/a	17.8	8.2	13.6	0.0	2.5	4.6	7.1	2.4	8.1
Disagree	47.9		46.7	53.1	50.0	44.8	52.5	43.1	42.9	45.1	48.5
Agree	40.7		31.1	34.7	36.4	51.7	40.0	45.9	50.0	43.9	39.6
Strongly agree	4.8		4.4	4.1	0.0	3.5	5.0	6.4	0.0	8.5	3.8
Application essays convey important information about applicants.											
Strongly disagree	6.3	n/a	13.3	10.4	14.3	3.5	3.9	2.7	0.0	6.2	6.8
Disagree	26.5		20.0	33.3	42.9	20.7	24.4	26.1	7.1	18.5	30.3
Agree	61.8		62.2	52.1	38.1	69.0	70.5	62.2	85.7	65.4	59.0
Strongly agree	5.4		4.4	4.2	4.8	6.9	1.3	9.0	7.1	9.9	3.9
I have experienced pressure from senior level administrators to admit some applicants.											
Strongly disagree	31.4	44.7	20.5	36.7	40.9	24.1	28.4	35.4	28.6	32.5	31.1
Disagree	40.8	39.5	52.3	28.6	36.4	41.4	46.9	38.1	35.7	37.4	42.4
Agree	22.8	12.3	25.0	28.6	13.6	24.1	21.0	22.1	21.4	24.1	22.3
Strongly agree	5.0	3.5	2.3	6.1	9.1	10.3	3.7	4.4	14.3	6.0	4.2
I have experienced pressure from trustees/board members to admit some applicants											
Strongly disagree	33.7	59.7	29.6	42.9	40.9	24.1	28.4	36.3	35.7	28.9	35.3
Disagree	42.6	30.7	45.5	34.7	45.5	37.9	50.6	39.8	42.9	39.8	43.7
Agree	18.9	7.9	20.5	16.3	9.1	31.0	18.5	18.6	14.3	26.5	16.4
Strongly agree	4.7	1.8	4.6	6.1	4.6	6.9	2.5	5.3	7.1	4.8	4.6
I have experienced pressure from the development office and big donors to admit some applicants.											
Strongly disagree	31.3	n/a	20.5	38.8	36.4	17.2	29.6	36.4	35.7	25.6	32.6
Disagree	45.1		54.6	30.6	54.6	37.9	49.4	44.6	28.6	42.7	47.0
Agree	19.4		22.7	24.5	9.1	41.4	18.5	12.7	21.4	26.8	17.0
Strongly agree	4.2		2.3	6.1	0.0	3.5	2.5	6.4	14.3	4.9	3.4
Many institutions are enrolling more international students. What's the current policy and experience at your campus on the issues listed below for the recruitment of international undergraduates? (percentage reporting yes)											
Does your institution retain agents (paid in full or part on commission) to recruit international undergraduates?	22.0	n/a	24.4	22.4	16.0	17.2	31.3	16.8	0.0	14.0	26.5
Is your institution considering the use of such agents for international recruiting?	32.6	n/a	26.2	48.9	32.0	24.1	39.0	26.1	0.0	26.5	37.2
The NACAC draft policy on international recruiting suggests that the same standards that apply to domestic recruiting (no payment based on commission) should apply to international recruiting. Do you agree with the draft NACAC policy?	65.4	n/a	72.7	61.7	65.2	69.0	57.0	69.0	78.6	72.1	61.8
Are you experiencing a continuing problem with fabrications on international applications?	18.2	n/a	27.3	11.4	16.7	31.0	15.2	16.5	14.3	25.6	16.0
Do you believe that paid agents often play a direct role in helping international applicants fabricate information on their applications?	46.5	n/a	48.8	50.0	31.8	46.4	39.0	52.9	57.1	56.4	42.9
If your institution has retained (or is considering the use of) agents for recruiting undergraduate international students, which office made the decision to do so?											
Not applicable, we do not use agents to recruit international students.	64.3	n/a	66.7	56.3	73.9	74.1	54.4	69.4	92.3	70.2	60.1
The final decision to use agents was made/will be made in the admissions office.	11.1	n/a	8.9	4.2	4.4	7.4	12.7	16.2	0.0	11.9	11.6
The final decision to use agents was made/will be made by other senior campus administrators.	24.6	n/a	24.4	39.6	21.7	18.5	32.9	14.4	7.7	17.9	28.3

