THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
ACADEMIC DEGREE PROGRAM PRODUCTIVITY REVIEW
2014

The University of North Carolina General Administration

May 2015

2014 Academic Degree Productivity Review
Executive Summary

The 2014 University of North Carolina (UNC) Academic Degree Program Productivity Review is the tenth biennial review of programs with low enrollments conducted by the UNC General Administration and UNC constituent institutions since this specific process began in 1995. Programs were identified for review based on specific criteria established by the UNC Board of Governors (BOG) for enrollments and graduation rates at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral/first professional degree levels. Using these criteria, 221 out of the 1,889 (12%) active degree programs at UNC institutions were identified as producing lower than expected.[1]

The 221 low productive programs are fewer than the number identified during the last three biennial reviews: 247 (2012), 264 (2010), and 272 (2008). The decreasing number of low producing programs is, in part, due to (1) focused efforts to increase program productivity and (2) ongoing campus efforts to streamline the academic program inventory. An important note regarding a subset of flagged programs: 46 of the 221 programs (21%) identified as 'low producing" are teacher education programs. This situation exemplifies the need to understand context, history, and a situation where policy and state need do not align.

In addition to the biennial system-wide review, UNC campuses continually evaluate their programs and 13 programs not flagged for review by this process will be voted on to be discontinued by the BOG at their May 2015 meeting. Also, in academic year 2013-14 (a non-review year), 22 programs were discontinued: evidence of an ongoing robust campus review process.

The data in Table 1 are a summary of the collaborative academic program review process between UNC-GA and all UNC constituent institutions during the 2014 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review. Additional details of the 221 programs reviewed are found later in the report.

---

[1] As listed in the UNC Academic Program Inventory as of April 29, 2015.

Table 1: 2014 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review Summary

	N	Notes
Total programs flagged and reviewed	**221**	**12% of all active programs**
Number of <u>discontinuations</u> or <u>combinations</u>	***56***	***25% of all <u>flagged</u> programs***
Total number of <u>discontinuations</u>	16	
Total number of <u>combinations</u>		
Combining programs <u>requiring BOG vote</u>	30	These will be discontinued and become concentrations in other programs
Combining programs <u>NOT requiring BOG vote</u>	4	These will absorb other low producing programs being discontinued
Programs identified to be <u>combined with other programs later in 2015</u>	6	Campus actions are underway to combine programs and ensure all student and administrative needs are cared for
Number of programs to be retained	***165***	***75% of all <u>flagged</u> programs***
Retained programs with campus <u>plans to increase enrollments</u>	103	51% were in the fields of Education, Biology, and Physical Sciences.
Retained programs that <u>will continue to have low enrollments</u> due to core mission of program or other campus-specific reasons	53	70% were in the fields of Education, Visual and Performing Arts, and Foreign Languages and Literature.
Retained programs that are <u>participating in the UNC Language Consortium</u>	9	These programs were exempt from full program review.

Introduction

      The Board of Governors (BOG) of the University of North Carolina (UNC) has the responsibility to "determine the functions, educational activities, and academic programs of the constituent institutions" [G.S. 116-11(3)] and to review the "quality, efficiency, and productivity of academic degree offerings" (UNC Policy 400.1). The primary purpose of reviewing academic programs is to improve their quality and academic program reviews are one component of a comprehensive and ongoing process to assess institutional effectiveness. Low producing programs are reviewed biennially at both the system-level and the campus-level and these reviews complement institutional self-studies for accreditation, campus program portfolio management, and professional accreditation for various disciplines.

      As a result of academic program review, administrators can decide to strengthen or consolidate programs, initiate alternative strategies (such as distance learning) to improve productivity, identify programs that will benefit from collaboration and the consolidation of resources, or discontinue programs that are not productive. The review of existing program quality informs the planning of new academic programs. The academic program review process is pivotal to the implementation of the strategic initiatives of the University to increase access, develop educational programs that are responsive to the needs of the State, continue to develop intellectual capital, and provide a foundation for the creation and transformation of new knowledge.

      University-wide and institutional academic program reviews are designed to strengthen academic programs and improve the quality of education. On a biennial basis, the university identifies programs that are characterized by low enrollments and low numbers of degrees conferred. The first such review was completed in 1995 and has occurred every other year since. The goal of increasing productivity in the delivery of programs and services reflects both fiscal reality and the need for good management practices in higher education.

      Public universities exist primarily to serve the educational needs of citizens. This purpose presupposes wide opportunity and reasonable geographic accessibility. Academic program planning within the University is designed to ensure the integrity of each institutional mission and to provide a balance and diversity of programs within

UNC as a whole. The University engages in academic program reviews to make certain that the constituent institutions are responsive to genuine needs and equally responsive in identifying resources that can be used to make certain that offerings are current, consistent with priorities, and used judiciously to respond to new developments in fields of inquiry and research.

North Carolina General Assembly Mandate

The 1993 Session of the North Carolina General Assembly passed legislation to implement a Government Performance Audit Committee's recommendations for a review of all UNC academic degree programs. Chapter 407, Section 1 of Senate Bill 393, 1993 Session Laws (GPAC/UNC Review Plan) mandates the following actions:

> Section 1. The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina shall review all academic degree programs and research and public service activities to identify those programs and activities that are of low productivity or low priority, or are unnecessarily redundant. The Board shall develop specific criteria for these reviews, and shall develop a process to review academic degree program productivity biennially. The Board's review shall emphasize identification of processes and resources to strengthen programs that are or can reasonably be made productive. With regard to those programs that are not and cannot be made productive, if any, the Board shall consider eliminating those programs in a manner that does not negatively impact upon the availability of educational opportunities for North Carolina citizens. In making its determination, the Board shall give consideration to the value of maintaining racial and geographic diversity and to assuring reasonable access for students who live off campus.

