

MEMORANDUM

Office of Academic Planning & Budget
2107 Murphy Hall
140501

March 9, 2015

Christina Palmer
Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee
760 Westwood Plaza, 47-422 Semel Institute
175919

Dear Christina:

Over the past two weeks I have had the opportunity to examine historical enrollment capacity and consider questions of future supply and demand for the current set of proposed courses that would satisfy the Diversity Requirement in the College. This exercise builds upon what we have learned from special studies of enrollment capacity for courses that satisfy the General Education and Writing II requirements, as well as general studies of enrollment capacity for all undergraduate courses during the past four years of significant growth in the undergraduate population at UCLA.

For purposes of analysis at this time, proposed courses under active consideration fall into three subsets:

- 50 approved courses
- 45 courses awaiting final approval
- 36 courses at an earlier state of the approval process

In the last two complete academic years (2012-13 and 2013-14) total enrollment capacity (the number of seats offered) has averaged about 6,000 per year for courses in the first group of approved courses and about 4,000 per year for courses in each one of the other two groups. Seats offered have been 87% filled on average, similar to the rate for all other undergraduate courses. If all proposed courses in all three groups are eventually approved, assuming no net change in the aggregate number of seats offered in these courses, total diversity requirement course capacity can be estimated at about 14,000 seats per year going forward.

Briefly stated, it seems clear to me on the basis of this analysis that in the subset of 50 approved courses alone there is more than enough capacity to get the first cohort of College freshman subject to the requirement off to a strong start in Fall 2015. It also appears to be the case that if all or most of the courses in the other two groups are eventually added to the roster there is a high probability that there will indeed be sufficient, sustained capacity in the future (at equilibrium) to ensure that demand for

enrollment to meet the requirement can be absorbed by the system without generating excessive strain either for the course system itself (bottlenecks, backlogs, etc.) or for the students who must meet the requirement (extended time to degree, etc.).

On the demand side, we expect the number of new undergraduates entering the College to average 4,850 per year at the freshman level from Fall 2015 forward and 2,850 per year at the transfer level from Fall 2017 forward (the first year in which the requirement applies to transfers) for a grand total of 7,700 new students who must meet the requirement each year from Fall 2017 forward. The number of 'requirement satisfying' enrollments in diversity courses would therefore need to be at least 7,700 per year at equilibrium, assuming that all entering students will be retained at least long enough to need one diversity course, and that all 'satisfying' course enrollments must occur here at UCLA.

For at least the first two years, 2015-16 and 2016-17, the number of 'satisfying' enrollments does not need to be anywhere near this figure, since the entering transfer cohorts will not be subject to the requirement and students in the first two freshman cohorts will be distributing the 'satisfying' enrollments over four years of attendance at UCLA. It is also clear that the total capacity of diversity requirement courses will eventually need to be much greater than the baseline 7,700 figure in order to ensure sufficient space for enrollment by students who have already met or do not need to meet the requirement, but who will continue to enroll in these courses for a variety of other reasons. How much greater total capacity needs to be, and how soon it needs to get to this level, are questions that will benefit from additional study, but if capacity eventually approaches the 14,000 seat total cited above, it appears to me that prospects are very good that the diversity requirement will impose little or no additional strain on students or on the course system as a whole.

I am happy to discuss any questions you may have about the statements above and to support any further discussion or need for analysis that may arise in connection with these issues.

Sincerely,



Robert Cox
Director, Enrollment Planning and Academic Performance Analysis
Academic Planning and Budget

cc: Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Scott Waugh
Vice Chair College Faculty Executive Committee, Joseph Bristow
Associate Vice Chancellor Glyn Davies
Assistant Provost Maryann Gray