September 27, 2010

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
    Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary Parliamentarian
    Rise B. Axelrod (English), CAP
    David S. Pion Berlin (Political Science), Committee on Research
    Paulo Chagas (Music) Academic Computing
    Peter Chung (AGSM) P&B
    Steven Clark (Psychology) Undergraduate Admissions
    Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
    Christine Gailey (Women's Studies), COC
    John Ganim (English), PRP
    Gerhard Gierz (Mathematics), Preparatory Education
    J. Daniel Hare (Entomology), Faculty Welfare
    David Herzeberger (Hispanic Studies), CHASS Executive Committee
    Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council
    Manuela Martins-Green (Cell Biology), CODEO
    Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Junior Assembly Representative
    David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences) CNAS Executive Committee
    Erik Rolland (AGSM), AGSM Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling (GSOE) GSOE Executive Committee
    Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
    Albert Wang (Electrical Engineering), Senior Assembly Representative
    Jose Wudka (Physics), Educational Policy

FR: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, September 27, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, September 27, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220 2nd Floor, University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>Approval of the September 27, 2010 Agenda and July 12, 2010 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest Statement – P&amp;B, Biomed Executive Committee</td>
<td>2 (pp. 9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>3 (pp. 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td><strong>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflicts of Interest Statement – Executive Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action – Discuss and adopt for 2010-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following items are currently out for review:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Proposal to Rename UC &quot;Fees&quot; as &quot;Tuition&quot;</strong> – due 10/11/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Systemwide Review of the Report of the Post-Employment Benefits Task Force</strong> – due 10/18/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Systemwide Review of Council Recommendation and UCLA Statement on the Future of the University</strong> (aka Council Resolution on Downsizing the University) – due 10/20/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>4 (pp. 12-19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:15</td>
<td><strong>IMPACTED MAJORS PRESENTATION</strong> – Bracken Dailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action – discuss issues regarding creating a UCR Policy on impacted majors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(For background information please review the attached UCEP paper on this matter and their definition of impacted majors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV. Action/Information</strong></td>
<td>5 (pp. 20-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15-2:30</td>
<td><strong>REPEAT POLICY DISCUSSION</strong> – Bracken Dailey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action – Discuss proposal regarding waitlists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 3:00</td>
<td><strong>OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL &amp; COMMITTEE BUSINESS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
JULY 12, 2010

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM, Vice Chair
Dan Ozer, Psychology, Secretary Parliamentarian
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
Christine Gailey, Women’s studies, Committees
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Morris Maduro, Biology, Graduate Council
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
Erik Rolland, AGSM Executive Committee
John Trumble, Entomology, CAP
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Jose Wudka, Physics, Educational Policy

ABSENT:
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Steven Axelrod, English, Preparatory Education
John Ganim, English, Physical Resource Planning
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly
Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS Executive Committee

GUESTS:
Incoming Chair Mary Gauvain
Prof. Glenn Stanley, Chair, Psychology
Registrar Bracken Dailey
Assistant VC LaRae Lundgren

CONSENT CALENDAR:
Associate Vice Chancellor Tim Ralston was unable to attend the meeting due to illness and therefore the agenda for the meeting was modified and item no. VIII was discussed instead of the presentation that would have taken place. The agenda was approved with this modification. The minutes were also approved as written.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY:
Vice Chair Montgomery indicated that the document that was now being reviewed includes revisions from the office of Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP). However, the document was not ready for submission to committees for review because some of the changes that came from SCAIP had not been incorporated. The EC members thanked VC Montgomery for undertaking the revision of the document and indicated that it was now much easier to read and follow. Some suggestions were made with regards to the table on page two so that it read *Initial [Administrative] Review of case by:* - instead of *Administrative Review of Faculty member’s actions.* A question was raised by an EC member on what steps are taken to protect a TA who discovers that a student is cheating; the answer provided by Vice Chair Montgomery was that any TA should immediately communicate with the Faculty member in charge so that the faculty member can proceed with investigations. It is not up to the TA to deal with this issue.

The Academic Integrity Policy will be finalized and sent out for a preliminary review by an EC small subcommittee comprising of Prof. Christine Gailey, Prof. Jose Wudka, Prof. Morris Maduro and Prof. John Trumble with a request for response in two days after which it will be reviewed by the Senate Committees listed below in time for the next meeting of the Division to be held in fall 2010.

