

**SEE RESOLUTION #41 2005-2006**

**SUNY BROCKPORT**

College Senate  
State University of New York  
College at Brockport  
350 New Campus Drive  
Brockport, NY 14420-2925  
(585) 395-2586 (Fax) 395-2246

**Resolution # 10  
2004-2005  
COLLEGE SENATE**

**Deferred**

pending report  
of ad hoc committee  
in Spr 2006

TO: Dr. John B. Clark, Interim College President  
FROM: The Faculty Senate Meeting on: **April 4, 2005**  
RE:  I. Formal Resolution (*Act of Determination*)  
II. Recommendation (*Urging the Fitness of*)  
III. Other, For Your Information (*Notice, Request, Report, etc.*)  
SUBJ: **Application to Declare the Health Science Major, Intent to Major for Transfers and Enrolment Cap to balance majors to faculty #10 04-05 UC**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Dr. Dawn M. Jones, 2004-2005 College Senate President)

**Please fill out the bottom portion and return document to the College Senate Office.**

TO: The College Senate  
FROM: Dr. John B. Clark, Interim College President  
RE:  I. **Decision and Action Taken on Formal Resolution (circle)**  
a. Accepted. Effective Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
b. Deferred for discussion with the Faculty Senate on \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
c. Unacceptable for the reasons contained in the attached explanation  
II, III. **Response to Recommendation or Other/FYI**  
a. Received and acknowledged \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_  
b. Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

DISTRIBUTED BY PRESIDENT'S OFFICE TO: \_\_\_\_\_  
DISTRIBUTED BY PROVOST'S OFFICE TO: \_\_\_\_\_  
DISTRIBUTED ALSO TO: Originator, Academic Advisement, Registrar (as appropriate)  
Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Dr. John B. Clark, Interim College President, SUNY College at Brockport)



## SUNY BROCKPORT

### College Senate Office

April 12, 2005

Dear Colleagues,

As some of you have heard, and all can see on the agenda for the meeting next Monday, I will introduce a motion to rescind the recent action by the Senate to approve the proposal by the Health Science Department to limit majors by changing the timing and the means by which students are accepted into the program. If there is no second to my motion, it dies there. The Executive Committee has allowed the issue to be on the agenda, but it did so without endorsement, as is appropriate. This is, admittedly, an unprecedented action, one I have not taken lightly, since it could be read as challenging both your collective judgment as well as that of our colleagues on the Undergraduate Committee.

I see it somewhat differently. This proposal grows out of a real problem that has resulted in the possibility that students may receive less of an educational opportunity than they deserve. At the same time, it also breaks new ground for the College, especially in the way it will handle transfer students. As such, it becomes a powerful precedent for other departments and programs. As Director of Transfer Articulation, I am concerned about both the substance of the proposal and the lack of specific, focused discussion on an issue of this importance.

The fault for that, clearly, lies not with you, but me (and others) who understood the potential importance of this step, but who did not speak last Monday. There are various reasons for this. I, for example, found myself meeting with student advisees and chose to remain with them and complete our work instead of getting to the Senate meeting on time. So, I'm trying to correct a mistake that I made in not being available to inform you more fully at the most appropriate time.

Finally, nothing in this action should be read as criticism on my part of our colleagues in Health Science. They have acted in good faith at every step in this process, seeking to protect the integrity of their program and the quality of the education they are able to offer students. This cannot be done without the appropriate level of resources. About that there is no question.

I look forward our discussion next Monday.

Cordially,

Kenneth P. O'Brien  
Past President

COLLEGE	ROUTING NUMBER*	#10 04-05 EP/UC
---------	--------------------	-----------------

**RESOLUTION PROPOSAL COVER PAGE**

*NUMBER TO BE ASSIGNED BY SENATE OFFICE*

**DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS: FEBRUARY 23** - Proposals received after the deadline may not be reviewed until next semester.

Submit all proposals to the College Senate President electronically or on a disk with a hard copy.

Please provide cover page information requested.

[facprez@brockport.edu](mailto:facprez@brockport.edu), [fsenate@brockport.edu](mailto:fsenate@brockport.edu)

College Senate Office, 426 Allen Building

**1. PROPOSAL TITLE:**

Please be somewhat descriptive, for example, *Graduate Probation/Dismissal Proposal* rather than *Graduate Proposal*.

Application to Declare the Health Science Major, Intent to Major for transfers, and an Enrollment Cap to balance majors to faculty.

**2. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL:**

**In order to manage increasing numbers of HLS/HLLmajors due to education certification changes, an application including a personal statement of objectives and DARS/transcript based on 12 Brockport credits would be required. For those with less than 12 Brockport credits (e.g., transfers), intent to major would be declared. Enrollments to the major could then be managed to provide an appropriate level of interaction between majors and their faculty.**

**3. SUBMISSION & REVISION DATES:** PLEASE DATE ALL UPDATED DOCUMENTS and resubmit to the Senate Office electronically prior to Senate review and vote at [fsenate@brockport.edu](mailto:fsenate@brockport.edu).

First Submission	Updated on	Updated on	Updated on
11/05/04	2/1/05	2/11/05	2/24/05

**4. SUBMITTED BY: (contact person)**

Name	Department	Phone	Email
Douglas M. Scheidt, Ph.D., chair	Health Science	395-5356	dscheidt@brockport.edu

**5. COMMITTEES TO COPY: (Senate office use only)**

Standing Committee	Forwarded To	Date
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Enrollment Planning & Policies	Committee Chair	11/5/04, 2/24/05
<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty & Professional Staff Policies	Executive Committee	12/21/05
<input type="checkbox"/> General Education & Curriculum Policies	Senate Floor	4/4/05
<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Curriculum & Policies	College President	4/11/05
<input type="checkbox"/> Student Policies	Other	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate Curriculum & Policies		

*\*(ROUTING NUMBER WILL BE A CHRONOLOGICAL NUMBER SEQUENCE FOLLOWED BY COMMITTEE INITIALS)*

To: [fsenate@brockport.edu](mailto:fsenate@brockport.edu)  
Dawn Jones, College Senate President  
Tim Flanagan, Academic Priorities Committee  
Dave Brannigan, Undergraduate Curriculum & Policies Committee  
Priya Banerjee, Enrollment Policies Committee

From: Doug Scheidt, Chairperson

Date: 2/24/05

Re: Health Science Proposal

Enclosed is a revised proposal for a change in the policies and procedures for declaring the Health Science undergraduate major with a Liberal Arts Concentration (HLS/HLL). I have included a College Senate Resolution Proposal Cover Page and text describing the rationale and details of the proposal. Based on the request of the Executive Committee of the college Senate, I have described the process of application for a first year student and the evaluation of the application.

