



**University Expectations for Limited Enrollment Programs
(Senate Document #16-17-36)**

TO Wallace D. Loh | President

FROM Christopher Walsh | Chair, University Senate

I am pleased to forward the accompanying legislation for your consideration and approval. Jeffrey Henrikson, member of the Educational Affairs Committee, presented the committee's proposal on University Expectations for Limited Enrollment Programs (Senate Document #16-17-36), which the University Senate approved at its meeting on September 5, 2018. Please inform the Senate of your decision and any administrative action related to your conclusion.

Approved:

**Wallace D. Loh
President**

Date:

09-14-2018

Copies of this approval and the accompanying legislation will be forwarded to:

Mary Ann Rankin, Senior Vice President and Provost
Reka Montfort, Executive Secretary and Director, University Senate
Michael Poterala, Vice President and General Counsel
Cynthia Hale, Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel
John Bertot, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs
Elizabeth Beise, Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs
Sylvia B. Andrews, Academic Affairs
William Cohen, Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Studies
Barbara Gill, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
Eric Johnson, Assistant Dean and Director, Letters and Sciences
Alexander Triantis, Dean, Robert H. Smith School of Business
Toby Egan, Past Chair of the Educational Affairs Committee
Marsha Rozenblit, Chair of the Educational Affairs Committee



University Expectations on Limited Enrollment Programs

PRESENTED BY Toby Egan, Chair**REVIEW DATES** SEC – August 27, 2018 | SENATE – September 5, 2018**VOTING METHOD** In a single vote**RELEVANT
POLICY/DOCUMENT****NECESSARY
APPROVALS** Senate, President

ISSUE

In spring 2017, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) reviewed a proposal asking that Limited Enrollment Program (LEP) criteria for the A. James Clark School of Engineering be revised. LEP status allows certain programs where demand exceeds resources to manage enrollment, in part by establishing specific requirements for admission and performance reviews. In September 2017, the SEC charged the Educational Affairs Committee with a review of the expectations and current procedures for LEP status, review, and revisions.

RECOMMENDATION

The Educational Affairs Committee makes the following recommendations:

The University should:

1. Update its website on Limited Enrollment Programs (<http://www.lep.umd.edu>) to ensure that its content is presented in a more user-friendly format that is easy-to-read and consistent with the University's general web presence.
2. Ensure that information on LEPs, including information at <http://www.lep.umd.edu>, clearly identifies the range of pathways by which a student may enter an LEP (e.g., by direct admission, by admission to Letters and Sciences, by transferring from another major, or by transferring from another institution).
3. Ensure that information on LEPs—including their purpose, admission requirements, and criteria for the 45-credit review—is clearly articulated for a general audience.
4. Clearly differentiate between requirements for transfer admission and those necessary to remain in an LEP beyond the 45-credit review.
5. Distinguish between LEPs that guarantee admission once gateway requirements are satisfied from those that have a competitive transfer admission process.
6. Consider adopting terminology that differentiates between LEPs based on the criteria for admission, particularly LEPs with competitive admission for either freshmen or transfer students.

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions should:

7. Incorporate the student's academic home in the body of all admission letters.
8. Ensure that students who have applied to a competitive admission LEP as freshman and are not directly admitted are informed that they have instead been admitted to Letters & Sciences (LTSC) and will receive a subsequent letter describing alternate pathways to their preferred major.
9. Ensure that external transfer students who have applied to an LEP for which they are ineligible based on their academic record are notified of their status before the deadline to accept their admission offer to the University. This is particularly important when these students have already exceeded the maximum number of attempts of a gateway course or its equivalent.

LEPs with a competitive admission process for internal and external transfer students should:

10. Publish the minimum threshold for admission into the LEP program for internal or external transfer students. These programs should also publish information on the academic profile of recently admitted internal and external transfer cohorts, so that students who do not meet the minimum threshold requirement can assess their potential for admission through the established competitive LEP application process.

COMMITTEE WORK

Over the course of the academic year, the committee met with numerous administrators, as well as representatives of current LEPs, including associate deans from the A. James Clark School of Engineering, the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences, and the Robert H. Smith School of Business. In addition to meeting with the Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies from the Department of Communication, the committee also spoke with the Director of Letters & Sciences (LTSC). The Senate Student Affairs Committee surveyed students currently in LTSC working towards admission to an LEP, and reported its findings to the Educational Affairs Committee.

The committee spent the spring 2018 semester developing and revising its recommendations, which involved consulting with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and the Pre-Transfer Advising Office. The committee then circulated its draft recommendations with Admissions, the Director of LTSC, the Provost's Office, the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and administrators in the Robert H. Smith School of Business. The committee's final recommendations were approved by an email vote concluding on July 6, 2018.

ALTERNATIVES

The Senate could choose not to approve the recommendations of the Educational Affairs Committee and miss an opportunity to provide greater clarity and transparency to current and prospective students.

RISKS

There are no associated risks.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications.



University Expectations for Limited Enrollment Programs

2017-2018 Committee Members

Toby Egan (Chair)
Mohammad Ahmad (Ex-Officio GSG Rep)
Lindsey Anderson (Faculty)
Nick Armah (Ex-Officio SGA Rep)
Betsy Beise (Ex-Officio Provost's Rep)
Michele Callaghan (Faculty)
Lindsay Carpenter (Faculty)
Emily Conover (Faculty)
Vedat Diker (Faculty)
Cathy Fisanich (Non-Exempt Staff)
Jeffrey Henrikson (Faculty)
Andrew Katz (Undergraduate Student)
Linda Macri (Ex-Officio Graduate School Rep)

Joel Miller (Graduate Student)
Marcio Oliveira (Ex-Officio Division of IT Rep)
Joseph Oudin (Faculty)
Abani Pradhan (Faculty)
Doug Roberts (Ex-Officio Associate Dean for General Education)
Ann Smith (Ex-Officio Undergraduate Studies Rep)
Rebecca Sommer (Exempt Staff)
Yunfeng Zhang (Faculty)

Date of Submission

August 2018

BACKGROUND

During fall semester, 2017, the University Senate Executive Committee (SEC) charged the Educational Affairs Committee to review the expectations and current procedures for Limited Enrollment Program status, review, and revisions. The SEC decision to establish the charge was related to an April 2017 proposal to the Senate requesting that admission and review requirements for current and prospective students in the A. James Clark School of Engineering (ENGR) be aligned. The SEC determined that such a specific concern was best addressed by the administrative body responsible for overseeing the University's Limited Enrollment Programs (LEPs), housed within the Office of the Provost. However, the SEC noted that the Senate had not reviewed LEPs or their provisions since their creation in 1990, which is inconsistent with the original LEP recommendations.

In September 2017, the SEC charged the Educational Affairs Committee with: (1) a review of the Senate's past action on LEPs; (2) a review of the process for considering LEP proposals and renewals; (3) consideration of the impact of LEP status on program quality; (4) a consideration of whether the review requirements for direct admits and transfer students should be consistent; (5) investigation of relevant peer institutional practices; (6) consultation with a range of stakeholders; and (7) consideration as to whether University-wide expectations for LEPs should be revised (Appendix 8).

DEFINITIONS

The following is a list of key terms and definitions used to describe LEPs and their provisions--

I. **Types of Students:**

A. **Native Student:** An undergraduate student whose initial, post-secondary enrollment was at the University of Maryland (UMD).

B. **Transfer Student:** An undergraduate student who has completed post-secondary coursework and then changes enrollment to a new UMD major, whether from another UMD academic unit (internal transfer) or from another institution (external transfer). Unless otherwise indicated, when used herein, “transfer student” includes both internal and external transfer students. State law requires that both native and external transfer students be treated fairly and equally (see Appendix 6).

II. **Limited Enrollment Program (LEP):** A status granted to programs to help manage enrollment, typically in instances where demand exceeds instructional or physical capacity. Any College, School, or individual undergraduate major can apply for LEP status. The committee distinguishes between types of LEPs based on admission criteria, identifying them as “open admission” and “competitive admission.”

A. **Open Admission LEP:** A program that does not have competitive admission and admits anyone who satisfies gateway requirements. These include the following majors/schools:

- Communication (ARHU)
- Criminology and Criminal Justice; Government and Politics; and Psychology (BSOS)
- Journalism

B. **Competitive Admission LEP for Direct Admit Native Students:** A program that limits the total number native students admitted directly to each major. These include the following Colleges/Schools and majors:

- A. James Clark School of Engineering (ENGR)
- Robert H. Smith School of Business (BMGT)
- Biological Sciences; Biochemistry; Chemistry and Environmental Science; Policy-Biodiversity and Conservation (CMNS)

C. **Competitive Admission LEP for Transfer Students:** A program that admits transfer students selectively based on a holistic review of their application materials (e.g. test scores, extracurricular activities, essays).

- BGMT is the only LEP with competitive admission for transfer students. After satisfying the gateway requirements, students may apply to BMGT. BGMT caps the total number of admitted transfer students.

III. **Gateway Requirements:** A set of criteria that 1) direct admits must meet to remain in an LEP, or that 2) prospective transfer students must satisfy to be admitted to an LEP. Gateway requirements consist of minimum grades in gateway courses (up to three) and a student’s cumulative GPA in all college coursework.

A. **Gateway Courses:** Courses chosen because they are most predictive of success in a given program. They typically lack prerequisites and must be available to all interested students. Only one repeat of one gateway course is permitted.

B. **College Coursework GPAs:** GPAs are considered in several contexts. Native students admitted directly into an LEP are reviewed at the 45-credit mark, when they must have a minimum GPA of 2.0 across all college coursework to remain in the program. Students

transferring into an LEP must have a higher cumulative GPA in all coursework (including non-UMD coursework); currently, the transfer student GPA requirement ranges from 2.5-3.0. All students must maintain a 2.0 GPA, or above, throughout their time in an LEP or they will be removed from the program.

- IV. **45-Credit Review:** All native students admitted directly to LEPs are reviewed when they accumulate 45 credits. Students must have met established minimum grades in all gateway courses and have a 2.0 GPA, or above, in all coursework. Students who do not meet these criteria are counseled out of the program, though they have the option to appeal their dismissal.

LEPS: FORMATION & PRIOR ASSESSMENT

In 1990, the Senate approved a new “Admissions and Advising Policy” intended to address significant problems with admissions, enrollment management, and advising. Previously, certain high-demand majors had been designated “selective admissions programs.” Those programs managed enrollment by establishing various admission requirements, including prerequisite courses, minimum GPAs, and portfolios. Students working to gain entrance to selective admissions programs were designated “pre-” majors. The 1990 report indicated that two of every five incoming freshmen were admitted to these “pre-” programs, though more than half of them never gained admission to their desired program. The advising resources for these students were also inadequate.

This new policy replaced “selective admissions programs” with “limited enrollment programs.” It also called for additional changes in principles and practices intended to transition students into the new LEPs and help identify and advise those unlikely to be successful. Although the initial recommendation was that the Senate would be responsible for changes to general LEP rules or a program’s LEP status, in practice, LEP status has been granted/revoked and LEP rules have changed without Senate involvement. A detailed summary of the original recommendations and subsequent reviews may be found in Appendix 1.

In a 1993 report to the SEC, the faculty chair of the Provost’s Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising (PACAA) asked the Senate to make several changes in response to implementation challenges. These included (1) allowing high-credit transfer students additional time to identify a major; (2) assigning responsibility for advising students who were between majors; and (3) addressing some programs’ reluctance to abide by aspects of the new policy. A 1995 PACAA report noted that some LEPs were using gateway requirements to enhance their student body’s academic profile rather than simply aligning enrollments with resources. The report also recommended that the “limited enrollment program” system, as practiced, be replaced with a more flexible approach to restricting enrollments. The Senate did not act on PACAA’s recommendations.

In addition to the periodic reviews of each LEP discussed below, the Division of Academic Affairs has conducted at least two studies of LEPs and associated practices. The University’s 2008 Strategic Plan called for a review of undergraduate program sizes and the role LEPs played in recruitment, which led to the creation of the Enrollment Management Team (addressed below). In 2013, another review was conducted in conjunction with the Schools/Colleges that offer LEPs. A listing of the specific recommendations most relevant to the committee’s work can be found in Appendix 2.

LEPS: CURRENT STATE

At present, three Colleges/Schools and eight majors have LEP status:

Colleges/Schools	Majors	
Business	ARHU - Communication	BSOS - Criminology and Criminal Justice
Engineering	BSOS - Government and Politics	BSOS - Psychology
Journalism	CMNS - Biochemistry	CMNS - Biological Sciences
	CMNS - Chemistry	CMNS - Environmental Science and Policy-Biodiversity and Conservation

Just over half of the undergraduate degrees the University awards are in LEP majors.

LEP Pathways

Students have several ways to enroll in an LEP, including: (1) direct admission for native students; (2) as an internal transfer/change of major, or by adding an LEP as a second major; or (3) as an external transfer. Of the six Colleges/Schools enrolling LEPs, three admit all interested freshmen. Those directly admitted to an LEP must pass a 45-credit review by successfully completing gateway courses and maintaining a minimum GPA in all coursework. All LEPs, save one, admit any transfer student who satisfies similar gateway requirements (BMGT also reviews transfer applications on a competitive basis).

Letters & Sciences (LTSC) Advising

LTSC is the home for: (1) newly admitted freshmen who are either undeclared or who applied but were not admitted to a competitive-admission LEP; (2) external transfer students who are undecided or who are working to complete the gateway requirements for an LEP; and (3) students who have left a major and have yet to identify a new one. LTSC advises its students and works with them to create and regularly update four-year plans. Its advisors can assist students interested in any major, though students interested in an LEP often want to speak with advisors in the program itself. Nearly all LEPs can accommodate these requests, and ENGR has a dedicated transfer student coordinator. BMGT does not meet with interested students individually, though it does regularly host general information sessions. LTSC also facilitates the Business Exploration Series and STEM Exploration Series, each intended to help students learn about and prepare for admission to the respective school. LTSC's Transitional Advising Program also works with high-credit students who need to find new majors.

LEP Oversight

Any College/School or major may apply for LEP status (or request its LEP status be discontinued). Over the years, not all attempts to obtain LEP status have been successful. While in some cases an important long- or short-term enrollment management strategy, LEP status obligates programs to make all gateway courses available to interested undergraduates. Some programs have reverted to non-LEP status, including the School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation and the College of Education. Once approved, LEPs are reviewed periodically (approximately every five years).

Presently, LEPs are overseen by the Enrollment Management Team (EMT). Functioning as the "provost's advisory committee" identified in the 1990 legislation, the EMT meets monthly and is

responsible for reviewing requests to establish/discontinue LEP status or change gateway requirements (the instructions for requesting changes may be found in Appendix 3). When necessary, curricular changes are submitted to the Senate PCC Committee. The EMT also periodically reviews LEPs. EMT members are appointed by the Provost. The EMT includes the Dean for Undergraduate Studies (Chair); the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs; the Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel; the Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment; the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management; and the Associate Vice President for Records, Registration, and Extended Studies.

COMMITTEE WORK

In October 2017, the Educational Affairs Committee began its review by consulting with the Associate Provost for Academic Planning and Programs and the Associate Dean for General Education. Both provided an initial understanding of LEPs. Much of the committee's work over the remainder of the academic year was devoted to expanding and refining this understanding. In October and December, the committee met with associate deans from the A. James Clark School of Engineering (ENGR), the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (BSOS), and the Robert H. Smith School of Business (BMGT). In addition to meeting with the Chair and Director of Undergraduate Studies from the Department of Communication, the committee spoke with the Director of LTSC on two occasions.

In spring, 2018, the Senate's Student Affairs Committee (SAC) was asked to assess the experiences of students interested in LEPs. The SAC conducted a survey of current LTSC students working towards LEP admission, the results of which were shared by the Chair of the SAC at the Educational Affairs Committee's March meeting. The survey did not reveal any significant areas of concern (see Appendix 4). The Educational Affairs Committee attempted to consult students who had moved into LTSC from an LEP. A survey was sent to approximately seventy-five such students, though there were too few responses to provide useful insights. The committee chair and coordinator also met with the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, who conducted the comprehensive 2013 review of LEPs referenced above.

The committee spent the spring 2018 semester developing and revising its recommendations, which involved consulting with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions (Admissions) and the Pre-Transfer Advising Office. The committee then circulated its draft recommendations with Admissions, the Director of LTSC, the Provost's Office, the Office of Undergraduate Studies, and administrators in the Robert H. Smith School of Business. At its May meeting, the committee revised its recommendations based on feedback it had received. The committee's final recommendations were approved by an email vote concluding on July 6, 2018.

COMMITTEE FINDINGS

CLARITY & TRANSPARENCY

Differences in LEP Criteria

In addition to the concern raised in the initial proposal, the committee heard from students who feel it is unfair that 45-credit reviews and transfer admission requirements have different standards. Across the various LEPs, the minimum GPA required for transfer student admission is uniformly higher than that required of students at the 45-credit review. And in some instances (as with ENGR), the minimum grade required in each gateway course is higher for transfer students. While the committee is sensitive to these concerns, it notes that this perception of inequity is often based on a misunderstanding. While reviews and admissions may use similar criteria, those

criteria are being used to answer two very different questions: 1) should a student be admitted to a program, and 2) should a student who has already been admitted to a program be removed? By establishing what is, in essence, a higher standard when it comes to potentially removing a student, the University demonstrates its commitment to retaining and supporting students already in a course of study. While native students interested in the same competitive-admission LEP must meet different standards if they are not directly admitted, this is partly a reflection of state laws obligating the University to “maintain fair and equal treatment” between native students and those transferring from other institutions (see Appendix 5). Specific grade and GPA requirements are carefully calibrated through a collaborative, data-driven process involving each LEP and the EMT. These requirements are regularly reviewed to ensure they align enrollments with resources, identify students likely to be successful, and respect the principle that students should have the opportunity to study the subject of their choice.

The committee generally agrees with this rationale for establishing more stringent criteria to remove a student from a program, and with the process for determining those standards. It feels, however, that more clearly delineating review and admission practices and their justification will help prevent confusion.

LEP Website

The LEP approach to managing enrollment in high-demand programs is complex, and the committee identified areas where information could be presented more clearly. Many such areas involve the University’s primary online resource describing LEPs: lep.umd.edu. The site provides general LEP guidelines and links to PDFs with more detailed information on each LEP. As noted by the Director of LTSC, the information can be confusing for some students. The website does not clearly distinguish between differing procedures, applications, and timelines for internal and external transfer students. Its resources also consolidate information for both freshman and transfer applicants, which has led to student confusion. It is only by comparing PDFs for different programs, for example, that students would learn of the distinctions between different types of LEPs. Additionally, nothing explicitly indicates that certain LEPs admit freshmen on a competitive basis. The site also does not attempt to describe the various pathways prospective students may follow, which represents a lost opportunity. Such information is important enough that it should be easily accessible and articulated for a general audience. Finally, the appearance and design of the site is not consistent with the University’s general web presence. The findings discussed here and above led to recommendations #1-6.¹

The Robert H. Smith School of Business (BMGT)

The committee also found that information available to prospective BMGT students is inadequate. As will be discussed below, feedback from students and administrators revealed dissatisfaction with the advising available to internal transfer students. Because BMGT is the only LEP that competitively reviews transfer student applications, its lack of clear admission criteria is a source of frustration for many students. Prospective transfer students can satisfy BMGT’s gateway requirements and still not be admitted. Given transfer students have a single opportunity to attempt admission to BMGT, and given that BMGT caps enrollment, it is essential that students have as much information as possible about their prospects. This finding led to recommendation #10.