- Executive Committee of CHASS
- Executive Committee of CNAS
- Executive Committee of COE
- Executive Committee of AGSM
- Executive Committee of the GSOE
- Graduate Council
- Committee on Academic Freedom
- Committee on Educational Policy
- Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and
- Executive Council

**APPROVALS ON BEHALF OF THE DIVISION:**
The EC approved the following program changes on behalf of the division.

- **Post Baccalaureate Program – Request to extend the waiver of 3.30 GPA for the next three years for limited status students**– request from Associate Dean Schiller to extend the waiver of the GPA minimum of 3.30 for limited status students for applicants to the new Post baccalaureate Premedical Program. *EC members unanimously approved the request on behalf of the Division on July 12, 2010.*
• **Proposed changes to the B.S. Degree in Chemistry** – changing major requirements for the BA and BS degree in Chemistry – *EC members unanimously approved the proposed changes to the major requirements on behalf of the Division on July 12, 2010.*

**SCHOOL OF MEDICINE HEALTH SCIENCES RESEARCH BUILDING:**
The Executive Council unanimously approved the proposal that the Health Sciences Surge building should be named the School of Medicine Health Sciences Research Building. The name will be added to the November 2010 Division agenda for information.

**STRATEGIC PLAN DRAFT 3**
The Executive Council members in their discussion on the Strategic Plan Draft 3 felt that it was more complete than the previous two versions but still lacked details. Most EC members saw the plan as more of a brochure that highlighted UCR and included a strong articulation of UCR’s core principles with a vision of the campus for 2020. The members were concerned about the lack of information regarding resource allocation and the fact that it was not clear how the implementation will take place and how much faculty involvement will occur. There was also concern that CHASS was barely mentioned in the Plan.

Regarding the implementation plan, Planning and Budget recommended that the faculty members who will serve on the Strategic Planning Implementation Advisory Committee (SPIAC) be appointed by the Committee on Committees and should at minimum include the Chair of the Riverside Division, or his/her designee, as well as chairs of key Senate committees particularly Educational Policy, Planning and Budget, Graduate Council and Faculty Welfare. The members also strongly felt that just three faculty members were not enough to represent the some 700 faculty on campus. Further, it is important that Planning and Budget be involved as one Academic Senate Committee that plays a role in looking at the contribution (and cost) of administrative units to the mission of the University.

Overall, the EC members agreed that they were appreciative to have been asked for input; however, they were concerned with the lack of details regarding resources. They urged Chair Norman to send a cover memo indicating this and also indicating that they would like the implementation committee to include more than the three faculty members mentioned in the report.

**LIMITING MATRICULANTS ENROLLED IN IMPACTED MAJORS:**
Chair Norman indicated that he had invited Registrar, Bracken Dailey and Assistant Vice Chancellor LaRae Lundgren to discuss with the EC members the undergraduate majors that are impacted on campus and to explain the techniques used to limit registration to these impacted majors. He had also invited Prof. Glenn Stanley who is the Chair of Psychology to the meeting to discuss the impact on the Psychology major.
Registrar Bracken Dailey indicated that there are no guidelines related to identifying a major as impacted and/or a procedure to request a restriction for entrance to a particular major. She indicated that the Committee on Educational Policy offers a general guideline that indicated that any change must have:

- A thorough justification for the change
- Address motivation for change
- Address impact of the change on student participation on the program
- Include resource requirements for the program.

These guidelines do not specifically address impacted majors. The Registrar also indicated that she checked with UCB, UCLA, UCI, UCSB, UCSD and Merced to see if they had any campus procedures that they used. UCSD was the only campus that through its Committee on Educational Policy had a procedure on how departments could declare a major ‘impacted’. The Registrar indicated that at UCR, departments restrict admission using a variety of mechanisms such as implementation of pre-majors, increasing the minimum grade requirements in prerequisite courses, increasing the GPA to enter a major, special application deadlines, essays or a combination of all of the above.

The Registrar also discussed the courses that are currently impacted; these include lower division courses in Psychology, Economics and Sociology. UCR’s CEP in its memo to Chair Norman dated December 4, 2009 had indicated that ‘enrollment caps should be left to the department’s discretion.’ There is also a problem with the UCR pre-business major which has ~1000 students. The Committee on Courses is working on updating their General rules to include instruction to departments on how to request restrictions to enrollment.

Professor Glenn Stanley gave an update on what is going on within the Psychology department. Psychology had 1758 majors in their spring 2010 quarter with a capacity of about 1600 students total or 400 students per year. Most simply, that capacity of ~400 per year is based on the number that passes PSYC 12 in one year. PSYC 12 is a required 5 unit course where students do experiments, collect and analyze the data and write it up in publication formats and because of the workload max enrollment is 120 students per quarter (and that requires 6 TAs). Over the past 12 months 413 students passed with a C- or better, even though it was taught F, W, S and twice in summer to 120 students/quarter. Given the capacity in the major of ~400 students per year, and the expected melt to ~550 from the 684 SIRS into psychology for Fall 2010, is still about 150 students over Psychology's capacity. This does not even take into account the continuing students who might declare the major, which has over 243 continuing students having declared into Psychology in the past 12 months.