I look forward to Senate action on this proposal and support its passage. If you have any questions or need for clarification, please contact me at x5356 or [dscheidt@brockport.edu](mailto:dscheidt@brockport.edu)

***Health Science Proposal: Application to Declare, Transfer Intent to Major, & Enrollment Cap***

The Department of Health Science proposes a change to our declaration of major process for the Liberal Arts Concentration (HLS/HLL). Specifically, we propose an application process (based on a statement of objectives and a DARS/Transcript), enrollment cap, and an intent to major for transfers until they have 12 Brockport credits. We are submitting this as a major change because "one or more departments are affected by the changes." However, the only effect would be that departments may benefit by subsequent diversion of students to other majors.

There are several reasons for this proposal. The primary reason is to balance the number of majors (first and second) to the number of full-time faculty as recommended by our PPR reviewers. There are a number of contextual factors that shape this balance.

1. We have had significant increases in the number of majors (first and second). In 1986-1987 there were 139 majors. In 1991, at our last PPR, there were 225 HLS majors. By May 2004, we had 530 first and second undergraduate majors, plus an additional 36 graduate students.
2. The Department of Health Science remains at 11 full-time faculty members, unchanged since 1991.
3. Although the college statistics often report only first majors, the amount of advisement and the number of course seats required for a second major is the same.
4. HLS faculty members advise 40 to 45 undergraduates plus 3 to 5 graduate students.
5. Approximately 45 to 50 % of our course sections are taught by associate faculty members. The NCATE maximum is 50 %. The college target is 25 %.
6. Due to the changes in eligible majors for early childhood and childhood education, we have encountered an increase in major declarations and expect the increase to continue for another year or two. We expect to exceed 600 majors unless this proposal is implemented.
7. In addition to the large number of majors, the department manages four undergraduate programs and one graduate program. Health Science also contributes significantly to the general education program, especially in contemporary issues and women's perspectives.

As noted in the most recent Periodic Program Review (2003-2004) external reviewers,

*There was consensus across the three external reviewers that staffing across all programs and levels of programs is clearly inadequate. Although the current full-time faculty should be lauded for their dedication to the institution, to the department, and to the students it is apparent that they feel overworked and somewhat frustrated by advisee loads, many committee assignments, and the growing assessment requirements.*

*According to the data provided, the Department had 487 students as of 12/15/03, with 11 full-time faculty. This equates to an advising load of approximately 40-45 undergraduates, and 3-5 graduate students per full-time faculty. It was also reported that class size commonly exceeds 40 students. This is a tremendous burden on faculty who are also expected to fulfill the full range of expectations of faculty according to the SUNY Board of Trustees.*

*The reported advisee load is approximately 30 percent higher than the college average. This data does not include work as a member of master's candidates' theses or culminating paper committees.*

*The percentage of courses being taught by adjunct faculty is high. Although use of qualified adjuncts in targeted courses can be beneficial to the students and the department, the current level of adjunct use is twice the recommended level for the college.  
(PPR external reviewer report, May 2004).*

In order to balance the number of majors (first & second) with faculty resources, the department proposes to implement a cap on enrollments, managed by an application process. Specifically, we would change from our current process of on-going, open declaration of majors to an application-based process for majors in the Liberal Arts Concentration (HLS/HLL). We plan to have students submit an application, statement of objectives, and DARS/transcript by October 1 and March 1. Then, based on enrollment targets derived from a major-to-faculty ratio, an appropriate number of students would be accepted into the major. For transfers, an intent to major would be created until the students had 12 Brockport credits on which their application could be evaluated.

In summary, this proposal is designed to assure an appropriate major-to-faculty ratio so that HLS/HLL majors may be given a high quality education with an appropriate level of individual attention, advisement, and mentoring.

Specifically, we propose to cap the total number of HLS majors to a number based on 30 majors per full-time, tenure-track faculty member. This number matches the median ratio across departments (29.9). In addition, this number will allow the use of associate faculty to move closer to the College goal of 25% from the current 45% of courses taught by associate faculty.

With 12 FT/TT faculty, this would yield a maximum of 360 Health Science majors. With approximately 70 HLS/HLE, 60 HLS/HLD and 30 HLS/HLA majors, the enrollment cap would be set at approximately 200 HLS/HLL majors. This cap would be adjusted if staffing changes or enrollments in other HLS tracks increase or decrease.

#### Revision 2.0

The Committee is of the opinion that the cap should only be targeted to the LA (teacher certification) track.

This revision is included in the preceding text.

#### Revision 3.0

The Committee wanted the numeric formula for the cap based on a specific faculty:major ratio.

This formula is indicated in the text at the end of the proposal (i.e., 30 majors per full-time, tenure-track faculty member).

#### Revision 4.0

The Exec Committee would like you to indicate how a 1st year student would approach the application process. Would a first year student apply on October first of their first semester? Also you should state that selection will be done on a first-come basis.

A first year student would not apply in October. As is established College policy, first year students may not declare a major in their first semester. Therefore, first year students would apply in their second semester. This would allow their first semester GPA to be included in their application as part of the application, including a DARS/transcript and statement of objectives.

The selection would NOT be done on a first come-basis. Selection will be based on the evaluation of the application, including a DARS/transcript with a Brockport GPA based on at least 12 credits taken at Brockport, and a statement of objectives. Each semester, the students with the strongest application package would be admitted.

During the first two years of the enrollment cap (the phase-in period), the acceptance limit each semester would be one-fourth of the total enrollment cap. Therefore, after two years (four semesters), the department would have reduced the number of majors to the enrollment cap.

During subsequent semesters, the number of acceptances will be one-half of the number of open spaces determined on August 31st of that year. This would account for openings based on graduation (May and August). One-half of these openings would be filled in the Fall semester. The other half would be filled in the Spring semester. This would allow for an even chance of acceptance, especially as transfers may be applying in Fall or Spring, depending on when they transfer.

*Feb. 17, 2006 draft  
Ad Hoc Committee Report  
On Deferred Resolution #10 2004-2005*

## Procedures Regarding Limiting Enrollment to an Undergraduate Program

**Purpose:** This information is intended to set forth the basic procedures by which an academic undergraduate department may seek and gain approval to limit enrollment of students. This process involves attention to both curricular and resource matters. The guidelines are intended to ensure that all appropriate administrators and all affected campus offices review the implications of limited enrollment proposals, and that interested students, high schools, and community college counselors have adequate notice and sufficient time to prepare for the change in the enrollment policies of a Brockport program.

**What is a Limited Enrollment Program:** An undergraduate program is designated as a *limited enrollment program* when the number of qualified students interested in a particular program exceeds the number of available spaces that the College can accommodate in the major/program given the instructional resources and physical capacity of the College.

