

UCAS

at the heart of connecting people to higher education

ADMISSIONS
PROCESS
REVIEW
**RESPONSE
FORM**

We hope to receive a high level of response to this consultation from all those who have a stake in the higher education admissions process. We want to understand as fully as possible those aspects of the proposals which you support and those which cause concern. Where there are perceived problems, we encourage you to put forward preferred solutions. All your responses will be carefully analysed and a summative report will be published in March 2012.

In order to assist with the analysis and evaluation of responses, we would be grateful if you would provide us with the information requested below. Please note that any information given will be held by us and will only be used for the purposes of consultation and research. You are not required to provide your name but we will treat your identity in confidence if you do give it to us.

Name	Dr Eva Sharpe
Job title	HE Policy Officer
Organisation	Society of Biology

Are you replying as an individual or on behalf of your organisation?

On behalf of the Society of Biology

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of a Task Force: Dr Hilary MacQueen, Open University (Chair); Dr Sandra Kirk, Nottingham Trent University; Dr Jeremy Pritchard, University of Birmingham; Dr Malcolm East, University of Southampton; Prof Jeremy Ward, Kings College London; Ian Harvey, Hills Road Sixth Form College; Dr Ruth Bastow, GarNET; Karen Devine, British Ecological Society; James Lush, Biochemical Society; Jess Strangward, British Pharmacological Society; as well as written submissions from Prof John Brookfield, University of Nottingham; Prof Julia Buckingham, Imperial College London; Thomas Mercer, Cardiff University.

Please indicate which of the following categories applies to you/your organisation?

Higher Education - University
 Higher Education - College
 Higher Education – Private provider
 School
 FE college
 Applicant or potential applicant
 Parent of an applicant or potential applicant
 Government body
 Non-Government body
 HE sector body
 Other (please state)

Please enter one of these categories below:

Other: Professional body

Application post-results: proposed system

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 23.6.1)

A system of application post-results would deliver a fairer admissions process because the applicant would submit actual results and the reliance on predicted grades would be removed

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

4 – strongly disagree

While we are broadly supportive of a concept of post qualification admission, there will still be a large dependency on the level of advice and support that students receives that renders the system unfair. Although post qualification admission reduces a lot of uncertainty in applications, grades are not the only factor when selecting applicants.

(APR Consultation ref 23.6.2)

Applying post-results will not necessarily have positive impacts on equality and diversity.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2 - agree

There will still be a large range in the amount and quality of advice given to students, particularly with the removal of Connexions and the lack of coherent information, advice and guidance in schools. Moving to a post results application system will have very little effect on this and so may not have the desired effect on equality and diversity.

(APR Consultation ref 23.6.3)

Two choices is an adequate number for Apply 2, allowing applicants both an aspirational and a more realistic application.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

4 –strongly disagree

We would encourage a broader choice for applicants applying through both Apply 1 and Apply 2. Grades are not the only factor in selecting university applicants and students may find themselves rejected from courses despite meeting the grade requirements, particularly if applying for competitive courses. This may result in students applying for a less aspirational second option in Apply 2 in order to avoid having to go through Apply 3, where there are only an estimated 6,500 places.

The proposed system of two options particularly disadvantages applicants who change their plans after receiving unexpected results and may not have had the chance to visit the universities they select or to have spoken to the admissions tutors before applying.

--	--

(APR Consultation ref 23.6.4) A system of application post-results may encourage a mechanistic approach to admissions with contextual and other data used less effectively.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>1 – strongly agree</p> <p>It is difficult for universities to distinguish between the good and the best students; in a post application system where grades are known, the process may become more mechanical, with universities relying more heavily on algorithms and less on admissions tutors. The system does not allow for adequate relationship building between the applicant and the Higher Education Institution (HEI) which will also have negative repercussions on retention rates.</p>

(APR Consultation ref 23.6.5) The lack of flexibility in the proposed post-results system may mean that HEIs are forced to reject candidates they might have accepted in the current system.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>2- agree</p> <p>Some HEIs currently accept near-miss applicants who were made offers based on over-prediction of grades by schools. This system is unfair to students who were given realistic but lower predictions and may not have been made offers. The current system does not provide much benefit for HEIs in this regard, and removal of the flexibility to accept near-miss candidates would not be a negative in this context.</p>