Given the incipient crisis, 3 actions have been taken:

1. Prof. Stanley froze entry into the major.
2. The department submitted a formal "catalog" proposal to make the major selective by cumulative GPA so as to yield 400 majors per year. (Importantly, approval before
instruction begins fall 2010 may be necessary to ensure application to the fall 2010 over-capacity SIRS.)

3. Prof. Stanley submitted a draft proposal to Associate Dean Steve Brint in CHASS to raise the AIS for freshman and the GPA for transfer students to yield 300 matriculating psychology majors per year for F11 and beyond (300 so that 100 continuing students can declare into the major), to prevent a yearly recurrence.

The first 2 actions are to prevent an unacceptable situation where there are +150 majors beyond the course availability needed to progress in the major and graduate on time. Alternatively, PSYC 12 could be expanded; however, the resource cost will be steep. To create space for these students just in PSYC 12 will necessitate teaching it not only every quarter but twice in one quarter, plus also further upping the enrollment in summer, and doing this will take 8 additional quarters of TA support. Moreover, to graduate the 150 over-capacity students will required an added total of ~30 TA quarters of support, just for their required psychology courses, resources that may not be available.

To summarize, Chair Norman indicated that he will be setting up a meeting to include all the Deans and Chairs with the impacted majors to start a discussion in an effort to handle the issue before it gets out of hand.

**CNAS'S REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO IMPLEMENT AN EXCEPTION TO UC REGULATION REGARDING A STUDENT'S ABILITY TO REPEAT A COURSE:**
The Registrar, working with Associate Dean Michael McKibben had sent a request to Chair Norman requesting an exception to UCR Senate Regulations R1.6, R1.6.1, R1.6.2 and R1.6.3 related a student’s ability to repeat a course. This is an effort to deal with the unprecedented demand in CNAS for core math and science courses. It was noted that there are about 30% repeaters in Biology 5C and that 50% of these repeaters were able to move on to other classes after their 'repeat'. The EC members were wary of putting policies in place that would hamper students from graduating. Some courses are only offered once a year and if the student who wants to repeat it is not allowed to register, they would have to wait a whole year.

The Secretary Parliamentarian indicated that the Dean did not need an exception to the regulation and the EC members agreed that the policy needed to be made clearer and transparent and the below are the changes to the policy unanimously agreed upon by the Executive Council members:

(a) Departments who offer courses for which the maximum enrollment is exceeded by student interest shall create and maintain a two ‘Wait Lists’.

(b) *Wait List-1* will include the names and student ID number of all students who had not previously taken the course in question (i.e., first-timers) and who could not be accommodated in Course X in the present quarter.
(c) Wait-List 2 shall include the names and student ID number of all students who have previously taken the course in question (i.e., retakers) and who could not be accommodated in Course X in the present quarter.

(d) Wait List-1 and Wait List-2 students will be carried over to the next quarter that the course is offered. The priority of enrollment of students into the ‘next quarter’ offering shall be Wait List-1 students over new first-timers, new first-timers over Wait List-2 students, then Wait List-2 students, then new retakers. Thus second-time takers have no priority over first-time takers and may not be able to take a course for the second time in the quarter that they prefer.

(e) Only under extenuating circumstances will the Associate Dean consider approving third-time enrollments. Third-time takers have the lowest and may not be able to take a course for the third time in the quarter that they prefer.

This policy should be promulgated widely in the UCR catalog, CNAS websites and advising offices and with other information for the course(s) to which it applies.

**OTHER BUSINESS:**
None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:20 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

_Sellyna Ehlers_
_Executive Director_
_Academic Senate_
The Committee on Planning and Budget has reviewed and revised their conflict of interest statement and has adopted the following Conflict of Interest Statement for 2010-11 by a unanimous vote:

Potential conflicts of interest may occur as members of the committee formulate recommendations of concern to the campus. Accordingly, members of the Committee on Planning and Budget will be available to offer the Committee information and to participate in discussions, but will excuse themselves from the vote on matters pertaining to departments and programs of which they are members or through which they might materially benefit.
September 14, 2010

TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division

FROM: Daniel Straus, Chair
      Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee

RE: Conflict of Interest Statement

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee adopts the following policy on conflict of interest: If a member of the committee believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, said member should bring the potential conflict of interest to the attention of the Chair. The Chair will convene a meeting in the absence of the person with the potential conflict and those present will determine whether a conflict exists. If the decision is in the affirmative, the individual considered to have a conflict may be asked to absent him/herself during committee discussions of the subject matter in question and, should a vote be taken, will not vote on the issue. If the Chair is the person considered to have a conflict of interest, the most senior member of the committee will serve the function of the Chair in the process outlined above.
September 27, 2010

Readopted for 1987-88
Readopted for 1988-89
Readopted for 1989-90
Readopted for 1990-91
Readopted for 1991-92
Readopted for 1992-93
Readopted for 1993-94
Readopted for 1994-95
Readopted for 1995-96
Readopted for 1996-97
Readopted for 1997-98
Readopted for 1998-99
Readopted for 1999-00
Readopted for 2000-01
Readopted for 2001-02
Readopted for 2002-03
Readopted for 2003-04
Readopted for 2004-05
Readopted for 2005-06
Readopted for 2006-07
Readopted for 2007-08
Readopted for 2008-09
Readopted for 2009-10
Readopted for 2010-11

The Executive Council at its meeting on September 28, 2009, adopted the following conflict-of-interest statement:

If a member of the Executive Council believes that a conflict of interest exists for him/herself or for another person on the committee, that member should call the possible conflict to the attention of the chair. The chair will convene the committee except for the individuals with the possible conflict, and those present will decide by majority vote if a conflict exists. If the decision is affirmative, the individual with the conflict will leave the room during discussion of the conflicted matter and will not vote on that matter.

Mary Gauvain, Chair
August 5, 2009

LAWRENCE PITTS
INTERIM PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT – ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Re: UCEP White Paper on Impacted Majors

Dear Larry:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) recently wrote a white paper on impacted majors at UC. In brief, the paper notes that a clear set of policies does not exist on any of the campuses whereby pressures on impacted majors can be relieved. The paper provides UCEP’s definition of an impacted major, and highlights factors that result in an impacted major. The paper also documents current mitigation strategies used by various departments and makes the recommendation that the timely and accurate counseling of students is probably the most effective tool to minimize the impact on various majors on UC campuses.

At its July 29, 2009 meeting, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed UCEP’s request to the Provost to distribute its white paper on impacted majors to deans, deans of undergraduate education, CEPs, UG Councils, and directors of student affairs.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding Council’s request.

Sincerely,

Mary Croughan
Chair, Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl. 1
Best Practices for Managing Impacted Majors

UCEP
July 2009

Every established campus of the University of California has a number of majors where the student/faculty ratio is inordinately high and where the students’ educational experience suffers because of insufficient instructional support. The reasons for these situations vary as do the approaches to remediate; however, especially in the extreme budget climate in which we find ourselves, these overenrolled programs generally are found to be under extreme pressure, often serving their students relatively poorly.

Definition

In general we have found that a clear set of policies does not exist on any of the campuses whereby pressures on impacted majors can be relieved. This is exacerbated by the fact that there is not even a clear definition of what an impacted major is. To our thinking, if any of the following problems pertain, then a major is impacted:

- Students are unable to declare their desired major even though they are ‘in good standing’
- Significant numbers of students are turned away from required courses due to insufficient numbers of seats
- Number of laboratory stations are insufficient
- Required classes are inordinately large
- Inordinate number of lecturers are needed to cover classes needed for graduation
- It is difficult to find qualified lecturers to cover required classes
- Use of temporary lecturers leads to a lack of consistency in the program
- Insufficient numbers of trained TAs are available to cover discussions/labs
- Insufficient funding for TAs
- Ladder faculty are unable to teach graduate courses because of need to cover required undergraduate classes

Causes

- Students find the major interesting, challenging and fulfilling. This is a proper and fitting reason to have high demand for a major and one that should be accommodated as much as possible.
- Students and/or their parents perceive the major as valuable. A bachelor’s degree earned in many majors will directly lead to lucrative job offers at the close of an undergraduate’s career. Other majors are seen as good preparation for entrance into a professional school. In either case there is a natural draw toward those majors. However, in some cases the perception may not be correct. Because a bachelor’s degree usually takes about four years, the whims of the free market can cause whole professions to go from boom to bust over that
time period. Also sometimes perceptions may be flawed; the name of a major may seem to indicate it is a good preparatory path when others might be better.

- **Students perceive the major as easy.**
  Though we might hope that the ‘ease’ of a major would not drive a student’s decisions, human nature being what it is, this will happen. Sometimes, this is arises because some students are simply gifted in that particular field; however, one would hope that instructors in any given major would be able to challenge the gifted as well as the average student.

