Transcript of Interview with Kevin Browne, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Enrollment Management
June 3rd, 2010

K= Kevin Browne
G= Gregg Camfield
L= Laura Martin

0:13 Start
G: So I hope you got the questions
K: Yes
G: and were able to prepare for this
K: Yes, and no.
G: So in response to the first one, I mean, the whole thing that WASC is doing is making sure that we have procedures.
K: Yes
G: And we use data. Now, as you can see, we couched this to make sure that our explanation of data is broader than, I think, they would want.
K: Oh we have so much data. And –
G: The crucial thing is we have to do qualitative stuff because we haven't been here long enough to have a data stream that's really…
K: But given the fact that you see admissions requirements set system-wide by BOARS in the academic senate, we use the exact same admissions criteria as the other 9 undergrad campuses. Eligibility is eligibility is eligibility….
(01:00)
K: there's no difference in that.
G: Right.
K: "Selection" gets into this weird UC specific vernacular, but from a selection standpoint on admissions, we have 100 years worth of data. We know what the best predictives are and Sam Agranow and the folks at BOARS on their website have 10s of thousands of pages of data, this is just the brief summary. This is the LRDP and there are references in here to all of the data. So we've got data, don't worry about that, and we use the same admission standards, we use comprehensive review, we got an A by E policy cleared by undergrad council by less than 3% of our kids. And as you know from your senate, we can admit up to 4% of our kids A by E admissions by exception. We don't come anywhere near from a percentage at Berkley or LA or SC or anyone else even does. Berkley and LA uses all of their A by E slots. We use about 70% of them.
(02:00)
K: Can you guess why they use all of theirs?
G: It's the only way they can get any diversity probably.
K: Nope, football players. Half of the A by E slots go to athletes. This is why you never like this stuff recorded. Um, but it's a matter of public record. So their special talent is that they're a good 3-point field goal kicker. Not necessarily the fact that they ever took Physics.
G: Gotcha.
K: So, you know they can kick the ball; they just can't do the math behind it. We use ours (meaning A by E) for homeschooling kids because they don't have the A-G pattern. But they've got really good test scores. So our A by E is used also for kids that are one-tenth of a point below the minimum GPA.

QUESTION 1: How are admissions-related policies and procedures developed that respond to system-wide requirements and local campus concerns and goals? In particular, what data will you use as you work with the Admissions subcommittee of the UGC to adapt to the ETR policy that comes into effect in 2011-2012?

G: So the answer to your first question is pretty much "you're using system-wide data"?
K: Yep
(02:45)
G: But what do we use that's campus-specific?
K: For what?
G: That is to say, if we are finding students who are coming from particular schools that are…
K: Not allowed to do that.
(03:00)
G: You're not allowed to do that at all. You can't track—
K: Oh we do, we track everybody. We can track the API state-wide, and we know that kids coming from Atwater High School, I'm making up a school, that has a low API, that the kids we admit from there do as well from anywhere else.
G: You do track how well they do.
K: We do, but we can't say, "Okay Atwater; because you're a hard grader we are going to give you a tenth of a point-grade bump." And that we know that this is a good high school, and that's a bad high school. And we can't adjudicate accordingly. That's what we can't do. Because that violates the BOARS principle. And those are faculty principles, not anything that I want to do because I don't set the standards for admissions. Faculty controls that. In 1870, we give them complete control over admissions, curriculum and degrees. I'm just a hand-maiden to BOARS.
G: Okay.
(03:52)
K: And I used to say to our chair, do you know uh—I can't think of his name, our chair at BOARS at Santa Cruz, you know if we ever failed to meet our numbers he wasn't the one that was going to get fired, it was me. But you know, he was responsible for admissions, he would say. I said so what's the difference between a pig and a chicken involved in a bacon and egg breakfast? The chicken was involved but the pig was committed. We are committed to the process. Getting to the numbers is a different conversation but if you look at quality of the student, we look at the master plan: The top fifth of the high school graduating class and the 14 BOARS criteria and we've weighted them here, upon the guidance and directions of the undergrad council. And we do that for those students, but there are 1200 high schools in California, you and I could probably pick out the best 200. We would then be vilified from Eureka to National City.
G: That really wasn't the question I was driving at. What I was driving at was, if we have students who come here and they end up dropping out, do you track that kind of stuff? That is to say, if we are finding out that a school underperforms, not only in the API, but the students coming here are underprepared, and they're in need of more support, do we track that?
K: No University of California tracks that because retention, the primary issue of retention is after freshman year. And by that point, we can no longer (statistically?) go back to indicate that the high school or the community college was the problem. And the biggest reasons to leave the UC is not academic, it's financial. Which is a code word for 'my life is screwed up; I need to leave for a while.' The office of the president does yield analysis of those schools. And, as you know, the status of K-12 in this state is, shall we say, problematic? So the question is, how much responsibility to we take for that?

Because we're admitting from the top fifth, of the high school graduating class unlike the CSU who is admitting from the top third, we've not found that issue in any of the campuses and I've been around enough of them to know...
(06:00)
K:… What they're looking at. The question we get is why don't we give good schools an advantage in the GPA to allow more likely that the student be selected?
G: Well it's obvious why we can't do that.
K: We get that all the time, oh my god! All the time! And we actually give a bump to low API schools. So what you've asked is actually counterintuitive to what your colleagues have done, because their sense is: if you were successful, at a bad high school, you're the sort of kid that we're looking for. And those kids do amazingly well. The A by E kids have the highest cohort GPA on any campus in the UC system, because they're hand selected.
(06:36)
G: Now are you getting that data from UCOP?
K: We have our data, through Nancy Oshner, and us so we do GPAs, we do analysis, and most of our data is looking at yield data. The retention has never been noted any differently from any particular segment. So, LA based schools, urban schools, rural schools, we are not seeing the fact that "Atwater High School" is a bad high school.
(07:00)
G: But you are collecting that data.
K: The office of the President does, because they do it from a system-wide, because they have system-wide data.
G: And you're taking that system-wide data.
K: We look at it. It has never shown anything. And again, 1200 high schools, the top 200 high schools in the state are giving us 80% of our kids. Above 50%, may not be 80%. Might be down to 70%. They have huge sending rates, they are UC admissions engines. They are great schools.
G: What is YOUR office doing to improve the application rate from schools that are not traditionally sending students to UC?
K: Several things: 1 our applications have led the University of California in both absolute percentages in the last 3 years. Both freshmen and transfers, our freshmen are up 2%, our transfers are 49%. We are doing that by putting admissions people in the field who work with schools on a day in day out basis.
(08:01)
K: It is (retail?) outreach. So we have someone who lives in Bakersfield, it's a story I'll explain later, Los Angeles and San Jose, and we've got regional people who service the central valley. We and Berkley are the only two campuses, system-wide who recruit state-wide. Everyone else is a regional campus. More than 50% of their kids are coming locally. We are the only two who have bucked the trend. Of course, we are also the only public university in the United States, non-military, whose majority is male. We have no idea. We didn't do anything about it, we haven't affected it. We are still 52%-53% male. It makes no sense. It's stable for us; females are 56%-58% nationally. It's a 10-point swap in the national data trend. I don't plan to put it in a brochure but we do track those data points all the way along out of curiosity.
(09:00)
K: We also track every single school we visit and what their win-loss ratio is, so we can look at the top 100 high schools and I can show you how we won and lost against our major competitors. And I'll go grab the report before we're done. So we buy College Board test data, where the kids are sending test scores, plus we have all the UCOP data. So when we go out, we are going to visit 500 schools in the next year, as we build Fall 2011. And those visits are…
(09:26)

K: anywhere from an hour to 5 hour admissions, application workshop. We spend time at those schools.