(APR Consultation ref 23.6.6) Giving young applicants more time to make application decisions recognises how much they mature over the final year at school or college.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>2 – agree</p> <p>However we note that conversely, by bringing the examination timetable forward, students will be completing coursework and taking A level examinations before they have had time to fully mature and develop all of the skills that they need to succeed.</p> <p>Also, by postponing the application date, students may not think more broadly about their higher education choices until later in the school year, and they may find out too late that they are studying an inappropriate combination of subjects. Greater advice on subject choices is needed much earlier in the school system; although students may not know during their GCSEs exactly what they want to study at university, there needs to be</p>

	<p>advice on appropriate combinations of subjects that will ensure that they are not disadvantaged when it comes to university applications.</p> <p>One positive we see from a post qualification system of application for subjects which are as diverse as biology, is that students are currently submitting their applications before they have studied the full syllabus, and have not covered the breadth of the subject, making it difficult to identify aspects of biology which they enjoy the most and may wish to specialise in at HE. A later application deadline allows them to fully explore the full syllabus before making decisions about what biology programme to study in the future.</p>
--	--

<p>(APR Consultation ref 23.6.7) A post-results system will not be agile enough to provide a better experience for all groups of students; those with A levels, those with Scottish Highers and those with other academic or vocational qualifications.</p>	
<p>1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree</p>	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>2- agree</p> <p>In order to be agile enough for students from different regions, the timetable must take into account appropriate times for students from such regions (both within the UK and internationally).</p>

<p>(APR Consultation ref 23.6.8) Please specify any particular group of students whose needs would be less well met in a post-results system</p>	
<p>A post-results system may not have the desired effects on widening participation (please see answers to section 24 below).</p>	

<p>Please enter any further comments about this section below</p>	
<p>We agree that a review of the higher education application process is timely. The current system in which universities receive applications over a five month period favours those students that submit their applications early. We would welcome the development of a system which is transparent and fair, enables students to make informed applications, and is workable for the higher education sector and schools.</p> <p>Apply 1 provides ample time for rigorous, objective selection methods to be employed. It is likely to be most attractive to students who take gap years, to mature applicants, and to students who did not achieve the A level grades they expected (better or worse) and who have reflected and modified their choice of higher education institution and/or degree pathway accordingly. One unintended consequence of the proposed system may be that Apply 1 becomes a less competitive route of entry for students rather than Apply 2. A system where all applications were submitted by a single date and released to institutions on a given date so that each application could be considered on its merit would be fairer.</p>	

Application post-results: widening participation

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 24.8.1) A wider group of applicants would be encouraged to make more aspirational applications with the confidence of knowing they have achieved appropriate qualification results.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below: 4 – strongly disagree We appreciate the desire to encourage students who perform better or worse than expected to rethink their plans and note the positives of this approach particularly for students with low aspirations who perform better than expected. However, the current system makes lower offers to some applicants judged to fulfil widening participation criteria, which are often subjective and confidential. In a post-qualification system, an applicant who has achieved grades slightly below the published entry grades may not have the confidence to apply without an understanding of the use of contextual data and what it means for them. If students are only to make two choices in their applications then this will also decrease aspirational applications. Please see the answer to question 24.8.2. We also note that without conditional offers, some students may not be motivated to work hard for their A levels. Instead they could wait for their results and then chose a higher education institute and course based on their achieved grades. The current application system does act to provide motivation for students to do well in the A level examinations.

(APR Consultation ref 24.8.2) Applicants would be deterred from making aspirational applications by having to make decisions quickly and being restricted to two choices.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below: 1 – strongly agree Please see answer to 23.6.3 about the impact of restricting the number of choices. We are also very concerned that the short period between the release of A level results and the Apply 2 deadline would not provide students with the opportunity to reflect on their position and research the new options open to them thoroughly if they do better or worse than expected. This could have a detrimental effect on widening participation and also lead to increased dropout rates as a result of students making inappropriate choices.

(APR Consultation ref 24.8.3)

Applicants may not understand the importance of contextual data and would be deterred from applying for some courses if they have not achieved the grades.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2 – agree

The use of contextual data is not widely understood by applicants or schools. Please see answer to 24.8.1.