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
What proportion of the applicants for full-time undergraduate admissions do you typically admit to your college or university?											
Less than 20 percent of applicants	4.1	n/a	0.0	4.0	4.0	17.2	1.3	4.4	100.0	0.0	0.0
More than 20 percent and less than 50 percent	25.2	n/a	24.4	18.0	16.0	48.3	16.5	31.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
50 percent or more of all applicants	70.7	n/a	75.6	78.0	80.0	34.5	82.3	64.6	0.0	0.0	100.0
How would you characterize the volume of undergraduate admissions at your institution for this fall (2011) compared to fall 2010 and fall 2008?											
<i>First-year applications: fall 2011 compared to fall 2008</i>											
Total first-year applications											
Much lower	4.8	2.7	2.3	2.1	10.5	0.0	5.5	6.8	0.0	2.6	5.8
About the same	23.2	46.4	18.2	31.9	21.1	10.3	16.4	30.1	14.3	25.6	22.9
Much higher	72.1	50.9	79.6	66.0	68.4	89.7	78.1	63.1	85.7	71.8	71.3
Full-time students											
Much lower	4.8	7.2	2.3	4.1	4.0	0.0	9.1	4.6	0.0	2.5	5.9
About the same	29.1	55.0	27.3	34.7	36.0	13.8	18.2	37.6	14.3	32.1	29.1
Much higher	66.1	37.8	70.5	61.2	60.0	86.2	72.7	57.8	85.7	65.4	65.0
Part-time students											
Much lower	8.4	3.6	9.5	6.1	4.2	0.0	9.3	11.5	0.0	6.6	9.6
About the same	78.1	46.0	83.3	69.4	50.0	96.2	78.7	81.7	100.0	79.0	77.0
Much higher	13.4	50.5	7.1	24.5	45.8	3.9	12.0	6.7	0.0	14.5	13.5
Low-income students											
Much lower	3.3	1.8	0.0	4.2	4.4	0.0	3.9	4.7	0.0	1.3	4.3
About the same	61.4	50.5	62.2	56.3	56.5	44.8	66.2	65.4	42.9	66.3	60.7
Much higher	35.3	47.8	37.8	39.6	39.1	55.2	29.9	29.9	57.1	32.5	35.0
Middle-income students											
Much lower	2.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	1.3	4.6	7.1	1.2	2.1
About the same	71.5	64.6	75.0	66.7	65.2	62.1	66.7	79.6	42.9	82.7	69.2
Much higher	26.4	32.7	25.0	33.3	34.8	34.5	32.1	15.7	50.0	16.1	28.6
"Full-pay" students											
Much lower	9.3	8.1	2.4	0.0	8.7	6.9	11.7	15.1	7.1	7.7	10.0
About the same	75.0	74.8	78.6	78.7	78.3	69.0	74.0	73.6	57.1	78.2	74.9
Much higher	15.7	17.1	19.1	21.3	13.0	24.1	14.3	11.3	35.7	14.1	15.2
Minority students											
Much lower	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	1.3
About the same	46.5	69.6	53.3	34.0	60.9	24.1	53.9	47.2	28.6	47.5	47.5
Much higher	52.6	28.6	46.7	66.0	39.1	75.9	43.6	51.9	71.4	52.5	51.3
Older/returning students											
Much lower	10.2	2.7	14.3	4.0	17.4	3.6	11.5	10.6	7.1	16.9	8.2
About the same	73.2	61.8	81.0	72.0	47.8	92.9	71.8	72.1	85.7	70.1	73.8
Much higher	16.6	35.5	4.8	24.0	34.8	3.6	16.7	17.3	7.1	13.0	18.0
Veterans/military personnel											
Much lower	1.5	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	1.9	0.0	0.0	2.2
About the same	61.7	44.4	41.9	50.0	47.8	62.1	57.1	81.7	92.9	66.7	58.4
Much higher	36.8	54.6	58.1	50.0	52.2	37.9	39.0	16.4	7.1	33.3	39.5