¹ The committee notes that some of the lep.umd.edu changes it discussed over the course of its work have already been adopted. In addition, new information has been added to the Undergraduate Admissions website.

Admission Letters

The committee learned that some students only realize they have not been admitted to their preferred LEP when they attend orientation. For external transfer students who have already made multiple gateway course attempts (thus rendering themselves ineligible for admission to the LEP), this realization can be particularly difficult. All students offered admission receive a welcome letter with their major, advising college, and residency status. Depending on their circumstances, students receive various follow-up letters (which may be found in Appendix 6):

- Freshmen who were not directly admitted to a competitive-admission LEP receive a letter with information on LTSC and a link to the LEP site.
- External transfer students who have not yet met the gateway requirements for any LEP are sent a similar letter; if they are currently enrolled in gateway courses, they may be sent a letter deferring a decision until updated transcripts are received.
- External transfer students who met BMGT's gateway requirements but were not admitted, as well as students who are ineligible for an LEP based on course attempts, are sent a letter with information on LTSC and a link to the LEP site.

The committee agrees with Admissions that a student's initial letter should be exciting and celebratory, and that some information should be shared later in the admission process to avoid overwhelming or discouraging students. Yet the committee also feels that the current approach to admission letters is not sufficiently transparent. Letters should clearly inform prospective freshmen when they are not directly admitted to a competitive-admission LEP. Such a decision can be communicated in a variety of ways that are both direct and celebratory. One example discussed by the committee was: "It is my great pleasure to inform you that although we are not able to directly admit you into _____, we are delighted to offer you admission to the University of Maryland. You will be advised by the Office of Letters & Sciences, which will help you learn more about the resources available to students and how they can assist you in identifying a path to your major of choice." Admission letters should incorporate important information (major, advising college, and residency status) in the body of the letter, rather than in an administrative block at the bottom of the page. Finally, when a prospective student will never be admissible to their preferred major, this should be stated explicitly. These findings led to recommendations #7-9.

ADVISING

The University has various ways of communicating LEP provisions to prospective students. Admissions provides information when visiting high schools, attending college fairs, and hosting campus visits. Admissions also discusses LEPs at conferences that bring hundreds of high school counselors to campus. The Pre-Transfer Advising Office provides on-site advisors at four MD community colleges that serve as feeders for the University (staff periodically visit the remaining institutions). Any changes to gateway courses are announced at least two years prior to implementation, and students are grandfathered in as appropriate. Both the Admissions and Pre-Transfer Advising websites provide basic information on LEPs and direct users to lep.umd.edu for more information.

As noted above, LTSC provides comprehensive advising services to all undeclared students. The committee learned that one of the biggest challenges for LTSC students and advisors involves BMGT and its lack of clear admission criteria. The holistic nature of BMGT reviews makes it difficult for students to know precisely how to increase their chances for success. The Director of LTSC indicated that this uncertainty produces frustration and anxiety for many students. The committee notes that both the 1990 legislation and the 2013 review recommended that students be advised by their intended major/college/school, an approach the committee fully supports. While there clearly remains a strong student desire for BMGT to provide additional advising resources, the

committee has not recommended any specific action. Its tenth recommendation, however, should ensure that prospective BMGT students have more information with which to assess their admission prospects.

TERMINOLOGY

The committee feels that the term “limited enrollment program” is confusing and even misleading, a view shared by some of the students and faculty the committee consulted. The perception that the University is “limiting” access to some of its most popular programs is unfortunate, given only one of the current LEPs actually “limits” enrollment. The committee discussed various options, including:

- Restricting “LEP” to programs with competitive admission for transfer students (presently, BMGT), and adopting a different term for all others;
- Restricting “LEP” to all competitive-admission programs, and adopting a different term for all others; or
- Restricting “LEP” to programs with competitive-admission for transfer students, adopting a different term for the remaining competitive-admission programs, and selecting a third term for all others.

The committee acknowledges the potentially disruptive effects of changing a system in place for more than twenty-five years. However, concerns with the LEP designation date to the 1993 recommendations to the SEC discussed above, and the committee decided that the benefits of greater clarity are significant enough to merit serious consideration, which led to recommendation #6.

PEER RESEARCH

The committee reviewed practices at a number of peer and Big 10 institutions (see Appendix 7). While terminology varies, managing enrollment to high-demand majors through the use of gateway/prerequisite courses and GPAs is commonplace. Benchmarking and committee members’ experiences also indicate that the most common model involves direct admission to colleges/schools, with GPA requirements in core major classes necessary to advance to upper division coursework. The committee discussed the benefits of such a system, noting that it reduces uncertainty for students and could streamline the admission process by eliminating duplicative reviews. While there could be value in further exploring such an approach, the committee decided not to recommend any specific action, given feedback that such a change would be administratively cumbersome and require a deep institutional commitment.

OVERSIGHT

In its review, the committee noted several significant differences between the 1990 LEP model and today’s system. While the responsibilities of the “Provost’s Advisory Committee” are being fulfilled by the Enrollment Management Team, the EMT’s composition is strikingly different than the body initially envisioned; the EMT is composed entirely of upper-level administrators, and contains no faculty (who were to be the majority), students, or advisors. The EMT has also assumed responsibility for changing the rules governing LEPs, as well as for granting or revoking LEP status, both intended to be Senate responsibilities. The 1990 legislation also indicated that LEP status should be withdrawn as soon as possible once other enrollment management mechanisms are adopted. Yet five of the original LEPs still retain that status (Business, Engineering, Journalism, Government and Politics, and Psychology).

The committee acknowledges that the current system fulfills, in some fashion, many of the core 1990 functions. Additionally, programs proposing or renewing LEP status must provide more

extensive information than originally called for, and none of the LEP administrators the committee consulted expressed concerns with the current review process. While the committee was not given an opportunity to review the findings of the 2008 or 2013 studies directly, administrators noted that the latter's recommendations largely align with the Senate's original LEP parameters. It is also the case that the current LTSC better meets the advising needs of students than the original "Division of Letters and Sciences": LTSC provides comprehensive services better tailored to prospective majors than those offered by advisors within individual programs/Schools, whose primary responsibilities involve helping current students quickly earn their degrees.

While the Senate has not exercised its originally intended oversight role, the committee did not identify any significant concerns with the University's current approach and determined that recommendations regarding future oversight were not necessary.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on available documentation and extensive input, review from key stakeholders from across campus, and careful deliberation, the Educational Affairs Committee recommends the following:

The University should:

1. Update its website on Limited Enrollment Programs (<http://www.lep.umd.edu>) to ensure that its content is presented in a more user-friendly format that is easy-to-read and consistent with the University's general web presence.
2. Ensure that information on LEPs, including information at <http://www.lep.umd.edu>, clearly identifies the range of pathways by which a student may enter an LEP (e.g., by direct admission, by admission to Letters and Sciences, by transferring from another major, or by transferring from another institution).
3. Ensure that information on LEPs—including their purpose, admission requirements, and criteria for the 45-credit review—is clearly articulated for a general audience.
4. Clearly differentiate between requirements for transfer admission and those necessary to remain in an LEP beyond the 45-credit review.
5. Distinguish between LEPs that guarantee admission once gateway requirements are satisfied from those that have a competitive transfer admission process.
6. Consider adopting terminology that differentiates between LEPs based on the criteria for admission, particularly LEPs with competitive admission for either freshmen or transfer students.

The Office of Undergraduate Admissions should:

7. Incorporate the student's academic home in the body of all admission letters.
8. Ensure that students who have applied to a competitive admission LEP as freshman and are not directly admitted are informed that they have instead been admitted to LTSC and will receive a subsequent letter describing alternate pathways to their preferred major.
9. Ensure that external transfer students who have applied to an LEP for which they are ineligible based on their academic record are notified of their status before the deadline to accept their admission offer to the University. This is particularly important when these students have already exceeded the maximum number of attempts of a gateway course or its equivalent.

LEPs with a competitive admission process for internal and external transfer students should:

10. Publish the minimum threshold for admission into the LEP program for internal or external transfer students. These programs should also publish information on the academic profile of

recently admitted internal and external transfer cohorts, so that students who do not meet the minimum threshold requirement can assess their potential for admission through the established competitive LEP application process.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 — Previous Senate Action on Limited Enrollment Programs

Appendix 2 — 2013 LEP Review Outcomes

Appendix 3 — Limited Enrollment Programs and the Enrollment Management Team

Appendix 4 — Memo from the Student Affairs Committee to the Educational Affairs Committee
(3/1/2018)

Appendix 5 — Annotated Code of Maryland, Admission of Transfer Students to Public Institutions
(13B.06.01.02-1)

Appendix 6 — Admission Letters

Appendix 7 — Peer Institution Research

Appendix 8 — Senate Executive Committee Charge on the University Expectations for Limited Enrollment Programs (Senate Document #16-17-36)



Parenthetical citations reference the red page numbers in the lower-right corner of each page, rather than any pagination in the original documents.

Report on Admissions and Advising (Senate Document #89-90-113A)

In 1990, the Senate's General Committee on Educational Affairs completed work on a new "Admissions and Advising Policy" (Policy), which was approved by the Senate later that spring. Its report and recommendations were intended to address several significant problems with admissions, enrollment management, and advising. At the time, certain majors where demand exceeded capacity (instructional, physical, etc.) were designated "selective admissions programs." These programs managed enrollment by establishing various admissions requirements, including potentially large numbers of prerequisite courses, minimum GPAs, and portfolios.

There were three general areas of concern the committee sought to address:

- The difficulty in accommodating "non-uniform student interest across the majors offered by the University" (3).
- Problems attending the practice of designating "pre-" majors to hold students not admitted to their desired selective admission program. At the time, two of every five incoming freshmen were admitted to "pre-" programs; 60% of them would leave the "pre-" program within two years (more than half of them leaving the University altogether). That system had become "a purgatory of false hopes and unrealized promises" (3).
- An inadequate advising system that provided students far too little guidance.

The committee also developed a dozen general goals intended to move students smoothly into the new LEPs and help identify and advise those who were unlikely to be successful (4-5). The committee's recommendations were grouped into five primary areas.

I. Admissions

Students should be encouraged to identify interests and majors as early in their academic careers as possible. They should generally be admitted to and advised in their desired major, which the University expects will happen by the middle of their sophomore year (but no later than 56 credit hours into their studies). Students interested in an LEP who meet certain gateway requirements should be admitted to the program. Students who are undecided or not admitted to their desired LEP should enroll in the newly created Division of Letters and Sciences (Division).

II. Division of Letters and Sciences

The Division was intended to be an administrative home for all undeclared undergraduates. Students with an interest in a particular major would ideally be advised by the relevant College, while the Division would assume advising responsibility for students who were truly undecided or who wanted to change their major (prior to 56 credits). Rather than a new bureaucratic structure, it was envisioned as a "coordinating umbrella" that would align the efforts of existing administrative units. Administered by the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, it would be overseen by a Steering Committee composed of the various Deans, student representatives, and others.

III. Limited Enrollment Programs

Replacing "selective admissions programs," LEPs were designed with the principal goal of "achiev[ing] resource balances." Admission to LEPs would occur after satisfying gateway requirements, which included specific courses and a minimum GPA. It was intended that these gateway courses, of which there would be a maximum of 3, could be taken in a single semester, but no later than between 45 and 56 credits. Only a single repeat of a gateway course would be permitted. Any student who successfully completed the gateway would be admitted to the LEP. Students who performed poorly in an LEP would be dismissed at 45 credits. The LEP model was designed to help students learn as soon as possible if

they would be admitted to their desired major, and to ensure that students whose performance in an LEP did not indicate future success could be properly advised as they moved to a more appropriate program.

Administratively, LEPs were to be overseen by a “Provost’s Advisory Committee,” which would be responsible for: 1) approving specific gateway requirements and the review criteria used to dismiss students from an LEP, 2) reviewing programs with LEP designation every three years and determining whether the limits should be retained, and 3) advising on changes to the “rules for granting LEP designation” (5, 8). Any changes to those general rules were to be reviewed and approved by the Senate.

IV. Transfers

In general, external transfer students were to be treated the same as “native” students. Transfers who satisfied the gateway requirements for an LEP would be admitted to the program. Undecided students entering with 45 credits would be admitted to the Division and given a semester in which to select a major. Transfer students with 56+ credits could only be admitted directly to a major (LEP or otherwise).

V. Implementation

In addition to the aforementioned Steering Committee, the Provost’s Advisory Committee would be responsible for helping LEP programs make necessary adjustments and exercising regular oversight over admissions and advising. The committee was to be composed of faculty (majority), students, and advisors. The new LEP model and accompanying recommendations were to be reviewed by the Senate five years after implementation.

Updated LEP Procedures (Senate Document #90-91-26Z)

The following November, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) approved urgent guidance on the new Policy’s implementation. The Provost’s Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising (PACAA), fulfilling the duties of the “Provost’s Advisory Committee” called for in the Policy, was wrestling with the difficult task of setting target LEP enrollments for freshmen and transfers and establishing criteria for the 45-credit review. The guidance explained that “LEP status is not, in the context of the University, particularly desirable,” and proposed several strategies for managing enrollments short of applying for LEP status. It then suggested six questions that programs considering LEP status should answer.

Admissions and Advising Second-Year Report

Responding to an SEC request, PACAA prepared an interim report on the status of the Policy in the spring of 1993. The report addressed four primary concerns that had arisen since the Policy’s adoption, and asked for action from both the Senate and the Provost.

I. 56-Credit Threshold

PACAA indicated programs were increasingly running up against the 56-credit threshold (the point at which the Policy required that students be admitted to a major). Increasing numbers of non-traditional students and promising transfer students with relatively large numbers of credits were being told they could not be admitted to their chosen LEP (given they had not fulfilled the gateway requirements yet had over 56 credits and so could not take an additional semester to do so). PACAA recommended that the Senate consider making the threshold more flexible by providing such students an additional semester to meet LEP admission requirements.

II. Between-Majors Students

The Policy did not clearly provide for the advising of students who were between majors, whether by choice or because they had not passed their 45-credit review. PACAA recommended that the Senate consider changes to the role of the Division to clarify its responsibilities.

III. LEP Gateway Courses

PACAA reported that most LEPs were unable or unwilling to specify gateway courses that met the Policy’s guidelines, and instead had requirements that could not be completed in a semester. In some cases, programs added prerequisite courses or required competencies that delayed student progress.

Additionally, some LEPs had not opened their gateway courses to all students, as the Policy recommended. PACAA urged the Senate revisit the guidelines for gateway courses and revise them so as to strike “a balance between the integrity of the various LEP disciplines and the needs of students” (22).

IV. The Mindset Problem

PACAA reported that some LEPs were having difficulty accepting the distinctions between the previous selective admissions system and LEPs; the former were intended to admit students “on the basis of strictly academic standards,” whereas LEPs were designed to accommodate resource constraints and were intended to be available to as many students as possible (22). PACAA reported that programs were making “ad hoc LEP-generated alterations” that were incompatible with the new approach (such as limiting access to gateway courses as a way to select majors or establishing informal admission/retention provisions). These observations did not lead to any specific recommendations for Senate action.

PACAA Report (1995)

In 1995, PACAA submitted another report to the Senate. Its chair described the committee’s actions over the past several years and presented several additional recommendations for Senate action. The committee’s approach to working with LEPs on an individualized basis had led to several departures from the Admissions and Advising Policy, among them:

- As was noted in the 1993 report, some units continued to use their LEP status to enhance the academic profile of their undergraduates by adjusting enrollments based on “considerations other than enrollment pressures” (37). PACAA also introduced a new rationale for granting LEP status based on “documented national standards for a given academic area that [would] put the UMCP unit at a recruiting disadvantage if certain protective measures [were] not instituted” (39).
- In order to advise more students within their desired majors, PACAA permitted programs to move gateway courses “*inside* the major, i.e. to be completed after the student is allowed to declare the major, rather than before” (36). The report referred to this as the reestablishment of de facto “pre-” majors (which was permitted in at least two instances). While the specific mechanism may have departed from the provisions of the Policy, its effect—that students interested in a particular LEP would be advised by that LEP—advanced another of the Policy’s goals.
- PACAA adopted a position that “academic standards that exceed general university requirements are granted only in the context of some LEP rationale” and should not be “formalized outside of the LEP process” (37).
- PACAA also envisioned what are essentially perpetual LEPs, programs that would maintain LEP status indefinitely, arguing that “if enrollments are in balance this is a sign of success of the program, and not a sign that protection should be lifted” (37).

The report also assessed the strengths/weaknesses of the Policy and recommended several changes. These include:

- The term “limited enrollment program” should be discarded, and a more “flexible policy of enrollment protection be instituted” (39). PACAA should assume greater responsibility for helping units experiencing enrollment issues establish “circumscribed protective measures” short of LEP designation (39-40).
- The Policy should explicitly acknowledge “documented national standards” as a valid rationale for LEP status.
- PACAA should develop tools to monitor enrollments and proactively identify “enrollment-based stress on academic resources” (40).
- The Senate should clarify the role the Division plays in advising and ensure effective oversight.


Correspondence between Senate Chair and Dean for Undergraduate Studies (1996)

In the spring of 1996, the Senate Chair asked the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean for Undergraduate Studies to submit its biennial report to the Senate on the state of advising on the campus. In their exchange, the Senate Chair and Dean discussed LEPs and the relationship between the Senate and PACAA, confirming that: changes to the rules/procedures governing LEPs would go to the Senate for approval, while adjustments to specific aspects of existing LEPs would be handled solely by PACAA (48); and the granting or removal of LEP status for any program would be determined by the Senate (47). The Senate Chair also noted that the Senate had yet to review the Policy as required.

The Senate archives do not contain any additional information on changes to LEPs (granting/removing status or adjusting criteria). There is no indication that the Senate conducted the review called for in the original legislation.

Report on Admissions and Advising (Senate Document #89-90-113A)

(Form Revised, 11-17-89)



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

CAMPUS SENATE

TRANSMITTAL FORM FOR REPORT/PROPOSAL

Date March 28, 1990

TO: Executive Committee

THROUGH: Executive Secretary

FROM: General Committee on Educational Affairs

SUBJECT OF REPORT: Report on Admissions and Advising

The committee requests that the Executive Committee consider the enclosed for:

Placement on the next Senate meeting agenda for report to membership.

Placement on the next Senate meeting agenda for Senate action.

ENCLOSED DOCUMENT IS:

A report to the Executive Committee not requiring Senate action.

A report to the Senate that does not require Senate action.

A report with resolutions requiring Senate action (Resolutions should be clearly numbered and in boldface)

Senate is requested to endorse entire report.

Senate is requested to vote on Resolutions one-by-one.

Senate is requested to vote on Resolutions in single vote.

A new policy requiring Senate action.

A policy proposed by others on which Committee review was requested.

Senator who will present the report Dr. Marvin Breslow

(Signature, Chair of Submitting Committee)

ADJUNCT COMMITTEE ACTION ONLY

The General Committee on _____ has approved the enclosed material.