- **Students’ talents are not matched with the major.**
  It is not unusual for students to choose a major based on pressure from family. If a major is perceived by the family as good preparation for a profitable career, subtle and not so subtle urging may result in a student pursuing an education in a field in which they have neither the passion, nor the talent to succeed. Again these perceptions themselves may be incorrect, but in this case there is a double tragedy in that the student also may be following a path for which she/he has no gift and/or passion.

- **Student demand is not given enough consideration in the distribution of FTE.**
  None of us feel that student demand should drive the allocation of FTE, especially given the vicissitudes of the job market and student interests. Nevertheless it seems that some consideration based on student numbers should be applied in the allocation FTE, perhaps in the form of temporary or continuing lecturers, or even lecturers with security of employment, especially for programs with long records of consistent impaction but with high general levels of satisfaction among their majors.

- **Poor management by department/program.**
  Some programs simply do not exercise sufficient control over student enrollment, faculty teaching distribution, or curriculum to assure adequate coverage of course offerings or a sufficiently challenging program of study to discourage those who choose a major based on ease of completion.

- **Unreplaced retirements/separations.**
  In these extreme budget times it is commonly the case that retirements and separations are left unfilled for a number of years. The untimely loss of instructors, especially when several may be involved, can almost instantaneously cripple what previously was a healthy and vibrant program.

- **Inadequate budget support.**
  Again our present budget situation has led to reductions in temporary sub-0 funds, which often has meant fewer lecturers and less TA support. This tends to have an especially deleterious effect on impacted majors.

- **Students are studying longer.**
  In these tough economic times some students are staying in school rather than graduate, thus students are accumulating more course units, increasing the demand for seats in classrooms. Also many students pursue double majors, which also increases demand on instructional resources.

One important factor that must be kept in mind is that many impacted majors reside within departments but some of these majors are Interdepartmental Programs (IDP) that may
have no or just a handful of FTE. For departments, the impacted major is typically central to
their mission, the number of faculty involved is relatively constant, and requests for replacement
or augmentation of FTE are made through a single dean. Also majors residing in a department
tend to have a more stable demand for the major. Many IDPs focus on areas of study that are
more faddish in nature or their themes are in emerging fields where few if any departments exist
nationwide and a track-record for employment possibilities does not exist. By nature they tend to
be more unstable in student demand. Also, for IDPs the director typically has little authority,
with few, if any, permanent FTE, and the program is dependent on voluntarism of faculty, which
may or may not be encouraged or supported by their home department. If FTE reside in the
program, replacement/augmentation of faculty participants often must pass through more than
one dean. If no FTE exist, participating faculty must be recruited on a voluntary basis, which is
by nature more volatile. Credit for service in an IDP is uneven; some departments might reward
a participating faculty member, others might ‘punish’ or at least offer no course relief to teach
within the IDP.

**Current mitigation strategies**

A simple definition of an impacted major is a situation where resources are insufficient to
handle the total workload. Total workload is the product of the number of students times the
work required for each student. One solution is to reduce the latter. For example, in majors
where laboratory courses are a regular part of the curriculum, there is a temptation to dilute the
requirement: offer fewer laboratory courses, conduct fewer experiments. In programs where
significant writing is required and resources aren’t available to mark those papers, fewer or
shorter assignments are given. In both of these cases the educational process is compromised to
the detriment of the student. Consequently, a more common approach is to reduce numbers of
students.

The most common strategy to deal with student numbers in impacted majors is to limit
enrollment into the major and the establishment of a pre-major is generally the method by which
that is accomplished. The pre-major typically includes a series of lower division courses that
may or may not be courses within the major. Often they include prerequisites taught in other
departments. Frequently this series of courses must be completed with a minimum average GPA
that is considerably above the 2.0 that is required for graduation. In some majors a portfolio of
work may be judged for admission to a major.

The pre-major often, but not always, has the advantage of demonstrating to the student
who is denied admission to the major that perhaps this is not the major she/he should be
pursuing, thus providing valuable feedback early in the education process. This is likely true for
the student who chooses a major based on family pressure rather than on their own interests and
talents. For them a pre-major experience offers them evidence to support a decision to change
majors, one that is more fulfilling and provides more motivation. In general colleges should
establish a policy such that when a department or program proposes a pre-major or changes to
their pre-major, they must provide justification for how those requirements predict or contribute
to success in the major.