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
<i>First-year enrollment: fall 2011 compared to fall 2008</i>											
Total first-year enrollment											
Much lower	6.1	8.3	2.3	2.1	8.3	3.5	8.0	8.3	0.0	3.7	7.3
About the same	42.4	66.1	40.9	57.5	58.3	10.3	38.7	44.0	35.7	43.9	42.2
Much higher	51.5	25.7	56.8	40.4	33.3	86.2	53.3	47.7	64.3	52.4	50.4
Full-time students											
Much lower	6.4	14.3	0.0	4.2	8.0	3.5	10.7	7.4	0.0	3.7	7.7
About the same	45.3	66.1	52.3	52.1	52.0	13.8	40.0	50.0	35.7	46.9	45.3
Much higher	48.3	19.6	47.7	43.8	40.0	82.8	49.3	42.6	64.3	49.4	47.0
Part-time students											
Much lower	4.8	5.4	4.9	6.3	4.2	3.9	4.1	4.9	0.0	2.6	5.7
About the same	88.0	58.9	92.7	83.3	62.5	92.3	89.2	92.2	100.0	89.5	86.8
Much higher	7.3	35.7	2.4	10.4	33.3	3.9	6.8	2.9	0.0	7.9	7.5
Low-income students											
Much lower	2.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	4.4	3.5	2.7	4.7	0.0	2.5	3.1
About the same	75.3	63.7	81.4	78.7	65.2	44.8	82.7	76.6	57.1	75.3	76.4
Much higher	21.9	34.5	18.6	21.3	30.4	51.7	14.7	18.7	42.9	22.2	20.5
Middle-income students											
Much lower	2.2	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	4.7	7.1	0.0	2.6
About the same	78.6	78.6	85.4	80.9	87.0	55.2	77.3	80.4	64.3	80.0	79.0
Much higher	19.3	16.1	14.6	19.2	13.0	37.9	22.7	15.0	28.6	20.0	18.4
"Full-pay" students											
Much lower	5.9	9.9	0.0	2.2	8.7	3.5	5.3	10.4	7.1	6.3	5.8
About the same	81.3	82.9	87.8	84.8	82.6	69.0	82.7	79.3	64.3	76.3	84.1
Much higher	12.8	7.2	12.2	13.0	8.7	27.6	12.0	10.4	28.6	17.5	10.2
Minority students											
Much lower	1.9	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	2.7	2.8	0.0	2.5	1.7
About the same	64.9	83.2	62.8	66.7	73.9	27.6	74.7	66.4	35.7	63.0	67.4
Much higher	33.2	15.0	37.2	33.3	26.1	69.0	22.7	30.8	64.3	34.6	30.9
Older/returning students											
Much lower	4.4	1.8	4.9	4.1	8.7	7.1	4.0	2.9	0.0	10.4	2.6
About the same	85.6	77.7	92.7	79.6	73.9	82.1	85.3	89.3	92.9	77.9	87.7
Much higher	10.0	20.5	2.4	16.3	17.4	10.7	10.7	7.8	7.1	11.7	9.7
Veterans/military personnel											
Much lower	1.6	1.8	0.0	2.0	4.6	7.1	1.4	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.9
About the same	77.0	59.3	61.0	65.3	68.2	67.9	81.1	90.3	100.0	75.0	76.2
Much higher	21.5	38.9	39.0	32.7	27.3	25.0	17.6	9.7	0.0	21.1	22.9