(Signature, General Committee Chairperson)

Campus Senate ACTION

Presidential ACTION/Board of Regents ACTION

Revised 26 March 1990



GENERAL COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL AFFAIRS

REPORT ON ADMISSIONS AND ADVISING

Introduction

When the State of Maryland recognized and designated UMCP as the flagship campus, it agreed to provide enhancement funds, and UMCP agreed to make major improvements in the educational program. For undergraduate education, the adoption and implementation of the Pease Report on general education and the Markley Report on Honors represent exciting first steps towards improving undergraduate education at UMCP. Curriculum reforms cannot flourish in a vacuum, however. Students require guidance and help in finding their ways through the rich possibilities of the undergraduate academic experience. UMCP needs reforms in admission and advising to take full advantage of the opportunities in educational reform.

We have an opportunity to establish a system of admissions and advising that will provide a new level of support for our students, while enabling us to manage more effectively enrollment problems resulting when more students desire admission to a program than that program can handle.

Our two major proposals (for an administrative structure called the Division of Letters and Sciences overseen by a Steering Committee representing the whole campus; and a new procedure for handling entrance into Limited Enrollment Programs) are aimed at:

1. presenting incoming students with a clear educational structure and "home",
2. providing all students with broader, deeper, and more consistent advising, especially in terms of general education requirements,
3. simplifying, clarifying, and speeding up the process through which students are either admitted to Limited Enrollment Programs or are informed that they will not be admitted and must find an alternative major,
4. cutting down on the waste that results when students take five or more "gateway" courses only to discover that the gate will remain closed for them,
5. encouraging students without definite career goals to explore new areas of study here on campus,

6. ensuring that gradually there grows increasing awareness of all the opportunities on campus both among our students, and among faculty and advisors.

Since 1988 the General Committee on Educational Affairs has had under review the problems that have been somewhat loosely gathered under the heading of "Admissions." The Educational Affairs Committee inherited this task from an ad hoc Committee on Admissions that was chaired by Dr. Richard Austing, and we all are the beneficiaries of the thoughtful and provocative work of the Austing Committee. Its report was the inspiration for our initial hearings and our reception of many and various opinions on these issues. While the Austing Report was the foundation of the earlier efforts by the Educational Affairs Committee, we have continued to learn, and our proposals show development towards what we believe to be workable solutions for UMCP.

Certainly we have problems that call for workable solutions, and we can offer a sense of the dimensions of the problems: we want good general education for all students, but we also act as if 17 year old students were making definitive career choices. These are not necessarily contradictory positions, but neither do they conform to current reality. General education is not a primary concern in most advising, and for a variety of reasons, most students change majors. Efforts to address one set of problems often, in fact, lead to the discovery of another set of problems in the exasperating puzzle that is undergraduate admissions and advising.

The problems are several. The most visible problem is created by non-uniform student interest across the majors offered by the University. In order to strike some balance between enrollment surges and resources, the University adopted selective admissions. We also allowed a classification of "pre" to be used so as to permit, where space opened, students who had not at first qualified into a selective admissions program to attempt a later admission. The root of our problem is not so much the numbers of students in selective admissions programs as the number of students who do not get into our selective admissions programs. Currently, about two of every five new freshmen enter pre-programs. Over 60% of the "pre" students will have switched out of their programs within two years (that means they will not be in either the "pre" or the program itself). Of the 60%, half will have left UMCP entirely. "Pre" has become a purgatory of false hopes and unrealized promises. Understandably, frustrated students wander into other majors or wander away from College Park. These secondary and tertiary waves of "pre" students swell the ranks of majors in departments that cannot accommodate such numbers, producing a deterioration of the programs in those departments and a lack of availability of their courses for all students.

The "pre" is the most visible problem, but there are other problems perhaps more educationally corrosive. Advising systems have become so swamped that often they are, in spite of good will, little more than course-approval systems. The general education purposes that have been reaffirmed by the adoption of the Pease Report are thwarted; too often a student's program is coherent only by accident. Students, selecting their majors while still in high school, often find themselves disappointed and frustrated.

Many options have been offered and studied. Among the options proposed have been doing nothing, creating an undergraduate college for all entering students, moving resources sufficient to meet each change of student demands. After our study of proposals and their variations, we are confident of one point: there is no perfect plan. What we now offer is a plan that has two major innovations: (1) the creation of a Division of Letters and Sciences that will be the location for undecided students and the coordinator of undergraduate general education advising and (2) a "gateway" set of requirements that will be more quickly responsive to the management of enrollments in programs with high demand. We think that our proposals will provide better admissions and better advising for the undergraduates at UMCP.

We have developed the following general goals :

1. Any student has the right to apply to a major at the time of admission to UMCP.
2. The category "pre-major" will be abolished.
3. A greater proportion of the undergraduate majors in Limited Enrollment Programs should be admitted as freshmen.
4. Students desiring admission to Limited Enrollment Programs after matriculation at UMCP will be evaluated, at least in part, by their performance in small number of specified "gateway" courses.
5. Students should become connected as soon as possible with faculty and advisors in departments and colleges; and, insofar as it is possible, a student in a major should be advised by a faculty member in the major department.
6. Transfer students should be treated in the same way as "native" students.
7. We need to provide better and more varied forms of advising for undecided students and for undergraduates changing majors.

8. All students should have access to information about the many major programs available at UMCP.

9. Advising should assist students both in their general education programs and in their majors.

10. All departments should be equally eligible to apply for Limited Enrollment designation, based on criteria developed by the Provost and approved by the Senate.

11. The campus must give high priority to making sufficient seats available in gateway courses.

12. The repeat policy must be revised both for gateway courses and the undergraduate curriculum as a whole.

I. ADMISSIONS

Students admitted to UMCP will be able to follow several paths:

A. At the time of application to UMCP, students will identify their academic interests and will be admitted to majors or LEP colleges according to their priorities and the criteria of UMCP.

B. Students who want to explore the educational opportunities available to them at UMCP should enroll in the Division of Letters and Sciences until such time as they choose a major in no case later than 56 credit hours.

C. Students who think that they have clear career goals may declare a major and should enroll and be advised in the major department (or in certain cases in a college) unless that department is at that time a Limited Enrollment Program.

D. Students who are interested in a UMCP program that has enrollment limits may apply to that program. Those students whose academic credentials and preparation indicate a reasonable chance of success will be admitted to the program. Other students may choose a major that is not an LEP or will enroll in the Division of Letters and Sciences where they will be assisted to explore available options.

Discussion:

These statements describe the "flow" of students from admission as freshmen until they have found a major. The expectation is that by the middle of the sophomore year undecided students will have received the experience and

advising to help them decide on a major. For the students on campus who develop a strong interest in a program with enrollment limits, the process (as described below in III, E-J.) would provide them with an earlier, clear, rapid, and final decision so that they could make reasonable career choices.

II DIVISION OF LETTERS AND SCIENCES

The Division of Letters and Sciences will be the administrative home for all undergraduates not enrolled in a degree-granting major. As soon as a student has determined an area of interest and is accepted into that major (whether at the time of admission to UMCP or subsequently) the student will be advised by that department or college. The purposes of the Division are to strengthen general education advising provided to all undergraduates and to help students make wise decisions about the choice of major. These goals will be carried out by coordinating existing administrative units rather than creating an additional layer of bureaucracy.

A. Students who choose not to select a specific major or who are denied entry into an LEP as freshmen and who still wish to attend UMCP, will be enrolled in the Division of Letters and Sciences. Students who have decided to change majors before 56 credits, but are unclear about their destination, may also join the Division. These students will be provided general education advising as well as advising to assist them in finding a major. Actual major advising, however, is the responsibility of academic departments, not the Division.

B. Students will be assigned to advisers based on the expressed needs and interests of the student. If a student is admitted to a major, the student will be assigned to an adviser in that major. If a student, who is enrolled in Letters and Sciences, identifies several areas of interest that seem to fall within a college, then the student will be assigned to an adviser in that college. If, however, a student expresses interest in areas that are across colleges, then the student will be assigned to an adviser in Letters and Sciences. Those students who are truly undecided also will be assigned to advisers in Letters and Sciences. Students' official files will be kept in the offices of the advisers to whom they are assigned.

Discussion:

Any college which has the staff and the interest to handle students with reasonably well-defined academic interests should be able to assume responsibility for those students, including stamping authority and maintenance of the official record. If the college is unable to provide these services, Letters and Sciences should provide them. In all cases Letters and Sciences should keep track of the responsible adviser.

C. The Division of Letters and Sciences is not equivalent to already existing colleges. Rather, it is an administrative structure with oversight by a Steering Committee (as outlined in Part V, Implementation) composed of the Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Humanities, Life Sciences, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Physical, Math and Computer Sciences, student representatives, and, on a rotating basis, representatives of the other colleges across the campus.

D. The Division of Letters and Sciences will draw upon resources distributed throughout the campus. Advising will be decentralized both in its location and its use of personnel. As additional resources for advising come to the campus, as outlined in the Enhancement Plan, their allocation will be determined in part by student demand and in part by other requirements of the Division (with advice from the Steering Committee).

E. The Dean for Undergraduate Studies will administer the Division of Letters and Sciences. Among the activities to be coordinated by the Dean are training new advisers, workshops on CORE requirements and other campus-wide curricular changes, support for students interested in changing from one major to another, and monitoring and enforcing general education requirements, including exceptions to these rules.

Discussion:

The need to solve some of the real problems of high demand for certain majors also provides an opportunity to improve significantly the undergraduate experience at UMCP. The creation of the Division of Letters and Sciences recognizes that many students will come to this campus without a clearly focused academic interest; others will change their minds once they arrive on campus. This proposal gives validity to the process of exploring the academic riches of the university. Secondly, the plan gives greater emphasis to the role of general education in the total undergraduate program as called for in our acceptance of the Pease Report and other campus documents. The Division will also break down isolation and provide more consistency in our academic guidance across campus.

Advising for students who, as might be expected, often do not have clear goals is a problem for the students and the campus. Many of the 132 majors on this campus are subjects with which high school students are unfamiliar. Furthermore, a university whose students arrived with a goal and never changed it would be an educational failure; one part of undergraduate education should be discovery and exploration. The Division of Letters and Sciences is a coordinating umbrella that symbolizes our commitment to general education and breadth as complements to the major.

Some of the difficulties in advising students who are undecided, undeclared, or unable to get into their program of choice are structural. When we abolished the very broad College of Arts and Sciences in favor of our current four inheritor colleges, we gained many things, but we lost the natural location for advising the undecided undergraduate, which a vast majority of our students are at some point in their careers here. Our current structure does not match some of the natural clusters of interests our students have. Undergraduates with a general interest in American government must look to the College of Arts and Humanities (for history) and the College of Behavioral and Social Sciences (for government and politics); those with broad interests in the physical sciences must look to the College of Life Sciences (for chemistry), the College of Physical, Math, and Computer Sciences (for physics), and perhaps the College of Engineering as well.

The creation of a Division of Letters and Sciences, with strong involvement of all colleges across campus through steering and policy committees, will provide an arena for addressing a whole range of issues concerning core undergraduate education and academic advising.

III. LIMITED ENROLLMENT PROGRAMS

A. The designation Limited Enrollment Program (LEP) replaces the term "selective admission."

B. Normally, LEPs shall be granted to achieve resource balances. The rules for granting LEP designation should be reviewed by the Provost's Advisory Committee. Among other considerations, the Advisory Committee should take into account that the granting of an LEP to a given program can have significant consequences for other programs. It should also consider alternatives to an LEP that could be used to achieve a resource balance. Should the committee recommend changes in the rules for LEPs, those recommendations shall be submitted to the Senate for appropriate action.

C. All LEPs should be reviewed every three years by the Provost's Advisory Committee in order to determine whether they should retain LEP designation.

D. Adjustments to the LEPs limiting criteria should be made by the Provost's Advisory Committee in consultation with the appropriate academic unit.

Discussion:

The term Limited Enrollment Program is intended to express more accurately the reasons for the designation: to balance demand with resources.

In other words, LEPs are a regulatory necessity, and they should be closely supervised. An LEP needs to be evaluated in relation to its impact on other programs. LEPs need to be reviewed frequently so that, when conditions change, the LEP can be changed and the designation withdrawn as soon as possible. Because the granting of LEP designation is essentially regulatory, the process should be more responsive to changes and less cumbersome than the current procedures. Changes in the rules remain subject to the Senate, but the operation of the rules can be better achieved by a committee that is also specifically charged to scrutinize the ongoing need for any specific LEP. [See Part V, Sec. C.]

E. LEPs will admit as many freshmen as they can, consistent with reasonable assessments of student achievements and chances for success. This assessment should take into account diversity of interests and backgrounds. The Provost's Advisory Committee in consultation with the appropriate academic unit shall regulate the number of students admitted to an LEP.

Discussion:

In the course of our consultations various percentages of freshmen admissions have been suggested, and they have ranged from 25% to 80%. On closer examination it appears that legislating a percentage would produce an unnecessarily arbitrary figure that does not take into account admission standards and competition for seats across the colleges. Some colleges admit as many as they reasonably can, but others do not. It will be a task of the Provost's Advisory Committee to help establish a freshman admissions target that will admit, subject to space available, all those freshmen whose credentials predict success in the program.

Our proposal derives from our look at the widely variant current freshmen admissions to two colleges, BMGT and ENGR. For the fall of 1989, BMGT admitted only 72 of a probable graduating class of about 1,000, with an additional 543 students admitted as declared pre-majors (for each one of the pre-majors who succeeded in getting into BMGT, three students were admitted into BMGT from other majors on campus.). ENGR, however, admitted 336 new students as freshmen, while another 277 came in as pre-ENGR majors. If we required BMGT to admit as freshmen 50% of a prospective graduating class of approximately 1,000, then we would, in effect, be asking the College to take another 428 majors, or over 75% of the entering "pre-majors." In part, at least, what militates against this request is the data about the eventual "success" of pre-majors. Of the 582 pre-majors enrolled in the fall of 1986, 393 were not admitted into BMGT after three years. In effect, two-thirds of this entering pre-major class either are no longer interested or have been unable to demonstrate the requisite credentials for admission to the College. In general, fewer than 40% of the entering pre-BMGT majors

ever make it into the College. On the other hand, over the last few years ENGR has admitted increasingly more of its students as freshmen. Most recently (fall,1989), of a potential graduating class of about 660, the College admitted 336 (51%) as full-fledged majors. Clearly BMGT needs to admit more freshmen as majors, but flexible, rational entry standards need to be developed for BMGT as well as any LEP.

F. Students may attempt an admission by gateway to an LEP. LEPs will develop entry requirements specific to their major or program (gateway sets of courses and related GPA criteria) which will be the basis for admission or exclusion. The gateway program should consist of a course or a set of courses that can be taken in one semester, in which a student must achieve a given grade in order to be considered for admission to the LEP. Additional requirements beyond the gateway courses, such as GPA or portfolios, may also be part of the gateway. Depending upon resource constraints, selection requirements may be adjusted to control the enrollments in LEPs. The gateway must be completed no later than when between 45 and 56 credit hours, depending upon the nature of the program, have been attempted. The student who has successfully passed the gateway requirements to an LEP may enter the LEP at any time. The gateway requirements specific to a program shall be developed by the program for approval by the Provost's Advisory Committee.

G. A Department within an LEP College may apply to the Provost's Advisory Committee to restrict its enrollments.

H. Admitted students who perform poorly in the LEP will be dismissed from the LEP at 45 credits. Performance criteria should be above the retention criteria for UMCP. The performance criteria shall be determined by the Provost's Advisory Committee in consultation with the LEP. Students who are dismissed from an LEP can choose a non-LEP or can locate in the Division of Letters and Sciences for one semester where they will be advised on finding a suitable program.

Discussion:

The "gateway" concept addresses the complex admission issues that result from the facts (1) that student demand for particular programs often exceeds available space and resources, (2) that many students will change majors after admission, and (3) that, because there are differences among high schools, not all entering freshmen will have the the academic experience to be admitted directly to degree-granting programs of their choice. To address the fact that many programs attract their majors towards the middle or later in the student's college career, some flexibility is provided for LEPs to set their gateway deadline. Students are provided some flexibility in that they can satisfy the gateway requirements to an LEP but, where allowable,

exercise the option to enter the LEP at a later date. Additional continuous selection requirements, such as GPA, allow the number of admissions to an LEP to be controlled so that the balance between numbers of students and available resources can be maintained.

I. Gateway courses must be completed with a "C" or better in each gateway course. Only one repeat of a single course of the set of gateway courses will be considered for determining admission to an LEP. A student may apply only once to any given LEP.

Discussion:

The gateway is a maximum of three courses that are selected because of their ability to predict eventual success in majors. These predictor courses should be related to the major so that they would be part of the usual courses prescribed by the major. The courses also may be agreed upon by allied fields of study. For example, the pressures on BMGT have led to enrollment surges in Economics, Consumer Economics, and Agricultural Economics. These academic units may concur in what constitutes a set of predictor courses that would offer a common gateway. If a common gateway is developed (for example, for BMGT, Economics, Consumer Economics, and Agricultural Economics), students would be allowed to apply only once to this cluster of allied fields of study.

J. In computing a student's average for purposes of admission to an LEP, grades from any repeated course will be averaged and may be used to determine whether a student meets the continuous selection GPA requirements.

Discussion:

In order not to squander the resources of either students or the University, the gateway process should be such that students may quickly know whether or not they will be admitted into an LEP. This effort to balance fairness with resource constraints means that students should not continue to attempt to raise their GPA in order to get into an LEP by multiple repeats of numerous courses, nor should they occupy valued places in gateway courses more than once. Gateway courses should be so basic to the field that the inability to achieve at least a "C" in them on the first attempt should be a good indicator that the student's talents lie elsewhere. As soon as it becomes known or projected that a student will not be admitted into the LEP, the advisors should work with the student to find alternate majors consistent with the student's interests and talents.

K. When there are extraordinary reasons, an LEP may grant exceptions to normal admissions. Such extraordinary reasons might include a student undertaking a second baccalaureate degree, double majors, etc.

IV. TRANSFERS

A. Transfer students with approximately 45 credits and beyond will be encouraged to select a major.

B. If the transfer student with approximately 45 credit hours is truly undecided about a major, the student will be admitted to the Division of Letters and Sciences with the understanding that during that initial semester the student will complete 12 hours and will select a major.

C. If the transfer student meets the standards for the major selected, the student will be admitted to the major. If the student applies for a LEP and is not eligible, the student will be informed that admission to that LEP has been denied; but, providing the student meets general admission standards to UMCP, the student will be invited to select an open enrollment major.

D. Students with 56 or more credits must meet the criteria for direct admission into an LEP or must choose another program in order to be admitted to UMCP.

Discussion:

These proposals essentially treat transfer students in the same way as "native" students (the student admitted as a freshman). Transfer students with fewer than 45 hours will continue to be treated the same as incoming freshmen. However, an undecided but advanced transfer student is given a semester in Letters and Sciences in order to help adjust to UMCP and to be helped in deciding in what to major. Because "native" students must choose a major no later than at 56 credits, transfer students with 56 credits must choose a major in order to be admitted to UMCP. Transfer students with 56 credits who seek admission to an LEP must have satisfied the entry requirements to the LEP at the time of admission to UMCP.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

A. An Advisory Committee shall be appointed by the Provost with the advice of the Senate. The Advisory Committee shall be composed of a faculty majority, students, and members of the advising staff. So that the Advisory Committee can benefit from wide range of viewpoints, attention should given to the distribution of its membership from among the colleges.

