

To: Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division

At the Academic Senate meeting on November 18, 2016, we hope to discuss the following issues:

Long Range Enrollment Plan (LREP)  
Impaction Work Group  
Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)

Respectfully Submitted;  
Abel Rodriguez  
Kim Lau, Vice-Chair  
Ólöf Einarsdóttir, Chair

appendices

November 7, 2016

## APPENDIX A

**Long Range Enrollment Plan, Impact, and Long Range Development Plan**

Last spring, the State Legislature allocated an additional \$25 million to UC to increase the number of in-state undergraduates by 5,000 for the 2016-17 academic year. The UC Regents approved the enrollment plan<sup>1</sup> in November of 2015 and UC President Napolitano shared the campus targets in a Dec. 22 letter to UC chancellors.

UC Santa Cruz's increased enrollment in 2016-17 is our response to targets that President Napolitano set under a plan to increase the systemwide enrollment of new California undergraduates by 10,000 over the next three years, including a combined 5,000 freshmen and transfer students in 2016-17. Campus administrative and Senate leadership are examining implications for the campus — including everything from the impact on faculty, staff, graduate and undergraduate students to teaching space, student housing, and student support services — and how to address them. Toward that end, we jointly invite all faculty to participate in an initial discussion of these critical issues at the November 18, 2016 Senate meeting.

Our hope is to open a dialogue between faculty and Senate and campus leaders with the primary objective of soliciting input on what is and is not working with the new influx of students. In particular, we would like to hear from the faculty what compelling examples exist or could be formulated to report on the impacts of increased enrollment across campus and in specific disciplines (e.g., the campus move to shorten class periods; reduction in writing assignments; etc). These measures will be critical at both the campus and the systemwide levels as UC negotiates enrollment targets and budget compacts with the Governor and Legislature.

The campus process of planning and responding to enrollment growth has only just begun. Your feedback is essential at this early stage and throughout the process. This year we will begin to develop two major campus plans: UCSC's response to the Long Range Enrollment Plan (LREP) and the Long Range Development Plan (LRDP). The systemwide LREP centers on each campus' specific enrollment targets, broken down by categories at each level: undergraduate (California residents, transfers, non-resident and non-resident transfer) and graduate (PhD, MFA, masters and non-degree). The LRDP process is in its initial stages and will incorporate LREP assumptions, space needs and available funding, as well as collaborations with the City and County. The purpose of this discussion is to invite open questions and comments, which can be incorporated into the considerations for planning and the timeline and format of future consultations.

As student demand shifts and resources remain limited, a program may find that their existing resources are no longer sufficient to accommodate all qualified students. In response to this changing landscape, VPAA Lee has been leading a joint Senate and administrative working group to investigate ideas for improving capacity and a process for capping admissions and major declaration when all other measures have proved insufficient. This group has provided an interim

---

<sup>1</sup> The enrollment plan may be viewed at - <http://universityofcalifornia.edu/press-room/regents-committees-approve-plan-enroll-more-californians>

report, which is included in the Senate agenda package. In this draft report, the working group summarizes the guiding principles supporting their deliberations and requests faculty feedback on capacity issues, policies on enrollment caps and how to minimize impact of such policies on program diversity. The November 18 senate meeting will be a primary opportunity for sharing concerns with and providing feedback to the work group.

## APPENDIX B

**Impaction Working Group  
Interim Report Academic Senate**

As student demand shifts and resources remain limited, a program may find that their and their division's existing resources are no longer sufficient to accommodate all students who are interested in the major. A ten-member working group comprised of faculty, administrators and staff has been meeting during the Fall 2016 quarter to investigate options and generate a set of recommendations, some of which can be implemented immediately by departments, others will require approval of the relevant Senate committees. The group as a whole has met roughly bi-weekly during the Fall 16 quarter, and has formed four subcommittees to investigate specific issues.

This brief report is meant to inform the faculty at-large of the status of the work, bring transparency by allowing faculty to ask questions and raise concerns, and solicit feedback on specific issues that the working group has struggled with.

**Working Group Membership:**

Herbert Lee, VPAA (Chair)  
Richard Hughey, VPDUE  
David Smith, Chair, CAFA  
John Tamkun, Chair, CEP  
Abel Rodriguez, Chair, CPB  
Tracy Larrabee, at-large faculty representative  
Margarita Azmitia, at-large faculty representative  
Matthew Mednick, Academic Senate Director  
Kyle Eischen, Assistant Dean, Social Sciences  
Meg Lehr, Planning and Budget

**Guiding principles:**

1. Impaction declaration and capacity management should be the exception and not the rule.
2. Capacity for undergraduate instruction in a major should be assessed with objective metrics that take into account faculty workloads across the spectrum (undergraduate and graduate instruction, research, and service) and can be compared against other UC campuses. The assessment should also involve a comparison of the major's curriculum (both in terms of size and complexity) against other UC campuses, and an assessment of advising capacity for the program.
3. Limits to the number of majors admitted to some oversubscribed majors should be allowed, as is the case in almost every other UC campus. However, caps should be allowed only if other policies or processes are not enough to bring the number of qualifying majors to numbers that are consistent with the capacity available. Example alternatives include:

- a. Changes to the qualification policies that promote student success by channeling students who are highly unlikely to be successful in the major towards other degrees early in their career.
  - b. Tightening of enforcement of major declaration policies to minimize late declaration.
  - c. Restricting and/or prioritizing enrollment in gateway courses to majors.
  - d. Restructuring and streamlining of curriculum
4. The impaction/capacity management process should be faculty driven but in close collaboration with Academic Senate, divisional Deans, and other administrators.
    - a. Regardless of formal approval of impacted status for a program, any measures that would normally require approval by CEP and/or CAFA will still be discussed with and approved by those committees, and approved jointly rather than separately to insure that the solution makes the most sense overall.
    - b. There is an expectation that Academic deans will be involved in the generation of proposals, that local resources will be exhausted first, and that divisional staff, including curricular analysts, will provide substantial support for generating impaction reports/proposal.
  5. Any cap at the time of admission must be tightly coupled with changes in policies for major declaration so that students are not allowed to game the system by declaring one major on their application and then switching to their preferred majors.
  6. Any restrictions/caps should be clearly communicated to students applying to the campus.
  7. Departments must understand and attempt to minimize the impact of policy changes on student diversity when pursuing actions.
  8. The process for major impaction/capacity management should be kept as simple as possible and put as light a burden on departments and faculty as possible.
  9. Impaction should not be used as an excuse for reducing divisional resources allocated to departments.

**Issues on which the working group is looking for feedback:**

1. Should we think about caps as temporary solutions only (a way to manage impaction) and, therefore, require departments/divisions to generate an exit plan, or allow some of them to become permanent (a curricular capacity tool)? Permanent caps might make a lot of sense when constraints derive from lab/space availability. Also, permanent caps might be appropriate if the campus moves in the direction of strategic academic planning.
2. Most thinking has focused on majors. But there are a number of aspects of our service curriculum (understood as curriculum that spans large number of students across multiple divisions) that are also impacted. How could we think about those?
3. Should enrollment caps be applied at declaration time, admission time or both?
4. Should caps be applied to both students admitted as frosh and as transfers, or should transfer students be exempted from caps?
5. How do we minimize the impact of some of these policies on the diversity of the programs?
6. Should (at least some) minors and/or double majors involving impacted programs be limited?
7. What is the campus, divisional, and departmental responsibility to provide access to majors?