QUESTION 2: What data are used in the planning and decision making processes described in response to question 1? For example, how are admissions-related policies and procedures informed by retention and graduation data?
MAYBE QUESTION 3: What is the source of each form of data identified in question 2?

G: Now you talk about that as 'retail'. You're getting UCOP data, you're getting College Board data, campus data, and you're collecting your own data.
K: From that we build a plan. And we've been sending our enrollment management plan and the communication plan to the process. And we're actually more sophisticated than most of the other campuses, and you were here in the first two years.
G: No, I wasn't.
(10:00)
K: Oh, I thought everyone else had been here, everyone else I talked to – so those were the ugly years.
G: This is my 3rd year here.
K: The first two years were horrible.
G: The first two limping years, I missed, which I think was good.
K: … We did things we probably shouldn't have done. And this goes back to the reality of that situation, but I give these out every place I go. I don't know why everyone doesn't have one of these taped to their walls. Our enrollment goals are not a secret. And even with the compact, and the rest of the negotiation, the goal is to fund the long range enrollment plan. And this was the entire document, and this was the conversation that Rory Hume had in his last summer working in the University of California. And if you've not read the chronicle of higher ed. article on Rory Hume, you've got to read it, from a comedy standpoint, because they both took them to the wood-shed in the article, and then he responded individually to every single comment that's been posted. It's hysterical.
(10:55)
K: I'm sorry. So our goal is very clear, we are growing by 600 students a year, and we are able to affect our class by getting more applications, becoming more selective, last year we became more selective than Riverside, looking at GPA and test scores. This year is going to be weird because although our SIRs are up, their SIRs were up 2000 on freshmen more than expected. Santa Barbara took it in the shorts because they're down; everyone else is sort of okay. Davis was down, but they played that weightless game. So we try among the 9 enrollment management folks to figure out what about 52,000 18-year-olds are going to do. And if you've ever tried to predict what a single 18-year-old is going to do, that's sort of our metrics, and data doesn't help us a lot with that, it really is judging the market and making it more of an art than a science. And that doesn't say we don't look at the data, but Nancy's dynamic model. I know, but I'm just being honest.
G: I'm defining data more broadly. What are the kinds of artistic—?
K: We are looking at where the students are coming from.
(12:03)
K: So right now, we are sitting around with just under two-thousand SIRs for Fall 2010. That is freaking out the Assistant Deans, no matter how many times I tell them don't worry about it. We need a class of around 1450 for Fall 2010. We need that number because the grad folks are short 50. So I got to make those up. There's a little concern about continuing rate, so I got to make that up a little bit. So we're going to melt back over the summer, so in years past… Do you know how we do admissions?
G: Generally speaking.

K: Self reported, we don't check anything. Students tell us what their courses are, what their grades are, and what their test scores are.
G: From high school…
K: And community college. No, they've got to go back to the 9th grade.
G: You've never collected transcripts?
K: Oh good God, no. The last time we accepted a transcript was 1923. Here's why, we got 400,000 applications, how many transcripts is that? We have never accepted a letter of recommendation, because we have never seen a bad one. So our goal is we are not going to deal with the paper. We tell the students to tell us what is going on, we make a decision. If they SIR on July 15th they've got to get us the final records. Last year out of nearly 50,000 SIRs we found 180 kids who were in variance to they told us on their application, system-wide. We canceled them; they are banned from the University of California for 99 years. If we did it for life, they get an appeal process. The kids are amazingly honest. The regions ordered an audit three years ago; it was 99.7% accurate. They actually believe we know more than we do, it's sort of the IRS of the 1950s, and no one dared lie. But they actually believe us, and ultimately we are going to find out, so lying doesn't do any good.
(14:00)
K: And we're able to turn, in our case, 14,000 applications around from the end of November, to March 1st. And you couldn't do that without both the online application, and the absence of two Yosemites worth of trees in a box being printed for the evaluators. And Berkeley, 75,000 applications. We don't do paper. So by doing that, we are much cleaner. So our tools this summer are going to be as kids tell us about… Clint Eastwood's last good movie is the theme of this year "Unforgiven", you get a D, didn't get us a transcript on time.
L: So that's how you are going to melt—
K: There you go. So we're going to be working on maintaining the class in strength, but again, low grades we are not going to be very forgiving this year. And in the last years we were much more of the soft-touch because we needed to be. The way the budget works is, for every 100 students we enroll, is 1.2 million dollars. If we are short 50 students, it's 600,000 dollars. And apparently you all want to have paychecks and research budgets.
(15:18)
G: Oh details, details.
K: Exactly, we've got to keep the lights on. So we're very cognizant of not going too far over, though in my projections, I always predict 1% over. That's my fudge factor, that's my enrollment management airbag. Because, in the old days, if you were more than 1% over, you'd get growth money. If you were 2% down, they would take money back. Now they haven't played that game in years. But for us, 30 either way would have a huge impact for the faculty. At Santa Cruz, I could be 300 over and nobody cared. It was 3 million dollars of free money, I'd cram them into existing sections, they were late for dorms, not my problem to deal with the rental market. But it was cash on the table. Here, we don't have the capacity so we are much more cognizant of not going over.
G: Right.
(16:00)

QUESTION 6?

K: So the 1450 includes: half a point, as point fluff, which for us is between 60 and 80 kids.
G: Now how much of your projection is based on data from the system over time, and how much of this is a feel for—

K: It's both. I mean, I've been doing the work for 20 years, so I'm going to know how the applications flow. The problem is 1) we are a new campus. We can claim that we have no baseline. I was at Santa Cruz, we had 40 years worth of data, didn't matter. Classes were all psychotic because it's an entirely different population. There was no learning mechanism so the kids who apply for Fall 2010 never saw what you sent out for the kids of 2009. So, we try to do it, and I know it frustrates the hell out of Nancy because her model is: "Oh no, you're up in SIRs you're going to be way over." No I'm not; I'm going to cut their heads off on the numbers. I can get us back to where we need to go. So we'll come in with 1450 as of census. There are things that I can do to get to that class. If you're biology, and you didn't pass your math and science in community college, I'm canceling your offer, not a problem. And that doesn't take into account the data, those are tools. So we'll get where we need to go. We are in a great situation this year because we can melt back to a stronger class. Now next year, we can get into the referral pool and some of those issues and it's going to be different and the system is going to have to pony up to that conversation.
G: Talk about that.
(17:27)
K: The referral pool. God, I could get into trouble for this, we got to turn the tape recorder off for this. President….

