

# REPORT ON MANAGEMENT OF CLASS SIZE AND ENROLLMENT ISSUES IN ARTS AND SCIENCES

## THE DEAN'S CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Adam Jaffe, Dean of A&S, Chair  
John Burt, Humanities  
Judith Eissenberg, Creative Arts  
Jane Kamensky, Social Science  
Liz Hedstrom, Science  
Richard Parmentier, Interdepartmental Programs  
Gregory Freeze, Dean of GSAS  
Elaine Wong, Senior Assoc. Dean of A&S  
Danielle Wolfson, Student Union Director of Academic Affairs

May 2010

### 1. Introduction

With the growing undergraduate enrollment and the shrinking size of the faculty, the average number of students taught each year by full-time A&S faculty members will necessarily rise. Therefore faculty resources must be allocated carefully to maintain and enhance the quality of the educational experience for Brandeis students. It is also important that the increased teaching burden be distributed as fairly as possible, and through a process that is widely perceived to be fair. The heterogeneity of the curriculum (lecture, discussion, seminar, lab, etc.) and the variability in individual faculty member's pedagogical styles and skills rule out any mechanical, "one size fits all" approach to the management of class size in A&S. The ideal size for a given class depends on the subject matter, the instructional level, and the specific pedagogical requirements. The best use of faculty resources is to structure the curriculum so that all students are ensured a mix of courses of different sizes. It is also essential to achieve as much diversity in curricular offerings as possible, not only in class size and type, but in thematic focus as well.

To accomplish the goals of maintaining the quality and a diversity of the curriculum and a fair distribution of workload, the DCC recommends a combination of different practices and policies for managing enrollments. First, department chairs and the Dean will expect all faculty members to develop a repertoire of courses serving a broad range of students. For faculty whose research/scholarly interests happen to attract relatively small number of students, this will mean developing courses within the faculty member's general competence but outside her/his area of scholarly specialization. Second, a faculty member who offers courses that attract smaller enrollments will be expected to offer the small enrollment courses on a two- or a three-year cycle, thus increasing her/his annual enrollments and allowing the overall curriculum to provide students the broadest possible spectrum of courses. Finally, A&S needs to develop a set of new courses with broad undergraduate interest, designed to be offered as large lecture courses and thereby to absorb significant enrollments in a positive way.

We recognize that these new practices and policies may well require a significant “culture shift” in how we go about curricular planning. Historically, individual faculty decided which courses to teach, how often to teach them, and in what pedagogical modes, based on their interests and their judgments about the best way to present the particular material. Given the more constrained environment in which we now must operate, we will need to plan the overall curriculum from the perspective of students’ overall course experience. We can no longer rely on the sum total of individual decisions about courses—however valid from the perspective of making that specific course a great course—to generate the overall course variety and overall mixture of small and large courses that the students have the right to expect. This means that decisions about individual faculty and individual courses cannot be made in isolation from the overall curriculum, and that faculty preferences for when and how to teach particular courses will need to yield in some cases to the broader needs of the curriculum.

## 2. Description of status quo

Tables One through Five present data on current enrollments and class sizes overall, by school and by program. These tables are based on enrollment information for the period from Spring 2008 through Fall 2009. We felt that a two-year period was necessary to get an accurate picture of overall enrollment patterns, and this period was the most recent two-year period available as we began our analysis.<sup>1</sup>

Table One shows that we currently teach between 650 and 700 courses each semester, with total enrollments of about 15,000. Of these, slightly less than one-sixth are graduate courses, and the rest undergraduate.<sup>2</sup> The data confirm that the student body is growing and the faculty shrinking, with total enrollments increasing approximately 3% between calendar year 2008 and calendar year 2009. This increase is likely due mostly to the increasing size of the undergraduate student body, but growing GSAS Master’s enrollments is also a contributor. As a result, average class size has begun to creep up, rising from 21 in the Spring of 2008 to 23 in the Fall of 2009.