*Limited Enrollment Program* status requires approval by the **President's Cabinet**, and those programs designated as limited enrollment are then authorized to implement procedures and/or criteria approved by the **Academic Priorities Committee (APC)** to manage their enrollments.

### A. General Guidelines

1. The resource implications for the limited enrollment program should be addressed primarily by the dean of the school in which the program seeking the limit is offered and the provost.
2. Unless otherwise mandated by law, accrediting agency, or other external authority, a request to limit enrollment must be primarily based upon limitations in the requesting program's resources.
3. The program applying for limited enrollment must consult the Directors of Admissions, Academic Advisement, Registration and Records, and the Transfer Articulation Coordinator early in the process to identify possible implementation issues.
4. The Office of the Provost, in collaboration with the APC, will provide guidelines for the comparative institutional data to be supplied by those programs requesting limited enrollment and the rationale validating the intended outcome. The same data shall be required for either a new application or a renewal of limited enrollment status. Examples of data may include: college enrollment by first and

second major, advisement loads, general education courses offered through a particular program, credit hours, etc.

5. Any limited enrollment program should be publicized by the program and the Offices of Admissions, Transfer Articulation, and Marketing/Communications at least six months prior to implementation. Implementation shall commence no earlier than the first term (fall or spring) which is at least six months after approval by the President's Cabinet.
6. The program limiting enrollment shall be expected to assume responsibility for any additional processing required for the implementation. Additional resources needed should be addressed by the dean and provost at the time of the request to limit enrollment.
7. Once a limited enrollment policy is implemented, it applies to all students seeking admission to the program regardless of which *Undergraduate Studies Catalog* is being used to satisfy other requirements.

#### B. The Process for ~~Approval~~ Submitting a Proposal for Limiting Enrollment

1. The ~~approval~~ process begins with the program submitting a request and justification for limited enrollment to the dean of its school.
2. The dean shall discuss with the provost the resource implications of the application. At the conclusion of the dean/provost discussions, the provost shall in a timely manner forward a letter of recommendation to the dean indicating concurrence or non-concurrence with the request for limited enrollment.
3. Following the dean's and provost's consideration of resource issues, the program seeking to limit enrollment shall prepare a proposal to be reviewed by the APC, followed by ~~approval~~ consideration from the President's Cabinet.

#### C. The Limited Enrollment Proposal

1. The proposal to limit enrollment should include statements from the dean of the school and from the provost supporting or opposing limited enrollment on the basis of resources.
2. The proposal should include justification for the need to limit enrollment and describe how limited enrollment would be implemented, with explanation sufficient to justify the particular procedure chosen to implement the policy.
3. Although resource matters are addressed primarily by the dean and provost, the proposal should include data showing the minimum/maximum number of students feasible with existing resources.

**Commented [JL1]:** I don't know if this is a big deal but for some reason, the word "approval" sounded to me like it could be a done deal. So I suggest some changes here. I also would like to build into this section language stipulating that depts. are notified of the recommendation at each step of the way, similar to the tenure process for faculty. But maybe this is something that we want to discuss tomorrow.

4. The proposal must include a statement of limited enrollment to be inserted in the *Undergraduate Studies Catalog*. The statement must include:
  - a. A description of the methods to limit enrollment.
  - b. Provisions for transfer students.
  - c. When applicable, the deadline for application and the date for notification to the student.

#### **D. Renewal of Limited Enrollment**

Justification for a program continuing its limited enrollment policy shall be addressed after every five years. Should demographic or enrollment shifts cause decreased enrollments, department chairs, in consultation with their dean, may suspend the enrollment cap. As with an initial application, the dean and provost will need to discuss the resource implications of continuing limited enrollment. Approval for continuation or modification to the limited enrollment procedure is recorded in the President's Cabinet minutes.

#### **E. Supplementary Admissions Criteria for Consideration in Limiting Program Enrollments**

Each proposal shall include supplementary admissions criteria which may be used in screening applicants. Following are suggested, although not all-inclusive, criteria that may be considered when limiting program enrollments. When departments are considering such criteria for increasing requirements and reducing numbers of majors, it is strongly recommended that the authors keep in mind issues of simplicity, consistency, fairness and ease of implementation

It is important that departments work closely with the directors of Admissions, Academic Advisement, and Registration and Records in selecting one or more of these criteria:

1. Where appropriate, establish and hold to firm deadlines for applications to limited enrollment programs. Consider "file completion" and/or "deposit" deadlines rather than initial application deadlines.
2. Require program prerequisites or other "tool" course sequences be completed prior to acceptance.
3. Transfer Students—simply CAP transfer numbers. Chair, dean, VPs, negotiate a maximum number of students to be admitted after careful monitoring by the academic department of retention numbers, graduate enrollments, graduation numbers, projected yields, and department resources.
4. Establish a separate application process for high demand programs similar to Nursing, Social Work and Education.

Personnel and procedures would then need to be assigned to a) make decisions and evaluate applicant qualifications b) communicate with applicants, c) handle administration and monitoring of the program, d) provide timely and accurate advisement to applicants, e) handle

all appeals and complaints, and f) process all paperwork changing intended majors to approved majors.

5. Consider a moratorium/limit on spring semester admits (fall admits only).
6. GPA - A minimum overall GPA may be required for admission or enrollment into a program. This could be used in combination with “tool” courses. (Caution/College Senate policy)
7. Consider not accepting applications from lower division community college transfers to limited admission programs (they have other choices).
8. Consider reducing/eliminating 2nd baccalaureate degrees in limited enrollment programs.
  9. Designate selected major courses as “majors only” to limit them to only those students that a department has formally accepted into a program.
  10. Suspend or limit special admits to limited enrollment programs..
  11. Consider geographic proximity in the admission process – priority given to applicants from regional high schools and community colleges.
  12. Require completion of specified lower-division general education requirements for lower-division transfer students.
13. Consider use of auditions, portfolios, recommendations, work experience, exam scores.
14. Consider use of *gateway* course(s), as with this example used with physical education & sport.

Limit access to PE/TE (as evidenced by enrollment in PEP 441) by requiring successful completion of at least 45 credits, including a 2.5 Brockport GPA for at least 12 credits of work where no more than 25% are from physical education “performance” courses.

**Commented [JL2]:** I guess we have to decide what to do with this. Our final document won't have this paren in there will it?

**Commented [JL3]:** What would be the rationale for this? I haven't read our MOU yet but in senate exec comm. Last night I thought I heard mention of looking beyond just western ny. Don't know if that's true or not.