Part 2
K: The commitment to the referral pool needs to get addressed next year.
G: Okay can you back up now and talk about the size of the pool, and those numbers.
K: We've got additional numbers, and I can get you those numbers as well.
G: Does this have the native?
K: No, no, those are just enrollment targets. Technically if I brought it 2000 applicants and I could yield 1400 of those, everyone would be happy. We can't, so we try to grow the applications every year. That report is on the on the UCOP's site. The goal is to distinguish between those who applied to Merced showed an interest and see how we win or lose against that population against out sister campuses. We enroll about 18% of the kids who apply to us natively; the referral pool take rate is about 2%. Berkley has the best take rate which is just under 40%. Because they're competing with Harvard. I mean there's always a bigger fish. Santa Cruz bumped up this year from 17 to 23. They had a good year. Davis and Santa Barbara went down.
G: Why?
K: Just the nuances of the market. I think the messaging on the wait list. We'd have to turn—this is another conversation with (alcohol?) on what Davis did.
(01:21)
K: They had 5000 kids on their wait list. So there were just under 12,000 kids on the UC-wide wait list scam. Davis put 5000 of their kids on a wait list. Of which they all went back and talked to the first 500. So the yes, no, maybe scenario I think is a disaster. We and la are the only two campuses that did not play. Berkley didn't want to play so they got hugely pressured to be on the waitlist. So they put 200 kids on the wait list that would normally would have been in their appeal process. It's not a tool we need because we have other tricks in our bag. So Berkley and San Diego have their spring admit program. So they apply to Berkley for fall, we don't have room, so we're going to make you a spring bear. You get to come in the spring semester. San Diego does that for their winter quarter. So you have 400 kids that are going to come, they're in a drawer, if you need them, you can come and get them; without pissing off 4000 families. San Diego had 2200 kids on their wait list. They went to none. So there was 2 months in this critical cycle where they could be making other arrangements. And I don't think maybe helps us. And that's what I think affected the numbers a little, but UCOP is going to go ahead with this, because

the President has always worked on campuses with wait lists. That's what they've told us. So I think that's going to be a problem. We can manage enrollment, we can manage the numbers, and if we get a dip in applications. There are things that we can do to improve yield. So there's a whole strategy of where we go to visit. What we do as far as on campus events. We run three, and last year four, chancellor's receptions which yield events. So Steve and Mia on the road for 4 days doing events from San Diego to Fremont.
G: Okay, so much of what you're doing is, as you call it: art.
(03:14)
K: We have take rates on all of our events. And our chancellor's receptions yielded 78% of the kids who attended. I can't tell you if that's good or bad. Why did I lose the other 22%?
G: do you have that data?
K: Well I know I won 78%; I just don't know what it means.
G: well you've got all these people out in the field. Each of them has (feelers?) out—
K: Each of them do visits, and we can track every single high school of what their applications were, over the last 3 years. And whether or not we are going up or down. And we get that from (UCOP). And for the first time in the last year, they're doing our application against the national database. Do you know about the national clearinghouse scam?
G: Yes I do.
K: But the goal was, we can now tell where kids are so they applied.
G: Talk about the National Database.
(03:59)
K: so the national clearinghouse created by the banks, maybe one of the last things they did right, as a way of being able to do verification of enrollment. So there are now the 4400 recognized credit universities and colleges in the US. About 3900 are part of the clearing house. Where every year we send all of our students and the number of units that are enrolled, and the banks can do the long verification directly off of it. What we've discovered is that we can now say that John Jones who got admitted to Berkley is now at Brown. So we are finally able to look at what the UC overlap is with our out of state competitors.
G: So in specific, they didn't want to pony up the money to get that data, is that something (UCOP) is doing?

PIECE OF QUESTION 1 perhaps?
(see bold below)
K: (UCOP) is the one that didn't want to pony up the dollars, but now they want to do it. Because it's part of our accountability standards. So if we get nothing else out of that process, we can now say that our kids have great choices. I mean, we're exactly the same price, within a few dollars, as Berkley. I know that I will lose against Berkley 98/100 times. Next year I want to lose 94% of the time. And Santa Cruz we got it down to 89. We were winning 11/100, I can live with that. Best public university on the planet, because we talked about what that campus had to offer for those individuals. Our campus was found 140 years after Berkley, we've learned how to do it right. Which is part of our 'shpiel' when I'm with Berkley at an event. They really get annoyed with that. But I mean, it's Berkley, um, we look at what we are trying do at the high schools and the community colleges**.** There's a basic premise of enrollment management: so this is Merced, we draw a circle of 100 miles around the campus; we are going to get 90% of our transfers from that area, but only 10% of our freshmen. I don't care what you do, we could have people at every single high school every single day, and you're going to get about 10% of your kids from those high schools. It's intuitive why don't you think they'd come here.
(06:02)
G: They want to stay.

K: They want to get the hell out of here.
G: Except when you take the community college students. They came from local high schools too.
K: No, no, no, then they got commitments so the 2 years or 4 years, they have jobs, they have kids, they can't leave. That's why you get 90% of your transfer kids. The problem is think about how many good community colleges there are in the 100 miles surrounding this place. That's all I'm saying. Santa Cruz has their same issue. So our best feeders are from the (back something? 06:31) of other UCs.
G: you've had some good community colleges over in the bay area, from Santa Cruz.
K: (whispers) not really.
G: San Mateo one, what's that?
K: I mean, those kids would go to Stanford or USC or, so it's also about the ranking. So yes, the kids who completed those programs that get (C cleared?) is a very small number. But we've still got 2000 of them. We did what we needed to do. But it's still about, 'why do you want to go to Santa Cruz, when that's where you went for one of your high school drunken weekends?' Which is really true. You ever drive 17 in Santa Cruz County? Yeah, it's a trip. The goal is to work within the area.
(07:15)

QUESTION 4: How is admissions-related information communicated and to whom?

G: You've got all these people out in the field…
K: 5.
G: You bring them back, I assume, regularly to talk about what you're seeing and doing. Is there any specific process you use to collect that qualitative data? Do you debrief? Do you try to…?
K: we have joint meetings with both undergrad council and BOARS, and every year in July, all the Directors of Admissions meet with the BOARS committee for two days at a joint meeting, and that's the way we attempt to deal with that. But the board's policy doesn't take into account quantitative information, we have 14 criteria the local campus can wait then, but if you're a CA high school with an A-G pattern, you're on the list.
(08:01)
K: so what we talk about is what is happening at the high schools. They've dropped AP's. So we look at every one of our applicants in context. So you went to Atwater high school where they have 24 AP's and you took 1. You went to Berkley high school where they offer 1 AP exam and you took it. Your success is not the same. You did not take advantage of what you had available to you and that's part of our evaluation. We look at success in context. You had to work 20 hours a week to help pay the rent, you were a cheerleader or vice versa. How does that work out? So we try to put that in context, it doesn't deal with misery factor but it says: 'okay, you both 4.0s but, you had to work 20 hours a week, you had to be involved in a home business. Or your family owns a grocery store or whatever. How do you put that into context? That's what we pull out of the evaluation process, not the outreach process.
(09:00)
G: In the outreach process, is there any targeting particular students? Or you let the—
K: Well, Prop 209 took care of most of that. No, we track regions and schools. So if they notice a dip over a couple years, we try and figure out what's going on. But usually, if we see a blip, it's in the rearview mirror. Because "Mrs. Greenjeans" retired and they stopped offering Spanish as an AP course and since we weren't invited to her party, we didn't know. But we try to track that. I should try to explain the ELC. So eligibility in the local context. There are 4 pathways to be admitted to the University of California. State-wide A-G test pattern, SAT alone, eligible in the local context. So in the summer