Table Two provides basis statistics on all graduate and undergraduate class sizes by departments. In addition to average class size, it reports the median class size, which is a better indicator of the “typical” class size than the average, because the latter can be

---

<sup>1</sup> Analysis of class sizes based on enrollment data from the registrar is complicated by two quirks of how we track courses. First, the data from the registrar are a mixture of classroom courses and a variety of courses that are, in effect, independent studies. Some of these (92, 93, 98) are easy to identify and remove from the analysis, but others are not. For example, in some departments 300 level courses are independent studies while in others they are “real” courses. Second, for some courses, the registration data show multiple sections that are separate sections for the purpose of TA assignments, but not really distinct class sections. The analysis that follows is based on data that has been “cleaned,” to the best of our ability, so that each “class” is a distinct class, and the data do not include “courses” that are not truly classroom courses. There are probably still some inconsistencies, but we believe the data are adequate for our purposes.

<sup>2</sup> For this purpose, all courses below the 200 level are considered “undergraduate.”

affected greatly by a small number of very large classes. Our overall median class size for this 2-year period was 16.<sup>3</sup> The median does vary significantly across departments, however, from a low of 7 in theater and education, to a high of 36 in economics. Note that some of the interdepartmental programs also have high median class sizes, but this number applies only to those courses bearing the programs course designation. In all cases, students majoring in these programs are also using courses offered with departmental course designations to complete their programs, so the median size for the program courses is probably not a meaningful indicator of the students' experiences in the major.

Tables Three and Four provide more fine-grained information on the distribution of class sizes. They show for schools (Table Three) and for subject areas (Table Four), the number of classes (graduate and undergraduate ) and the fraction of students experiencing classes that are very small (< 8), small (8 to 20), moderate (21 to 34), large (35 to 50) and very large (> 50). Overall, as we report to U.S. News, 69% of all classes have 20 or fewer students. But since these classes are small, the fraction of student enrollments that they represent is much lower. Over this period, about 37% of student classroom experiences were in classes of 20 or less. Conversely, only 6% of our classes are greater than 50 (about 40 each semester), but these account for 28% of all enrollments. Over 40% of all classroom experiences are in classes of 35 or more students.

Not surprisingly, there are significant differences across the four schools in these proportions. In the schools of science and social science, more than half of all student experiences are in classes with 35 or more students. In the Humanities and the Creative Arts, the preponderance of student experiences is in classes with 20 or fewer (71% and 62%, respectively). Only about 5% of student experiences in Humanities and Creative Arts are in very large classes, compared to 40% in the sciences and 37% in the Social Sciences.

Again, variations across departments are significant, and even within those departments that generally have larger classes there is significant variation. For example, while biology and economics have similar average class sizes (39 and 42, respectively), biology has enough classes with 20 or fewer students that about one-sixth of all enrollments are in such classes, compared to only 3% of enrollments in economics being in classes of 20 or fewer. This is important, because it is the average class size (ratio of students to classes taught) that must rise over the next few years. Our challenge is to figure out how to preserve significant opportunities for students to experience a reasonable number of small classes, even as the overall average class size rises.

Finally, Table Five addresses a specific aspect of policy and practice that affects class sizes, the imposition of enrollment caps on specific courses. It shows the number of courses that had binding enrollments in different ranges.<sup>4</sup> Overall, there are about 175

---

<sup>3</sup> This means that half of all classes were 16 or larger, and half were 16 or smaller.

<sup>4</sup> An enrollment cap was defined as binding if the actual enrollment in the course was within 3 of the stated enrollment cap. Thus, courses with enrollment caps significantly above the actual enrollment were not

courses each semester with binding enrollment caps. (In addition, there were about 150 courses each semester with enrollment caps that were not binding.) In some cases, these caps are required by room constraints, or other physical constraints such as laboratory stations. In other cases, the caps are imposed by faculty to achieve specific pedagogical objectives. These objectives have merit, but binding caps do have the effect of forcing students into some other course, which at least in some cases will be a course with more students than the course they would have taken if there were no cap. Caps do have a significant impact on our overall ability to accommodate student demand for classes. This issue is discussed further in Section 4 below.