(APR Consultation ref 24.8.4)

Widening participation would be supported by more constructive and focussed advice and guidance.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

1 – strongly agree

(APR Consultation ref 24.8.5) How do you think a system of application post results could be managed to enable it to promote widening participation?

Students which meet the widening participation criteria often need special consideration and the use of contextual data is required. Many HEIs are moving to semi-automated admissions systems that automatically reject applicants who do not meet the entry requirements. If suitable candidates for widening participation could be identified by UCAS and flagged to HEIs, then flagged students who have near misses on their grades could be passed to an admissions tutor for further consideration. HEIs need not be sent data on individual circumstances, but a generic flag could be used indicating that the candidate falls into a recognised widening participation group without specifying details.

Please enter any further comments about this section below

Application post-results: Efficiency improvements

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 25.18.1)

A post-results system is an efficient system as fewer applications require processing by HEIs.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

3- disagree

We note that a post results system in itself does not necessarily make a more efficient system; speed does not equate with efficiency.

Decreasing the number of applications a student can make would decrease the administrative burden for universities as they would have to process

	<p>fewer applicants, but with applications occurring over a shorter period of time, this will put an increasing burden on HEIs, particularly for courses which need to interview candidates or that have entrance tests. The delay in getting final student numbers through this approach will also create practical difficulties for example planning class sizes.</p> <p>The timing is particularly bad because (a) many staff with families will be on leave at this time, (b) the summer is protected research time in research intensive universities and (c) this time scale will have a very serious impact on the recruitment of overseas students because of the time required to obtain a visa once the student has a firm offer (visa applications cannot be made before this time) – this in turn will threaten the international standing of UK HE as well as have very serious financial consequences for our universities.</p>
--	---

(APR Consultation ref 25.18.2) A more efficient streamlined process would enable HEIs to make financial savings.	
<p>1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree</p>	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>2 – agree</p> <p>We agree that a more streamlined process would allow savings, however we only envisage minor savings from the proposed system. If the system makes the process of selection less effective then HEIs may take in more students who find it difficult to cope, leading to decreased retention rates and costing more in the long run. Any new system must improve selection so that HEs are selecting those students who are best qualified to benefit from the education provided.</p>

(APR Consultation ref 25.18.3) A more streamlined process would make the process easier for applicants to navigate.	
<p>1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree</p>	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>2- agree</p> <p>We agree that streamlining the system would make the process easier to navigate but the proposed system will not necessarily be a more streamlined than the present one.</p> <p>A central source of information will make the system easier to navigate for applicants. HEIs currently provide advice and guidance on individual institution websites, but all websites are different and students may not know where to look for the information that they need.</p>

(APR Reference 25.18.4) What disadvantages in terms of process efficiency, if any, could be experienced by HEIs, applicants or advisers as a result of a post-results system?	
<p>For students we note that the period of Easter – September will be a very high pressure period, during which they will have to sit exams, apply for university –and potentially reapply several times if they are not successful - and arrange accommodation. This will not facilitate decision making in a calm way, and may</p>	

lead to rash decisions.

For HEIs, there will be an increased burden during the summer months due to applications occurring over a shorter period of time, problems arranging accommodation later in the year, delays to timetabling lectures and practical classes until numbers are known.

Please enter any further comments about this section below

We note that UCAS must also be able to efficiently process all applications during the shortened application time period and their infrastructure (IT, telephone lines, and website) must be able to withstand the duress.

Application post-results: International and part-time students

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 26.5.1)

It is desirable for international applicants to apply through a centralised system and not direct to HEIs.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2- agree

International students are already encouraged to apply through UCAS rather than directly, however the proposed timetable would be hugely disadvantageous to overseas students who require a visa to study in the UK, which takes a period of at least 6 weeks to obtain. This would have a seriously detrimental effect on the international competitiveness of UK universities.

(APR Consultation ref 26.5.2)

It is desirable for part-time applicants to apply through a centralised system and not direct to HEIs.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2 – agree

In principle it is desirable for part time students to apply in the same way as full time students for fairness. Part time students could apply using whichever of the application routes is most suitable for their circumstances.

However, we note that this will cause a huge increase in the number of applicants using the UCAS system, and that UCAS's IT and other infrastructure systems must be able to cope with this additional strain, particularly during Apply 2 when there will already be enormous strain on the system.