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
<i>First-year applications: fall 2011 compared to fall 2010</i>											
Total first year applications											
Much lower	7.7	2.7	2.4	6.1	12.5	3.5	6.8	11.2	7.7	2.4	9.7
About the same	33.5	46.4	31.0	42.9	20.8	34.5	29.7	35.5	46.2	39.3	30.8
Much higher	58.8	50.9	66.7	51.0	66.7	62.1	63.5	53.3	46.2	58.3	59.5
Full-time students											
Much lower	6.9	7.2	0.0	4.2	12.5	3.5	9.3	8.7	0.0	0.0	9.7
About the same	37.4	55.0	34.2	39.6	29.2	34.5	34.7	42.3	53.9	43.0	34.7
Much higher	55.8	37.8	65.9	56.3	58.3	62.1	56.0	49.0	46.2	57.0	55.7
Part-time students											
Much lower	7.7	3.6	13.2	10.4	4.2	3.9	5.4	7.8	8.3	4.0	8.9
About the same	78.5	46.0	79.0	70.8	50.0	88.5	81.1	84.3	83.3	81.3	77.7
Much higher	13.8	50.5	7.9	18.8	45.8	7.7	13.5	7.8	8.3	14.7	13.4
Low-income students											
Much lower	4.7	1.8	0.0	2.1	8.7	3.5	5.3	6.7	7.7	1.3	5.8
About the same	63.8	50.5	62.5	63.8	52.2	48.3	72.0	65.4	61.5	64.6	63.6
Much higher	31.5	47.8	37.5	34.0	39.1	48.3	22.7	27.9	30.8	34.2	30.7
Middle-income students											
Much lower	2.5	2.7	0.0	2.1	4.4	3.5	1.4	3.9	0.0	1.3	3.1
About the same	73.2	64.6	82.5	66.0	60.9	69.0	67.6	80.8	69.2	76.9	72.0
Much higher	24.3	32.7	17.5	31.9	34.8	27.6	31.1	15.4	30.8	21.8	24.9
"Full-pay" students											
Much lower	10.2	8.1	2.6	2.2	13.0	6.9	9.3	17.3	15.4	7.7	10.8
About the same	74.9	74.8	79.5	84.4	65.2	75.9	74.7	71.2	76.9	76.9	74.0
Much higher	14.9	17.1	18.0	13.3	21.7	17.2	16.0	11.5	7.7	15.4	15.3
Minority students											
Much lower	2.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	4.4	3.5	4.1	3.9	0.0	1.3	3.5
About the same	53.9	69.6	61.0	50.0	60.9	34.5	48.7	60.6	61.5	54.4	53.5
Much higher	43.3	28.6	39.0	50.0	34.8	62.1	47.3	35.6	38.5	44.3	42.9
Older/returning students											
Much lower	7.6	2.7	5.1	8.5	17.4	7.1	6.7	6.9	0.0	11.7	6.7
About the same	78.7	61.8	87.2	72.3	39.1	82.1	82.7	83.3	100.0	79.2	77.6
Much higher	13.7	35.5	7.7	19.2	43.5	10.7	10.7	9.8	0.0	9.1	15.7
Veterans/military personnel											
Much lower	2.2	0.9	2.5	0.0	4.4	6.9	1.3	2.0	0.0	1.3	2.7
About the same	67.9	44.4	45.0	55.3	56.5	62.1	70.7	85.2	84.6	73.1	65.5
Much higher	29.8	54.6	52.5	44.7	39.1	31.0	28.0	12.9	15.4	25.6	31.8