between junior and senior year the Office of the President asked the 1200 high schools in the state of CA to send us the transcripts on their top 10% of their students.
(10:04)
G: Oh my God.
K: You have no idea what we do in the summer, and they do that by hiring our evaluators as overtime during the summer to evaluate, to determine who is the top 4%. And they get a nice letter from President Yudof at the end of August saying "congratulations, you're in the top 4% of your high school, you're UC eligible. To help you along, we've prepopulated an application for you on our system-wide online application from the information your high school gave us. You just have to go in and amend it." Then we tell the kids who are from 4-6% that "you're on track." 6-10% you get another letter saying, "With a little work, you might be eligible." But we populate an application for those kids that opens up in November. So if you're eligible in the local context most campuses, with the exception of Berkley and LA, will guarantee you admissions. We guarantee admissions to ELC. And those are the top 4% of any high school in CA with a graduating class greater than 50. Because if you're homeschooling, we're not going to give you ELC because you beat your brother out by 2/10ths of a point.
(11:08)
K: The 4th way is A by E. Those are the 3 regular admit conduits, then admissions by exceptions. So we are working with the high schools over summer so right now (UCOP) is writing to the schools saying, "Send us in these transcripts." 1200 packets!
G: So what you said before about now collecting transcripts on applicants. You're collecting them before they are applicants.
K: we are but we are looking at numeric values. We looking at recalculating GPA and shredding the process because all we care about is the fact that you're above 3.0 on you're A-G pattern. And again there are four GPAs on our online systems: the high school's GPA, the A-G, and the weighted GPA because we cap GPA at 4.4, with honors and AP courses, and major prep for the community college folks. Major prep is: if I'm coming from Glendale community college, and I want to go into engineering, we'll track the engineering prep courses separate. Because engineering wants to know what your math scores were.
(12:10)
G: What do you do with a high school student who has taken some of his or her high school requirements at a junior college?
K: well it happens most of the time.
G: how does that count?
K: that's the only time you can double count, community courses or UC courses, that count as honors courses and get a full GPA bump. So if you got a B, we give you an A.
G: And then you can transfer the course when you get it.
K: Yep, the only time you can double count is between college and high school. So the question is how do we make sense out of what that record is? Most of our records are now mixed. Nobody comes in with one high school any more, that is the vast minority. They will have 3 or 4 high school records because they moved a lot. And with foreclosure it's even worse. And you throw in AP and college prep. And with high schools abolishing higher level math courses, or chemistry. They are taking those at community colleges, who are now cancelling courses. SF City College two weeks ago announced they were cancelling summer. They didn't have any money. Canceled summer. After they've canceled huge courses in fall and spring. And the community college, as bad as K-12 is, is challenged. And nobody likes my solution to solve it. We could solve it tomorrow. Right now, they charge 22 dollars a unit. I think they should charge 200 dollars a unit, and if they pass the course, you get 180 dollars back. The vast majority of the classes are full at the beginning, and all opened at the beginning. Because at 22 dollars a unit, you have no skin in the game. I'm tired, I'm not driving to class, I'm going to drop it and take it next

term. So there's a huge investment on the school's part that is never balanced out. They still get the enrollment money because they were enrolled as a census. And the biggest issue is in the college prep courses. If you want to be a mechanic in those programs there's a job, but for the CSU, UC prep courses, there's just a huge lack of seats available in the sections.
(14:14)

QUESTION 6 REFERENCE

G: okay so I think we have here, processes used for managing admissions, how projections are made, how they are monitored. We don't necessarily have the roles and responsibilities of the individuals, but I can go back and fill that in.
K: such as? The enrollment targets were you thinking?
G: well, the whole process, I mean.

QUESTION 5 BEGINNING?

K: We have to divide it up a little bit, because it is not exact. So, and this is where shared government sort of comes in, so: the chancellor sets the campus enrollment targets and consultation with the Office of the President. So this is the process, and you've got all the secrets. And Peggy O'Day, was the only senate rep from a campus who came to that meeting, and Merced brought a faculty rep. No one else did. Everyone else brought administrators. I attended on behalf of Merced with Keith and Peggy. The goal was it was a faculty buy-in, enrollment management is a faculty capacity, so the goal has been: are these targets rational? That's the whole debate with this conversation about the compact. We have a target. You can argue about space and those things, which is why we are trying to create the Campus Enrollment Management Committee. So the senate countered on the charge that I wrote, that Keith presented back and forth. That—
G: I believe that is going to be done pretty soon right?
K: It's been 18 months.
L: I thought the goal—
K: Well I proposed it 18 months ago.
G: We understand.
K: So the goal is to have that committee be a sounding board for a wide variety of folks who would then be an advisory to the chancellor. And ultimately the targets are the chancellor's responsibility. Because it's financial. Who we get is a faculty choice. How many we get is has always been management's responsibility at the table. You're not going to go out and recruit probably. Although, faculty has been great now that we've got a defined role with these programs. So we do have a plan now-2020 which is pretty good. Whether or not they will fund us for any of this stuff, I can't really guarantee. But there is a process; right now it is almost entirely administrative. And nobody is happy with that, including us. The debate continually goes back on who we should be admitting. Not how we should admit. Should we be looking at major prep, or looking at major interest? And I'm of the mind, No. Because 50% of our kids, like every other campus are undeclared, the other 50% are wrong. So LA got around that by having the School of Arts and Letters, everybody is in Arts and Letters unless you're in Engineering or Architecture. We chose not to do that here. Good, bad, or indifferent. We went with the Berkley model with 3, and now 4, schools, which is the school of undeclared. And that's the largest school. But if you do the admissions based on major, you're building your entire future on a bed of sand. So we said to the schools, "no, we'll admit based on UC eligibility, you can hold students to a higher standard when they declare a major." Santa Cruz we had a Psych major, pre-psych, and a pre-pre-psych major.

(17:37)
G: We've got that problem on UGC.
K: Well we've resolved that problem with Biology; I think we've resolved it with Engineering. SSHA needs to figure what they want to do. Gatekeeper courses are actually the better model to control admissions into a program. And then you create the internal economy. At Santa Cruz, did this audit, 70% of engineering students that came in graduated from another major. Sorry, another school. So there's an internal economy that we need to get our heads around.
G: 70% is high for engineering.
K: 70%. National standard.
G: I thought that engineering was about 60%.