B. Among its implementation responsibilities, the Advisory Committee shall have, the review of the rules for granting LEP designation, the review of LEPs already granted, the approval of gateway proposals, and development of the guidelines for the creation of the Division of Letters and Sciences. After implementation the Advisory Committee shall be given regular oversight of admissions and advising.

C. A Steering Committee for the Division of Letters and Sciences shall be composed of the Deans of the Colleges of Arts and Humanities, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Life Sciences, Physical, Math, and Computer Sciences, student representatives, and, on a rotating basis, representatives of the other colleges. The Steering Committee shall have oversight in the establishment and management of the Division of Letters and Sciences.

D. The proposals in this report shall take effect for students entering in the fall of 1991.

E. This Admissions and Advising policy shall be reviewed by the UMCP Senate at the end of five years in order to determine the effectiveness of the policy.

Discussion:

The establishment of the Advisory Committee provides a way to "fine tune" some of the more general proposals, especially about admissions, so that adjustments can be made to fit the specific situations. The Advisory Committee is intended to provide ongoing oversight, and to bring unforeseen problems to the attention of the campus. While the committee has a faculty majority and student representation, an important part of such committees must be the advising staff members.

The Letters and Sciences Steering Committee will assist the Dean for Undergraduate Studies in establishing the Division of Letters and Sciences, and it will continue to direct its attention to the improvement of advising through training, coordination, and enhancement.



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK
CAMPUS SENATE



Approved by the Executive Committee,
Acting Under Emergency Powers of the
Bylaws of the College Park Campus Senate,
Section 4.3, on November 28, 1990



Memorandum to Departments and Colleges about new Limited Enrollment Program procedures.

Last spring the Campus Senate approved a new Admissions and Advising policy (enclosed), which will affect students entering in the fall, 1991. Among its key provisions are several that affect high-demand degree-granting programs. First, the term "Limited Enrollment Program" (LEP) replaces "Selective Admissions." Second, these LEPs are normally programs whose available resources are inadequate to meet all the demands. Consequently, LEPs are normally programs for which student major demand exceeds capacity. Third, LEPs will admit as many freshmen as they can, consistent with reasonable assessments of student achievement. Fourth, students who were admitted as freshmen will be subject to a review of their performances as early as possible in the semester after they have earned forty-five credits. Finally, students who wish to attempt admission to an LEP after their matriculation at UMCP or who are transfers from another institution to UMCP may do so via a gateway.

This fall the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising has begun to tackle its responsibilities for implementing the new policy. As a first step, we have had to produce target numbers of new freshmen and transfers to admit in 1991, and we have worked with current high-demand programs to project those numbers. A second and longer term effort has focused on devising the guidelines for Limited Enrollment Programs in successive years. Ideally, we should have defined the permanent guidelines before we sought target numbers for next year, but the time frame was just too short. The 1991-92 academic year, thus, will truly be an interim year in the implementation of the new admissions and advising policy.

Before we outline the guidelines that will shape the proposals that prospective LEPs will submit, we would like to share with you some of the major points of the new policy that we have debated and discussed. First, a **central goal** of the new admissions policy is **efficient enrollment management**, both in high-demand programs and across the University. Consequently, we believe that the critical, normal determinant of LEP status is **demand relative to capacity**. Second, as the policy recognized, students will

RECEIVED

NOV 26 1990

UMCP 15
Campus Senate

seek admission to an LEP at one of two points, either at matriculation or at some point after matriculation (whether as internal or as external transfers). Our dilemma, and probably yours as well, is predicting how many students will desire admission at either point and what the attrition rates of freshmen and transfers will be. None of us wishes to admit too many students, especially as freshmen, whose past performances suggest they will not progress satisfactorily in a high-demand program, nor do we wish to exclude too many non-freshmen who may possess satisfactory records and who may eventually decide to seek admission to an LEP. Consequently, we shall need to determine an admissions ratio for freshmen and transfers. We shall also need to define the gateway procedures and the forty-five credit review in tandem because the threshold of each will affect the flow of students.

All of these issues will require serious thought and planning on the part of prospective Limited Enrollment Programs. The starting point, or the primary criterion, for determining whether high-demand programs should become LEPs, however, is the matter of whether student major demand really exceeds capacity. Given that LEP status is not, in the context of the University, particularly desirable, we also expect that prospective LEPs will have attempted to manage their enrollments through existing means. All degree-granting programs can, to some extent at least, manage their enrollments in at least three ways:

- * by establishing and applying standards for satisfactory completion of the major program,
- * by adequately advising their majors and helping them to determine whether they are really interested and capable of succeeding in a program, and
- * by maintaining and applying consistent standards in granting exceptions to academic policies.

Once a high-demand academic program has evidence that its student major demand does exceed its capacity and that these three measures can not sufficiently contain that demand, then it should seriously consider applying for Limited Enrollment Program status.

In the course of our discussions, we have worked through numerous scenarios about what an LEP might look like and how it will operate. Needless to say, there are many

viable options. Consequently, we do not intend to define an apriori model of an LEP. Instead, we expect each degree-granting program that meets the minimum criteria noted in the previous paragraph to make a case for itself, a case that explains the **objectives, standards, expectations, and consequences** of LEP status. In addition to indicating how and with what effect a unit has attempted to manage its major enrollment, this case should also include answers to six questions:

1. **What is the student major capacity of your unit, in terms of both overall numbers of majors and of majors in each class level?**

We do not believe that there is a magic formula for determining these capacities, but we do recommend that you consider the many facets of your program in doing so. These include available space and equipment, student-faculty ratios, accreditation needs, advising, demands on your program for general education, lower and upper level service to other programs, graduate work, gateway course availability, etc. Provide us with a complete explanation of how you determined the capacity figures.

2. **What is the expected demand of both freshmen and transfers (internal and external) for enrollment as majors in the program?**

Again, there is no precise formula for determining demand, and past trends may not be particularly helpful. The Undergraduate Admissions and Institutional Studies offices will have useful data about freshmen and transfer (internal and external) demand. A program may also wish to survey student staking gateway courses.

3. **How many seats would you allocate to directly admitted freshmen, internal and external transfers, and students who appeal for admission?**

These numbers should reflect predicted attrition rates.

4. How would your unit construct and implement the gateway procedures?

There appear to be many options for the content of the gateways. As the policy indicates, however, gateway courses should be:

- * of relevance to the discipline
- * able to be completed in one semester
- * no more than three courses, and
- * completed prior to forty-five credits.

Gateway course minimum grades may not produce the number of students for whom the program has room. Consequently, a unit may have to employ other criteria to reduce further the pool of prospective students. These criteria might include an overall GPA, a portfolio, completion of a certain percentage of CORE courses, etc.

5. How would your unit construct and implement the forty-five credit review in the context of satisfactory progress?

As is the case with gateway procedures, the actual content of the forty-five credit review may vary from unit to unit. At the very least, however, this review should include grades in gateway courses, which, for directly admitted freshmen, would actually be "required" courses rather than gateways. Other criteria might include an overall GPA, major course GPA, GPA in selected recommended CORE courses, etc., all relative to numbers of attempts (per course or series of courses) and semester loads. Also, since the forty-five credit review is really a review to determine whether directly admitted freshmen are making "satisfactory progress," it should establish performance standards at some logical level above the University minimum for satisfactory progress.

Finally, given that no program would want to eliminate directly admitted freshmen who are making satisfactory progress even if some potentially "better" transfer students want to enroll, a prospective LEP should think seriously about the relationship between the forty-five credit review and the gateway procedures. The program should also consider the effect of each procedure and the manageable ratio of freshmen to transfers (both external and internal).

6. How would LEP status for your program affect other programs in your College and across the University?

To avoid repeating the problems of the past, we need to be certain that prospective LEPs discuss their plans with College representatives and with people in related programs. If students are not enrolled in a high-demand program of their choice where will they go? Will LEP status for one program redirect the demand to other programs, and can these programs enroll the surplus? If we resolve one program's problems, are we creating problems for others? The Office of Institutional Studies can provide information to assist in developing this response.

If you have any questions either about these criteria and guidelines or about the new admissions policy as it affects Limited Enrollment Programs more generally, please contact. . . . Proposals for LEP status, signed by the program head and the dean of the College, are due by . . . and should be submitted to. . . .

Admissions and Advising Second-Year Report



RECEIVED

APR 22 1993

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK
UMCP
Campus Senate

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PROVOST

April 15, 1993

MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Lissitz, Chair
Campus Senate

FROM: Bruce R. Fretz, Acting Associate Provost *BRF*

RE: Admissions/Advising Second-year Report

As was discussed earlier with the Senate Executive Committee, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising has prepared an "interim" report, identifying a number of issues that both the Senate and the Office of Academic Affairs should consider. Our office is now reviewing implementation procedures for the recommendations listed which have not already been attended to. May I ask that you refer this report to the appropriate committee(s) to consider the recommendations for the Campus Senate. To serve our current and prospective students most effectively, it would be extremely helpful to have any Senate committee recommendations for policy changes brought to the Senate at its October or November meeting so that such changes could be implemented for student registration at the earliest possible time.

BRF:pr

cc: N. Struna

4/29/93 To EC - Deferred

5/13/93 To EC



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

DEPARTMENT OF KINESIOLOGY

27 March 1993

Memorandaum

To: Dr. Jacob Goldhaber, Acting Provost

From: Nancy L. Struna, Chairperson
Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising

Re: Admissions/Advising Second-year Report

In accord with the Campus Senate Executive Committee's request, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising has discussed the "points of contention" relative to the current admissions and advising scheme. In the attached pages, we are providing you with the substance of those discussions and recommendations for changes in the policy. There seem to be four central points of contention on campus regarding the undergraduate admission/advising policy: the 56-credit threshold, the need for an advising home for students who are "between" majors, the gateways for Limited Enrollment Programs, and the tension between two different mind-sets.

If either you or the Senate Executive Committee have questions about our assessment, please do not hesitate to ask me.

Executive Summary, Admissions and Advising Two-year Report

As requested by the campus Senate Executive Committee, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising has reviewed the "points of contention" relative to the current undergraduate admissions and advising scheme on campus. There seem to be four central points of contention regarding the undergraduate admission/advising policy: the 56-credit threshold, the need for an interim advising home for several groups of students, the gateway courses for Limited Enrollment Programs, and the tension between two different mind-sets. Below are our recommendations for action by both the Senate and the office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost. The review, in its entirety, then follows.

Recommendations for the Campus Senate:

The committee requests that the Senate:

- Review the 56-credit threshold provision in the admissions policy, with a view to increasing its flexibility for external transfers, returning students, and native students who are making progress toward LEP eligibility but will not have completed the gateway by the time they complete 56 credits.
- Review the provision for Letters and Sciences in the admissions policy, with a view to expanding its responsibilities as an advising home for particular groups of students.
- Review the nature, function, and relationship to LEP curricula of the gateway courses, with a view to redefining the concept of gateway courses to one that strikes a balance between the integrity of the various LEP disciplines and the needs of students.

Recommendations for the Office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost

The committee requests that the Provost's office:

- Empower and fund the Division of Letters and Sciences to provide an interim advising home for all students who need one.

- Empower the Office of Undergraduate Admissions to admit 56+ credit external transfer and returning students who are academically sound and who appear to need one semester to complete LEP gateways and place them in the interim advising "home" noted above.
- Resolve issues involving gateway course accessibility in LEPs.
- Resolve ad hoc LEP-generated responses to the new admissions and advising scheme.
- Monitor the consequences of the 45-credit review by LEPs, particularly the flow of students into and out of the LEPs.

Submitted by Nancy L. Struna, Chairperson,
for the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising
29 March 1993

Admissions and Advising Two-year Report

As requested by the Campus Senate Executive Committee, the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising has reviewed the "points of contention" relative to the current undergraduate admissions and advising scheme on campus. The current admissions policy was implemented in the fall semester, 1991, so no cohort of students has yet made its way through the university under this policy. What follows, then, should not be read as a final review of the policy. Nor should it be read as a comprehensive review; it is the product of an advisory committee that has focused its advice to the Provost on guidelines for implementing the policy, including setting up the Limited Enrollment Programs. The responsibility for monitoring the programs and students affected by the policy rests with the office of the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Thus, the Provost's office may wish to offer additional comments to the Senate Executive Committee.

There seem to be four central points of contention on campus regarding the undergraduate admission/advising policy: the 56-credit threshold, the need for an advising home for students who are "between" majors, the gateways for Limited Enrollment Programs, and the tension between two different mind-sets. I shall describe the issues and the committee's recommendations about each of the four items.

56-Credit Threshold

Perhaps the most significant issue involving the new admissions policy is the 56-credit threshold. The policy states that all students must declare an academic major when they complete 56 credits. The same threshold applies to applicants, both internal and external, to Limited Enrollment programs. To date, the Provost's Advisory committee, Undergraduate Admissions, Letters and Sciences, and most LEPs have tried to honor this rule, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to do so. Since the Senate adopted the policy in the spring of 1990, several factors have changed. For one thing, with the recession and the demographic "blip," the campus has seen a decrease in the numbers of traditional students both applying to and enrolling in UMCP and an increase in the activity of older students and returning/re-enrolling students. Moreover, external transfer students have become more important in the quest to achieve, or even approximate, campus enrollment targets.

This provision in the admissions policy is increasingly problematic on two counts. The first is the academic matter, particularly in the context of

LEPs. Implemented strictly, the policy mandates that LEPs admit, and the campus enroll, only those students who meet the gateway requirements by the time they have completed 56 credits. Students who meet the gateway requirements are to be admitted to the LEPs, while those who do not are to be advised to select another major. By now, however, we are seeing three groups of students for whom the 56-credit threshold, especially when coupled with the curriculum requirements of LEP majors, may be an unnecessary and perhaps unfair and unwise barrier. There are external transfer students, many of whom possess good academic records, who do not meet the gateway requirements for a variety of reasons when they come on campus. There are also older, returning students who have decided that they are now interested in an LEP major. Finally, there are native students, would-be internal transfers, who did not, when they initially enrolled at UMCP, have the requisite backgrounds, especially in courses which rely on expertise in mathematics, to complete all of the gateway courses by the time they reached 56 credits. Students in each of these categories need at least a semester beyond the 56-credit threshold to test their interests and/or to complete the gateways.

Some of these students, especially prospective external transfers and older ones, have chosen not to enroll at UMCP since they were not admitted to their major of choice; and this behavior leads to the second point, the matter of marketing. The simple fact is that the campus needs these external transfer and returning students, especially the better ones. Yet, it is difficult to convince them to attend UMCP, where, if they are at or over 56 credits, they can not be admitted to LEP majors. They have institutional options, and they can and will go where they have access to their desired majors.

Recommendation:

The committee thus recommends that the Senate review the 56-credit threshold provision in the admissions policy, with a view to increasing its flexibility for external transfers, returning students, and native students whom we may be able to retain if we give them more time to complete the gateway courses. We know, of course, that this exploration will not and can not occur overnight. Thus, we also recommend an interim course of action for two of the three groups of students whom we have discussed. In consultation with the Provost's office and the affected LEPs, Undergraduate Admissions should admit 56+-credit external transfer and returning students who are academically sound and who appear to need one semester to complete LEP gateways, to an interim advising "home." This could be set up under the auspices of the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, perhaps in Letters and Sciences.

If a program for interim advising is secured in Letters and Sciences, we also suggest that it may accommodate the third group of students:

native students, or would-be internal transfers, who appear to need more time to complete gateways. As more directly admitted students leave the LEPs, either before or after the 45-credit review, there may be room for such students in the LEPs. Given that possibility, the final disposition of this group of students is probably best determined by the Provost's office and the affected LEPs. The abysmal retention rate of the campus encourages a less categorical approach to these students, but only a Senate review of the 56-credit threshold will determine their fate.

Between-Majors Students

Not unrelated to this temporary solution for students who are at or over the 56-credit threshold is another collection of students who also appear to need temporary homes. The new admissions policy provided for the entry of students into academic majors, both LEP and non-LEP, as well as for the entry of undecided students below 56 credits into the Division of Letters and Sciences. What it did not provide for well, however, is for students who are between majors, regardless of their credit level, and for students who had been directly admitted as freshmen to LEPs and who then "failed" the 45-credit review. "Where do these students go?" is a question we are ginning to hear often at this point, and the situation will only worsen as more students leave LEPs. So this is the second critical point of contention regarding the new admissions and advising policy.

The new policy established Letters and Sciences as an initial home for undecided freshmen and sophomores. Its goal was two-fold: to ensure that those students got sound advising on a program of general education courses and to advise students about possible majors and help them make the necessary connections to academic majors. Nothing in the policy suggests that Letters and Sciences was intended to advise freshmen and sophomores who were between majors, either by choice or because they had been ejected from LEPs after the 45-credit review. Nor does anything in the policy suggest that Letters and Sciences was to become a home for students with more than 56 credits who wanted to leave a major but who had not decided on another one.

All of this is not to suggest that the Division of Letters and Sciences could not or should not become the home for these kinds of students. In fact, it might be very sensible for Letters and Sciences to house and advise all "interim" students. It is not, however, within the purview of this committee to make such an assignment. Moreover, to extend the definition and function of the Division of Letters and Sciences, we believe, requires another change in the policy.

Recommendation:

So on this point, we again recommend that the Senate review the provision for Letters and Sciences in the admissions policy. We also recommend an interim course of action: the Provost's office and the Dean for Undergraduate Studies should empower and fund the Division of Letters and Sciences to provide an interim advising home for all students who need one.

LEP Gateway Courses:

The third major point of contention involves the gateway courses for Limited Enrollment Programs. Actually, there are several sub-issues here. One is the matter of course accessibility. The policy maintained that LEPs should make their gateway courses available to all students who wish to try them. Some LEPs still have not done so.

A second sub-issue is the nature of the gateway courses, and on this matter the committee assumes some responsibility. The policy specified that gateway courses, which are only one component of the entire gateway, should be predictors of eventual success in the major and be able to be completed in one semester. In only one case did this ideal type become reality. In other cases, the committee acceded to the wishes of the programs for gateway courses that were required by and logically sequenced within the LEP curriculum. Most departments/colleges either would not or could not define a one semester course gateway that made academic sense; their gateway courses thus require more than one semester, and a few have prerequisites. Moreover, some incoming freshmen are not prepared to take the gateway courses, either immediately or even in a timely manner (this issue is raised above, in the context of the 56-credit threshold). This is particularly true for courses that require a math competency. In one case, as well, Maryland community college students who might have wished to transfer to UMCP were unable to get a gateway course on their own campuses.

The point to all of this is that we on the committee have implemented a gateway course process that is more complex than is the one anticipated by the policy. This process, in turn, is complicating the progress of some students. Some students are progressing slowly through the gateway courses; and, in the case of the math-dependent courses, some students may not make it through all of the courses by the 56-credit threshold. The entry of some transfer students especially may be delayed.