These data show that the issue of growing enrollments is a complex one, with a wide distribution of class sizes both within and between each of our programs. The problem of enrollment management is, essentially, the problem of finding a distribution of class sizes for the curriculum as a whole, and for each program, that is achievable given our student body and resources, and which gives students the best possible variety of opportunities to experience faculty in different settings, including some opportunities for the kind of interaction that is only possible in relatively small classes.

Overall, the average class size in Arts and Sciences will have to increase in the next several years from the current level of about 23 to the high twenties, given the projected increases in enrollment and decreases in faculty size. If this were to occur by adding 10 or more students to all of the classes that are currently in the range of 21 to 34 students, it would significantly degrade the student experience. On the other hand, to the extent the increase could be accommodated by increasing the enrollment of some very low or low enrollment courses, or by encouraging the development of exciting new large courses, students and faculty alike would benefit. Most likely, the best overall approach will involve a combination of changes in policy and practice. The remainder of this report recommends several specific changes that we believe, taken in combination could allow us to accommodate the increase in average class size while maintaining or enhancing the quality of the student experience.

### 3. Specific policies: minimum enrollments

- a. Any course that has fewer than 8 students enrolled in initial enrollment will be canceled before the start of the semester unless it meets one of the following conditions:
  - i. It is a required course (not just one from a list of several courses from which students must choose one), and there is reason to believe that students must take the course this year.

---

included in Table 5. Note that while the Table includes both undergraduate and graduate courses, almost all of the binding enrollment caps are in undergraduate courses.

- ii. It is a 200-level course, offered as part of a strategy to offer the appropriate number of courses designed specifically for graduate students.
  - iii. It is a course that can be expected to attract students who did not participate in initial enrollment (first years and new graduate students).
  - iv. It is a specialized course that is important for the curriculum, and its frequency has been set at an appropriate rate, such as every second or third year.
  - v. There is some other mitigating circumstance, such as a new instructor or a new course that needs a chance to find its constituency.
- b. If courses are offered in consecutive years with fewer than 8 students, the department will be asked to review the requirements to see if they could be modified in such a way as to require the low-enrollment course to be offered less frequently. If the course is not required but is important to the curriculum, its frequency should be adjusted to a level commensurate with the student interest, typically every second or third year.
  - c. Faculty whose course is canceled due to low enrollment should be reassigned to another course that will draw adequate students, take on substantial extra advising, independent studies, or program coordination within the given term, or be required to teach an extra course within one year.

#### 4. Specific policies: enrollment caps

- a. Background: our practice has been “laissez faire” with respect to the establishment of enrollment caps. Instructors have been permitted to set any enrollment cap they believe to be appropriate.
- b. Most faculty use enrollment caps appropriately to achieve pedagogical objectives. But it is hard to justify a system in which caps are set at so many different levels with no apparent rationale. Students may be shut out of one course, and shunted to another that actually is more crowded, simply because some faculty are more aggressive in their use of caps than others.
- c. Henceforth, no course will have an enrollment cap unless it is either imposed by the registrar for scheduling/classroom reasons, or specifically approved by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. For existing courses, faculty desiring enrollment caps should provide an explanation of the pedagogical need for an enrollment limit to their departmental or program curriculum committee. The curriculum committee will review all requests for caps,

and decide which ones should be incorporated in the curriculum, taking into account both the specific pedagogical needs of the courses and the overall need of the department/program to offer a diverse mix of courses of different sizes.

- d. The enrollment limit for classes that are intended to be taught as seminars should be set at 18. While sizes smaller than 18 facilitate better discussion in many contexts, 18 does allow for a meaningful level of discussion and interaction; if restricting it to a smaller number means turning students away, that cannot be justified in the current environment. A seminar size of 18 has worked well in the USEM/FYS program and for faculty across a wide number of departments, and students with a wide variety of backgrounds and abilities. (Of course, many or even most seminar classes will still be smaller than 18; not all capped courses enroll to the level of their caps.) Caps lower than 18 will be permitted only if there is a specific constraint (such as inadequate laboratory stations).<sup>5</sup>
  - e. The departmental or program curriculum committee's recommendations regarding enrollment caps (both for seminar courses set at 18, and for other courses that may have caps at higher levels) will be forwarded by the department/program chair to the dean, along with their pedagogical rationale. The dean will forward approved limits to the registrar, and inform the department/program of any proposed caps that s/he rejects.
  - f. Currently, while departments may assign their own TAs in whatever way they see fit, GSAS provides funds for additional course assistants only at the rate of one CA for every 40 students. To facilitate the avoidance of enrollment caps for lecture/discussion courses in the range of 25-40 students, A&S will provide funds for course assistants for every 25 students for courses that require significant writing or other assignments that require time-consuming grading.
5. Specific policies: encourage the development of exciting new courses designed to draw significant enrollments.
- a. The dean should provide incentives for the development of new courses that would add to the variety and vitality of the Brandeis curriculum and attract relatively large numbers of students. Of course, since faculty resources are scarce, any new course must replace an existing course or