QUESTION 6 PIECE

K: Who don't graduate, not who drop out. That's another number. But those who do graduate, we've found that 70% graduate from another major. Mostly SSHA type majors. Which is why we need to get Management and other things moving, but that's just me. So that's how we get numbers. Application is, there is no direct correlation, because if we go too high, I can beat us back. If we are too low, I can inflate. So my first year here, to meet the class, we stayed open until April. This year we closed on November 30th. There are things I can do to manage the class. In the first year, we were short 600. Second year we were short 1000. With the growth in the last 3 years we are now back on target. First two years it was really barren around here, I mean it was really hard to market this place when everyone is going to class in hard-hats. Majors weren't named right; there wasn't a clear pathway to graduate school with the explanation of the WASC status. I mean, this campus had everything thrown at it but, you know money.
L: So what happens to students if they're admitted to the campus and are in the undeclared pool, and every school has some sort cut-off?
K: Well it's a gate-keeper course. They would all be able to get into the first course. And if they fail that course, they are demajored. And the way we nicknamed Natural Science's demajoring process is "Natural Deselection", so, there is a process, and it's not a bad one. They go into undeclared; our goal is that they shouldn't be bounced from the university because they didn't make it as Biology major.
L: right, which is what the old model would do.
K: There is no really good model but right now, there's one advisor who works for Elizabeth with 1500 majors. She is advising and undeclared. So our number one priority in the division is to create another advising position, the national standard is 1 to 500. We are slightly above it right now. Well we get one this year, we will be thankful. We also need tutoring space is what we are looking for. So one of the subcommittees of this enrollment management committee is looking at space. So we've got the new Social sciences Management building coming open. One of the questions is, we got the Dean's suite for SSHA, could that be an interesting university-wide advising center? We could pull them out of all the Deans' offices. Several of the Deans would like a new SSHA advisor, and engineering advisor, and this area managed by Elizabeth and the undeclared advisors. So you've got critical mass, it'd be an interesting idea. We made one mistake; we never built a SSHA Dean's office in social sciences. It wasn't built in the building; we built a Dean of Management's Suite. We never built the Dean of SSHA in there so we are looking at that space and trying to be more creative with how do we handle those advising issues. That's why it went so long because that answer is I think there is some creativity we could bring into this. Our students are as well prepared as almost any other campus. That may not be good news, but it is in fact, accurate. Our kids are admittable to 90% of American higher education.
(21:33)
L: Just based on their…?

K: GPA, high school prep, and what their grades are once they get here. I mean, Berkley is weird because their average GPA was 4.4. Their retention rate is 97%. Our retention rate is 88%, I was at Purdue for 3 years and our rate was 46%. For big 10, that was pretty good.
G: They should be embarrassed.
K: It's Indiana, we're always embarrassed. Sorry, I'm from New York. But for a land-grant school, that was a good number. Our numbers are double the national average; the problem is we are below everyone else in the UC system. That's like being the one short guy on a basketball team. You might be 6'2'', but when standing next to 7', 7'8'', you're short. So our number is nothing to be embarrassed about except in the company we choose to keep.
G: We can manage that.
(22:24)
K: And we're getting better at that every year. So our goal is to improve retention once a year, one point. And to improve the yield 1% a year. We are also looking to recruit international students who tend to have much better academic records.
G: Okay now, you have a goal to improve retention 1pt a year. You also have management tools to get the class size where you want. So sometimes I can see that these goals will be going like "this."
K: Oh we are crazy this time of year. We are looking at summer numbers retention numbers and Fall admission numbers. And none of them are complete.
(23:01)
G: So how do you in your primary responsibility, admissions, how do you improve retention numbers?
K: Well I also oversee the registrar and financial aid. The visitor center and student first. It's looking at everything, and one of the ways we are looking at retention is, we track every single student who is eligible to come back to Fall 2010 and has not registered. And we've been contacting them nonstop. I'm surprised they haven't cited us for stalking at some point. So, first two weeks of term, the registrar personally goes to the classes to say you're registered but you haven't paid and we're about to drop you. We knock on doors on the dorms, we go after the individual. We have, during the first few weeks of every term what we call a "Come to Jesus" meeting. Financial aid, cashiers, housing, the advisors, the schools, registrar, financial aid admissions, who go through rosters of every single kid who is not enrolled. And where are they? And we know every single student, because it's the same list every single year. He hasn't registered yet.
G: you get that data from?
(24:06)
K: From the registrar's banner system.
G: From banner.
K: It's three populations, those who are eligible, those who are registered but have not paid, those who have paid but not registered. Then the grad division who is just all screwed up so we gave up on them.
G: There are some who have paid but not registered?
K: Yes.
G: Now that's odd.
(24:26)
K: Because they thought they registered, so in my reports this morning on SIRs we've got. I live off this report every day. We've got 81 kids who started the SIR process but haven't finished it. So we called them the week that they are in that population saying, "Did you think you finished?"
G: Now this is all in banner?

QUESTION2/3?

K: This is an extra (section of) banner. We get that report every morning at 5am; this is what I wake up to every morning with coffee.
G: And you share that with?
K: Everybody, that's the list it goes to. The problem is, and I'll be frank with this, every time I send this to the Assistant Dean or the Deans, I got to spend two days putting out the fires. "Oh my God, you're bringing in 2000 freshmen? What the hell do you expect us to do?" By the time I get (Cammy?) off the wall, or James, it's not worth it. So I normally don't tell anybody the first few months that these reports come in. The chancellor used to ask for the SIR numbers, and I won't give it to him. Because we go up and down. Yes, this is a high number, this is our total SIRs, but I can melt that. It's easy to melt than build. And one because most of those folks were here the first few years, they don't believe anything. (25:45)
G: Okay so SIR complete, SIR rescind?
K: We canceled them.
L: We did it.
K: Yep
G: This will increase—
K: Oh yeah! So will the next one. 'Rescind' means a student who has canceled it, 'Canceled' means we canceled it. So we track all those… You keep that…. There's got to be some trust in the process, and I think in the last 3 years we've come in exactly on target. And that is our goal.
G: And then, SIR number?
K: No, they told us, no.
L: They said no, they were offered and said no.
K: And we track those. I want to know where everyone is in the universe; we track down to the (N of 1?) I know where every student ended up.
G: So the rescind they send us in the SIR and then they backed out?
K: correct. And now see; now they are part of our summer melt. I got married, I got pregnant, I got a better school, I got drafted, and we lost the house, whatever the story is. And we call each of those individuals as a follow-up so that if they say it's financial, financial aid calls them. We talk about payment plan; we try to save everyone we can. At least of the continuing. And the way this works out, this gets a little confusing because you have to look at applications. That's the referral pool. That's the regular. Early opt-in is a program we started two years ago when I got rid of Shared Experience. Which was like the bane of our existence thanks to the San Jose Mercury News. Kids who applied to the University, but not to Merced, we write to them in January and say 'did you think about us?' and they can add us. And this year 1100 kids added us. We got 160 SIRs out of that. In January, I can work with those kids to get a good yield number.
G: That's actually very high.
K: Yeah, thank you. We are pretty good at this, we've cleaned up our materials, and I mean our publications 3 years ago were horrible. 4 years ago. We now have a family publication. That said put Merced into a context that family can use to judge us against our sister campuses. I'm going to work with Sam on the grad piece because I still hate that piece. There are fewer and fewer pieces that I really hate. But our publications were horrible; we didn't have a visitor's guide, for example. So we now run 21000 people a year through our visitor's center. We have the first UC international brochure since 1868. We've never done one of these and Merced did it first.
G: Do you have these all online?
K, L: yeah they're in the CPR.