Recommendation:

Only one of the issues involving gateway courses requires action by the

Senate, we believe. This is the matter of the definition of gateway courses, the letter of which the Provost's Advisory Committee has violated. The committee recommends that the Senate review the nature, function, and relationship to LEP curricula of the gateway courses. Perhaps the Senate will agree with the committee that the conception of the gateway courses as indicated in the policy was, at best, simplistic and that a more academically sound approach is one that strikes a balance between the integrity of the various LEP disciplines and the needs of students.

The other issues can be resolved with no policy review. The issue of accessibility can be resolved by the Provost's office. Changes, if any, in the exact gateway courses can be negotiated by the Provost's office and the committee on one hand and an LEP on the other hand. We have already seen one gateway course change occur, to the advantage of transfer students; and we can work to clarify the messages about gateway courses that campus agents give or that in other ways get out to prospective students.

The Mind-Set Dilemma

The final major point of contention involves the attitudes of administrators and faculty within the LEPs. About this issue, we on the committee have no formal recommendations about Senate action and only one for Provostial action. We do, however, urge both units to encourage or in other ways get more people "on the same page."

Many of the criticisms of the new policy, many of the problems that the committee and the Provost's office have tried to resolve, and much of the undercurrent of dissent that comes from the LEPs owe, we believe, to the fact that a sufficient mind-set change has not occurred. The old policy permitted selective admissions on the basis of strictly academic standards; the new one established program limits on the basis of resource constraints. LEPs were to open their doors to as many students as they could accommodate, given their resources. With the probable exception of the gateway course requirements, the committee has tried to be true to this principle. In many instances, however, we are seeing ad hoc LEP-generated alterations, adjustments, and messages given to students, which reflect a residual selective admissions mind-set. Most of the resultant "problems" are program specific. One LEP is limiting access to one of its gateway courses precisely because it wants to use the course to select majors. Another is setting up an informal system of provisional admission and retention. Still another is refusing to view Maryland community college students as "native" students (which is an articulation definition) who can complete the gateway courses on their own campus, pass through

the equivalent 45-credit review, and be immediately admissible to the LEP when they enroll here.

Taken together, however, all of these limited LEP-specific ad hoc procedures and "requirements" are creating a public relations nightmare for the campus. This is especially critical, given the bad publicity UMCP has already received in the state because of our budget problems. As a campus we need either to get more people on board this new system, including the fact that it is not like the old selective admissions, or we need to change it substantially to accommodate the selective admissions mentality of some programs.

Recommendation:

The Provost's office should identify and resolve ad hoc LEP-generated actions that detract from the goals of the new admissions and advising plan.

Conclusion


These four items, we believe, are the substantive "points of contention" regarding the new admissions policy at this point. One additional "problem" may arise as more students fail to progress through the 45-credit review. We all may be wise to anticipate one undesirable consequence of this process: some students who just barely fail the review, either because they have not completed all the requirements or because they fall just below the passing threshold, will have to be turned out. Depending on the outcome of the Senate review of the 56-credit threshold, the fate of some of these students may be less harsh; the group of students who were not completing the gateway "on time" were discussed earlier in this report.

In any case, the ejection of students, especially borderline or more slowly progressing ones, from LEPs will undoubtedly generate additional problems for the campus. Some LEPs may find interesting ways to keep some of these students, e.g., setting up provisional retention categories; and in so doing, they may also keep out a student who completed the gateway process. Parents of students on the margins, on the other hand, may complain that "if my student was good enough to get in why should he or she not be considered good enough to stay?" We bring this up because we believe we need to have an answer ready. In the next month the committee will try to formulate some responses and solutions to 45-credit review related issues, and the Provost's office will undoubtedly generate others. We also recommend that the Provost's office monitor the results and consequences of the 45-credit reviews.

In closing, the committee suggests that the most critical "points of contention" are the first and the last ones we have described, the 56-credit threshold and the "mind-set problem." The Senate needs to be apprised of the damaging academic and marketing effects of the strict 56-credit limit provision. Especially given that the fiscal and demographic climate in which the new admissions policy was conceived has changed, this limit needs to be rethought and, more to the point, either eliminated or altered so that Undergraduate Admissions, the LEPs, Letters and Sciences, and the campus as a whole have some latitude in which to work with and for students. Second, we need to get more people to understand and to work within a policy predicated on resource constraints rather than the selection of the very best students. The option is to change the policy in more dramatic ways than we have suggested.

Submitted by Nancy L. Struna, Chairperson,
for the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising
29 March 1993

PACAA Report (1995)



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS
AND DEAN FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES

November 29, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Daniel Fallon
Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

FROM: Robert Hampton *RA*
Associate Provost for Academic Affairs
and Dean for Undergraduate Studies

SUBJECT: PACAA Report to College Park Senate

On the basis of work done by the PACAA committee during the 1994-95 academic year, Joelle Presson, former chair of PACAA, prepared the attached recommendations in July. After reviewing her report, I believe we should accept her overall recommendations, some of which need to be sent to the College Park Senate for discussion. Michael Coplan, as current PACAA chair, will oversee the committee's future direction and has agreed to work with both the Senate and with this office on the discussions of ways to implement the recommendations in this report.

General observations

PACAA is charged to work on achieving resource balance, i.e. when there is a significant imbalance between departmental or college resources and enrollments. The resolution of such imbalances often directly affects enrollments in other units on campus. Because these problems are interconnected, the campus would benefit from a closer relationship between PACAA and the Enrollment Management Working Group, which makes recommendations about enrollments campus-wide. One member of PACAA should be designated to serve as a liaison to the Enrollment Management Working Group.

In terms of its responsibilities toward the campus' Limited Enrollment Programs (LEPs), PACAA should continue to survey these programs in order to anticipate where enrollment-management problems may develop and to assist LEPs already experiencing problems to solve them. One of PACAA's emphases in the coming year should be to clarify and expand its involvement in deciding which programs become LEPs. The Presson report recommends that the term "Limited Enrollment Program" be eliminated and that a new title that suggests greater flexibility be instituted. I agree that the LEP title and policy should be reviewed; the name change seems less important, however.

Selected specific recommendations

For Senate review:

- **Enrollment control:** According to the original Senate Policy, "Normally, LEPs shall be granted to achieve resource balances. Other considerations may include specialized requirements of the major and professional accreditation standards." The recommendations include a proposal that an additional factor be added so that programs with "[d]ocumented national standards for a given academic area that put the UMCP unit at a recruiting disadvantage if certain protective measures are not instituted" should be referred to the College Park Senate for consideration.
- **PACAA and campus advising.** The report notes that PACAA's original mandate does not make clear its relations to advising in general and to the advising handled by Letters and Sciences in particular. Dr. Presson's recommendation is that PACAA limit its oversight to advising in the LEP units. She then recommends that advising in Letters and Sciences be under the purview of the originally mandated committee of deans. (While I believe it would be helpful if the Senate clarified PACAA's role with respect to advising, I am not recommending that PACAA's Letters and Sciences oversight be resurrected.) Furthermore, I would like to present the Senate with a set of recommendations about advising that include Letters and Sciences.
- **Program access.** All students should have the right to declare and to try any major on campus. The report recommends that this policy continue, though attention should be given to reconsidering how gateways to LEPs work within individual programs. I believe we must do all we can to continue this access for our students.
 - Once students are admitted to LEPs, their progress should be monitored and assessed. Students who are not successful in an LEP once they are admitted should be helped to choose other majors in order not to unnecessarily increase their time to graduation.
 - Advising throughout the LEPs should be expected to be continual and close during a student's progress through the first 45 credits of an LEP program or until the final decision about admission to the LEP is made.

For administrative follow-up:

- **Broadened role:** PACAA was established by the Senate policy to "...provide ongoing oversight, and to bring unforeseen problems to the attention of the campus." In the first several years of its existence, PACAA devoted its time and energy in establishing the LEPs in the departments needing enrollment controls. During the past year's review, the committee began to discuss ways of monitoring enrollment shifts as they occur around campus to be able to anticipate problem areas. PACAA's purview should be extended to deal with enrollment problems experienced by any academic unit and not just LEPs. PACAA would use its experience in dealing with LEP enrollment to help other programs focus on the problems specific to them but would not consider campus-wide enrollment-management issues.
 - The University should develop more comprehensive, set measures to use as a baseline in evaluating programs experiencing enrollment-based stress.
 - Some mechanism should be developed that will help PACAA and the University to detect key changes in enrollment figures or other information that might help to predict such stresses. The full report suggests how this might be done.

- Institutional support for PACAA. As PACAA's role has become more widespread, its need for administrative support has increased. Specific support recommendations are appended to Dr. Presson's report; however I believe that significant support must come from my office.

cc: Michael Coplan, Chair, PACAA
Joelle Presson, Former Chair, PACAA
Charles Wellford, President, College Park Senate

Enclosure: PACAA Report to the College Park Senate



RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

UMCP SENATE

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

COLLEGE OF LIFE SCIENCES
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES PROGRAM

July 5, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: DR. ROBERT HAMPTON, ASSOCIATE PROVOST,
FROM: DR. JOELLE PRESSON, CHAIR PACAA
RE: REPORT TO SENATE ON PACAA

*Academic
Affairs,
Dean Undergraduate
Studies*

The enclosed report summarizes the work of PACAA under my direction through Spring 1995, along with the committees recommendations for the future of the LEP program. I request that you forward this to the Provost for his approval, and that it then be sent to the chair of the Senate. Please call if there are any questions.

With the delivery of this report I formally resign from PACAA, both as member and chair. I have served the committee for three years, and it is time for new leadership. I have enjoyed this opportunity to contribute to the Campus and will be available to transition the new chair.

REPORT TO THE SENATE
from the
PROVOST'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE on ADMISSIONS AND ADVISING: PACAA
prepared by
JOELLE PRESSON, CHAIR FALL 1993 to SPRING 1995

I. Brief history of PACAA.

PACAA was instituted in 1991 as a result of the implementation of a Senate policy regarding admissions and advising. The policy dealt with two campus-wide problems. One was the need for a single advising home for students with no declared major. The second was need to protect academic units from the swings in enrollments that put pressure on existing resources. The first was accomplished by the establishment of Letters and Sciences as an advising unit within undergraduate studies. The second was accomplished by the establishment of the LEP: Limited Enrollment Program. The LEP had associated with it policies regarding admissions and advising.

Two committees were established to oversee these operations and programs. First, a committee of Deans of various colleges was intended to monitor and control the operations of Letters and Sciences. To our knowledge, this committee has never functioned (see recommendations below). The second committee, PACAA, was constituted as a faculty advisory committee. It was intended to consider applications for LEP status, monitor LEP programs, and make recommendations to the Provost regarding these. PACAA has been very active since the initiation of the Advising and Admissions policy, and has grown to play a central role in negotiating the implementation of the policy within the confines of the Admissions and Advising guidelines.

A report was made to the Senate in Spring 1993 by the previous chair of PACAA, Nancy Struna. The present report will deal with the activities of the PACAA since that time, overall success of the LEP policy, and suggestions for its form in the future. This report will be abstract and conceptual, in an effort to convey the principles at work without being lost in the details.

I. Summary of PACAA activities from Fall 1993 to Spring 1995.

During the 1993 - 1994 academic year PACAA was in a reactive mode. The enrollments in some of the LEP programs was falling, overall enrollment in the University was falling, the State-supported University budget was falling, and incoming students, both freshmen and transfers, were alienated by an admissions policy that restricted access to certain majors. At the same time, some LEP units, in an effort to enhance the quality of their undergraduates, made efforts to strengthen the academic standards used to admit and graduate students. These forces clashed in the 1993-1994 academic year and PACAA played a central role in negotiating compromises to satisfy all parties concerned.

In dealing with these conflicts, a number of guiding principles emerged. These represent the current operating philosophy of the committee, and are formalized in the recommendations in section III below.

1. Each LEP unit was dealt with individually. A "one program fits all" approach did not work. PACAA worked carefully to be responsive to the enrollment stresses of each LEP unit, while at the same time balancing the overall needs of the campus.
2. In cases where students were entering the University with a clear interest in an LEP major, we found it desirable to have advising in that major rather than in Letter's and Sciences. This policy was adopted for Engineering, Business, Psychology, and Government/Politics, with individual variations. In all cases this was done by effectively moving the LEP gateway (i.e. the courses that must be completed to declare the major) *inside* the major, i.e. to be completed after the student is allowed to declare the major, rather than before. In two cases this meant the establishment of, essentially, a "pre-" major within the College concerned, with the stipulation that the advising responsibility for these students lies squarely with the home College and not in Letters and Sciences. This simple shift in policy, while taking much time to negotiate with each unit, left Admissions, students, and the LEP units with a much clearer sense of how to accomplish their goals and stress in the system was greatly reduced.

3. In conjunction with the PCC committee, PACAA adopted the position that academic standards that exceed general university requirements are granted only in the context of some LEP rationale. These should not to be formalized outside of the LEP process.
4. There is no apriori reason why an LEP unit cannot maintain protection from enrollment pressures, in the form of its LEP program, indefinitely, if their enrollments are maintained at a target level. If enrollments are in balance this is a sign of success of the program, and not a sign that protection should be lifted.
5. In some instances the case for enrollment protection in the form of selective academic standards might be made based upon considerations other than enrollment pressure. This was done in the case of Engineering, and is considered more fully in section III below.
6. LEP units must have a stable "window" of time during which the impact of any new change in operations can be assessed. PACAA guaranteed the units involved that there would not be a review of enrollments for a period of at least two years after a program change. PACAA would certainly be available for discussions if the units needed attention.

One advantage of allowing the units time to evaluate the impact of changes in academic policies was that PACAA now had much needed time to consider the overall LEP process. Thus, the academic year of 1994-1995 was profitably spent considering the shape of its year-end recommendations to the Senate. This deliberative processes was carried out with input from the Senate PCC regarding the respective roles of the two committees; both in the form of a joint meeting with PCC and the chair of PACAA, and by the presence of the chair of PCC on PACAA. In addition, we collaborated very fruitfully with ACCESS on issues of using data to evaluate enrollment stress on a unit. The results of these deliberations are best expressed in a formal set of recommendations, for both the future of the LEP policy, and for the work of PACAA. These follow in section III.

III. Recommendations to the Senate regarding the nature of LEP protection, and the operations of PACAA.

A. Current LEP program, weaknesses and strengths.

1. Weaknesses

a. Current policy forces all programs to adopt a similar overall structure to control enrollment.

b. The imposition of restrictions on declaring a major associated with the current program has had a greater than desired negative impact on recruiting and enrollments.

c. The establishment of Letter's and Sciences was a positive step (see below), but the policy of having Letter's and Sciences advise students who clearly want a particular major is not ideal. Such students should be advised in that department as they work to meet the requirements of that major.

d. The current policy of using academic standards to control enrollment confuses the two issues, which really need to be discussed separately.

2. Strengths of current program.

a. While there is some debate about the appropriateness of enrollment control, most concur that at times protection from over-enrollment can allow programs time to develop a more controlled major. The key to success of such protection is to NOT overcompensate, causing enrollments to fall, and to be sure that the unit is progressing with appropriate changes in the program during the control period.

b. The establishment of L&S provides a needed home for students who do not know what major they wish to declare.

c. The establishment and operation of PACAA has: 1) provided a venue for monitoring the LEPs; 2) a group of campus-wide faculty to help the units in the modifications

to their programs; 3) an open forum for discussion of enrollment issues related to specific academic units; 4) a conduit for presenting the case of each unit to the higher Administration; 5) a means of individualizing the LEP program to the needs of the individual units.

B. Concrete suggestions for enrollment control policy.

PACAA recommends that the Senate re-write the enrollment control policy around the following themes.

1. We recommend that the formal designation "limited enrollment program" be eliminated for any future units that earn enrollment protections, and that a more flexible policy of enrollment protection be instituted. That policy would embody features discussed in this summary, and would be implemented by PACAA.
2. Enrollment control may in some cases be necessary. PACAA recommends the following considerations in determining the need for enrollment control. These are not exhaustive, but indicative of the range of problems units might encounter. Note that the list emphasizes documentation of the special circumstances.
 - a. Objectively measured enrollment pressures that strain available resources.
 - b. Documented national standards for a given academic area that put the UMCP unit at a recruiting disadvantage if certain protective measures are not instituted.
 - c. Documented need for special skills or background in order for students to succeed in major.
2. Enrollment control problems being experienced by any unit (not just current LEPs) should be considered by a faculty committee. Since PACAA has a successful history of dealing with these issues, we recommend that PACAA continue in this role, under the following guidelines:
 - a. PACAA should NOT consider the broad campus-wide issues of enrollment management. Rather, PACAA should deal with

individual units to come up with solutions to local enrollment problems. More specifically PACAA would provide an open faculty forum in which units could discuss enrollment problems and arrive at solutions tailored to their needs. Furthermore, PACAA would act as an official advocate for the unit and its proposals to the various decision-making and resource-allocating committees and offices on campus. Under these guidelines a unit might, in consultation with PACAA, be allowed circumscribed protective measures without being labeled an "LEP".

b. We suggest that PACAA use a more comprehensive set of objective measures as a starting point to evaluate enrollment-based stress on academic resources. PACAA has worked closely with ACCESS and OIS to come up with a proposed list of such measures. We emphasize that this list would be a beginning point in discussions with units. PACAA is keenly aware that negotiations with any unit must be individualized and proceed with full input of the units perspective. However, we also argue that the campus would benefit if all units coming to PACAA were to share at least some common measures of enrollment pressure. The list developed in conjunction with ACCESS would provide this. This list is attached at the end of this report. *Note: PACAA has not had the opportunity to discuss this list with current LEP units. We recommend that before the list, or any other, is adopted that we execute some trial analyses in collaboration with selected LEP and non-LEP units to determine the list's utility.*

c. PACAA suggests that some mechanism be implemented to detect changes in these key numbers that might predict future stress in a unit. The aim of such a mechanism would be to intervene with more modest adjustments early on in an enrollment surge in order to avoid more precipitous measurements needed when the problem becomes overwhelming. *Note: PACAA recommends that more deliberation is needed before deciding exactly how to use such a list*

of measures. Several options have been discussed, but thus far a consensus has not been reached. We plan to continue these discussions next year. Some of these options are:

1. OIS could run these numbers, or a subset, routinely on all Colleges. The information could be provided to: the Colleges themselves with a note pointing out measures that are indicating potential stress; PACAA; some central administrative office or officer; or any combination of above.

2. The availability of this comprehensive set of numbers could be advertised to Colleges on campus and their use left with the academic units.

3. The set of measures could be run at the request of PACAA in the event a unit comes forward with a proposal for protection.

d. The current enrollment policy gives PACAA a role in evaluating advising. PACAA has to some extent fulfilled this charge with respect to advising as it relates to units with enrollment pressures. However, the intent of this empowerment is not at all clear from the original document, particularly with respect to oversight of Letters and Sciences and to overall advising efforts on campus. Advising in both of these contexts requires oversight by a faculty committee, but PACAA's charge is sufficiently time-consuming without these additional items. Thus, we make the explicit recommendation that PACAA's role in evaluating advising be restricted to those units and situations that are related to enrollment pressures.

With regard to the advising role of Letter's and Sciences, PACAA recommends that the originally mandated committee of Deans begin operating as an oversight committee for this advising unit.