(APR Consultation ref 26.5.3)
Access to improved data about international and part-time applications will be a benefit of being part of a central admissions service.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2 - agree

(APR Consultation ref 26.5.4)
The proposed new process has the capacity to offer greater flexibilities which will support international and part-time admissions.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

3 – disagree

Please see answer to question 26.5.1 about international student visas.

Please enter any further comments about this section below

--

Application post-results: Examination, results and applications timetable

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 28.7.1) The changes to the examination timetable should not have a major impact on the accuracy of assessment; with appropriate changes to their systems, awarding bodies should be able to maintain accuracy and rigour in a shorter marking period.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below: 4 – disagree We would be concerned about any increased pressure on the marking of A levels, particularly in the light of the growing concerns about the standard of marking and the increase in the number of appeals. The revised timetable would also mean that there would be less time for schools to challenge marks. Additionally in terms of resources, school teaching staff will be required by schools to be available for students to provide advice and guidance on applications and reference writing during the exam marking period and may become unavailable for marking.

(APR Consultation ref 28.7.2) The option of starting the HE term for first year students in late October is worthy of consideration.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below: 3 - disagree Whilst we broadly support the concept of post qualification admission, from the HEI perspective the proposed timescale is unworkable. Moving the start date decreases the time available for a process which requires careful consideration of applications by several individuals, potentially a decision over whether or not to interview applicants, arrangement of interviews, and any additional tests the university may require. This cannot be achieved in the short time scale indicated. Problems for universities would include arranging accommodation, timetabling lectures and practical classes in a shorter space of time once all of the applications have been processed and they know the numbers and students they will be taking. In order to provide enough time for this process to take place efficiently, a substantial loss of teaching time would be required and we find this to be a worse option. We are strongly against any decrease to the length of academic year.

(APR Consultation ref 28.7.3) The option of starting the HE term for first year students in January is worthy of consideration.	
1- strongly agree 2- agree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

<p>3- disagree 4- strongly disagree</p>	<p>3 – disagree</p> <p>From a school perspective, starting university in January would work well as it would allow more time to prepare for exams and applications at a later date. However, for HEIs this would require a large amount of restructuring and would either require losing three or four months of teaching time, or a complete shift in the academic year to run from January to December. A great concern if the academic year were to run from January to December would be that UK graduates would be out of sync with the rest of the world which would have repercussions for start dates for postgraduate study and the annual recruitment cycles of the major multinationals.</p> <p>If the academic year were to continue to run as it is, but with students losing the first three months of term, this would have repercussions on teaching, particularly for subjects such as the sciences which require the extra teaching time. Many reports show that employers feel that graduates lack the practical skills needed to progress to employment and we would strongly oppose a decrease in teaching time. An alternative is that Year 1 runs from Jan – August with minimal breaks to get the 30 weeks in and that subsequent years run on a normal academic cycle.</p>
---	---

<p>(APR Consultation ref 28.7.4) The resources available in schools and colleges will be sufficient to give students support to make applications and manage offers in the timescale proposed.</p>	
<p>1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree</p>	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>4- strongly disagree</p> <p>The proposed timetable means that Apply 3 applications will take place at the end of July and during August, when school staff will be on holiday and unable to provide advice and guidance to applicants.</p> <p>With the major changes to the school system from the Education Bill, teachers will already be increasingly burdened to implement these changes, further reducing the time to ensure appropriate information, advice and guidance for all students. Changes to the system should not be made in isolation but in the context of the changes that will already be implemented at school and higher education level.</p>

<p>(APR Reference 28.7.5) What provisions could be made within the educational and qualification structures in Scotland to make a UK system of application post-results workable for Scottish students?</p>	
<p> </p>	

<p>(APR Reference 28.7.6) What steps could be taken to secure parity for Northern Irish applicants whose school term currently ends at the end of June?</p>	
<p> </p>	

Please enter any further comments about this section below

The changes to the examination timetable will either result in a decreased amount of time to cover the A level syllabus or a need to decrease the content. We would be gravely concerned if the proposed plans to reschedule A level examinations had an impact on the content of the A level syllabus and/or the standards attained by the students. There is much concern amongst HEIs and Learned Bodies that A levels are not providing adequate training for students to progress successfully to higher education, as evidenced by the growing need of universities to run remedial classes in the first year to bridge the gaps.