**F. Following are enrollment-related issues that should be taken into account when considering enrollment limitations to programs:**

1. Be careful when considering setting limits on incoming freshmen, many of whom are unsure of their future majors and/or may choose to enter Brockport as “undeclared” and explore options. Clearly informing incoming applicants of higher standards and selectivity for limited enrollment programs, however, is highly recommended and may reduce applications from less-prepared students.
2. Exercise extreme caution when considering *transfer* GPA in any admissions decision to a program. Rationale for not including transfer GPA as an admissions requirement:
  - a. Many Admissions decisions are made when most transfers have courses in progress, making GPA only temporary and in flux.

- b. Transfers frequently have more than one transfer college, with many from three or more colleges. Which GPA would we use? Newest, highest, combined? Combined GPA's are not calculated anywhere at the time the Admissions decision needs to be made. (i.e., a student dismissed from Cortland with 1.2 GPA after 6 semesters then attends one semester at MCC with 2.5 GPA).
  - c. At many community colleges, GPA's are recalculated as students change programs, removing from GPA calculations all courses no longer relevant to the new program. Transcripts then are not a true reflection of previous coursework. (i.e. potential students do poorly in one program, change programs, and start with a clean slate for GPA)
3. There needs to be careful and on-going communication with major transfer feeder colleges to inform them of all proposed changes and to provide accurate transfer course articulation to assist transfer students in arriving at Brockport well informed and well prepared.
  4. Dual Admits (2 + 2 students) are already "Brockport" students even though they complete their first two years at their community college.
  5. The expanding requirements of Brockport's general education program (SUNY and local requirements), combined with increasing programmatic demands imposed from outside accrediting bodies, should be considered.
    - 6. Consider a fall-back major/minor to minimize impact when upper division prospective majors are denied admission to a program (particularly important for transfer students). Consider someone having to answer the question "What am I supposed to do now?" For example, students not reaching the required GPA to complete the physical education/teacher certification program have the option to still complete the liberal arts physical education major (no certification). Students not meeting the GPA requirement for criminal justice can opt to complete another major such as sociology, complete a criminal justice minor, and still reach their career goals.
  7. Consider the impact of capping strategies in a high demand program on other majors.
    - 8. Before proposing program caps, have chairs considered issues such as flexible and year-round (summer) scheduling, distance learning and use of technology, using facilities and personnel imaginatively?
    - 9. Before proposing program caps, have chairs considered strategies to improve graduation rates and/or reduce time to graduate, particularly in credit rich programs?
  10. Any plan should not extend programs and time to graduate.

**SUNY COLLEGE AT BROCKPORT**  
**PROGRAM ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES**  
**March 1, 2006**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>MINIMUM GPA</b>	<b>COURSE GRADE REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>PRIOR EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION/ INTERVIEW</b>	<b>SEPARATE APPLICATION</b>	<b>CAP</b>
Accounting	2.5 in prerequisites	C in all ACC courses C- all others					
Business	Cumulative 2.5 GPA in prerequisites	C- all prereqs, coreqs, core & specialty					
International Business	3.0 in prerequisites	No grade below C-					
Criminal Justice	2.5 GPA at admission						
Childhood Education	2.5 cumulative GPA	C+ in all EDI courses C in non EDI courses	Supervised experience w/children	Writing sample	2 recommendations	Yes	60 per semester
Early Childhood Education	2.5 cumulative GPA	C+ in all EDI courses C in non EDI courses	Supervised experience w/children	Writing sample	2 recommendations	Yes	25 annually
Adolescence Education	2.5 cumulative GPA and major	C+ in all EDI courses C in non EDI courses	Supervised experience w/adolescents	Autobiography	3 recommendations	Yes	15 each certification each semester
School & Comm. Health Ed.	2.5 in prerequisites	C in required courses					

PROGRAM	MINIMUM GPA	COURSE GRADE REQUIREMENTS	PRIOR EXPERIENCE	PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT	RECOMMENDATION/ INTERVIEW	SEPARATE APPLICATION	CAP
Liberal Arts HLS		C in required HLS courses					
Nursing	2.75 cumulative GPA	C in prerequisites			Satisfactory references	Yes	60-70 annually
Social Work	2.5 cumulative GPA	C in all major courses		Essay	2 references	Yes	45-70 annually
Recreation and Leisure Studies		Minimum C in REL core courses and emphasis courses					
BFA Studio Art	2.5 overall GPA 3.0 in Art	C in all major courses					
BA/BS Studio Art		C in all major courses					
BA/BS Arts for Children		C in all required courses				Yes	
Communications		C in specific courses					
Dance		C in all major courses		Audition			
Physical Ed P-12 Teacher Ed Adapted PE	2.5 GPA (12 Brockport credits)	C in PEP 441, 442, 444, 445 , 483 and all PE activity classes				Yes	Transfers restricted 100 Fall 40 Spring
Exercise Physiology		C in all concentration courses					
Sport Management	2.2 in concentration						

Athletic Training	2.5 cumulative GPA	C in required courses			2 recommendations Interview	Yes	Based on # placements
Theatre Acting				Audition	Interview		
Theatre Design Tech					Portfolio Review	Interview	
<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>MINIMUM GPA</b>	<b>COURSE GRADE REQUIREMENTS</b>	<b>PRIOR EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION/ INTERVIEW</b>	<b>SEPARATE APPLICATION</b>	<b>CAP</b>
Foreign Languages	2.5 in major	Minimum C for major courses					
Biology & Medical Tech		Minimum C in BIO 201, 202 to progress in major					
Computer Science -Advanced Computing	Major & cognate courses average grade C or better	Minimum C in CSC 203, 205, 311					
Computer Science -Software Development	Major & cognate courses average grade C or better	Minimum C in CSC 203, 205, 311					
Computer Science -Information Systems	Major & cognate courses average grade C or better	Minimum C in CSC 203 & 205, CIS 202 & 303					
English		Minimum C in ENL 303					

History		Minimum C in major courses					
---------	--	-------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

## AD HOC COMMITTEE ON ENROLLMENT CAPS

### Departmental Survey and Responses

March 1, 2006

To help us address our charges, the committee sought answers from programs that already use, or might be considering using, some mechanism(s) to manage enrollment. Based on our own knowledge of existing policies, college catalog information, and consulting with the three Deans, we identified nine relevant departments. As noted in our main report, the sample is not exhaustive of all potentially relevant departments, but it does provide a good starting point. The committee formulated a list of questions to be asked of the chairs of the departments selected. To help standardize the response and to expedite the process, we emailed the questions to chairs and invited them to send their responses also via email. We sent one follow-up question for additional detail. Not every department responded to every question. Responses included here in this report are verbatim except where otherwise noted.

#### ***1. What were the issues you face(d) that led you to implement (consider) strategies for limiting enrollment in your program?***

##### Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: There was a sudden influx of applicants to nursing (a nationwide phenomenon)—for a long while freshmen entering as nursing majors were guaranteed a place in nursing if they met basic requirements. When we were flooded with transfer applications, we were turning away many excellent students and admitting a number of borderline students because of prior commitments to freshmen admits. Plus, it did not seem ethical to just keep admitting students when there was little to no hope of them actually entering the nursing program.