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC			PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's	Bacc.	Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants
<i>First-year enrollment: fall 2011 compared to fall 2008</i>											
Total first year enrollment											
Much lower	9.8	9.1	4.9	4.4	13.0	6.9	18.3	8.5	0.0	5.1	12.1
About the same	50.0	71.8	51.2	58.7	47.8	48.3	40.9	52.8	76.9	50.6	48.2
Much higher	40.2	19.1	43.9	37.0	39.1	44.8	40.9	38.7	23.1	44.3	39.7
Full-time students											
Much lower	9.3	14.3	7.5	6.4	14.3	3.5	18.1	5.9	0.0	4.1	11.6
About the same	52.7	72.3	47.5	57.5	57.1	51.7	44.4	57.8	76.9	54.1	50.9
Much higher	37.9	13.4	45.0	36.2	28.6	44.8	37.5	36.3	23.1	41.9	37.5
Part-time students											
Much lower	5.9	3.6	5.3	6.4	4.6	3.9	4.2	8.0	0.0	2.8	7.3
About the same	87.5	62.5	92.1	83.0	68.2	92.3	88.7	90.0	100.0	86.1	87.3
Much higher	6.6	33.9	2.6	10.6	27.3	3.9	7.0	2.0	0.0	11.1	5.5
Low-income students											
Much lower	5.2	2.7	0.0	4.4	9.5	3.5	5.6	6.9	0.0	1.3	6.8
About the same	76.0	69.1	81.6	69.6	57.1	69.0	83.3	77.5	76.9	76.0	75.9
Much higher	18.8	28.2	18.4	26.1	33.3	27.6	11.1	15.7	23.1	22.7	17.3
Middle-income students											
Much lower	3.9	4.5	2.6	2.2	4.8	3.5	2.8	5.9	0.0	1.3	5.0
About the same	80.6	83.8	84.6	76.1	66.7	75.9	83.3	83.3	84.6	82.7	79.6
Much higher	15.5	11.7	12.8	21.7	28.6	20.7	13.9	10.8	15.4	16.0	15.4
"Full-pay" students											
Much lower	6.6	9.9	0.0	4.6	14.3	3.5	5.6	10.0	7.7	4.1	7.3
About the same	83.2	84.7	86.8	84.1	76.2	86.2	86.1	80.0	84.6	78.1	84.9
Much higher	10.2	5.4	13.2	11.4	9.5	10.3	8.3	10.0	7.7	17.8	7.8
Minority students											
Much lower	3.2	2.7	0.0	2.1	4.8	3.5	2.8	4.9	0.0	2.7	3.6
About the same	69.1	79.5	67.5	57.5	71.4	58.6	76.4	72.6	69.2	65.3	70.4
Much higher	27.7	17.9	32.5	40.4	23.8	37.9	20.8	22.6	30.8	32.0	26.0
Older/returning students											
Much lower	5.2	1.8	2.6	4.3	14.3	7.1	5.6	4.0	0.0	9.6	4.1
About the same	86.0	74.3	94.9	80.9	57.1	82.1	87.5	90.9	100.0	79.5	87.3
Much higher	8.8	23.9	2.6	14.9	28.6	10.7	6.9	5.1	0.0	11.0	8.6
Veterans/military personnel											
Much lower	2.0	2.7	0.0	2.1	9.5	6.9	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.3
About the same	76.8	60.9	59.0	61.7	66.7	75.9	78.9	92.6	100.0	80.8	74.1
Much higher	21.2	36.4	41.0	36.2	23.8	17.2	19.7	7.4	0.0	17.8	23.6

THE 2011 INSIDE HIGHER ED SURVEY OF COLLEGE & UNIVERSITY ADMISSIONS DIRECTORS: DATA TABLES

	Four-Year Colleges & Universities	Community Colleges	PUBLIC		PRIVATE NONPROFIT			UNDERGRADUATE SELECTIVITY		
			Doctoral	Master's Bacc.	Doctoral	Master's Bacc.		Admit less than 20% of applicants	Admit from 20% to 50% of applicants	Admit at least 50% of applicants

SPECIAL QUESTIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Compared to fall 2008, is your institution enrolling more “traditional” students who in the past might have enrolled at public or private four-year colleges or universities?

A decline in the number of traditional students at my campus since 2008.	2.6
No real change in the numbers of traditional students enrolled at my campus in the past three years	15.4
A slight increase (under 5 percent) in the numbers of traditional students	29.9
A modest increase (5-15 percent) in the numbers of traditional students	37.6
A major increase (16-25 percent) increase in the numbers of traditional students	12.0
A dramatic increase (over 25 percent) in the numbers of traditional students	2.6

Compared to three years ago (fall 2008), how would you describe the competition for students with for-profit colleges?

Not really an issue for my institution; little competition from for-profits	36.4
Some additional competition compared to fall 2008, but nothing we cannot handle	34.8
Significant competition for students in selected programs (e.g., health care, information systems)	22.0
Significant competition for students across all fields and programs	6.8

Compared to three years ago (fall 2008), how would you describe the role of online programs (not courses, but complete online programs) at your institution?

Not applicable: we offer online courses, but not online programs	27.0
Not a significant component of our program offerings or of our enrollment	13.9
Generally a small, but rising component of our enrollment.	25.2
A rising and increasingly important component of our total enrollment	33.9

Are there programs at your institution (for example, nursing) where admission is highly competitive?