The alternative is for the same content to be covered in less time, which would also be a concern as students may be taking course work and exams before they were fully ready and also reduces time for the teaching of practical work. This would decrease both the depth of subject knowledge being taught as and enrichment and enhancement activities which support the science curriculum.

As the A level syllabus is likely to be reviewed in the next year by the Department for Education, we recommend that UCAS enter discussions with them to ensure that any changes are made in parallel.

Application post-results: Proposed timetable changes

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 29.4.1)

An earliest start date of circa 8 October for first year students would not have a serious impact on the delivery of HE courses.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2- agree

(APR Consultation ref 29.4.2)

Universities could make appropriate resources available to make offer decisions and process applications between mid-July and end August.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2- disagree

In research-led universities, the summer is a protected research period and provide an essential opportunity for staff to focus on activities such as writing grants and papers and attending conferences. The Government agenda for growth relies heavily on universities to deliver and translate research – interfering with this summer period would threaten this. If applications are to be processed during this period, staff will either be unable to carry out research activities during this period (which would have a detrimental effect on the standing of UK universities), or additional non-research staff would be needed during July to process these applications.

Selecting students requires experienced academic staff who know how to read and judge applications in the context of the courses they teach and so we would be concerned if additional staff are employed specially during this period. If this were the case then incoming staff must be sufficiently trained to consider all applications equally and carefully and be appropriately supported. What safeguards will there be to ensure the applicants receive a

	<p>response in a timely manner regarding an application that has been carefully considered? This system may run the risk of ad hoc admissions to prevent breaching the deadlines and avoiding a fine.</p> <p>August is also often a time when staff take annual leave with their families; proposals to process applications between mid-July and the end of August would counter efforts to ensure that universities offer family friendly terms to their staff.</p>
--	---

(APR Consultation ref 29.4.3) Please give any suggestions about what needs to be done to ensure that interviews can be successfully completed within the proposed model of applications post-results.

Universities currently interview over a wide period of October – March; it would be very difficult to carry out interviews in the proposed timetable. Will there be a separate admissions process for courses that require interviews? If so, how will this differ from the current system and the proposed system?

It is also unclear how national tests such as the BMAT could be fitted into this schedule. These may need to be carried out prior to applications.

(APR Consultation ref 29.4.4) Please give any suggestions how to accommodate applications for courses requiring auditions or the submissions of portfolios.

--

Please enter any further comments about this section below

--

Application post-results: Benefits and risks of the proposed 2014 year of entry enhancements

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

**(APR Consultation ref 31.3.1)
A single offer date for all applications would help minimise the real or perceived advantages of applying as early as possible in the cycle.**

1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below: 2 – agree
--	--

**(APR Consultation ref 31.3.2)
The current process can be improved with a more disciplined approach to deadlines, service level agreements for decision-making by HEIs, with no informal agreements to relax them.**

1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree	Enter number between 1 – 4 below: Deadlines should already be enforced by UCAS.
--	--

4- strongly disagree	
----------------------	--

(APR Consultation ref 31.3.3)
The replacement of Clearing with a managed process of applications with equal consideration for places available at that point would give students a more positive experience and achieve a better match of applicants to courses.

1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>2- agree</p> <p>We agree that an Apply 3 in the 2014 model is a much more managed process than Clearing and this is a positive step. However we note that the proposed system still involves waiting and a high potential for rejections, particularly if students may only apply for two courses during Apply 2.</p>
--	--

(APR Consultation ref 31.3.4)
A short break between Confirmation and Apply 3 would help to improve the process to place applicants after they have received their results.

1- strongly agree 2- agree 3- disagree 4- strongly disagree	<p>Enter number between 1 – 4 below:</p> <p>1 – strongly agree</p> <p>Clearing is currently not an efficient system, with many students unable to contact universities due to the phone lines being busy. Some HEIs don't tell applicants with conditional offers immediately whether or not they have been accepted, particularly if the applicant has only narrowly missed their offer grades, meaning that not all students have equal chance in the current Clearing system. We are pleased to move away from this. Having a short break between confirmation and Apply 3 will allow for a more managed and fairer system, with increased time for advice and reduced stress for students, and making it easier for HEIs to evaluate their position.</p>
--	---

Please enter any further comments about this section below

The review makes no mention of the ways in which the higher education sector will be changing over the coming years, for example with regard to funding of university degrees and student numbers. There will certainly be a change in the landscape by 2016 and the decisions about admissions procedures should be made in this context.