Education: Over 1000 certification students (approximately 600 are graduate students) with 15 full time faculty along with the need to place these students in internship sites led to a need to restrict the number of students admitted into EDI certification programs.

Social Work: Our accrediting body, CSWE, requires that we maintain a faculty student ratio of not more than 1:25. Given the staffing resources available, we admit (through a separate admission to the major procedure) only 75-80 junior level students each fall.

PE: In PES, our issues have always been in teacher certification, not the other concentrations (athletic training, exercise physiology and sport management currently have no enrollment management problems). The pinch in teacher certification was felt most in terms of access to the Introduction to PE class (PEP 441). Since this class is the first in the teacher cert. sequence students needed it in order to proceed with their concentration. When every section of 441 closed before the end of the first day of registration, parents would call Frank Short, who was then the Chair, to complain that their child couldn't take anything else until they completed 441 so they were "stuck". We couldn't just open up more sections of 441 since 441 was a feeder to the rest of

the methods classes (442, 444, 445). If we overloaded 441 we would just have the same backlog of students at the next level and we didn't have faculty to cover more sections of the next sets of methods courses. As it was (and still is), we have adjuncts teaching all the sections of 441 because we have FT faculty teaching the more advanced methods sections.

While the 441 course was the primary issue, tangential to that was the fact that we were saturating local schools because the state requirement for field experience hours increased, thereby increasing pressure on all the methods classes. That's part of the reason that it was pointless to add more sections of methods classes even if we were given additional faculty to staff them (which we weren't). Methods classes need to maintain "reasonable" class sizes (i.e. less than 30-35 per class) in order to allow students some time to practice teach but, as I indicated above, this was not the primary reason for the cap.

As an FYI our problems have never been in places like advising (although our faculty advise about 40-45 students each). Faculty just seem to deal with this, even if they do so grudgingly.

#### Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Business: Too many students declaring a major in our department, too many relative to faculty resources, too many poorly qualified students entering the program at SOAR sessions which made SOAR unbearable for students, faculty, and parents.

#### Criminal Justice:

*(Committee Note: Two individuals from CJ responded. We include verbatim their responses here, although there may be some repetition.)*

Our 2.5 GPA was implemented primarily to prevent our program from becoming the dumping ground for CRJ students transferring after their community college program. Our competitors had GPA requirements. An additional factor was the belief it would eliminate many of the students with very poor GPA's that also tend to take up a disproportionate amount of advisement time (both transfer and native) – when you have an excessive advisement load to begin with, it is quite demoralizing to be spending a lot of your time with students that for one reason or another will never graduate.

- A. An attempt to keep the numbers down
- B. To make sure our students can handle the expected work towards the major requirements
- C. External evaluators (Spring 2005) strongly suggested the need for limiting the enrollment
- D. This is directly related to faculty student ratios in our Department when compared at the Campus level, and
- E. Need additional resources both in terms of faculty lines as well as secretarial help.

Dance: Quality was the main issue. All students are not adequately prepared in dance to successfully pursue a college degree in dance.

#### Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Psych: 600 majors and 13 faculty. We have too many large classes, and we can only cover requirements—no room for seminars, nonrequired courses, etc. With an average of about 60-70 advisees per faculty member, we spend a lot of time doing advising that is just barely adequate.

Health: Since 1986, the HLS major has grown approximately 8% per year, from 135 students in 1986 to approximately 500 in 2005. FT faculty staffing has not changed. Adjunct staffing has grown to 45-50% of SCH, and expected to exceed 50% soon.

#### *Follow-up to #1—Where do they specifically feel the pinch?*

#### Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: Regarding nursing - our accreditation agency and clinical agencies require a clinical ratio of faculty to student of 1 - 8 or 1 - 10, depending on the acuity level of the patients involved. That is the number one issue I worry about as far as resources - can we hire adequate numbers of faculty - even if the college authorizes more money for faculty, the shortage of nursing faculty could prove a big hurdle.

The second biggest issue for nursing is the size of the nursing lab - we are really over capacity at 70 students - to serve more students we would need a day AND evening group - I have worked that way at another college, and it works well - BUT we would virtually have to double the current faculty to accommodate that structure.

Another hurdle that I cannot control is that every nursing school has increased enrollment and clinical sites are literally bursting at the seams. And then there are still the advisement/committee loads.

Education: Our accreditation requires us to be at least 50% FT faculty. At this point, EDI is hovering around 25%; our faculty supervise an average of 43 graduate advisees each; EDI is forced to use adjuncts to supervise capstone projects since there are around 100 theses, projects each year.

#### Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

#### Health:

1. We have hundreds of students taking courses in summer and winter sessions, not due to preference, but because they cannot get into these

required courses during the regular semesters and face delays in student teaching and graduation.

2. Similarly, in order to meet student demand, HLS 301 in the summer session has been "uncapped" so that it is not limited to 25 or 40 students, but may take as many as need it (usually between 60 and 85), even in a time shortened (2 or 5 weeks) format. This is not based on student success or quality.

3. Also, in order to meet student demand, we are over-staffed with adjuncts. We have been running 43-48% SCH taught by adjuncts and expect that to break the 50% level in 2006.

4. With regard to advisement, having 40-50 advisees, including 4-5 graduate students, diminishes the quality of the mentoring. Generally we meet with our advisees for 15 minutes per semester, only to schedule courses. It is not possible to do independent studies, internships, senior seminars, or other capstone or mentoring experiences with this number of advisees. Sadly, it is difficult to even know their names, much less their academic or career goals. These are just some of the most pressing issues with regard to the supply/demand imbalance.

**2. *What alternatives to limiting enrollment did (are) you explore[ing]? In your mind (or based on departmental discussion), what do you see as the advantages or disadvantages to specific alternatives?***

Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: We do not see any alternatives to limiting enrollment, as there is a severe and worsening nursing faculty shortage, local clinical sites are bursting at the seams, and we do not presently have adequate lab or office space to admit more students even if the other obstacles could be addressed.

Education: We are exploring raising the minimum GPA to 2.75 from 2.5, requiring a C or better in all cognate courses, and a C or better in all courses in the liberal arts majors. Advantages of these are: reducing the numbers while positively affecting student quality in our program. Disadvantages: GPA and grades alone are not the only criteria used for admittance.

Social Work: Our admissions process does take considerable time. It is a major program governance assignment for one faculty member and requires much time on the part of our department secretary.

Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Business: Strategies being explored include limiting enrollments by major and increasing GPA entrance requirements. Advantages are controlling the number of students to more manageable numbers and raising standards and quality of program/classes/graduates. No disadvantages.