What is generally not included in the establishment of pre-majors is an exit-strategy for
the students who do not gain entrance into the major. Programs should look for ties with other
majors and work together to establish some common pre-major requirements thus providing
more options for students who may be denied admission to a particular major.
These mitigation strategies can, however, carry some downsides that need to be considered before adoption. The most obvious is that students who are denied admission must choose another major and perhaps be exposed to yet another pre-major requirement. This often results in a longer time-to-degree, therefore any pre-major requirement should be limited in scope to provide feedback as soon as possible so that it will not severely disadvantage those who are denied admission but rather allow them to choose another path that will not require a virtual ‘start over.’ Also the more courses that are included in the pre-major requirement, the larger enrollment those courses will have. This is especially important for departments outside the major whose courses are included in the pre-major courses, thus they must be consulted before including their courses in the pre-major.

Another straightforward means to limit enrollment in a major is to limit enrollment in specific classes. This ‘sledge hammer’ approach may take the form of limiting classes to majors only, or might limit enrollment in a given class to a specific number of students. Generally such an approach is applied to upper division courses, but it obviously limits the opportunity for students in other majors to broaden their horizons and in the case of limiting numbers of students in a class it can again lead to longer time-to-degree as students wait their turn to take required classes. In some cases students may proceed in a timely manner to graduation but will not be able to take courses that interest them and thus create dissatisfaction with the program.

Some departments do not require a pre-major but simply limit the number of students entering as freshmen. Students can transfer into these departments but they must take required courses as non-majors (typically requiring instructor approval on an individual basis) and have a minimum GPA in those courses. Those students who are admitted as freshmen must only maintain the 2.0 minimum GPA. This approach can work if only a few departments choose such an approach, but were every department to choose this method then a very systematic approach would need to be developed.

For the student who is simply pursuing the wrong major, pre-majors can be a blessing, but for some, setting limits on enrollment into impacted majors means they must choose a major not their first choice and thus lack motivation and engagement. These majors sometimes develop relatively poor reputations. ‘You can always be a _______ major, they’ll take anyone.’ And these alternate majors may themselves become impacted.

A very different strategy and one that is extremely unlikely in the present budget climate is to increase FTE in the impacted majors. Again this should not occur based on student numbers alone, but this can certainly be a factor. The best approach would be to add ladder faculty, but this is an expensive way to reduce student/faculty ratios. A more cost effective way that also lends stability to a program is to hire lecturers with (at least possibility of) security of employment. These lecturers carry a much heavier teaching load, but will also tend to be longer term faculty members. The negative side is that these positions require a line in the FTE count of the department, which makes this a hard sell when annual FTE requests are made. Because they have security of employment, they will remain in a program even if student demand decreases to the point where they are no longer needed. Hiring temporary lecturers is a common strategy because they teach almost three times as many courses as a ladder faculty member but quality control is more of a challenge and length of employment is highly variable often leading to a lack of cohesion in the curriculum. Utilizing visiting faculty also detracts from the ability of the program to provide a consistent education to their students. Some departments also have established a practice of using ABD graduate students in the roll of instructor of record in order to reduce the pressure on faculty in teaching lower division courses in their major. This practice
can provide the graduate student with valuable experience, but it can also be a heavy burden on them. Graduate student instructors can provide undergraduates with a high quality educational experience but at times this has resulted in poor instruction. Again quality control can be a problem with this approach.

**Recommended approaches**

In looking at the causes of impacted majors, it appears that timely and accurate counseling of students is probably the most effective tool that we could employ to minimize impaction of the various majors on UC campuses. This counseling need not always take the form of face-to-face encounters, it can also come in written form in catalogs and on-line. It would need to cover a variety of topics:

- **Reasons the student is choosing a given major.**
  When pressure being applied by family or peers, how can they be given tools to push back? Help them understand where their gifts, interests, and passions lie and the importance of enjoyment and fulfillment in the career they choose.

- **Making good class choices that maximize flexibility.**
  What courses should a student take when they don’t know where their interests lie? There are many courses that satisfy general education requirements that also provide an introduction to a field a student might want to pursue. Some courses provide fundamentals that are needed in a variety of majors.

- **Importance of general education.**
  Why should a student take courses that are not related to their interests? In spite of the express goal of GEs to broaden and enrich the perspectives of our students, those students often try to tailor their GE requirements such that the courses relate as closely as possible to their chosen major. By broadening their palette of GE courses a student may find that a field that differs radically from their major may turn out to be more to their liking and a better fit to their skills and talents.

- **Facts about the program.**
  What are the chances of entering the program? Students should be told how many begin the pre-major, what percentage gain entry into the major and what percentage graduate in the major and how long does it take on the average. ‘Truth in advertising’ should always be adopted. If there is a sequence of pre-major courses, which one(s) are most indicative of whether a student will succeed in the major? Students should be encouraged to take this course or these courses early on in their educational program, not other courses that most students do well in.