---

<sup>5</sup> For the Spring 2008 through Fall 2009 period analyzed for this report, there were a total of 338 courses with enrollment caps less than 18 (over 150 per year). If each of those courses had increased their enrollment to 18, over 500 additional enrollments per year would have been accommodated. Obviously, some of these courses do have real constraints that would prevent that increase, and some of them might not have attracted 18 students if the cap had been set at that level. But these numbers indicate that current practices with respect to caps below 18 are a non-trivial restriction on our ability to accommodate student demand overall.

extend the course rotation of a given faculty member. To be effective, this strategy has to produce new large courses that replace existing smaller courses. (There is no benefit to replacing an existing large course with a new large course.) For this reason, faculty who routinely teach mostly small enrollment courses are one target group for this proposal.

- b. Incentives to develop these new courses might include the possibility of team-teaching, funds for new course development, and the assignment of a TA or CA during the development phase before a course is offered.
- c. One possibility to maximize the benefit of these new courses from a curricular and student recruiting perspective would be to organize them around a theme. They could be used as a vehicle for increasing the social justice content of the curriculum, or they could be organized around topics of “hot” current interest (or both). Student representatives have suggested that students would be interested in courses specifically designed for seniors as a capstone experience in the manner of the historic “Gen Ed S” program.

6. Specific policies: additional “UPI-like” courses

- a. A small number of additional courses taught by PhD students would enrich the curriculum while giving PhD students the benefit of teaching their own course. The dean should explore providing funds for each department to offer, on a competitive basis, one or two courses taught by advanced PhD students who have completed their normal teaching obligations.

# TABLE ONE

## Classes and Enrollment, Spring 08 through Fall 09

Semester	Number of Courses			Enrollments			Average Class Size		
	Grad	Undergrad	Total	Grad	Undergrad	Total	Grad	Undergrad	Total
S08	96	555	651	763	12928	13691	8	23	21
F08	94	567	661	854	13451	14305	9	24	22
S09	98	532	630	898	12791	13689	9	24	22
F09	106	560	666	884	14263	15147	8	25	23

### Increase from Spring /Fall 2008 to Spring/Fall 2009

Number	14	-30	-16	165	675	840	0.5	2.5	1.8
Percentage	7.4%	-2.7%	-1.2%	10.2%	2.6%	3.0%	2.8%	5.3%	4.2%

**TABLE TWO**  
**BASIC ENROLLMENT STATS BY DEPARTMENT**

All Undergraduate and Graduate Courses, excluding independent studies  
Spring 08 through Fall 09