Criminal Justice:

Since we take in a very large number of transfer students and admissions accepts juniors only with declared majors, one easy way to limit would be to stop taking them after a certain number – CLOSE ENROLLMENT after 50 acceptances are sent, for example. A little analysis would easily overcome the uncertainties associated with whether some will really come or not (i.e. accepting 50 will get only 40 or 45). The native freshman group is harder to cap. One of our competitors caps internally by deciding how many spots it will have and then has an application time after the sophomore year and accepts based on GPA (for example if they will take 50 a year, the top 50 in GPA get admitted; that may put the cutoff at different GPA's from year to year, but a general trend develops to guide students who may have to consider other majors.

We have used the intent status to allow students to get CRJ advisement while they try to reach the 2.5 GPA requirement, but if they reach it, we take all comers. We have too many majors. If we continued to use that system and wanted to reduce numbers we would consider raising the GPA to 3.0. A problem with internal cumulative or department grade based systems, though, is that it promotes overtly or covertly grade inflation pressures. That's why we have not considered raising the current GPA requirement as a capping mechanism. Also, Brockport is getting a better quality student in the first instance, according to admissions data, so now does not seem the time to raise internal standards – I see us moving to the "Harvard Model" that assumes the students admitted can all do the work and graduate – the problem becomes encouraging them in that pursuit. That puts capping for freshman back in the hands of admissions with some type of selective targeting of admissions categories or special requirements to get into Brockport's CRJ program in the first instance as a freshman admit.

- A. Currently, we do not have an exit course in our program.
- B. External evaluators strongly suggested the need for developing a capstone course.
- C. This would be advantageous to the department, and
- D. Perhaps in limiting the enrollments

Dance: There has been much faculty discussion on this issue. In addition, we are somewhat bound by the accrediting organization, NASD. We have established a rather successful non-major program as an alternative to those students who are interested in dance, but who may not have the requisite background to be a major.

#### Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: Over the years, we have repeatedly requested additional faculty lines, but have not had an increase in FT faculty. That would be our preferred option: to meet demand with appropriate supply and allow qualified students to succeed in the major of their choice. However, absent sufficient staffing, we have proposed an application to enroll in HLS, with acceptances based on a cap defined by the level of faculty staffing. (Please see the HLS cap proposal of 2004).

Psych: We have considered requiring a 2.5 GPA to declare, requiring a minimum 2.0 in all required classes, etc. The usual stuff.

3. *or those of you who have used various strategies to manage enrollment, has it worked? Did it solve the issue you originally set out to address?*

Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: Admission of transfer students was suspended for 2 yrs. Current Brockport students still changed their major to nursing, and some savvy students figured out they could be admitted under another major and then change to nursing. However, overall, closing transfer admissions temporarily was effective in decreasing the number of students who could not realistically be admitted to nursing here.

Education: Yes, our current GPA requirement allows us to deny about 5-10% of applicants and likely prevents others from applying.

Social Work: Generally speaking this has worked well. The only caveat is that we currently face a reduction in full time faculty and will have to reduce enrollment if other alternatives fail.

PE: I do believe the "cap" on incoming transfer students has helped manage the numbers. Perhaps more importantly, we have added the requirement of a 2.5 gpa after a minimum of 12 credits at Brockport in order to enter 441. This has helped students realize that there is not an "automatic" entry to the program; they need to earn it. At this point we no longer have a problem with access to 441. Between the "cap" and the additional requirement we seem to have greatly reduced the problem in PES and have increased the individual student's ability to succeed in 441.

Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Criminal Justice:

- A. The department in the past has discussed the need for limiting the number of transfer students from the local community colleges
- B. This is directly related to the high enrollments in our program, and
- C. Currently, these alternatives are on the table

Dance: Yes, all prospective students are required to audition for entrance into the program. In addition all students are interviewed by faculty and required to write an essay on dance.

Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: NA

Psych: NA

4. *What do you think has been the impact of your policy[ies], whether intended and/or unintended?*

### Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: The downside of this is we have prevented a lot of very talented transfer students from coming to Brockport.

Education: See above [Yes, our current GPA requirement allows us to deny about 5-10% of applicants and likely prevents others from applying.]

Social Work: NA

PE: *[Committee Note: The following is based on additional, more recent comments provided by Dr. Petersen after she had written her response to #3 above..]* Students who fail to meet gateway requirements do not necessarily just “go away,” never to be seen again. Based on recent course scheduling work done by the PE department, they’ve discovered a “backflow” of people who did not meet the GPA requirement initially in their gateway course (441) now coming back to complete the requirement. They had to add an additional section of the course for the spring. Some may also be coming from other areas once they met the GPA requirement. This surge may also add to problems in later requirements such as their methods courses (e.g., more sections likely needed) and student teaching.

### Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

#### Criminal Justice:

- A. Our departments major concern is to develop some meaningful measure in limiting the enrollments, and
- B. If possible secure additional support from the administrators to meet the student/faculty ratios.

Dance: All prospective students are required to audition for entrance into the program. In addition all students are interviewed by faculty and required to write an essay on dance.

### Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: NA

Psych: NA

5. *Are you aware of any impact on other programs? If you’ve actually had to limit the number of students in your program, could you estimate the number of students who have been affected (turned away) because of the limit?*

### Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: I have no real figures—many students probably give up when they apply on-line and get the message back that the program has closed. I have not kept track of my phone calls, but between my secretary and I, we have probably turned away over 100 potential applicants this past year.

Education: See #3 [Yes, our current GPA requirement allows us to deny about 5-10% of applicants and likely prevents others from applying.]

Social Work: I would guess we turn away 10-15 students each year. I assume a few select a related major while the majority wait and reapply the following year. If social work is the profession they want and they plan to go on the grad school, spending an extra year to get a BSW can reduce their MSW studies (one year). This is cost effective for most students.

### Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

#### Criminal Justice:

Criminal Justice has some naturally related departments that “intents” who don’t make the GPA can go to as juniors or sooner – Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, and Afro-American Studies. That has make it easier to enforce the 2.5 requirement (students can be advised into other disciplines that still serve their career goals)

Dance: It is difficult to ascertain. We accept approximately 1/3 of the students who audition. Some of those turned away may or may not have decided to come to Brockport anyway.

#### Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: Please note that summer 2005 SOAR sessions, following caps in PES and NUR, saw transfer students declaring HLS, but without interest or plans to take HLS courses, but a plan to change their major when possible. This seems to disserve students and to funnel students from those overenrolled programs to HLS, an overenrolled program that has not been able to manage enrollments in any way.

Psych: NA

## **6. How have your policies affected transfer students that you’re aware of?**

### Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: As above. [I have no real figures—many students probably give up when they apply on-line and get the message back that the program has closed. I have not kept track of my phone calls, but between my secretary and I, we have probably turned away over 100 potential applicants this past year.]