3. If procedures are put in place to control enrollment, they

should be aimed at gradual adjustments to meet the demand, not large, abrupt adjustments.

4. All students should have the right to declare and try any major on campus, even under conditions of enrollment pressures.

1. The process by which units allow this can vary depending on the academic background required to be successful in the major, the current enrollment pressures on the major, etc. The recently worked-out arrangements with some of the current LEP units are examples of how to individualize this requirement.

5. One of the first steps in controlling enrollments is to identify students who are not successful. Procedures should be instituted to modify the major to more quickly inform students that they are not succeeding, and to get them into a more appropriate major.

6. Straight academic controls, such as GPA or SAT should be instituted only as a last resort, or if the unit can make a convincing argument otherwise for their need.

7. All of the enrollment control procedures clearly require a maximum of advising effort. A procedure should be worked out whereby units under enrollment pressure have adequate advising resources to deal with those students. Advising at UMCP should be adequately supported with resources, and some percentage of the advising resources should be "mobile". I.e. able to follow the enrollment pressures to different units on campus.

C. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT FOR THE WORK OF PACAA. PACAA's work over the past few years, and the work recommended for the committee in this report, require a certain amount administrative support. While the chair of PACAA takes some administrative responsibilities, the need is greater than a faculty member volunteering time can provide. Some explicit recommendations for such institutional support are given here.

A. It is recommended that someone associated with the Provost's office be specifically designated to work with and support PACAA. This person would be responsible for keeping track of PACAA recommendations to encourage timely action on them. Also, someone is needed to oversee and ensure the implementation of approved PACAA recommendations. This person would bring together and organize any information that PACAA required in its deliberations, such as enrollment figures, admissions numbers, etc. While many of these functions are currently carried out informally, the lack of an individual explicitly empowered to act in this manner has hindered PACAA efficiency in the past.

B. It is recommended that the units working with PACAA give brief reports, via the contact person in the Provost's office, indicating how the program is progressing. The brief report would include indications of which of the specific recommendations have actually been implemented, and what further action is needed. This would alleviate the current difficulty of PACAA not always knowing the results of their actions, and thus whether the specific recommendation was indeed appropriate.

LEP Determination Form

5/2/95

working document - under discussion

POTENTIAL INDICATORS OF STRESS	DEPT #1		Comparison	
	Measure	% chng 1990-94	Measure	% chng 1990-94
Number of Majors, Fall 1994	Undergraduates			
	Graduates			
Average Lecture Size, Fall 1994	Lower Level			
	Upper Level			
	Graduate			
Average Discussion Size, Fall 1994	Lower Level			
	Upper Level			
	Graduate			
Average Lab Size, Fall 1994	Lower Level			
	Upper Level			
	Graduate			
Average Number of Waitlist Courses, Fall 1994				
Percent of Majors Waiting for Major Courses	Undergraduate			
	Graduate			
Total Credits Taught by Dept Academic Year, 1994-95	Lower Level Course			
	Upper Level Course			
	Graduate Course			
Percent of Credits Taught by Department That Were Taught to Non-Majors, AY 94-95	Lower Level Course			
	Upper Level Course			
	Graduate Course			
Number of Graduate Assistants, Fall 1994	% state-supported			
# of TAs Who Were Instructors of Record, Fall 1994				
Total Faculty Headcount, Fall 1994				
Total Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty, Fall 1994				
Turnover Rate of Tenured/Ten-Trk Faculty (1993-94)				
Actual Instructional FTE (Ten/Ten-Trk Only), FY1995				
Percent Breakdown of Lower Level Course Credits Taught by Faculty, Fall 1994	Tenured/Ten-Trk			
	Teaching Asst			
	Other			
Percent Breakdown of Upper Level Course Credits Taught by Faculty, Fall 1994	Tenured/Ten-Trk			
	Teaching Asst			
	Other			
Majors per Instructional FTE, Fall 1994	Undergraduates			
	Graduates			
State-Supported Budget, FY95				
Total Sponsored Research Dollars, FY95				
One-Year Retention Rate, Fall 1993 Freshman Cohort	Retained in Major			
	Retained on Campus			
Number of Applications, Fall 1994	New Freshmen			
	Transfers			
Number of Admissions, Fall 1994	New Freshmen			
	Transfers			
Number Enrolled, Fall 1994	New Freshmen			
	Transfers			
STUDENT FLOW DATA				
Number of majors, Fall 1994	Freshmen			
	Sophomores			
	Juniors			
	Seniors			

POTENTIAL INDICATORS OF STRESS DATA DEFINITIONS

Number of majors

Number of undergraduates and graduates who are enrolled at UMCP in the fall of 1994 and are registered as being a major in the department.

Average lecture size

Average number of students taught in courses that are considered to be lecture courses in the department, Fall 1994.

Average discussion size

Average number of students taught in courses that are considered to be discussion courses in the department, Fall 1994.

Average lab size

Average number of students taught in courses that are considered to be lab courses in the department, Fall 1994.

Average number of waitlist courses

Average number of waitlisted courses in the department per waitlisted student at the end of Day 1 of schedule adjustment, Fall 1994.

Percent of majors waiting for major courses

Number of majors on a waitlist for courses in their major on Day 5 of schedule adjustment as a percentage of the total number of majors, Fall 1994.

Total credits taught by department

Total number of credits taught over the academic year 1994-95 in courses in the department (faculty can be from any department).

Percent of credits taught by department that were taught to non-majors

Proportion of the credits taught in the department in the academic year 1994-94 to students who were not majoring in the department. This number represents a measure of department "contribution" to the university.

Number of graduate assistants

Total number of teaching and research assistants during the Fall 1994, including the percent of these assistants who were state supported.

Number of TAs who were instructors of record

Total number of teaching assistants who were registered as being the instructor of record for courses in the department, Fall 1994.

Total faculty headcount

All persons listed as active faculty by personnel at the time of the Fall employee freeze (October), including those who are tenured, on tenure-track, and not on tenure-track, employed by the department in Fall 1994. This number includes department chairs and does not include GAs.

Total tenured/tenure-track faculty

All persons listed as active faculty by personnel at the time of the Fall employee freeze (October) who have tenure or are on tenure track. This number includes chairs and assistant chairs, but excludes Deans.

Turnover rate of tenured/tenure-track faculty

The percentage of tenure and tenure-track faculty who were in the department in the Fall of 1993 and exited by the Fall of 1994. The number of faculty who exit the department or UMCP is divided by the total number of faculty in the department in Fall 1993.

Actual instructional FTE tenured/tenure-track faculty

The FTE associated with the instructional funds paid by the department to tenure and tenure-track faculty, FY95.

Percent breakdown of lower level course credits taught by faculty

The number of course credits taught by each group of the total number of credits taught in the department, including only course credits at the 100 and 200 level, Fall 1994.

Percent breakdown of upper level course credits taught by faculty

The number of course credits taught by each group of the total number of credits taught in the department, including only course credits at the 300 and 400 level, Fall 1994.

Number of majors per instructional FTE

The total number of undergraduate and graduate majors per each instructional FTE faculty in the department, Fall 1994.

State-supported budget

The state-supported budget of the department, FY95.

Total sponsored research dollars

Total number of dollars spent on sponsored research, including direct and indirect costs, FY95.

One-year retention rate

Percent of first-time, full-time, degree-seeking freshmen in a major who began in Fall 1993 and are either retained in their major or are still enrolled UMCP in Fall 1994.

Number of applications

The number of undergraduate applications received by UMCP for the Fall 1994 entering class, by freshman and transfer status.

Number of admissions

Of the number of undergraduate applications received by UMCP for the Fall 1994 entering class, the number who were offered admission, by freshman and transfer status.

Number enrolled

Of the number of undergraduate applications received by UMCP and admitted for the Fall 1994 entering class, the number who enrolled in Fall 1994, by freshman and transfer status.

Number of majors by level

The number of students registered in a major at the end of Fall Schedule Adjustment (Day 10 of classes), by class standing, Fall 1994.

Correspondence between Senate Chair and Dean for Undergraduate Studies (1996)



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AT COLLEGE PARK

COLLEGE PARK SENATE

April 11, 1996

Dr. Robert Hampton
Dean, Undergraduate Studies
2130 Mitchell Building
CAMPUS

Dear Dean Hampton:

Thank you for your response of April 1st. The Senate Executive Committee agrees with your interpretation of the 1990 legislation on Limited Enrollment Programs (LEPs). In that Legislation the Provost's Advisory Committee on Admissions and Advising (PACAA) was to work with the approved units in adjusting standards where necessary, but the addition or subtraction of approved units were to come to the Senate.

The Admissions and Advising report (See Part V., Paragraph E., "Implementation") also calls for the Senate to review the policy after five years. This review is now due, if not overdue, and a good beginning would be made if PACAA were to provide the Senate with information on the additions or subtractions of units since the initial legislation.

As the Senate and Academic Affairs review the policy it should be remembered that the 1990 policy was based upon the understanding that at a public university any enrolled student should be able to enroll in any program but scarce resources sometimes required temporary limits on heavily demanded programs. In other words, LEPs are undesirable and, when necessary, should be as few and as short-term as possible.

We look forward to working with you on these issues.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Charles F. Wellford".

Charles F. Wellford
Chair, College Park Senate

cc Michael Coplan
Chair, PACAA

4/19/96 TO EC

1 Apr 96 12:49:40 +1100
From: "Charles Wellford" <CWELLFORD@bss2.umd.edu>
To: ks76@umail.umd.edu
Date: Mon, 1 Apr 1996 12:49:12 EDT
Subject: (Fwd) PACCA Recommendations

for exec comm

----- Forwarded Message Follows -----

From: Robert Hampton <rhampton@deans.umd.edu>
Subject: PACCA Recommendations
To: cwellford@bss2.umd.edu
Date: Mon, 1 Apr 1996 10:04:00 -0500 (EST)
Cc: dfallon@deans.umd.edu, lwerth@deans.umd.edu, rhampton@deans.umd.edu

Good morning Charles,

Dan Fallon asked me to respond to your questions concerning PACAA. As I read the policy, basic issues governing Limited Enrollment Programs (LEP) require Senate involvement, however, adjustments to existing programs do not. Within this context the committee can recommend to the Provost changes to current LEP's (Architecture, Business, Engineering, Journalism, Government and Politics, Psychology, and Education). This procedure was adopted to provide a process that was responsive and less cumbersome than previous practices. The Senate receives an annual report that describes any adjustments that have been made to LEP's.

Earlier this year the Provost approved a PACAA recommendation for enrollment adjustments in the College of Business and Management. Several of us continue to work closely with the College around issues of implementation.

Last month, I received a recommendation from PACAA regarding enrollment adjustments in the School of Architecture. We are conducting a staff review of this recommendation and we are working with the academic unit to clarify some issues prior to forward it to the Provost for action.

If PACAA feels that there should be changes in the rules for LEP's, those recommendation must be submitted to the Senate for appropriate action. Joelle's Presson's Report to the Senate on PACAA contains several items. On behalf of the Provost, I am in the process of drafting an additional set of recommendations that I believe will assist the campus efforts to address enrollment control issues at the unit level.

I hope this is helpful. Please do not hesitate to let me or Dan know if you have additional questions.

Bob

4/3/96 TO EC

26 Mar 96 17:09:51 +1100

From: "Charles Wellford" <CWELLFORD@bss2.umd.edu>
To: dfallon@deans.umd.edu
Date: Tue, 26 Mar 1996 17:09:15 EDT
Subject: PACAA Recommendations
Cc: ks76@umail.umd.edu

PACAA

I reviewed your response to my inquiry concerning PACAA recommendations with the Executive Committee at our meeting on March 25. While we understand the reason for the delay in forwarding any recommendations, we wanted to be sure that no changes were being made in existing limited enrollment programs and that no additional programs were being approved without Senate action. Some suggested that perhaps changes were being approved without Senate involvement and asked me to seek your assurance that this was not the case. ARCH and GVPT were specifically mentioned but the suggestion was that there were others. Any help in clearing this up would be very much appreciated.

Charles



The key recommendations of the LEP task force are summarized below. Note that these do not necessarily represent changes in prior practice.

- The courses selected for the gateway should be those that are most predictive of graduation in the major.
- The gateway should not include courses that are required of all students, such as fundamental studies.
- The gateway should ordinarily include no more than three courses. These courses should not ordinarily have prerequisites. If an LEP wishes to have more than three gateway courses, the LEP should present an analysis showing that the additional courses are necessary to ensure that students admitted to the LEP will have a sufficiently high probability of graduation.
- The minimum grade in each gateway course should ordinarily be “C–.” If an LEP wishes to set a grade threshold for any gateway course higher than a “C–”, the LEP should present an analysis showing that the higher grade threshold is necessary to ensure that students admitted to the LEP will have a sufficiently high probability of graduation.
- The gateway courses and minimum grades for transfers should ordinarily be the same as for freshman. If an LEP wishes to have different gateway courses or higher grade thresholds for transfers, the LEP should present an analysis showing that these are necessary to ensure that transfer students have about the same probability of success as freshmen.
- Departments must ensure that students are able to complete all gateway requirements by 30 credits or in two consecutive semesters, taking into account the preparation of most students seeking entry to the LEP.
- Departments must ensure that seats in all gateway courses are actually available for all students seeking admission to the LEP.
- All gateway requirements should be completed within 45 credits or three semesters. Students admitted as freshmen will be reviewed after they have earned 45 credits; those who have not satisfied the gateway requirements will be removed from the major. Internal transfers should apply for admission to the LEP as soon as the gateway requirements are completed, but no later than the semester in which they have earned 45 credits. External transfers with 45 or more credits should satisfy all gateway requirements within one semester of admission to the University.
- Only one repeat of any of the gateway courses is permitted. If more than one course can satisfy a gateway requirement, only one repeat of any of the set of courses is permitted.
- Gateway requirements for each LEP should be reviewed every five years. Gateway courses and grade thresholds should be reviewed to ensure that they are the best predictors of success in the major; cumulative GPA thresholds should be reviewed to ensure that enrollment targets are being met.
- Actual enrollments and the enrollment target should be reviewed every five years to determine whether LEP status continues to be warranted.
- All LEPs should be given a corresponding program code in LTSC. This code would be used for tracking and advising only. Students seeking internal transfer to any LEP should notify their advisor, and advisors should ensure that the student is assigned the corresponding major code (e.g., LSTC-COMM).
- Advisors in each LEP major must be available to meet with students seeking internal transfer to the LEP. If individual advising is not available, LEPs should hold group information sessions about once per month during the fall and spring semesters for students seeking internal transfer admission.

The rationale for the recommendations was:

- Improve student success, increase graduation rate, and decrease time to degree for the entire undergraduate study body.
- Simplify, clarify, and accelerate the process through which students are admitted to LEPs or are informed that they will not be admitted and must find an alternative major.
- Maximize the ability of students to select any major for which they are qualified and prepared to succeed and likely to graduate in a timely fashion.

(Provided by Steve Fetter, Associate Provost for Academic Affairs)

Limited Enrollment Programs and the Enrollment Management Team

October 2017

The Enrollment Management Team (EMT) is appointed by the Provost and is the group designated to oversee the status of Limited Enrollment Programs (lep.umd.edu), among its other responsibilities. Currently, the EMT has the following members:

- Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies (Bill Cohen)
- Associate Provost for Academic Planning & Programs (Betsy Beise)
- Associate Vice President for Finance and Personnel (Cindi Hale)
- Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment (Sharon La Voy)
- Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management (Barbara Gill)
- Associate Vice President for Records, Registration & Extended Studies (Chuck Wilson)

There have been periodic reviews of Limited Enrollment Programs since the 1990 legislation. Most recently, there have been two comprehensive reviews.

- 2008-2009, after completion of the University's [2008 Strategic Plan](#). Goals 1.B and 2.H in the Undergraduate Education section called for review of undergraduate program sizes and examination of the impact of LEPs on recruitment. The Enrollment Management Team was established as the administrative oversight group as a result of the Strategic Plan.
- 2013: a cross-cutting look at LEPs, in collaboration with the units that offer them, to re-examine the current policies and procedures with a goal of improving student success and simplifying and clarifying the process through which students are admitted, and establishing common deadlines for application. A specific focus was to increase the number of native freshmen admitted directly in to LEPs. There was also a call for LEP programs to provide advising to students who were seeking internal transfer into the LEP. All LEPs were reviewed during this effort.

There have also been requests from programs to become LEPs, as well as requests for changes in the gateway requirements. These are accompanied by an analysis of need and impact on students as well as on other programs to which students might turn should they not gain successful entry. They are reviewed by the EMT, and then must be approved by the Provost prior to implementation. Every effort is made to ensure that external transfer students (e.g., from community colleges) are treated comparably to internal transfer students, so it may take up to two years for implementation for changes that impact transfer student admission.

Curriculum changes for approved LEPs will be reviewed by the EMT prior to review by the Senate PCC.

The Associate Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies maintains a document outlining procedures for proposing and renewing LEPs.



Instructions for Submitting LEP Proposals or Renewals

Limited Enrollment Programs (LEPs) are majors at the University of Maryland that control enrollment numbers to address situations where program capacity has been reached. Once a student has earned 45 credits, he or she must have successfully completed a specific set of courses called gateway requirements.

Students are either admitted to the programs as freshmen (direct admits) or as transfer students (internal or external). Directly admitted students must complete the gateway courses by 45 credits and maintain a GPA of 2.0. Transfer (internal or external) students must complete the gateway requirements to be admitted to the program but often must earn a higher GPA than direct admits. Gateway requirements must be the same for both direct and transfer students. In both cases, only one repeat of one gateway course is allowed.

Proposals for new LEPs, as well as changes to existing programs and applications for renewal of LEP status, should be submitted to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies. Curricular changes require a PCC proposal.

Please address the following questions when applying for or renewing LEP status or when requesting a change in LEP requirements.

1. Describe the current status of the LEP.
2. If you are proposing a change in requirements, what is the reason for requesting the change?
3. Describe the following features of the program.
 - What is your current enrollment limit? What is your proposed enrollment goal?
 - What are the current or proposed gateway courses?
 - If renewing the LEP or requesting a change to an existing program, what is the current transfer GPA?
 - If proposing a new LEP or requesting changes, what will the transfer GPA be?
 - Which of the gateway courses are available at UMD feeder community colleges (AACC, PGCC, MC, CSM)?
 - Policy requires that LEPs offer enough seats in gateway courses for all students attempting the LEP. How many seats are currently be offered in each of the proposed gateway courses this academic year? What are current enrollments in those courses?
 - For proposed LEPs or changes to existing programs, what is the timetable for phase-in of new students and transfer students? (Normally we use a two-year phase-in for external transfer students.)