- **Facts about the skills that a given major will supply.**
  Given the student’s interest, what program will provide the best background? Sometimes the name of a major can be misleading and often other majors that might not come to mind might be more valuable. For example English and philosophy provide good background for Law and more and more engineers end up working in the field of medicine. As programs and departments improve their assessment of their objectives for their students, more information regarding the specific educational goals of the major will be available. Students can then be
aided in matching specific program objectives against skills needed for their career choice.

- **Facts about employment opportunities that exist for graduates of given majors.** How many jobs are available? What are the entry salary levels? For example, according to NACE in 2004 the starting salary for Psychology majors with a bachelor’s degree was $27,791; for a biology major it was $29,750; but for an English major it was $31,169. What are the opportunities for advancement?

Most campuses have trained staff and faculty who know the answers to most of these questions. However, experience tells us that students often do not seek such advice from those advisors and they are often overworked in impacted majors; just getting an appointment can hard. It is likely that peers would be more effective in conveying to the students the information that is needed. Recent graduates working in careers related to the major are the best possibilities for such service, but they would obviously need screening and training. Graduate students could also be used for advising as well. Roundtables where undergraduates can ask questions and hear answers and opinions are quite valuable as long as the information is accurate and honest. Clubs associated with majors can also be an effective means of disseminating information as well.

The earlier such advice can be offered to students the better. For example freshman orientation would be ideal. For transfer students, it is harder to provide such counsel because generally the counselors at community colleges simply do not have enough detailed information about specific UC campus programs and the counselor to student ratio at California community colleges is currently running at about 2000:1. For both transfer students and students who come in as freshman it is important that counseling opportunities come regularly. Not every student is prepared to listen to advice at the same time so there needs to be a number of opportunities to hear it.

**General suggestions**

Each campus should actively seek to make the names of majors, minors, programs and emphases accurately reflect their content. Furthermore in their online and catalogue descriptions, programs must provide information about the goals and objectives, and what skills the student will learn. Also they should include accurate information about the kinds of careers that their graduates pursue. For professional tracks such as pre-medicine and pre-law and for those interested in pursuing a career in business, it is important to integrate information from a spectrum of majors that share objectives that are valuable in these career paths. Good websites with this information are invaluable. Many campus websites have information that aid in selecting majors but few go into detail about how learning outcomes for a given major map into skills needed for a given career. Also, providing lists of alumni from a number of different majors who have gone on in these professional careers and business, including testimonies, would perhaps encourage dissemination of students among a greater variety of majors.

For impacted majors where temporary lecturers are used extensively, for some cases, hiring of lecturers for longer terms of employment, for example two or three years would engender more consistency in instruction as LSOEs do, but could at the same time have much more flexibility. However, there is always risk in such longer contracts. Again if demand drops, personality conflicts arise or lecturer performance slips, it is more difficult to terminate, than with short term lecturers. Another idea that might be pursued is postdoctoral teaching fellows. For example those receiving doctorates in programs in which impacted majors reside (or closely
aligned programs) who intend to pursue teaching careers could spend two or three years in a
secure lecturer position further developing their teaching skills. Furthermore they would be
persons with whom the program is familiar, with known backgrounds.

Over-enrollment in specific programs might be reduced by using a more systematic
approach than is currently employed. Every campus has an enrollment committee of some kind
to determine how many students they should have. If these campus committees were to expand
their current practice to include working with both impacted and under-utilized programs to
encourage more uniform selection of majors, through providing more accurate and germane
information. Departments should be encouraged to work together. Furthermore there is a new
systemwide committee that is overseeing the overall system enrollment. By collecting (and
publishing online) information from individual campuses regarding large majors (impacted or
not) and what their emphases are, it might help students better select the appropriate campus (and
major) at the outset.

Finally, it is imperative that deans establish a proper balance between weight given to
undergraduate enrollment in its historical context, quality of management of the department or
program, and its scholarly merit when it comes to providing FTE. Phase out
programs/departments that consistently under-serve students regardless of resources available to
them. Reward departments/programs with large numbers of satisfied student demand, who
demonstrate good stewardship of their resources, and who demonstrate scholarly achievement in
spite of high undergraduate student demand.
Request for Exception to Repeat Policy

As the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences (CNAS) continues to wrestle with unprecedented demand for its core math and science courses, we are requesting an immediate exception to UCR Senate Regulations R1.6, R1.6.1, R1.6.2 and R1.6.3 related to a student’s ability to repeat a course. It is desired to have the following enrollment priorities approved for academic year 2010-2011:

1) First-time course takers have seat priority over second-time takers, who in turn have seat priority over third-time takers. Only under extenuating circumstances will the Associate Dean consider approving third-time enrollments.