Education: Yes

Social Work: We admit rising juniors before transfer students so depending upon the size of the transfer pool, we turn away as mentioned above 10-15 students. Those who come to Brockport and delay entering the major are admitted early in the next admissions cycle.

Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Criminal Justice:

- A. Our department attracts a large number of students from the local two year colleges.
- B. We require a 2.5 overall GPA to enter into our program, and
- C. Perhaps there is a need to redefine the policies pertaining to transfer students.

Dance: Some transfer students come from community colleges where dance is not offered. These students often have to spend more than two years to complete the program requirements.

Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: See #5. [Please note that summer 2005 SOAR sessions, following caps in PES and NUR, saw transfer students declaring HLS, but without interest or plans to take HLS courses, but a plan to change their major when possible. This seems to disserve students and to funnel students from those overenrolled programs to HLS, an overenrolled program that has not been able to manage enrollments in any way.]

Psych: NA

- 7. Following up on the issue of impact, is there any thing else you'd like to add? Other specific problems/issues you've run into that we haven't thought to ask about?**

Programs with Explicit Caps

Nursing: NA

Social Work: NA

Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Criminal Justice:

- A. Specific problems, directly related to class size, advising and our ability to the related administrative tasks/expectations.
- B. Faculty – impacts the ability to engage in active research, and
- C. Attending the regional, national annual meetings

Dance: As expected students are disappointed when they are not accepted to the program. The other issue is that we have continued to recruit extraordinary students to the dance program.

However, due to a lack of freshman scholarships we have been unable to get them to come to Brockport (even though they are very interested in doing so).

Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: NA

Psych: NA

- 8. *For those of you thinking about taking steps to manage your enrollment, what strategies might you implement to address the issue?***

Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Business: As stated in #2, limiting enrollments by major and increasing GPA entrance requirements.

Criminal Justice:

- A. Develop strategies to offer capstone courses, and
- B. We need the administrative support in developing this activity.

Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: Our preferred strategy would be to have administration apply a faculty allocation model which is responsive to student demand. Given the decades during which this has not occurred, we developed a proposal to set an enrollment target/cap based on staffing. Instead of setting an arbitrary GPA, which would inaccurately suggest the effort is based on managing student quality, rather than quantity, we decided to propose a cap directly based on staffing. Alternatively, we could propose a GPA cap, but that might still miss the goal of accurately matching enrollments with staffing.

Psych: See #2 above. [We have considered requiring a 2.5 GPA to declare, requiring a minimum 2.0 in all required classes, etc. The usual stuff.]

- 9. *If you're considering establishing limits of some kind, what do you anticipate to be some of the costs and/or benefits of such action?***

Programs with some Enrollment Policies in Place

Criminal Justice:

- A. By establishing limits of some kind, will be advantageous to the students in our program.

- B. We will be in a position to offer some level of individual attention.
- C. Faculty can develop innovative teaching models, enhances critical thinking, reading and writing skills.
- D. Helps faculty in providing opportunities to meaningfully engage in research related activities.

#### Programs Considering Enrollment Policies

Health: The most important cost is the loss of student autonomy. Specifically, we would be sacrificing the right of students to succeed in the major of their choice. Clearly, the preferred option would be to adequately match supply and demand, to match staffing with enrollments.

Let me be clear that our preferred option would be to have supply (staffing) meet demand (enrollments). We have estimated that 4-5 additional FT faculty in HLS would accomplish this goal, allowing students to select the major of their choice, and to have it adequately staffed with FT tenure-track faculty. I realize that requesting 4-5 faculty in 2005 seems unreasonable. However, imagine if we had been allocated 4-5 faculty lines over the last 20 years (since 1986) during which time our enrollment growth has been a stable, predictable trend. That is one line every four years. Suddenly, that does not sound so unreasonable. But now we are past the tipping point, requiring hundreds of students to take summer and winter courses in order to graduate on time. Our education students recently rated the availability of courses as problematic (discussed in the PEU Assessment Committee 10/05).

Again, the preferred option is matching supply (staffing) with demand (enrollment) via faculty allocations. The less preferred option requires managing student enrollments in some way (e.g., applications, capping, GPA requirements, weed-out courses), which inherently limits student choice, autonomy, and potentially, student success.

Psych: The most important cost is that significant numbers of students who want to major in psychology will not be able to do so.

**March 1, 2006**

**TO: Dr. John Halstead, President**  
Dr. Mark Noll, President College Senate

**FROM:** Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Caps  
Jeffrey Lashbrook (co-chair), Christine E. Murray (co-chair),  
Susan Petersen, Bernie Valento, Tom Nugent, Peter Dowe

**RE:** Final Report

In October 2005, this committee was charged to investigate the issue of program enrollment caps at SUNY College at Brockport and to develop a set of recommendations for College Senate consideration. This committee's work is also responsive to Strategic Plan II, Committee 1 recommendations on student quality and the College's Memorandum of Understanding II (draft 6.1) with regard to transfer success. The draft MOU states that transfer admission standards will be raised to require a 2.5 GPA and that programs regularly enrolling more than fifty transfers a year will be permitted, when possible, to impose an admissions cap or to institute special requirements for transfer acceptance and admission.  
(p. 15).

This report discusses our efforts to understand departments' efforts to manage their enrollments through a variety of mechanisms, the impact on students in a selected number of departments whom we have surveyed, and our recommendations. Accompanying our report are three documents: a matrix outlining program enrollment management strategies, our survey of departments, and procedures regarding limiting enrollment in an undergraduate program.

It is important to note that the committee recognizes that there are multiple mechanisms that departments currently use to manage their enrollments, both at the entry point through numerical caps and entrance requirements **and** through program completion requirements that impact students' decisions about continuing in specific programs. In addition, entrance requirements are used by some programs to assure that students have the performance skills to be successful in the major. These program enrollment management strategies are outlined in the accompanying Program Enrollment Management Strategies chart.

To better understand the impact at the programmatic level, the committee surveyed nine departments which already have some mechanisms for restricting enrollment or which are considering implementing restrictions. In selecting the departments that were included in the survey, the committee consulted with the three school deans for their recommendations. The committee does not view this as an exhaustive list of departments which may request to limit enrollments. Rather, it was intended to provide a quick, but thorough, understanding of the various dimensions of the issue. The results of the survey are also included as a separate document.

This report is organized as a response to each of the seven charges to the committee.

Charge to the Committee

*The Enrollment Cap Ad Hoc Committee should consider the following items among their review of this important issue:*

- *Development of an analysis of the issues related to any given program/department request for enrollment caps. Among these could be: accreditation requirements; limits on student placements for student teaching, internships, etc.; increasing numbers of students interested in the major; and available faculty resources compared to student demand.*

The departments of Education and Human Development, Nursing, Social Work, and Physical Education currently have enrollment caps on one or more programs. Without exception, these caps are a result of accreditation or state education department requirements. The School and Community Health Education program in Health Science is also governed by the SED teacher education program regulations (50% of courses taught by full-time faculty), but demand has not exceeded the current number of seats available.