- What are the alternative majors students may select if they do not meet the gateway requirements?
 - Does the timing of the gateway review and subsequent courses allow transfer students to complete the major at the same rate as direct admits? Please include a four-year plan.
 - What is the market demand for this major?
4. If changing GPA and/or gateway requirements (or proposing the LEP for the first time), please provide data to support the request. For example, if the GPA is raised, is there evidence to show that current students who successfully complete the gateway requirements are not graduating from the program? If the change reduces student enrollment, how many students would no longer be admissible? Does the change disproportionately affect a particular groups of students?
 5. If a proposed LEP change concerns a modification to the curriculum, the PCC proposal should be attached.
 6. If the proposal involves courses offered by departments in other colleges, please attach comment from those departments on the impact of the changes on those departments and colleges.
 7. Submit the proposal to the Dean for Undergraduate Studies, together with attachments.
 8. Members of the Enrollment Management Team will review the proposal and contact you for a discussion of particulars. They will then discuss a recommendation. The chair of the Enrollment Management Team will forward a recommendation to the Provost. Once the Provost has made a determination, the chair of the Enrollment Management Team will release the PCC proposal to the Associate Provost for Planning and Programs. The Associate Provost for Planning and Programs also sends colleges and departments formal notification of approval of a PCC action once it is complete.
 9. When the LEP and PCC processes are complete, the Dean for Undergraduate Studies creates the formal memo stating the new requirements, sends it to the Provost/EMT chair for signature, forwards the signed memo to the college/department, posts the new information at www.lep.umd.edu, and communicates the outcome to Undergraduate Admissions, the Registrar, assistant and associate deans for undergraduate education, and advisors.

July 5, 2017

William A. Cohen
Associate Provost and Dean for Undergraduate Studies



1100 Marie Mount Hall
College Park, Maryland 20742
Tel: (301) 405-5805
www.senate.umd.edu

Memorandum

To: Toby Egan, Chair, Senate Educational Affairs Committee

From: Krystina Hess, Chair, Senate Student Affairs Committee

Date: March 1, 2018

Re: Assistance with University Expectations on Limited Enrollment Programs (Senate Document #16-17-36)

I am writing on behalf of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC) to address your January 27 memorandum. At its January 31 meeting, the SAC discussed the charge before the Educational Affairs Committee and ways to approach your request. Given the relatively short period available to the SAC, the committee determined to focus on the largest group of students you mentioned: those in Letters & Sciences who are currently working to obtain admission to a Limited Enrollment Program. The committee designed an anonymous survey that it administered with the assistance of the Assistant Dean and Director of Letters & Sciences between February 7 and February 23. The survey was designed to identify any broad areas of concern that EAC should consider, and it received 148 responses. The survey questions and results, as well as some additional analysis of specific populations, are attached.

Given the sample size and inconsistent distribution across intended LEPs, it is difficult to draw any firm conclusions. However, the survey results do not seem to indicate any significant areas of concern. Some general observations of the responses include:

- Transfer students seem to have found it more difficult to find admission requirements for LEPs than direct admits.
- Students interested in the A. James Clark School of Engineering seem to be the most pleased with the advising they are receiving.
- Students interested in the Robert H. Smith School of Business gave the lowest ratings for both ease of finding admission requirements and clarity surrounding admission decisions.

The SAC also identified several additional items that it feels merit consideration by the EAC. These include:

Advising

- On campus: The SAC recommends that the EAC consider speaking with advisors in LTSC to identify any recurring concerns they are hearing from students, and to assess their advising load. The EAC should also consider speaking with advisors in LEPs to see if students coming to them from LTSC or other institutions are being adequately advised. The committee might also investigate whether there is an advising gap for students already in a major who want to transfer to an LEP that does not advise outside students.

- **Community Colleges:** The SAC recommends the EAC consider investigating the nature and adequacy of advising offered to prospective LEP students at Maryland community colleges. SAC members noted that historically underrepresented students often make their way to four-year institutions through community colleges, which has ramifications for the STEM pipeline and UMD's commitment to diversifying its student body. The SAC recommends EAC consider consulting with advisors at Maryland community colleges to ascertain whether their resources and workloads allow them to provide prospective LEP students adequate advising.

GPA Requirements for Transfer Students

- The SAC noted the different GPA standards that apply for direct admits at the 45-credit review and for internal transfers when applying to an LEP. Some questioned whether this was justified.
- The SAC noted that students transferring from community colleges to large research institutions can experience a slight drop in GPA during their first semester while they acclimate. The SAC recommends the EAC consider investigating whether there is any evidence that this disadvantages students who are not transferring directly into an LEP and may be completing crucial gateway courses their first semester.

Additional Information

- The SAC was unable to survey all the populations identified in your memo, given the time constraints. It agrees that it would be useful to speak to students currently in LEPs. Questions asked of this group should be more open-ended and designed to assess students' experiences in the LEP and, when appropriate, their experiences working towards admission. For internal transfers (and external transfers coming from LTSC), such a survey might also ask what resources they found most/least valuable (e.g., friends already in the program, advisors, faculty, etc.).

Please feel free to contact me with any additional questions.

KH:amt


Attachments: LEP Survey Results

SURVEY QUESTIONS


- 1. What is your anticipated year of graduation?**
- 2. What is your gender?**
- 3. What is your race/ethnicity?**
- 4. What is your age?**
- 5. Were you admitted to UMD as a freshman or did you transfer from another institution?**
- 6. What major/program did you select when applying to the University?**
(Choices: LEPs, LTSC, Other)
- 7. What major/program are you currently working to gain admission to?**
(Choices: LEPs, Undecided)
- 8. How many semesters have you been in Letters & Sciences?**
(Choices: <1, 1-2, 2-3, More than 3)
- 9. Thinking back to when you first applied to the University, how easy was it to find information on the admission requirements and process for your program?**
(Extremely easy to Extremely difficult, 5 options)
- 10. When you learned you were accepted to the University, was it clear whether you had been admitted to your desired major?**
(Extremely clear to Extremely unclear, 5 options)
- 11. How knowledgeable is your advisor regarding admission requirements for your intended major?**
(Extremely knowledgeable to Not knowledgeable at all, 5 options)
- 12. Please describe any additional resources the University could provide to support you as you work towards admission to your intended major.**
- 13. Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?**
(Yes, No, Option for text entry)
- 14. Why do you think some programs limit enrollment?**
- 15. What else would you like to tell us about Limited Enrollment Programs at UMD?**

SURVEY RESPONSES

What is your anticipated year of graduation?




What is your gender?




1	Male	41.27%	52
2	Female	57.14%	72
3	Non-binary/third gender	0.79%	1
4	Prefer to self-describe	0.79%	1

What is your race/ethnicity?




1	White	56.80%	71
2	Black or African American	13.60%	17
3	Asian	20.00%	25
4	American Indian or Alaska Native	0.00%	0
5	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.00%	0
6	Prefer to self describe	8.00%	10
7	Prefer not to answer	1.60%	2

What is your age?




1	18-20	82.54%	104
2	20-22	12.70%	16
3	22-24	0.79%	1
4	24+	3.97%	5

Were you admitted to UMD as a freshman or did you transfer from another institution?




1	Admitted as a freshman	69.60%	87
2	Transferred	30.40%	38

What major/program did you select when applying to the University?




A. James Clark School of Engineering	24.80%	31
College of Mathematical & Natural Sciences: Biological Sciences, Biochemistry, Chemistry & Environmental Science, and Biodiversity and Conservation	20.00%	25
Criminology and Criminal Justice	0.80%	1
Government and Politics	2.40%	3
Psychology	3.20%	4
Robert H. Smith School of Business	19.20%	24
Undecided (LTSC)	27.20%	34
Other	2.40%	3

What major/program are you currently working to gain admission to?




1	A. James Clark School of Engineering	27.20%	34
2	College of Mathematical & Natural Sciences: Biological Sciences, Biochemistry, Chemistry & Environmental Science, and Biodiversity and Conservation	24.80%	31
4	Criminology and Criminal Justice	2.40%	3
5	Government and Politics	3.20%	4
7	Psychology	9.60%	12
8	Robert H. Smith School of Business	17.60%	22
9	Still undecided	15.20%	19

How many semesters have you been in Letters & Sciences?




1	Less than 1	30.40%	38
2	1-2	54.40%	68
3	2-3	6.40%	8
4	More than 3	8.80%	11

Thinking back to when you first applied to the University, how easy was it to find information on the admission requirements and process for your program?




1	Extremely easy	9.84%	12
2	Somewhat easy	44.26%	54
3	Neither easy nor difficult	18.85%	23
4	Somewhat difficult	21.31%	26
5	Extremely difficult	5.74%	7

When you learned you were accepted to the University, was it clear whether you had been admitted to your desired major?



1	Extremely clear	27.87%	34
2	Somewhat clear	18.03%	22
3	Clear	23.77%	29
4	Somewhat unclear	22.95%	28
5	Extremely unclear	7.38%	9

How knowledgeable is your advisor regarding admission requirements for your intended major?



1	Extremely knowledgeable	24.59%	30
2	Very knowledgeable	38.52%	47
3	Moderately knowledgeable	25.41%	31
4	Slightly knowledgeable	8.20%	10
5	Not knowledgeable at all	3.28%	4

Please describe any additional resources the University could provide to support you as you work towards admission to your intended major.

Advisors & Advising

- How it works with major specific classes that I need to take but am not in the major yet
- It would be helpful if the advisors in letter and sciences could have a bit more knowledge about the applications because honestly when I sat down with my advisor she was Not as helpful when I stated asking questions about the application and process.
- Advisors who are more knowledgeable, helpful, and encouraging.
- walk-in hours with advisors in LEP majors for students not in major yet.
- The advisors could be more knowledgeable about classes within each major.
- As an undecided student I struggled with finding what classes I needed to take. I didn't have an advisor and was worried I wouldn't graduate on time.
- Closer academic advising
- UMD needs to make it more clear how hard it is to internally transfer into LEPs. I did not know what I wanted to do initially and was under the impression that once I decided I could easily transfer out of LTSC.
- The LEP Programs should me more clear about the rigor of applying.

Resources


- The government and politics school site
- Information sessions that have morning and afternoon times. right now they only have morning information sessions
- A website dedicated to helping you switch majors

- different kinds of academic activities
- Transfer class requirements and 4 year plan
- Meetings for people who are interested in specific LEPs
- collaboration between LTSC and Engineering or other Majors
- when to apply for the major like email reminders or something

Other

- Requirements for Smith that guarantee admission
- I want thank the University for admitting me to the school of engineering
- Fairness and transparency
- An easier process to take lower level engineering classes before admission to the program

Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?



Nature of Requirements

- I should take math classes relevant to my major
- in most cases yes, but in some cases i feel that there are circumstances that should be put into consideration in order to ensure that a student still has the chance to receive admission to the LEP
- What did not make sense is when student is excellent in upper gateway courses what is the point to make them take the lower level again. You can have Phd but when you return here and you had phys 1 in 1990 with C, even if you get A on both Phys 2 and 3 you still can not go to engineering unless you retake phys 1 and get B
- Mechanical Engineers shouldn't be required to take Chemistry
- They don't have you cover any other requirements for other majors

Rigor of Requirements

- I do feel like the requirements are reasonable, but there might be spacial cases like mine where there was an outside circumstance that got in the way. I was registered for a class and even though I couldn't make it to class for medical reasons it counted as an attempt to the class even though I could assist to the class and since I had already used up my first attempt my 2 opportunity's were gone.
- they're challenging for me personally because they're designed to weed out students.
- There is a lot of stress on my end for transferring into the business school and I've heard discouraging things and I'm very worried that I won't get in.
- I believe that students intended to transfer in to an LEP should not have different requirements from students directly admitted in to the LEP

- some of them are clearly weed out courses and are extremely difficult, more difficult than if I were to take them in high school
- They are quite harsh, considering some people already in the program can be less knowledgeable and will do poorly if they take them.

Why do you think some programs limit enrollment?

Eighty-four students answered this question. Many gave multiple reasons, making generalizations difficult. However:

- 64% believe it is at least in part an issue of resources vs. demand
- 18% believe it is at least in part to weed out students unlikely to be successful
- 14% believed it is at least in part to increase the prestige of the programs
- 4% believe there is no legitimate reason to limit enrollment

What else would you like to tell us about Limited Enrollment Programs at UMD?

Forty-one students answered these questions. Their responses tended to clump around several themes.

Need for More Information, Better Advising

- It would be nice to have contact with an advisor in the LEP that you are intending on entering so that you understand how that school works
- have presentations about each
- They should be more clear when applying
- There is no mention of a "LEP" GPA that was explained to me as different from a normal cumulative GPA. This information was not available until after admission. It would have been nice to be aware of such a system, which might have changed my admission/major planning.
- It would be helpful if the LEPs told you if you were accepted before registration for classes begins
- As an undecided student in his second semester, I feel like a lot of options simply aren't available to me because I didn't know what I wanted to do initially, and now it is too late to enroll in an LEP.
- better resources to get to know how you get into them
- I wish my advisor had been more knowledgeable on the LEP program, because I had to find all of the information on my own. It would've been nice to have someone help me with it
- I think the requirement on repeating courses is confusing and should be better explained, this would save problems for student.
- Remind us when and where and how to apply to our programs when finished with requirements
- From the onset of applying to the University, it should be made more clear which programs have limited enrollment and which do not
- There needs to be more dedicated resources to describe the requirements and student attitudes to help students perform better.

Adjust LEP Requirements

- I would love to see more "loop holes" like for the case I just stated. The application says that you can only have 2 try's at the gateway classes but since I did poorly I'm on the first attempt and the second one was taken from me, I wish there was a way for me to prove myself that I could have been able to do it. [Medical reasons impacted attendance, yet the course still counted as an attempt.]

- The requirement is a little bit high
- I think the notion that if you leave an LEP you can never return is somewhat unnerving and unnecessary.
- the fact that I can't reapply to the Psyc major if I get in and then change my mind and drop it is VERY stressful
- It is so stressful that there's a chance I won't get into the business school even if I meet all the requirements.
- For the business school, it is way to hard to get in if you dont get in before freshman year
- It is frustrating to not be able to take psych courses before being accepted into the LEP
- They should not be as difficult to get in.
- they are challenging, seem intimidating... some are way to hard to get into (business)
- The gateway courses discourage many desiring engineering students
- it's extremely difficult to get into the Clark school of engineering and unreasonable
- I believe they are important but that the requirements are unfair for students trying to join
- Biology has a significant amount of gateway courses required than all other majors and that seems a bit unfair
- If students meet the gateway requirements they should be allowed admission. I feel like the alternatives to LEPs are not viable options.
- They make them too hard to get into

End LEPs


- LEPs should NOT be an active idea. Students should be given a second chance when it comes to THEIR passions, THEIR goals, and THEIR future.
- they're annoying
- All students should be able to declare any major
- It is morally wrong to limit enrollment because you are restricting someone of future experiences
- Kinda pointless for anything except business school since all we have to do is sign a form when we have the right gpa
- I'd rather you just decline or get rid of the program freshman connections and just differ admission until spring. LEP programs in my opinion are a pain because not many other schools have them in the particular design that UMD does
- Expensive

LEP Praise


- I think they are well designed
- I think the LEP organization is done well and LTSC is very good about transitioning from LTSC to the intended LEP.

FRESHMAN ADMIT DETAIL


When you first applied to the University, how easy was it to find information on the admission requirements and process for your program?




When you were accepted to the University, was it clear whether you had been admitted to your desired major?



How knowledgeable is your advisor regarding admission requirements for your intended major?




Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?




- they're challenging for me personally because they're designed to weed out students.
- somewhat
- There is a lot of stress on my end for transferring into the business school and I've heard discouraging things and I'm very worried that I won't get in.
- I'm not sure
- I believe that students intended to transfer in to an LEP should not have different requirements from students directly admitted in to the LEP

TRANSFER STUDENT DETAIL


When you first applied to the University, how easy was it to find information on the admission requirements and process for your program?




When you were accepted to the University, was it clear whether you had been admitted to your desired major?



How knowledgeable is your advisor regarding admission requirements for your intended major?






Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?




- I do feel like the requirements are reasonable, but there might be special cases like mine where there was an outside circumstance that got in the way. I was registered for a class and even though I couldn't make it to class for medical reasons it counted as an attempt to the class even though I could assist to the class and since I had already used up my first attempt my 2 opportunity's were gone.
- I have to re-take an english and then multiple math classes before I can apply
- I should take math classes relevant to my major
- in most cases yes, but in some cases i feel that there are circumstances that should be put into consideration in order to ensure that a student still has the chance to receive admission to the LEP
- What did not make sense is when student is excellent in upper gateway courses what is the point to make them take the lower level again. You can have Phd but when you return here and you had phys 1 in 1990 with C, even if you get A on both Phys 2 and 3 you still can not go to engineering unless you retake phys 1 and get B

ENGINEERING HOPEFULS DETAIL






Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?




- they're challenging for me personally because they're designed to weed out students.
- What did not make sense is when student is excellent in upper gateway courses what is the point to make them take the lower level again. You can have Phd but when you return here and you had phys 1 in 1990 with C, even if you get A on both Phys 2 and 3 you still can not go to engineering unless you retake phys 1 and get B
- Mechanical Engineers shouldn't be required to take Chemistry

BUSINESS HOPEFULS DETAIL






Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?




- There is a lot of stress on my end for transferring into the business school and I've heard discouraging things and I'm very worried that I won't get in.

CMNS HOPEFULS DETAIL



Do you feel the gateway courses and GPA requirements for your intended LEP are reasonable?



- I believe that students intended to transfer in to an LEP should not have different requirements from students directly admitted in to the LEP
- some of them are clearly weed out courses and are extremely difficult, more difficult then if i were to take them in high school
- They are quite harsh, considering some people already in the program can be less knowledgeable and will do poorly if they take them.



Admission Letters

Freshmen

All freshman applicants receive letter 1.a (fall admission) or 1.b (spring admission). Students who applied to a competitive-admission LEP but were not directly admitted also receive letter 2, which describes LTSC.

Transfer Students

Transfer students receive one of several admission letters.

- Those admitted to any non-LEP major, who were admitted to an LEP (traditional or competitive admission), or who are undecided receive letter 3a. Those in the third group also receive letter 4, which describes LTSC.
- Those who applied to a competitive-admission LEP but have required courses still in progress receive letter 3b.
- Those who applied to a competitive-admission LEP but will never be eligible based on their academic record receive letter 3.c. They also receive letter 4, which describes LTSC.

1a. Freshman Fall Letter



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

{a.("LETTER_DATE")}

Dear {a.("NAME_FIRST")}:

Congratulations! I'm thrilled to offer you admission to the University of Maryland for the Fall {a.("FALL_TERM_YEAR_LABEL")} semester. This year's applicant pool was exceptional, and our Admission Committee was impressed by your accomplishments.

At UMD, you'll join a community of smart, bold, fun, kind and curious students, faculty and alumni who are making profound contributions to our world. We're confident that you'll contribute to UMD's legacy of innovation and leadership too.

During the next few months, you'll hear from our faculty, staff and students about many of the exciting opportunities on our campus and beyond. Our location just outside Washington, D.C., offers unbeatable internship and research experiences and cultural programs.

When you are ready to respond to your offer of admission, please complete the **Decision Response** on your MyCoalition Checklist as soon as possible but no later than May 1. For more information about resident life, orientation, financial aid, details of your admission and other aspects of college life, take a look at our [Admitted Fall Freshman Checklist](#). From there, you'll be able to take the next steps to becoming a Terp!

Your major and resident classification are listed below. We hope you'll come visit our beautiful campus at one of our Admitted Student Open Houses starting in March. Please go [here](#) to sign-up and to read more about these events.