Wholesale change may not be the answer at this stage. Key problems are the quality and advice that students receive and the process of Clearing. This is where initial efforts should be focused for change.

The insurance choice

Option	Description	Benefits	Disadvantages
Keep insurance choice as is	A contractually-binding 2 nd choice, intended to offer a safety net to applicants not meeting the conditions of their firm choice	Supports applicants in making aspirational choices	Evidence shows that it is not well understood by applicants and is not used wisely

Remove insurance choice	Applicants accept one conditional offer and enter Clearing if they don't meet the conditions	Facilitates HEIs in managing their numbers	Does not support applicants in making aspirational choices; disadvantages recruiting institutions for whom the insurance choice may represent an important pool of applicants
Enforce correct use of insurance choice	Application system ensures that applicant has included at least one choice with lower entry requirements	Supports applicants in using the insurance choice as it was intended; fewer applicants needing to enter Clearing	Simple business rules don't reflect complexity of offers and what appears to be an unwise insurance choice may in reality not be, for instance for courses like medicine where the option for entry with lower grades does not exist.
Make insurance choice optional for HEIs	HEIs choose whether applicants can accept them as an insurance choice or only as a firm choice	HEIs for whom insurance choice is beneficial can continue with it; applicants can choose to apply to HEIs that accept insurance choice	More complex than current process and has capacity for unfairness
Replace insurance choice with priority wait list option	Applicant chooses one firm choice and can be added to wait list for up to four others. HEI gives priority to waitlisted applicants once CFs have been confirmed	Provides some back-up for applicant but not contractually binding on HEI so facilitates number management	Provides less certainty for applicants than current process. Is complex and would be difficult to implement

(APR Consultation ref 32.5)

In light of the information given above, please rank the options above in your preferred order (using 1 as the most effective through to 5 as the least effective).

Option	Rank 1 to 5
Keep insurance choice as is	1
Remove insurance choice	4
Enforce correct use of insurance choice	2
Make insurance choice optional for HEIs	3
Replace insurance choice with priority wait list option	5

Please enter any further comments about this section below

If there is to be large changes to the university admissions process for 2016 entrants, we see little point in altering the system of insurance choice for 2014 entrants.

Timetable for reform

To what extent do you agree/disagree with the following statements?

(APR Consultation ref 33.2.1)

2016 year of entry is a manageable start date for a system of applications post-results.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

4- strongly disagree

Depending on the level of changes following this consultation, there will be enormous changes to the system. Awarding bodies will have to make alterations to the A level syllabus, and HEIs will have to alter their course timetables and potentially content.

Students who will be starting higher education in 2016 will be starting their A levels in 2014. In order for any necessary changes to be made to the A level syllabus, these would need to be being made now, in order for them to be complete for 2014. We recommend that discussions take place between UCAS and the Department for Education who are currently looking into A level content.

(APR Consultation ref 33.2.2)

2014 year of entry is a manageable date to be ready for the proposed changes to the current system.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2- agree

(APR Consultation ref 33.2.3)

We believe that the proposed changes for 2016 year of entry and 2014 year of entry are workable solutions.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

3 - disagree

Please see answer to 33.2.1

(APR Consultation ref 33.2.4)

If the proposal for 2016 year of entry does not go ahead, further refinements are needed to the 2014 process.

- 1- strongly agree
- 2- agree
- 3- disagree
- 4- strongly disagree

Enter number between 1 – 4 below:

2 – agree

Please enter any further comments about this section below

For more information about the UCAS admissions process review, please visit:

www.ucas.com/admissionsprocessreview

Responses must be received in UCAS by 20 January 2012.

Please complete, save and return this document via email to:

admissionsprocessreview@ucas.ac.uk

Or if you wish, print out a hard copy and return the document to:-

APR TEAM
UCAS
NEW BARN LANE
CHELTENHAM
GL52 3LZ