These same departments listed above also have the challenge of identifying sufficient clinical placements for their students.

While the specific enrollment management mechanisms vary, beyond accreditation or SED requirements, the issues of program quality and lack of faculty resources to adequately meet student demand are the primary reasons for the implementation of enrollment restrictions. In some instances, student interest is increasing and in other instances there has been a persistent lack of adequate resources. Several areas need further examination if there is to be consistency in addressing requests to limit enrollment.

First, the College has no clear definition of what an appropriate advising load should be for a faculty member. Several departments point to lack of effective advisement as a reason for limiting enrollment. Establishing a college-wide standard for the faculty/student advising ratios would be helpful.

Second, Strategic Plan II sets a goal of 70% of student credit hours to be taught by full-time faculty. The question of how this goal relates to enrollment cap requests needs further examination.

Third, as student quality improves, students' expectations for internship opportunities, independent study opportunities, and collaborative work with faculty beyond the classroom are increasing. These critically important out-of-class learning opportunities require more from faculty. All of these activities require faculty involvement that needs to be considered.

**The question of available resources compared to student demand and appropriate resource benchmarks for high quality academic programs needs to be addressed.**

- *Review steps that have been or could be taken to try to manage enrollment related issues before enrollment caps would be requested for implementation, including mechanisms to meet additional student demand, and potentially reducing required courses for the major.*

The most common steps that have been taken to manage enrollment issues are to establish a minimum GPA requirement or minimum course grade requirements for admission into the program. Other mechanisms that have been used are to limit the number of transfer students accepted, requiring auditions or portfolio reviews, and interviews.

Reducing transfer enrollment at the program level has been somewhat effective, but is an imperfect strategy because students can enter the College under a different major and then change majors once they are enrolled.

For the most part, departments have met additional student demand by adding extra sections taught by adjunct faculty or by increasing class size. There is no evidence that departments have reduced requirements for the major in response to increased student demand. Likewise, there has been no decrease in the College's general education requirements which would be another way to redirect faculty resources.

- *Determine the criteria that are proposed for enrollment caps. Among them could be seniority, College GPA, major GPA, completion of required courses, or extraordinary scholarship.*

As indicated above and more fully outlined in the "Program Enrollment Management Strategies" chart, minimum GPA requirements and required grades in specific courses have been the most common criteria for program entrance and continuance. **Therefore, this committee recommends that the College Senate rescind the Senate resolution restricting departments from setting programmatic GPA requirements (#41, 2003-2004).**

The "Procedures Regarding Limiting Enrollment in an Undergraduate Program" document outlines a range of supplemental admissions criteria that departments could consider in developing a limited enrollment proposal.

- *Consider the impact on our current students if these criteria are implemented for enrollment caps. Determine the numbers of students with interest or intents to major in a program that could be prevented from continuing in the program. Determine alternative programs that these students might be able to switch to without extensive additional coursework/time required for completion. Determine the number of students that are likely to leave the College because of the inability to enter the program.*

The potential impact on students could be the delay of their entry into programs and subsequent delay in their program completion and graduation. There is some indication that this is occurring. In addition, students could find themselves with significantly reduced choices if they are closed out of programs that meet their academic and career interests. Students could end up spending additional time bouncing between programs, essentially being advanced level students without an academic major. In most cases it appears that students who are not able to enter a professional program are being advised to enter a liberal

arts program, either a liberal arts track within the department or in another liberal arts department.

It is very difficult to estimate the specific number of students who could be affected and which program(s) they might switch to without looking at a specific program. This is true for the question about the number of students who are likely to leave the College. Reliable information on this is problematic for a number of reasons. Formal exit interviews, which we do not do, suffer from a variety of limitations. However, we have collected some information through a mail-in exit survey. Response rates are low, however, and coding student answers is difficult. Anecdotal information supplied by our Separations Director indicates that there are a small number of students who left because they could not enter a program. Furthermore, some are surprised that they can be accepted into the program at another institution but not here.

- *Consider the impact on our potential transfer students. Review the mechanisms proposed for enrollment caps to ensure, to the greatest extent possible, that recently enrolled transfer students will not quickly be advised that they will not be able to enter their chosen program of study.*

This is a particularly complex issue as transfer students have a shortened time to complete major and degree requirements. Also, transfer GPAs are not considered to be comparable to Brockport GPAs so the transfer GPA is not a good indicator for program admission. **The College's policy on allowing students to change majors is very liberal; the College may need to consider limiting the option of changing majors into a limited enrollment program once transfer students are enrolled. The College should examine expanding the policy of admitting transfer students to a specific academic program with limited enrollment rather than general admission to the College.** The committee agrees that it would be preferable to refuse transfer students admission to a specific program rather than admitting them only to learn that they are not able to enter their preferred program.

- *Working with the Divisions of Administration and Finance and Enrollment Management, determine the financial impact on the College that would result from these proposed enrollment cap mechanisms. This would include the number of new transfer students that would likely not enter the College and potential enrollment declines in other areas that might be considered as candidates for additional program enrollment caps. The financial impact should include tuition and required fees, the number of residential students that would leave the residence halls and no longer pay either room or board cost since these are part of the College all funds budget. Potential increases in students into programs that could handle additional enrollment should be examined similarly to determine the net financial impact.*

Information provided by the Bursar's Office shows that the budgetary impact of losing 10 FTEs totals \$144,230 (\$96,430 in tuition and fees; \$47,800 for room/board). Much harder to estimate, of course, are the exact numbers of students we might lose because of limited enrollment policies. It is also difficult to gauge the financial impact from other programs that could handle increased enrollment. We are not aware of any evidence that there have been

increases in programs that could handle additional enrollments as a result of students being closed out of other programs. Programs that propose to limit enrollments will need to address the financial implications in their limited enrollment proposal.

- *The Chair, Dean, and Provost will be consulted concerning the impact on the accreditation status of an academic program, or the impact on student learning outcomes, associated with the decision to implement or not implement requested enrollment caps.*

**The committee has concluded that a clearly defined process needs to be created for the review and action on proposals to limit enrollment that would include the representatives from all three divisions of the College to assure that academic, enrollment, and financial issues are addressed.** We recommend the Academic Priorities Committee which includes College Senate representation be responsible for review of limited enrollment proposals with recommendations for action made to the President's Cabinet. The procedures for requesting limited enrollment are addressed in the "Procedures Regarding Limiting Enrollment in an Undergraduate Program" document.