We look forward to welcoming you to the University of Maryland class of {a.("FALL_TERM_GRADYEAR_LABEL")}!

Sincerely,

Shannon R. Gundy
Director, Undergraduate Admissions

- Major: {a.("UMD_MAJOR_LABEL")}
- Advising College: {a.("UMD_COLLEGE_LABEL")}
- Maryland Resident (Tuition Purposes): {a.("UMD_MD_RESID")}
- University ID Number (U_ID): {a.("UMD_U_ID")}

1b. Freshman Spring Letter



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

{a("LETTER_DATE")}

Dear {a("NAME_FIRST")}:

Congratulations! I'm pleased to offer you spring admission to the University of Maryland (UMD) for the semester beginning in January {a("SPRING_TERM_YEAR_LABEL")}. While we were unable to offer you admission for the fall semester due to space limitations, I'm excited to welcome you into our spring class of entering freshmen.

We encourage you to consider alternate plans for the fall semester. One option is to take courses at UMD through our Freshmen Connection program. To learn more about this opportunity, visit fc.umd.edu or call (301) 405-7762.

You might also spend the fall traveling, working, serving your community or taking courses at a community college. Visit the Transfer Credit Services at transfercredit.umd.edu or contact our office for information about transferring credit if you decide to enroll at another institution for the fall semester.

UMD is a world-class university with a strong reputation for academic excellence. Our location just outside Washington, D.C., offers unbeatable internship and research experiences and cultural programs.

When you are ready to respond to your offer of admission, please complete the Decision Response on your MyCoalition Checklist as soon as possible but no later than November 15. For more information about resident life, orientation, financial aid, details of your admission and other aspects of college life, take a look at our [Admitted Spring Freshman Checklist](#). From there, you'll be able to take the next steps to becoming a Terp!

Your major and resident classification are listed below. We hope you'll come visit our beautiful campus at one of our Admitted Student Open Houses starting in March. Please go [here](#) to sign-up and to read more about these events.

We look forward to seeing you on campus!

Sincerely,

Shannon R. Gundy
Director, Undergraduate Admissions

- Major: {a("UMD_MAJOR_LABEL")}
- Advising College: {a("UMD_COLLEGE_LABEL")}
- Maryland Resident (Tuition Purposes): {a("UMD_MD_RESID")}
- University ID Number (U_ID): {a("UMD_U_ID")}

2. Freshman Follow-Up Letter—LTSC



Dear {#First Name#},

Congratulations again on your admission to the University of Maryland!

You were admitted to Letters and Sciences, as noted on the bottom of your electronic admission letter. This will serve as your advising college for the beginning of your educational career at UMD. We know that you originally selected one of our Limited Enrollment Programs (LEP) as your preferred major on your application. The advisors in Letters and Sciences will assist you in taking the appropriate steps to meet the requirements for this LEP, or help you in choosing an alternate major.

As you progress through your educational career at UMD, you will have the opportunity to enter your preferred major as a current UMD student. Each major program has a series of courses that are called gateway courses, which are required to be completed before applying into the major. If you are able to successfully change your major, you still have the opportunity of completing a degree at UMD in your desired major! (Make one paragraph)For more information on specific requirements needed to enter your preferred major, please take a look at the [LEP webpage](#).

You can also visit the [Office of Letters and Sciences](#) to learn more about the resources available to students and how they can assist you in continuing your path to your major of choice. If you are interested in switching to an alternate major now, which is not an LEP, you may request a major change by sending an email to the [Office of Undergraduate Admissions](#).

Please let us know if you have any questions. We look forward to welcoming you to campus soon!

Office of Undergraduate Admissions

University of Maryland



Office of Undergraduate Admissions
University of Maryland
Mitchell Building
7999 Regents Dr
College Park, MD 20742, USA

3a. Transfer Admission Letter



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

{a("LETTER_DATE")}

{a("NAME_FIRST")} {a("NAME_LAST")}
{a("STREET")} {a("STREET2")}
{a("CITY")}, {a("STATE")} {a("POSTAL_CODE")}
{a("COUNTRY")}

Dear {a("NAME_FIRST")}:

Congratulations! I am pleased to offer you admission to the University of Maryland for the {a("TERM_LABEL")} semester. During our review, we were impressed with your academic achievements, talents and experiences. You should take great pride in all you have accomplished.

At the University of Maryland, you will join a community of scholars and leaders---students, faculty and alumni whose successes in the state and around the globe have had profound effects on our world. We are confident you will contribute to the legacy of innovation and leadership that has defined The University of Maryland as a premier research institution, renowned for its academic reputation. Our small, distinctive learning communities and enrichment experiences out of the classroom provide an environment of intellectual challenge and exploration.

To respond to your offer of admission, please log into www.mycoalition.org and go to the University of Maryland section of your Colleges list, and click on Decision Response. Your Decision Letter is posted inside your Checklist and you can also click continue at the bottom of your Decision Letter to submit your Decision Response. Please remember to **notify us of your enrollment decision within 30 days from the date of this letter**. For more information about Resident Life, Orientation, Financial Aid, conditions of your admission and other aspects of college life, proceed to our [Admitted Spring Transfer Checklist](#)

We look forward to welcoming you to the University of Maryland!

Sincerely,

Shannon R. Gundy
Director, Undergraduate Admissions

- Major:
- Advising College:
- Maryland Residency:
- University ID Number (U_ID):

3b. Transfer Admission Letter: LEP—Additional Requirements



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

{a("LETTER_DATE")}

{a("NAME_FIRST")} {a("NAME_LAST")}
{a("STREET")} {a("STREET2")}
{a("CITY")}, {a("STATE")} {a("POSTAL_CODE")}
{a("COUNTRY")}

Dear {a("NAME_FIRST")}:

Congratulations! I am pleased to offer you admission to the University of Maryland for the {a("TERM_LABEL")} semester. At the University of Maryland, you will join a community of scholars and leaders—students, faculty, and alumni whose successes in the state and around the globe have had profound effects on our world.

Your first choice major is a Limited Enrollment Program (LEP) with restricted space and additional requirements for admission. During review of your application, it was noted that you are in progress of completing these additional requirements. For this reason, we would like to reconsider your application at the end of the semester for the LEP you selected. Please be sure to send us your final transcript no later than January 3, 2018. You will be notified via email of the updated decision regarding admission to your LEP.

I hope you decide to join the University of Maryland family. To respond to your offer of admission, please log into www.mycoalition.org and go to the University of Maryland section of your Colleges list, and click on Decision Response. Your Decision Letter is posted inside your Checklist and you can also click continue at the bottom of your Decision Letter to submit your Decision Response. Please remember to **notify us of your enrollment decision within 30 days from the date of this letter**. For more information about Resident Life, Orientation, Financial Aid, conditions of your admission and other aspects of college life, proceed to our [Admitted Spring Transfer Checklist](#)

We look forward to welcoming you to the University of Maryland!

Sincerely,

Shannon R. Gundy
Director, Undergraduate Admissions

- Major:
- Advising College:
- Maryland Residency:
- University ID Number (U_ID):

3c. Transfer Admission Letter: LEP—Ineligible



UNIVERSITY OF
MARYLAND

{a("LETTER_DATE")}

{a("NAME_FIRST")} {a("NAME_LAST")}
{a("STREET")} {a("STREET2")}
{a("CITY")}, {a("STATE")} {a("POSTAL_CODE")}
{a("COUNTRY")}

Dear {a("NAME_FIRST")}:

Congratulations! I am pleased to offer you admission to the University of Maryland for the {a("TERM_LABEL")} semester. At the University of Maryland, you will join a community of scholars and leaders---students, faculty and alumni whose successes in the state and around the globe have had profound effects on our world.

Your first choice major is a Limited Enrollment Program (LEP) with restricted space and additional, more competitive requirements for admission. After a detailed review of your file, you have not been selected for admission to your chosen LEP. For this reason, you have been admitted instead to Letters and Sciences. You will find this program of great assistance to you as Letters and Sciences advisors will guide you to continuing your academic journey at UMD. For more information about the requirements, please visit www.lep.umd.edu. To learn more about Letters and Sciences, visit www.ltsc.umd.edu/welcome.html, or the pre-orientation website for Letters and Sciences, www.preorientation.umd.edu. For information regarding the Shady Grove campus, please visit www.shadygrove.umd.edu/institutions/umcp.

I hope you decide to enroll at UMD. To respond to your offer of admission, please log into www.mycoalition.org and go to the University of Maryland section of your Colleges list. Your Decision Letter is posted inside your Application Checklist and you can click continue at the bottom of your Decision Letter to submit your Decision Response. Please remember to **notify us of your enrollment decision within 30 days from the date of this letter**. For more information about Resident Life, Orientation, Financial Aid, conditions of your admission and other aspects of college life, proceed to our [Admitted Spring Transfer Checklist](#)

We look forward to welcoming you to the University of Maryland!

Sincerely,

Shannon R. Gundy
Director, Undergraduate Admissions

- Major:
- Advising College:
- Maryland Residency:
- University ID Number (U_ID):

4. Transfer Follow-Up Letter—LTSC

Dear {#First Name#},

Congratulations again on your admission to the University of Maryland!

You were admitted to Letters and Sciences, as noted on the bottom of your electronic admission letter. This will serve as your advising college for the beginning of your educational career. We know that you originally selected one of our Limited Enrollment Programs (LEP) as your preferred major on your application. The advisors in Letters and Sciences will assist you in taking the appropriate steps to meet the requirements for this LEP, or help you in choosing an alternate major.

When you attend [New Student Orientation](#) over the summer, you will meet with a Letters and Sciences advisor and register for classes. If you have not already signed up for orientation, we encourage you to [register online](#) as soon as possible.

For more information on specific requirements needed to enter your preferred major, please take a look at the [LEP webpage](#). You can also visit the [Office of Letters and Sciences](#) to learn more about the resources available to students and how they can assist you in continuing your path to your major of choice. If you are interested in switching to an alternate major now, which is not an LEP, you may request a major change by sending an email to the [Office of Undergraduate Admissions](#). Additionally, if you have reviewed the gateway requirements for each major and feel that you have completed them, please email lep@umd.edu for further assistance.

Please let us know if you have any questions. We look forward to welcoming you to campus soon!

[Office of Undergraduate Admissions](#)

University of Maryland



13B.06.01.02-1

.02-1 Admission of Transfer Students to Public Institutions.

A. Admission to Institutions.

- (1) Subject to §B of this regulation, a student attending a public institution who has completed an associate's degree or who has completed 60 or more semester hours of credit, may not be denied direct transfer to another public institution if the student attained a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.0 on a 4.0 scale or its equivalent at the sending institution, except as provided in §A(4) of this regulation.
- (2) Subject to §B of this regulation, a student attending a public institution who has not completed an associate's degree or who has completed fewer than 60 semester hours of credit, is eligible to transfer to a public institution regardless of the number of credit hours earned if the student:
 - (a) Satisfied the admission criteria of the receiving public institution as a high school senior; and
 - (b) Attained at least a cumulative grade point average of 2.0 on a 4.0 scale or its equivalent at the sending institution.
- (3) Subject to §B of this regulation, a student attending a public institution who did not satisfy the admission criteria of a receiving public institution as a high school senior, but who has earned sufficient credits at a public institution to be classified by the receiving public institution as a sophomore, shall meet the stated admission criteria developed and published by the receiving public institution for transfer.
- (4) If the number of students seeking admission exceeds the number that can be accommodated at a receiving public institution, admission decisions shall be:
 - (a) Based on criteria developed and published by the receiving public institution on the institution's website; and
 - (b) Made to provide fair and equal treatment for native and transfer students.

B. Admission to Programs.

- (1) A receiving public institution may require additional program admission requirements to some programs if the standards and criteria for admission to the program:
 - (a) Are developed and published by the receiving public institution; and
 - (b) Maintain fair and equal treatment for native and transfer students.
- (2) Courses taken at a public institution as part of a recommended transfer program leading toward a baccalaureate degree shall be applicable to related programs at a receiving public institution granting the baccalaureate degree.

C. Receiving Institution Program Responsibility.

- (1) The faculty of a receiving public institution is responsible for development and determination of the program requirements in major fields of study for a baccalaureate degree, including courses in the major field of study taken in the lower division.
- (2) A receiving public institution may set program requirements in major fields of study which simultaneously fulfill general education requirements.
- (3) A receiving public institution, in developing lower division course work, shall exchange information with other public institutions to facilitate the transfer of credits into its programs.
- (4) A receiving public institution shall ensure that any changes to program standards and criteria for admission and the transfer of credits maintain the fair and equal treatment of native and transfer students, and are communicated in a timely manner.

Appendix 7 - 3 pages - Peer Institution Research

To: Educational Affairs Committee of the University Senate

From: Michele Callaghan and Joel Miller

Re: Information on peer institution practices on limited enrollment programs

Date: April 16, 2018

We looked at practices at the following institutions: University of Maryland at College Park (UMD), University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), University at Buffalo (UB), Ohio State University (OSU), Michigan State University (MSU), Pennsylvania State University (PSU), University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), University of Wisconsin (UW), and Purdue University (PU).

Questions we addressed

How do other schools refer to what we call limited enrollment programs?

- Supplemental admission, additional requirements, or similar language: these terms are used when students need to submit information in addition to their application. It can be a portfolio, an audition, or an additional application to a college or major. Examples: UB, UCLA, PSU
- Mention of capacity: Some majors, especially engineering mention *restricted capacity*, *limited capacity*, and *open capacity*. Example: UIUC
- Closed programs: This information is only for transfer students and lets them know which majors are competitive. There is information on their website on which majors are accepting more transfer students. Example: PU
- Limited enrollment: Purdue used *limited enrollment major*. Examples: PU, UW.
- Enrollment control and enrollment limits: Examples: OSU, PSU.
- Special programs: Example: PSU

General observations: Everyone seems to have a name for such programs. Some distinguish between those requiring extra info to apply and those that genuinely limit enrollment.

What is the pathway for freshmen admits and transfer students to enter these programs? What do they call their equivalent to Letters and Sciences?

- UB: Criteria spelled out for both (need gateway classes or auditions): Clear information on the website for both, showing which classes are needed; seems to be similar for both groups.
- MSU: Criteria spelled out for transfers in great detail; limits to enrollment in business school; can get a degree in business but not have an official major in it.
- UCLA: Freshmen admitted by declared major (sometimes needing supplemental info) and transfers given info on the transfer admission page about their requested majors. Only freshmen can be undeclared.
- UIUC: Students enter the Division of General Studies (DGS) if not in their major. Transfer students see a list of majors that are open to more enrollees and those that are not as of this time.
- PSU: Freshmen enter the Department of Undergraduate Studies; some colleges have premajors; info on special programs and additional information for transfers on their application page.
- UW: Says it spells out entrance requirements for undergraduate majors on transfer page on majors but not on freshman admit page. However, links to pages on majors did not have any info on requirements for any majors. It was not clear where to find the info.

- PU: At Purdue, everyone applies directly to their major. Undecided majors go to Liberal Arts, the College of Engineering, or to Exploratory Studies.
- OSU: Students are admitted and then enrolled in their major/college. Undecided majors go to University Exploration.

General observation: Info for transfer students is always thorough; it is sometimes harder to track down for freshmen admits.

What is the equivalent to our “internal transfers” for undergrads?

We did not see this terminology anywhere but admittedly we didn’t search by the term in their websites. Places spoke of changing your major.

What is the process for business and engineering admissions at these schools?

- UB: Nothing less than 2.5 GPA for business; supplemental application, gateway classes, and other requirements for engineering.
- UCLA: None for business; admit by declared major for engineering.
- PU: Apply to major in both cases.
- UW: Must apply to engineering and then meet “progressive requirements”; for business, can be admitted as a freshman direct admit or go through prebusiness as an undergrad. Students can apply again during the spring semester of their freshman year if they are not direct admits to business.
- PSU: It is harder to get into business school on the main campus; students can also apply to other campuses. If they are accepted to the business school, they are considered premajors until they complete entrance requirements. There is an engineering school and a college of engineering.
- UIUC: Students in preengineering (PREP) “reside in DGS” until they complete the requirements for engineering; if they complete these requirements, they are guaranteed admission to engineering. Aspiring business students also “reside in DGS”; limit on number of transfer students accepted; no junior or senior transfers accepted. We might want to reach out to UIUC and learn more about PREP. According to this article (<http://www.news-gazette.com/news/local/2017-02-07/record-number-ui-applicants-leads-record-number-admissions.html>), the PREP program has allowed them to accept more students and has improved advising.
- MSU: Must apply directly to Eli Broad business school and then to individual majors; engineering is limited enrollment; limits are not obvious on the website.
- OSU: Students admitted to the university and then to the business school; freshmen and transfers must be admitted to pre-CSE (College of Computer Science and Engineering) and complete requirements.

General observations: Some places don’t have schools in these fields that are competitive. No doubt they have other programs that are competitive.

How easy is it to find this information on university websites?

Pretty much universally, the information was not front and center. Only UB had the info right on its initial admissions page. For ULCA, for example, there was nothing on these pages: Prospective Students, Majors and Minors, Applying for Admission. MSU applicants have to go all the way to Selecting Your Major to learn details about limited programs. PU had info on the requirement to apply to your major

front and center; specifics on limited programs required digging and was only provided for transfer students. UW uses the term *limited enrollment program* but doesn't define it.

General observations: We are not alone in having this info in a difficult to find place. We are alone in the typographic quality of our page on LEPs.



**University Expectations for Limited Enrollment Programs
(Senate Document #16-17-36)
Educational Affairs Committee | Chair: Toby Egan**

In 1990, the University Senate voted to accept the recommendations of a Report on Admissions and Advising (Senate Doc. No. 89-90-113A). This report called for the creation of “Limited Enrollment Programs” (LEPs) to aid in maintaining a balance between enrollments and resources within certain academic majors. Since that time, programs with LEP status have been reviewed and revised several times, and new LEPs established, as the University’s enrollments and student interests have evolved. The process by which they are reviewed has also evolved several times since 1990.

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and Senate Chair Falvey request that the Educational Affairs Committee review the expectations and current procedures for LEP status, review, and revisions.

Specifically, we ask that you:

1. Review past Senate action on Limited Enrollment Programs including the Senate Educational Affairs Committee Report on Admissions and Advising (Senate Doc. No. 89-90-113A).
2. Review the processes for considering Limited Enrollment Program (LEP) proposals and renewals.
3. Consider the impact of LEP status on the overall quality of the program and the academic experience.
4. Consider whether the review requirements for direct admits versus internal and external transfers should be consistent.
5. Review LEP standards and expectations at Big Ten and other peer institutions.
6. Consult with representatives of the Enrollment Management Team regarding implementation and oversight of admissions and gateway requirements for Limited Enrollment Programs.
7. Consult with a representative of the Office of Undergraduate Studies.
8. Consult with a representative of the Office of the Provost.
9. Consult with representatives of units with programs that have LEP status.
10. Consider whether University-wide expectations for LEPs should be revised.
11. Consult with the University's Office of General Counsel on any proposed recommendations for revisions to the current procedures and expectations for limited enrollment programs.

We ask that you submit a report to the Senate Office no later than **March 30, 2018**. If you have questions or need assistance, please contact Reka Montfort in the Senate Office (reka@umd.edu or 301.405.5804).