



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)