No: anyone who meets our basic admissions standards can enter any program.	7.0
Yes: Students must achieve certain grades in some prerequisite courses for admission to some programs.	42.6
Yes: Of students who meet basic requirements, we admit most (over 50 percent) of the applicants.	7.8
Yes: Of students who meet basic requirements, we admit less than half (50 percent) of the applicants, but more than a quarter of applicants.	22.6
Yes: Of students who meet basic requirements, we admit less than a fourth (25 percent) of the applicants.	20.0

PROFILE OF THE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

Age and gender profile of survey participants

Average Age	50	48	52	52	48	53	49	48	51	50	50
Median Age	50	50	52	53	50	53	50	48	47	49	51

Gender (percentages)

Male	59.9	28.0	57.8	46.0	56.0	75.9	65.4	59.7	78.6	64.0	58.1
Female	38.1	67.8	42.2	54.0	36.0	20.7	32.1	38.6	21.4	33.7	40.3
Unknown	2.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	8.0	3.5	2.5	1.8	0.0	2.3	1.7

How long have you served as the chief admissions officer at this institution?

Average years	7	7	7	9	6	7	7	8	10	9	7
Median years	5	6	6	6	5	6	5	5	8	7	5

Total years as an admissions or enrollment management officer at any institution:

Average years	19	13	20	19	18	23	18	19	21	21	18
Median years	19	10	19	20	15	25	18	18	20	21	18

Appendix A / Methodology

The *Inside Higher Ed* Survey of College and University Business Officers was conducted in August and early September, 2011. The survey deployed two questionnaires, one designed for four-year colleges and universities and a second developed for community colleges. There was significant overlap in the items on both questionnaires. However, the survey instrument for four-year institutions included some items that were not on the community college questionnaire; similarly, the community college survey included some items that were not on the questionnaire for four-year institutions. ¶ An e-mail invitation with a hotlink to an online questionnaire was sent in mid-August to the chief enrollment management or admissions officer at 2,040 public and private/non-profit two- and four-year colleges and universities. Discounting some 200 non-deliverable emails, the actual survey sample included some 1,840 two- and four-year colleges and universities that enroll 500 or more students.* A total of 462 senior admissions and enrollment management officers completed the survey by September 3rd, 2011. ¶ The number and types of colleges and universities that participated in the 2011 Inside Higher Ed survey of admissions officers are summarized below.

Category	Number of 2011 Survey Participants
All Institutions	462
All Public Institutions	238
Universities	45
Master's Institutions	50
Baccalaureate Colleges	25
Associate/Community Colleges	118
All Private Nonprofit Institutions	224
Universities	29
Master's Institutions	81
Baccalaureate Colleges	114
Selectivity (four-year institutions only)	
Very selective (admit less than 20 pct. of applicants)	14
Moderately selective (admit more than 20 pct. but less than 50 pct.)	86
Less selective (admit 50 pct. or more of applicants)	241

* Fall 2007 enrollment data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education System Data (IPEDS) data files of the US Department of Education reveal that 27.1 percent (1,152) of the nation's 4,253 accredited, degree-granting two- and four-year colleges and universities enroll under 500 students (headcount enrollment). These institutions account for some 271,932 (1.5 pct.) of the nation's 18.052 million college students as of fall 2007. In contrast, the 505 colleges and universities that enroll 10,000 or more students represent just 11.4 percent of the total number of U.S. degree-granting institutions yet account for 53.1 percent of total headcount enrollment, some 9.8 million students. (source: special analysis of the 2007 IPEDS enrollment data by The Campus Computing Project; see also Digest of Education Statistics 2008. U.S. Department of Education, 2008, table. 224).

Appendix B / About the Authors

KENNETH C. GREEN, senior research consultant at *Inside Higher Ed*, is also the founding director of *The Campus Computing Project*, the largest continuing study of the role of computing, eLearning, and information technology in American higher education. Launched in 1990 as an IT benchmarking project for colleges and universities, *Campus Computing* is widely cited by both campus officials and corporate executives in the college publishing and technology industries as a definitive source for data, information, and insight about a wide range of online education and information technology issues that

affect U.S. colleges and universities. Green is the author/co-author or editor of a dozen books and published research reports and more than 90 articles and commentaries that have appeared in academic journals and professional publications. He is often quoted on higher education, eLearning and information technology issues in *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Los Angeles Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Inside Higher Ed*, and other print and broadcast media. His *Digital Tweed* blog is published by *Inside Higher Ed*. In October 2002, Green received the first

EDUCAUSE Award for Leadership in Public Policy and Practice. The award cites his work in creating *The Campus Computing Project* and recognizes his “prominence in the arena of national and international technology agendas, and the linking of higher education to those agendas.” A graduate of New College (FL), Green earned a Ph.D. in higher education and public policy at the University of California, Los Angeles.