2) Departments can actively use waitlists to move students in and out of course seats during the open enrollment period(s), in order to enforce these priorities.

These policy exceptions will be applied only to the following impacted CNAS courses:

| STAT 048 | MATH 004 | CHEM-01LA |
| STAT 100A | MATH 005 | CHEM-01LB |
| STAT 100B | MATH 008A | CHEM-01LC |
| STAT 104 | MATH 008B | CHEM-112A |
| STAT 127 | MATH 009A | CHEM-112B |
| MATH 009B | CHEM-112C |
| BIOL 002 | MATH 009C |
| BIOL 003 | MATH 010A | PHYS 002A |
| BIOL 005A | MATH 010B | PHYS 002B |
| BIOL 005B | MATH 011 | PHYS 002C |
| BIOL 005C | MATH 015 | PHYS 02LA |
| BIOL 05LA | MATH 022 | PHYS 02LB |
| BIOL 010 | MATH 046 | PHYS 02LC |
| BIOL 030 | PHYS 040A |
| BIOL 034 | CHEM-001A | PHYS 040B |
| BIOL 040 | CHEM-001B | PHYS 040C |
| BIOL 102 | CHEM-001C |

Operationally departments will review courses and drop any third-time takers who have not received the required Associate Dean’s approval. Student will be notified of such. Courses that are full will be reviewed and second-time takers will be dropped from the course to allow first-time takers access to the course. Departments will notify the second-time students that they were dropped from the course and have been moved onto the waitlist.
June 29, 2010

To: Anthony W. Norman  
Chair, Academic Senate, Riverside Division

From: Marylynn V. Yates  
Chair

RE: Request for Exception to Repeat Policy

The CNAS Executive Committee members reviewed the Request for Exception to Repeat Policy and submitted their comments and votes via email. Of the eight members who did vote, six were in favor of the proposal and two were opposed.

The individuals who were not in favor of the proposal did approve of not allowing people to take the course a third time unless there was space available. However, with respect to not allowing people to take the course a second time, those individuals felt that it was not appropriate to allow a student to remain enrolled at the university, then suddenly tell them that they cannot take a course a second time, when this practice has been allowed for many years. The effect could be a year-long delay in graduating. In addition, one of the Committee members asked me to relay this specific quote, "I don't think students, especially "first-time offenders", should have to pay the price for the abject inability of both the campus and the college to competently manage our undergraduate enrollment and growth".

Another issue that needs attention was raised by faculty who are very supportive of this proposal. Something needs to be done about the current “withdraw” policy. Students can now take up space in a course well into the quarter, then decide to drop and receive a W. There should be some point at which a student should receive a WF which impacts his/her GPA equivalent to the manner in which receiving an F does. Reportedly, UCLA has recently begun to deal with this “withdraw” issue.
July 15, 2010

TO: BRACKEN DAILEY
REGISTRAR

FM: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: REQUEST FOR EXCEPTION TO REPEAT POLICY

The Executive Council met on July 12, 2010 and discussed the request for Exception to Repeat Policy dated June 15, 2010.

The Executive Council did not believe that an exception to the policy is required, however, the Council voted unanimously to amend your policy in the following manner:

(a) Departments who offer courses for which the maximum enrollment is exceeded by student interest shall create and maintain a two ‘Wait Lists’.

(b) *Wait List-1* will include the names and student ID number of all students who had not previously taken the course in question (i.e., first-timers) and who could not be accommodated in Course X in the present quarter.

(c) *Wait List-2* shall include the names and student ID number of all students who have previously taken the course in question (i.e., retakers) and who could not be accommodated in Course X in the present quarter.

(d) *Wait List-1* and *Wait List-2* students will be carried over to the next quarter that the course is offered. The priority of enrollment of students into the ‘next quarter’ offering shall be *Wait List-1* students over new first-timers, new first-timers over *Wait List-2* students, then *Wait List-2* students, then new retakers. Thus second-time takers have no priority over first-time takers and may not be able to take a course for the second time in the quarter that they prefer.
(e) Only under extenuating circumstances will the Associate Dean consider approving third-time enrollments. Third-time takers have the lowest and may not be able to take a course for the third time in the quarter that they prefer.

This policy should be promulgated widely in the UCR catalog, CNAS websites and advising offices and with other information for the course(s) to which it applies.

Cc:   Associate Dean Michael McKibben
      Associate Dean Steven Brint
      Associate Dean Chinya Ravishankar