School	Dept/ Program	Number of Courses	Total Enrollment	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum
CA	FA	111	2211	20	18	6	57
CA	MUS	115	1926	17	14	1	69
CA	THA	208	1824	9	7	1	42
<b>CA Total</b>		<b>434</b>	<b>5961</b>	<b>14</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>69</b>
HUM	CLAS	39	648	17	12	1	73
HUM	ENG	236	3925	17	16	2	81
HUM	GRALL	99	1363	14	14	3	36
HUM	HUM	2	38	19	19	5	33
HUM	NEJS	190	2510	13	12	1	49
HUM	PHIL	56	1600	29	19	4	96
HUM	ROMS	184	2857	16	16	5	29
<b>HUM Total</b>		<b>806</b>	<b>12941</b>	<b>16</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>96</b>
SCI	BCHM	15	417	28	20	8	91
SCI	BIOL	107	4165	39	21	3	223
SCI	CHEM	76	3490	46	17	1	272
SCI	COSI	45	1119	25	17	5	110
SCI	MATH	135	2464	18	18	3	47
SCI	PHYS	69	1946	28	12	1	141
<b>SCI Total</b>		<b>447</b>	<b>13601</b>	<b>30</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>272</b>
SS	AAAS	19	570	30	24	7	141
SS	AMST	45	1689	38	28	6	126
SS	ANTH	60	1601	27	19	1	151
SS	ECON	90	3765	42	36	14	192
SS	ED	78	602	8	7	1	27
SS	HIST	82	2218	27	22	4	120
SS	HRNS	16	154	10	11	3	13
SS	POL	84	2309	27	22	3	103
SS	PSYC	75	2970	40	22	7	178
SS	SOC	74	2149	29	21	4	109
<b>SS Total</b>		<b>623</b>	<b>18027</b>	<b>29</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>192</b>
IDP	BUS	33	1065	32	35	8	51
IDP	COEX	15	303	20	19	6	35
IDP	COML	10	174	17	16	3	52
IDP	CP	2	26	13	13	11	15
IDP	ENVS	13	218	17	15	8	25
IDP	FILM	5	146	29	15	13	87
IDP	FYS	97	1420	15	16	4	20
IDP	GSAS	2	34	17	17	7	27
IDP	HSSP	21	627	30	27	10	65
IDP	IGS	9	419	47	40	8	95
IDP	IMES	2	89	45	45	37	52
IDP	JOUR	20	401	20	19	5	52
IDP	LGLS	19	602	32	23	12	124
IDP	LING	20	265	13	10	3	46
IDP	QBIO	4	39	10	11	7	11
IDP	REL	5	144	29	26	17	44
IDP	SJSP	2	16	8	8	8	8
IDP	WGS	18	303	17	14	3	42
<b>IDP Total</b>		<b>297</b>	<b>6291</b>	<b>21</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>2607</b>	<b>56821</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>272</b>

## TABLE THREE

### Distribution of Classes and Enrollments over Class Sizes, by School

All Undergraduate and Graduate Courses, excluding independent studies  
Spring 08 Through Fall 09

	<b>&lt; 8</b>		<b>8 to 20</b>		<b>21 to 34</b>		<b>35 to 50</b>		<b>&gt; 50</b>	
	% of classes	% of students	% of classes	% of students	% of classes	% of students	% of classes	% of students	% of classes	% of students
Creative Arts	34%	13%	47%	48%	13%	23%	4%	10%	2%	6%
Humanities	13%	5%	71%	66%	10%	15%	4%	8%	2%	5%
Sciences	13%	3%	47%	25%	21%	21%	7%	11%	12%	40%
Social Sciences	5%	1%	37%	19%	28%	24%	16%	19%	14%	37%
Interdepartmental Programs	17%	9%	57%	55%	14%	18%	8%	11%	3%	8%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>28%</b>