SCOTT JASCHIK is editor and one of the three founders of *Inside Higher Ed*. With Doug Leder-

man, he leads the editorial operations of *Inside Higher Ed*, overseeing news content, opinion pieces, career advice, blogs and other features. Scott is a leading voice on higher education issues, quoted regularly in publications nationwide, and publishing articles on colleges in publications such as *The New York Times*, *The Boston Globe*, *The Washington Post*, *Salon*, and elsewhere. He has been a judge or screener for the National Magazine Awards, the Online Journalism Awards, the Folio Editorial Excellence Awards, and the Education Writers Association Awards. Scott is a mentor in the community college fellowship program of the Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media. From 1999-2003, Scott was editor of *The Chronicle of Higher*

Education. Previously at *The Chronicle*, he held numerous other positions and his reporting was honored by *Investigative Reporters and Editors* and *The Washington Monthly*. Scott grew up in Rochester, N.Y., and graduated from Cornell University in 1985. He lives in Washington.

DOUG LEDERMAN is editor and one of the three founders of *Inside Higher Ed*. With Scott Jaschik, he leads the site's editorial operations, overseeing news content, opinion pieces, career advice, blogs and other features. Doug speaks widely about higher education, including on CSpan and National Public Radio and at meetings around the country, and his work has

appeared in *The New York Times*, *USA Today*, *The Christian Science Monitor*, and the *Princeton Alumni Weekly*. Doug was managing editor of *The Chronicle of Higher Education* from 1999 to 2003. Before that, Doug had worked at *The Chronicle* since 1986 in a variety of roles, including as athletics reporter and special projects editor. He has won three National Awards for Education Reporting from the Education Writers Association, including one in 2009 for a series of *Inside Higher Ed* articles on college rankings. He began his career as a news clerk at *The New York Times*. He grew up in Shaker Heights, Ohio, and graduated in 1984 from Princeton University. Doug lives with his wife, Sandy, and their two children in Bethesda, Md.

Founded in 2004, *Inside Higher Ed* (<http://insidehighered.com>) is the online source for news, opinion and jobs for all of higher education. *Inside Higher Ed* provides what higher education professionals need to thrive in their jobs or find a better one: breaking news and feature stories, provocative daily commentary, areas for comment on every article, practical career columns, and a powerful suite of tools that keep academic professionals well informed about issues and employment opportunities, and that help colleges identify and hire talented personnel. ¶ The 2011 *Inside Higher Ed* survey of college and university admissions directors was designed to provide timely data about key issues across all sectors of American higher education. Support for this project was provided by Hobsons and SunGard Higher Education.

© *Inside Higher Ed*, 2011

INSIDE
HIGHER ED

insidehighered.com

“Inside Higher Ed is one of the best resources around for timely information on higher education.”

JANICE POSTON, SPALDING UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

“I don’t know how you folks do it, but you manage to capture just the right stories at just the right moments to let me connect the dots.”

OLEG BESPALOV, SAN JOSE/EVERGREEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

“Thanks for providing such an important news source for those of us in higher education.”

ANNE-MARIE MCCARTAN, COUNCIL OF COLLEGES OF ARTS & SCIENCES

join the conversation
online. daily. free.

sign up for free daily news updates at insidehighered.com/sign_up

maximize
**INSTITUTIONAL
EFFECTIVENESS**

increase
**STUDENT
SUCCESS**



MAXIMIZE INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

Hobsons is a premier provider of innovative technology and integrated marketing solutions that empower education professionals to maximize institutional effectiveness and increase student success through the entire student lifecycle. With end-to-end, enterprise-class products built from more than 30 years of education experience and market knowledge, Hobsons helps more than 6,500 global secondary schools, colleges, and universities achieve their goals.



hobsons.com