K: but the visitor's guide, half is the campus, half is about the city.
G: Do you think they'd remember everything in the CPR?
L: He wouldn't know. I know.
K: But I think we are getting much better in our publications, trying to talk about the Merced experience. The graduate division programs, we need to work on, because you can recruit centrally and make decisions decentrally. That's the model we had at Santa Cruz and it worked out pretty well. My regional staff is now doing some of the graduate fairs because they are in the regions. We can cover more things, less costs, more efficient. And for my staff it gets them some additional experience in other areas of admissions. Again, in all of our (paths?) we talk about the graduate programs as well as the undergrad, because we need to prove that we are in fact a university.
(29:10)
G, L: Right.
K: we track those individuals, you can track early opt-in referral-regular, and there's no early opt-in for transfers. So just referral and regular. And then we run this every morning. And again, this is where I would like to be, my guess is that we come in at 1925. So we're actually up. Last year the high water mark was 1600. We sweated meeting our numbers for Fall. So we go through, it is individual and even a campus of 17-19,000 like Santa Cruz does the exact same thing we are going to be doing for the next 10 years. First two weeks, triage. Where is john? I'm not kidding you; we go through every single individual.
G: I'm not surprised. I see my students.
K: But we picked up last year, through this cycle, 150 FTE. That was 1,000,008. That we picked up for a couple 30 min meetings.
G: So tell us how financial aid picture fits into this whole process.
K: Leveraging, good news and bad news.
G: That I'm sure you need lots of data.
(30:22)
K: well, luckily the methodology is federally mandated. So the federal financial aid process is pretty clear on the financial aid regulations. The biggest pot of money is the university return to aid.
G: Back up for just a second, where can we find all of the federal financial aid?
K: Financial aid website. Yeah, but that's not actually the interesting part. The interesting part is—
G: I'm just thinking about, when I'm putting the report together, what links I need to make, and where. And this is not something that the WASC people are going to really look at, what they are going to do is the have a checklist.
K: But our financial aid process is so… comprehensive and complete that no one on the WASC team is going to have anything even resembling what we do. So if you look at the folks who might know.
G: Oh well if it's something we do really well and interestingly let's talk about it.
K: It's a massive amount of money, and we do it really well, we've done studies for the last 30 years over 'indebtiture' of CSU graduates versus UC graduates, our costs are a 1/3rd to 50% more depending on how you cost it out. UC students at the end of a 4yr degree have about a 1300 dollar increase in total debt than a CSU student. We fund really well. Return to Aid is a very good model. So 33% of every dollar of every increase is going back to aid, so we've got the blue and the gold that says if you have a family of 70,000 or less, you pay nothing. Family contribution is zero. Assuming you're in the country legally, filed your taxes and got a SS number. And the vast majority do. We have very few (AB-540?) students here.
(32:09)
G: (AB-540)?

K: It was the CA law that said if the last 3 years of schooling was in California for the purposes of tuition, we are going to make you a California resident. Do you know the second largest group of illegal immigrants is? Mexicans are first. Irish is second largest. So my people get anywhere.
…
Here's where it gets confusing and I don't know how much we want to go into this because it's simply a proposal, but right now there is a committee of the UC called EFM, Educational Funding Model. And for the last twenty years or more the University of California has said, as a principle: money will follow need. We are going to take all of the Return to Aid from all 9 undergrad campuses and we're going to give it to those campuses who have enrolled the highest percentage of students with need. We've done this for 20 years. And they've been doing modeling that says, if you apply it at 3 campuses, the package is going to be about the same. We're not going to get into a bidding war. You're going to get what you need. Two of our campuses, say larger and more urban areas have decided, hey we are getting screwed in this. So there's a proposal—
G: Let me guess which two…
(33:37)
K: I don't want to name names. Their position is, money should follow head count. If we enroll them, we should get their return to aid. So Jane and others have been fighting to say, no. In the sake of fairness. And if Berkley wants more of the financial aid money, go recruit poor students. It's very simple. But for them, 5 million dollars will buy how many more national merits on my finalists? So they've got a case.
G: but they don't need to buy.
K: I wasn't going to go that far. But yes.
G: What I've learned about budgeting in this system, UCLA and Berkley should be taxed heavily because they are so well to do. Their complaints are just really self serving.
K: That's what the compromise might be. The compromise might be that yes, the campuses get their Return to Aid on campus, but then we're going to tax them for a central pot. Because, this President doesn't want (UCOP) doing anything. So the idea of keeping the money on the campus and doing a TOE (Transfer of Expenses) later is very attractive to them. I think it's very short-sighted, and really reduces our ability to leverage need to students. We do the best the job of educating low-income highly qualified students of any university in the country. If you look at (held?) grant recipients, we are the first 9 positions in national rankings. The only other one that is even in the top 15 is USC.

POTENTIALLY MORE USEFUL INFORMATION

G: See you're throwing data at us, where are you getting this?
K: (UCOP).
(35:10)
K: there's a (petal/pedal?) report. And Diana can go onto this forever. In general, the University of California (off the record) we have a great relation with the financial aid office at (UCOP). And if they have 100,000 left over, we get it. Because 100,000 for us is great! Berkley thinks it's an accounting error. So whenever there is short money, we've done very well. And we've been able to leverage our students' financial aids in ways I never could at Santa Cruz. So we are, because we are small, every little bit helps. And the 10 million dollar grant will help. Or the 10 million dollar campaign currently underway will help.
G: how much does the fact that we're small help you recruit students?
K: It's a double-edged sword. We sell it, but one of the reasons why we've got the graduate programs here, the list is really short. We need more majors. And I know we need more faculty. And I can't help that argument, what I can say is we need more majors, minors, grad students to be TAs, we need, we

need, we need. One of the reasons I'm willing to move people off properties is to make more space here for faculty eventually because we're not going to get anything in the "surge" building, Social Sciences, Management, gave me one class room. I get one classroom, and I got it to 60 because I took out all of the AV equipment. It was going to be a 40-seater; I took out the disks and said Crap! It's still going to have media, but it's not going to be able to broadcast to the space shuttle. Which is apparently what Rich wanted at some point. So I got one room of 60, and that's it until Engineering 2. I gain nothing, but if you look at the enrollment trend we're going to be 1800 more. So because I oversee registrar and space, I know what the admissions impact is. If we are successful, life it going to get really interesting. Which is why the "surge" building comes through. But again, until they get a decision o the budget, and the lease-bond issue, we may not see anything until Science and Engineering 2. Or whatever the hell we'll call it. But there's no instructional space gain. Even in "surge" I get no wet labs. I get 6 wet-labs for the entire campus. And again, nobody wants to go to Castle, so we keep the faculty here. The accountants, HR, what else can we move off campus? I'm not willing to articulate that unless we are willing to do it. If I move 6 people over already. I'm waiting for Keith to give me the space; it's only been 27 months. Because he was holding it for faculty, I think his visioning was right, but I don't believe any faculty will ever go there.
(37:58)
L: There is a core group of faculty there.
K: That would leave in a minute. Administrators we can put there. Because we don't need wet labs, we don't need piped in gas, I don't need refrigerators. I mean, my footprint is pretty small. I just need offices and cubicle space. So financial aid I think we are going to do very well. And I can get you more information on that.
L: we had some reports for…
K: Diana sent most of hers, if you go to the financial aid site, we talk about the rest. The interesting part is that Diana has put out, onto the street, about 180 million dollars worth of aid for next year. She has 60. She's got to package every one we've admitted.
G, L: then we melt.
K: We hope. We wrote checks, they get cashed and it freaks out Monir but we can't offer admissions without financial aid. Financial aid is a fiscal commitment. So we know what we've leveraged, I tell Keith, he turns (pal/pale?) and we move on. There's nothing else we can do. That's how we do it. And the way we get our yield is we do a complete package. We have financial aid and the admin offer. Berkley doesn't, it's weeks and months later. But it's Berkley so who cares? Berkley could get away with murder. When they send out their decisions, they close down their phone systems for 3 days. They're not taking any calls because they don't want to talk to anybody. They want them to read the documents. But if I did that? I'd be nailed to the side of the building by Jane.
G: One big question here and, I think you've answered it already, essentially. But I want to make sure that it's specific. There's a new ETR policy that comes into effect in 2011-2012. What are you going to be doing to address that?