**TABLE FOUR**

**Number of Classes and Share of Enrollments for Different Class Sizes, by Subject Area**

All Undergraduate and Graduate Courses, excluding independent studies

Spring 08 Through Fall 09

Class Size:		< 8		8 to 20		21 to 34		35 to 50		> 50		Total
Dept/Program	Subject	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes
Creative Arts:												
FA	FA	3	1%	76	51%	20	23%	7	12%	5	12%	111
MUS	MUS	33	9%	48	34%	25	34%	5	11%	4	12%	115
THA	THA	111	21%	81	54%	12	17%	4	8%		0%	208
<b>CA Total</b>		<b>147</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>434</b>
Humanities:												
CLAS	CLAS	4	4%	4	12%	3	17%	3	25%	3	42%	17
CLAS	GRK	10	59%	2	41%		0%		0%		0%	12
CLAS	LAT	3	16%	7	84%		0%		0%		0%	10
ENG	COMP		0%	20	100%		0%		0%		0%	20
ENG	ENG	8	2%	75	47%	10	12%	10	21%	5	17%	108
ENG	UWS	1	0%	107	100%		0%		0%		0%	108
GRALL	CHIN	2	3%	19	63%	6	34%		0%		0%	27
GRALL	GECS	1	8%	3	92%		0%		0%		0%	4
GRALL	GER	2	6%	14	83%	1	11%		0%		0%	17
GRALL	JAPN	6	11%	16	65%	2	14%	1	11%		0%	25
GRALL	RECS	3	21%	3	47%	1	32%		0%		0%	7
GRALL	RUS	5	20%	6	80%		0%		0%		0%	11
HUM	HUM	1	13%		0%	1	87%		0%		0%	2
NEJS	ARBC	1	1%	16	79%	2	19%		0%		0%	19
NEJS	HBRW	7	5%	48	76%	7	19%		0%		0%	62
NEJS	NEJS	33	12%	50	44%	16	29%	5	15%		0%	104
NEJS	YDSH	4	46%	1	54%		0%		0%		0%	5
PHIL	PHIL	5	2%	25	22%	7	12%	12	32%	7	32%	56
ROMS	FREN	3	3%	45	80%	6	17%		0%		0%	54
ROMS	HECS		0%	2	100%		0%		0%		0%	2
ROMS	HISP	2	1%	63	76%	13	23%		0%		0%	78
ROMS	IECS		0%		0%	1	100%		0%		0%	1
ROMS	ITAL	2	4%	14	74%	3	22%		0%		0%	19
ROMS	SECS	1	100%		0%		0%		0%		0%	1
ROMS	SPAN		0%	29	100%		0%		0%		0%	29
<b>HUM Total</b>		<b>104</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>569</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>798</b>

Prepared by DAS based on data from the Registrar

5/18/2010

**TABLE FOUR**

<b>Class Size:</b>		<b>&lt; 8</b>		<b>8 to 20</b>		<b>21 to 34</b>		<b>35 to 50</b>		<b>&gt; 50</b>		<b>Total</b>
Dept/Program	Subject	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes	% of students	Number of Classes
Sciences:												
BCHM	BCHM		0%	8	27%	3	19%	1	10%	2	44%	14
BCHM	BCSC		0%		0%	1	100%		0%		0%	1
BIOL	BIOL	3	1%	39	15%	16	12%	4	5%	17	67%	79
BIOL	BISC		0%	2	16%	4	48%		0%	1	36%	7
BIOL	NBIO		0%	7	17%	5	17%	5	33%	3	32%	20
CHEM	CHEM	16	2%	24	8%	10	7%	5	6%	16	76%	71
CHEM	CHSC		0%	3	45%	2	55%		0%		0%	5
COSI	COSI	2	1%	28	35%	8	18%	2	7%	5	39%	45
MATH	MATH	18	5%	66	38%	40	40%	11	18%		0%	135
PHYS	BIPH	1	100%		0%		0%		0%		0%	1
PHYS	PHSC		0%	2	15%		0%	1	29%	1	56%	4
PHYS	PHYS	17	4%	32	22%	3	5%	4	10%	9	59%	65
<b>SCI Total</b>		<b>57</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>447</b>
Social Sciences:												
AAAS	AAAS	1	1%	6	15%	8	36%	3	23%	1	25%	19
AMST	AMST	1	0%	14	13%	12	19%	7	17%	11	51%	45
ANTH	ANTH	5	1%	30	26%	14	22%	5	13%	6	38%	60
ECON	ECON		0%	7	3%	31	23%	40	41%	12	32%	90
HIST	HIST	10	3%	30	18%	19	25%	13	23%	10	32%	82
HRNS	HRNS	2	5%	14	95%		0%		0%		0%	16
POL	POL	5	1%	32	20%	31	37%	7	12%	9	30%	84
PSYC	NPSY	1	1%	4	11%	2	13%		0%	4	75%	11
PSYC	PSYC	1	0%	28	16%	15	16%	5	8%	15	60%	64
SOC	SOC	2	0%	33	22%	17	23%	9	19%	9	35%	70
<b>SS Total</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>149</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>541</b>
Interdepartmental Programs:												
BUS	BUS		0%	5	8%	11	29%	16	58%	1	5%	33
COEX	COEX	1	2%	9	50%	4	37%	1	12%		0%	15
COML	COML	2	5%	6	53%	1	12%		0%	1	30%	10
CP	CP		0%	2	100%		0%		0%		0%	2
ECS	ECS		0%	3	100%		0%		0%		0%	3
ED	ED	42	30%	33	58%	3	12%		0%		0%	78
ENVS	ENVS		0%	9	56%	4	44%		0%		0%	13
FILM	FILM		0%	4	40%		0%		0%	1	60%	5

**TABLE FOUR**

<b>Class Size:</b>		<b>&lt; 8</b>		<b>8 to 20</b>		<b>21 to 34</b>		<b>35 to 50</b>		<b>&gt; 50</b>		<b>Total</b>
<b>Dept/Program</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>	<b>% of students</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>	<b>% of students</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>	<b>% of students</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>	<b>% of students</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>	<b>% of students</b>	<b>Number of Classes</b>
GS	GS		0%	1	100%		0%		0%		0%	1
GSAS	GSAS	1	21%		0%	1	79%		0%		0%	2
HSSP	HSSP		0%	6	15%	9	41%	4	23%	2	21%	21
IGS	IGS		0%	2	5%	1	7%	1	10%	4	78%	8
IMES	IMES		0%		0%		0%	1	42%	1	58%	2
JOUR	JOUR	4	6%	9	37%	4	25%	2	19%	1	13%	20
LGLS	LGLS		0%	7	19%	10	41%		0%	2	40%	19
LING	LING	7	15%	10	46%	2	21%	1	17%		0%	20
PAX	PAX	1	8%	1	10%		0%	2	82%		0%	4
QBIO	QBIO	1	18%	3	82%		0%		0%		0%	4
REL	REL		0%	1	12%	2	33%	2	56%		0%	5
SAS	SAS		0%	5	100%		0%		0%		0%	5
SJSP	SJSP		0%	2	100%		0%		0%		0%	2
USEM/FYS	USEM/F	4	3%	93	97%		0%		0%		0%	97
WMGS	WMGS	2	3%	11	46%	4	37%	1	14%		0%	18
<b>IDP Total</b>		<b>65</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>387</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>401</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1405</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>433</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>2607</b>

## TABLE FIVE

### Undergraduate Courses with Binding Enrollment Limits at Different Levels, by Department

All Undergraduate and Graduate Courses, excluding independent studies

Spring 2008 through Fall 2009

Limit Set At:		8 or less	9 to 12	13 to 18	19 to 25	26 to 40	41 or more	Grand Total
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
CA	FA		10	13	27	1		51
CA	MUS	1		1	1	1		4
CA	THA	1	39		6	2		48
<b>CA Total</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>103</b>
HUM	CLAS					1		1
HUM	COMP/UWS	4	14	93				111
HUM	ENG		7	5				12
HUM	GRALL			9	7	1		17
HUM	NEJS			14	12			26
HUM	PHIL				1	2	1	4
HUM	ROMS			69	31			100
<b>HUM Total</b>		<b>4</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>271</b>
SCI	BIOL		7	3	9	1	2	22
SCI	CHEM	4		1	2		1	8
SCI	MATH				25		1	26
SCI	PHYS	1		1				2
<b>SCI Total</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>58</b>
SS	AMST		1	2	6	3	2	14
SS	ANTH				8	1	1	10
SS	ECON				1	54	2	57
SS	HIST			3	2	2	4	11
SS	POL				1	6		7
SS	PSYC		2		18	3	5	28
SS	SOC		2	1	4	1	3	11
<b>SS Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>138</b>
IDP	BUS				1	15		16
IDP	COML				2			2
IDP	ED		1		4			5
IDP	ENVS		1		6			7
IDP	FILM		1	3				4
IDP	HSSP				1	7		8
IDP	IGS		1					1
IDP	JOUR			2	3			5
IDP	LGLS				3	1		4
IDP	USEM/FYS	1	9	70				80
<b>IDP Total</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>12</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>702</b>

Prepared by DAS based on data from the Registrar  
5/18/2010