QUESTION 1 ETR POLICY

K: Absolutely nothing. It will have no effect on us.
G: Because?
(40:05)
K: It will have no effect on anybody, just being honest about it. Entitled to Review is a redefinition of how we describe something. It is not how we do anything. So one of the reasons I've invited Michael Brown to lunch, he wrote it, I want him to tell people: this is what it really means: It can't mean

anything if you think about it, because we are creating no additional slots at the university. So there are no more places. All this is about is rearranging deck chairs on the Titanic, but just don't put that in the report. For us it will mean nothing, we will use Entitled to Review before we deny anybody. We admit almost everybody. That'll be our A by E review process. It talks about getting rid of SAT2s; I go either way on that. Given my test scores I never thought I'd be defending the SAT but the high school GPA, and the SAT2s were the best predictors of UC success. We have 50 years worth of data. SAT1 doesn't give us much, but we couldn't get rid of it, because it would put ACT out of business because they don't offer subject tests. My take, off the record, unofficial, so we've got the SAT the 3 components and high school GPA, great predictors. But the SAT2s were better predictors, and we've gotten rid of them. That allegedly will clear the threshold. The hope is that more people will apply. We have no new place to put anyone. Doesn't that just sounds like you're going to piss off a whole bunch more people? Who have given you $65 when there's no more room at the end? So my take is: it's not going to do anything. It's about imaging to the population that we are now going to have a referral pool down to 9% instead of 11%. We don't have room for everybody; we're the last ones in the referral pool. So yeah, they've cut it from 1/5th to 9%. The guarantee is 9%. No campus next year will be in the referral pool. So just cheesed off a bunch of people that way.
(42:19)
G: So basically the 9-11%, that 2% is the ETR?
K: No the ETR is everybody. Everybody would be Entitled to Review, but if you're selected and deemed eligible, then the guarantee would go from everybody who is eligible to the top 9%. But we're not going to have room for them anyway. So I see us spending hundreds of thousands to do this, with no net result, and all the modeling we've done, the same kids would've been admitted under Comprehensive Review, will be admitted under ETR.
(42:52)
G: Is there anything that you're going to have to change in terms of your procedures?
K: Yeah, I'm going to have to be nice when I talk about this in public. I'll do that, I'll be fine. For us, no. In 20 years when we are as selective as Berkley, yeah. But you don't think they'll have something else by then? No, I've talked to Susan and others, even Martha; they're saying you'll need hundreds of thousands of dollars. I do, but not for this. If you're going to give me money I can do a better job of yielding a better class. I can do a better job of recruiting students from more interesting niche markets internationally, and domestically. We can do a better job on graduate. But for the evaluation, no.
G: There are other things that are happening system-wide that might have an impact, you've mentioned one of them. The idea of recruiting international students, what do you do there?
(43:48)
K: we've lead the charge on that. Well, after 7 years of griping, what are you doing on the 13th-14th of June?
G: I'm not going to be here.
K: Smart man.
G: I'm on a 9month contract; I'm giving my time right now.
K: Ah, well I'm taking my first vacation in 4 years, so I have empathy; you actually work more than me. So, I should give you this. So I've bitched about this for 7 years. When I first started doing international recruiting for Santa Cruz, people in the office of the President said I'd be going to prison, literally. The level of xenophobia, because I was using state money to recruit internationally. I asked for the words in writing and she said 'well it's not in writing, you should just know'. So we've got a first ever system-wide conversation about non-resident recruitment, we got Chancellor Birgeneau to the (key-note?); we've got 10 people from every campus. We are going to figure how we are going to work together. Summer, extension, credit, and the grad divisions. Looking to see what partnership we can do in the first day is all about data that UCOP has. The University of California, for the last 60 years has operated a Venus

flytrap methodology in undergraduate nonresident recruitment. You would stand there with your mouth open and if you flew in, we would reluctantly deal with you. Because of name and whatnot, Berkley got to 8%. Birgeneau wants them to be 25% nonresident. Their incoming class is 24% nonresident. It surprised even the admissions people. Their view is that the state of California has room for—that the state of California can pay for 5,000 FTE but we got room for 5,500, we are going to fill the place up, and the state of California can have as much enrollment, and by extension, as much diversity as it can afford. And we have an easier pathway on the international domestic nonresident is more of a tricky subject. Because they are eligible for federal aid, and what do we do with those individuals? Here's an interesting question, Berkley's got room for 3,500 California residents, and they are going to have 500 nonresidents who are going to pay an extra 25,000 dollars. Kid from Bakersfield says, 'fine, I'll pay the nonresident fees.' We don't have an answer for that question. So what we've done is to develop a strategy of key-markets so the State of California 6 years ago awarded a contract to handle recruitment into California from 4 countries: Vietnam, China, Canada, and Mexico. Paid for between the governor's office, and the US Department of Commerce, studyincalifornia.com. We are the only campus involved with them. Insane. It is just insane. When I travel I travel with Berkley because it is Berkley and Merced. So we're the little bird on the elephant who gets to go through the tall grass. I'm fine with that. Because what they can't deal with is more than enough for me. We've been very selective. We just had our first ever UC-sponsored trip to China two weeks ago. Independent Chinese foundation paid for all 9 of the campuses to send a recruiter to visit 11 cities in 14 days. San Diego and Santa Cruz didn't send anyone to a free trip. It drives me crazy because it's an opportunity to leverage the University of California branding because while we fight competitively in the state, and lie to one another horribly, Riverside has never given me correct numbers in 9 years, and I know they lie. They know, I know they lie. And we're fine. But out of state, if you look at Destination Indiana and Destination Philadelphia have done branding together, can you imagine what we could do as the University of California could do going in somewhere? It'd be huge; all of us could be in a pact. So our brochure is the base of the UC new international brochure. We've never attached this market. 50% of our graduates are international. We've never built up our undergraduate component. Huge cadre of in the California community colleges who we are going after first. So Merced has the first International Transfer Admission Guarantee of any campus in the UC that— is two years old. We have 36 agreements. Irvine, Santa Barbara, San Diego, are now copying out I-TAG agreement. Because there are thousands of F1 Visa students enrolled in California community colleges. There's 150 Russians down in Coalinga. How the hell they got there is beyond me. But they want to articulate if they can live in West Hills, in the middle of nowhere, Merced is going to seem like Eden. So when we are looking after, we've identified nontraditional markets, I do the Middle East pretty extensively, having lived there for 9 years. We're looking at selected areas in China and Central and South America. So we were just in Santiago on the graduate recruitment, I was helping Sam out.
(48:49)
K: Sam couldn't go so Ariel Escobar and Alex from my office went down with two other campuses. Huge event, you know what Chile did right? Okay so 5 years ago Chile sold all of the national mining mineral resources to China, all for about 50 billion US dollars. They put 5 billion of that into a millennial fund to send Chilean undergrads who completed "bachloriate" degrees, to earn PhD abroad. And they signed agreements with Canada, Spain, England, and the University of California. Not California, not the United States, us (the UC system). They send 500 fully sponsored PhD students, everything. We got 114 of them system-wide, Davis has the majority. Every grad student that I can bring in, is one less Freshman I need to find at the last minute. So I got to find 50 more because grad division is short. Santa Cruz is always short too so I'm used to this. But it helps us with that mix and I need those 50 grad students to be TAs for the undergrad courses. It really is the circle of life. This is why we look at enrollment management from a macro standpoint, not micro. It's not admissions, it's not just the registrar, it's not

just financial aid, it's not just marketing, it's not just publications, it's not just graduate division, and it's not just international. It is everything. So the international program staff is now in admissions. So we made their public area our old break room. Because, for one, we are out of space. But we also want them cohabitating to understand that international is the way we are going to meet 8% of our target eventually. So you got the brochure and the agenda. So Birgeneau has been a great lightning rod, he's gone so far out on this. And now the new chancellor at Davis as well.
(50:42)
G: Now if you have any input back into the system, the system is getting killed on the PR for this. Because what the university is saying looks like a horrible contradiction. It's saying, "we're going to recruit students from out of the state, and out of the country but not depriving any Californians of any places." To the rest of the world, what that looks like is a lie. What we have to say is, "we are not depriving any state-funded spaces." In other words it's got to be thrown back on the legislature.
K: well we need, well that's what we said. My line is, "if we have room, the state has paid for X number of students."
G: But that's not getting out.
K: I know.
G: When I see this ever come up in the newspaper.
K: Which is why we are fighting with the Fresno Bee. But we've attempted to place those stories, but that's not good news.
G: but when we say it, "oh we're not displacing any Californian students." We need to make sure what we mean by that is that the state has funded X and we're not displacing any of those.
(51:40)
K: I wouldn't say we're not displacing. But no one from Bulgaria is taking any kids place from Bakersfield. They're different targets.
G: Yes.
K: and that's what we've been trying to—it's not getting picked up.
G: Well no, because—
K: and I had to tell the Chronicle article this morning about the salaries again. Oh that's back on the front page.
G: executive salaries you mean?
(52:00)
K: Oh yeah. Well they're coaches and doctors. I mean, Yudof is like the 87th highest paid person in the university. Because I used to go through the list. When I first started working for the University of California, I was the 11,715th highest paid employee in the university. My goal was to break 10,000 at some point before retirement. Not going to happen. But no, we've been trying to be very careful about the message. For us it's about diversity, the fact that a lot of our kids are not going to be able to do an education abroad program. So how do we bring the world to them? And how do we get kids into the graduate school conduit. And this is one of the ways we've attempted to deal with that, but it's sort of interesting that we're the ones leading this. I can't help UCOPs' messaging. We attempt to.
(52:47)
G: Well you do have some feedback. Minimal but, we're getting killed on that one because we're speaking with insider knowledge that there are these two pools. Here's the one our state is paying for, and here is the capacity. We want to fill the capacity, but the state is not paying for it. And we're going to stop giving California students a free ride. We don't want to say that.
K: we stopped that a long time ago.
G: but I think what we need to be very clear on is that these are two different pools, and the state isn't paying for more than this. That's what – we're not displacing.

K: but the university won't articulate a target for the campuses based on FTE, they do it by dollar amount. And I think that's problematic, but this is not an administration at UCOP where we have much influence with. Especially through my counterparts.
(53:34)
G: Okay, is there anything else that you can think of that's coming down the pike? Or, I guess there's one other question. The degree to which these practices and procedures that you have are in a handbook for your employees or are written out?
K: Well you've got the enrollment management plan. You've got the communication calendar, that's part of the documents. We update that, we just met for two hours yesterday to update the calendar. Chon has huge reports on what they do. 30-40 pages. I've never read one. Only because, ultimately the only measurement that we're held accountable to is: did you meet enrollment target? Nobody cares about anything else. Did you meet target? And the way we can justify the agreement with the office of the president is for the last 3 years is because we've made targets. And they no longer ask, "Are you even viable?" So we've at least moved that conversation, but what I will give you though is… Chon's report is in there. And financial aid's.
L: I have this one from last year.
(54:38)
K: I think we gave you everything and Jane is working, Jane is a great historian. She actually loves writing this stuff.
L: Yeah we have all this.
K: I told her I'd read this when I retire. Because the only thing your colleagues, or mine, care about is: are we going to be short? Or too high? And in Santa Cruz, the logic was, if you're too high the faculty was upset with you. If you were too short, the chancellor was upset. The chancellor can fire me. So guess which way we are going to err. But because I also do facilities, we can't create any more sections and Keith won't release any more adjunct dollars. And we didn't get the TAs, so now what are we going to do? We can't go big, I mean, we can grow our way out of this budget crisis. If we had two more buildings. And you know, if we had 50 more faculty lying around. So instead of the 50, we got 85 that had been proposed. We know we need more faculty. I mean, that's the only way you can grow more majors, which is the way I can increase student enrollment. Now, we've got to grow in SSHA, and I know nobody likes to hear it, but Management is one of the low hanging fruits. I don't know why they think that is a low cost major but…
G: Who thinks it's a low cost major?
(55:48)
K: Larry (Pits?). "All SSHA is low-cost." Maybe compared to—
L: Well relatively, maybe.
G: Management is the high-cost, and Econ.
K: I know.
G: And the problem with Management for us is the economists.
K: I know. Get rid of them! I'm sorry.
G: There's a thing called—
K: Hire Management faculty. What I'd love to see the campus do is to find every senior-senior faculty member from Berkley or LA, full Professor, step 99, one year from retirement that wants to come build a program. Who can really just be the one to say: this is how we can build a curriculum. And just force it through and pay him more money than God. My guess is that if the chancellor were to approach Birgeneau or (Block?) they might give us somebody for a year. Because they're supporting us in other ways, I mean, have we even asked? So I've talked to Martha and other folks about what we might be able to do. But all I know is that if we market it, I can fill it. I'm not marketing Management right now because there is nothing there. I have no credibility if I go out on that road. We tried that the first year,

we brought in a cohort, everyone left. That goes back to retention. So I'm not going to sell something that doesn't exist. Even I'm not that good. Well the problem is that we would be successful for a year, and then we bite into the backside and that's one of my concerns.