The act also amended Section 2, General Statutes 116-11(3), which outlines the Board of Governors' responsibilities with respect to academic programs and degrees awarded by adding the following provision:

The Board shall review the productivity of academic degree programs every two years, using criteria specifically developed to determine program productivity.

Reviews of academic programs have been conducted since 1995 applying criteria and guidelines developed by the BOG's Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs Committee. Even before the enactment of the 1993 legislation calling for academic program productivity reviews, the BOG had routinely conducted biennial reviews of low productivity programs to identify candidates for discontinuation. However, in response to this legislation, the BOG formalized the process.

In the 1995 report, the BOG discussed concerns over program duplication and ways to monitor duplication of academic programs within and across institutions and when to establish or discontinue degree programs. They stated:

All but the most specialized institutions will depend on a reasonable array of courses and programs in [arts and sciences], not only because of their fundamental place in general education but also because they provide necessary training in support of professional programs or in preparing students for subsequent graduate or professional study. The size of institution and the nature of the field of study itself will be among the considerations that determine the extent of duplication.

The BOG stated that they would approve new programs "within the context of institutional academic program missions…where there were clearly defined needs" and discontinue programs, when necessary, through "system wide program reviews and biennial productivity reviews" based on their commitment to "general principles and priorities of good management."

UNC Academic Program Productivity

Currently, UNC offers 1,889 academic degree programs at the baccalaureate, master's, and doctoral levels and each are listed on the University's Academic Program Inventory. Table 2 presents the total number of degrees established or discontinued by the BOG since July 1972 by degree type and a more detailed chart of established and discontinued programs by degree level since 2001-2002 can be found in Appendix A.

Table 2: Actions on Programs by the UNC Board of Governors
July 1972 – February 27, 2015

	# Established	# Discontinued
Bachelor's	362	343
Master's	326	264
Doctoral	115	27
Total	803	634

Between July 1, 1972 and February 27, 2015 the BOG approved the establishment of 803 new academic degree programs. Over the 42-year period, that represents an average of just over one new degree program per institution per year. When comparing growth of academic degree programs with UNC enrollment growth over the past decade, enrollment has grown over 18% since 2004 while there has been virtually no net growth in the number of programs (See Appendix A for details).

External Reviews of UNC Degree Productivity Process

In 2011, former UNC Charlotte chancellor James H. Woodward was asked by the BOG to conduct a review of academic programs throughout the UNC system. As a part of that study, Dr. Woodward reviewed the standards and methods used to review low producing programs. His report was submitted to the Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs Committee as part of a larger effort spearheaded by this committee's Academic Planning Review Work Group that convened in 2011 to strengthen UNC's program productivity process.

The Woodward Program Duplication Study (hereafter referred to as the "Woodward Report") conducted a thorough analysis of all program offerings by UNC institutions, as well as actions taken by the BOG to establish or discontinue programs.[2] The review began with data from 1972, when there was a significant restructuring of the UNC system and each institution "was assigned an academic mission formally approved" by the BOG. These missions "provided boundaries within which a campus could propose new degree programs, and if approved, offer those programs." Periodic reviews of those academic missions have occurred since 1972 and have included suggestions to include doctoral degrees at some institutions as well as new degree programs in new subject areas.

Additional degree expansion occurred as a result of the 2007 UNC Tomorrow strategic plan as "campuses were charged with finding new ways to respond to current and future state needs and to the educational needs of enrolled students." This represented a change in policy and practice that allowed campuses to explore multiple options when responding to public, economic, and social indicators. UNC Policy 400.1 on Academic Program Planning, the policy that governs decisions on academic programs and the program productivity review, states the policy thusly: "Campuses shall continue to have a lead role in identifying academic program needs and in formulating proposals to meet those needs."

Dr. Woodward concluded that duplications of programs are largely avoided "due to a demanding process for consideration, review, and approval of new programs and a fairly rigorous process for reviewing the productivity of existing programs." Dr. Woodward did warn about the possibility of duplication in the future, but recommended that consistent reviews of program offerings, along with reviews of institutional missions, would help to curb this from happening.

---

[2] Quotations in this section are taken directly from the Woodward Report.

Institution Mission Review

In March of 2013, President Ross established guidelines and a timeline for UNC institutions to review and refine their missions, consistent with recommendations made in the 2013 strategic plan, *Our Time, Our Future.* As UNC institutions maneuver to be more nimble, efficient, and responsive while maintaining the three-fold mission of teaching, research, and service, it was concluded that institutional missions be reviewed to reflect changes on campus.

UNC-GA engaged Collaborative Brain Trust (CBT), a consulting group, to review the missions of all UNC campuses. The BOG reviewed and approved the revised mission statements at their February 2014 meeting. Along with the work on campus mission statements, CBT reviewed UNC's process to establish and discontinue academic programs. CBT found that "UNC's approval process for proposed new programs is exceptionally strong" and that "there is an equally excellent process in place for reviewing programs with low productivity and ones that merit discontinuance." They concurred with Dr. Woodward's study discussed earlier that there "is a superb assessment of unwarranted program duplication within UNC".

National Efforts to Evaluate Academic Degree Productivity

In attempting to assess the UNC's academic degree productivity review processes, the evaluation of guidelines of other institutions of higher education is critical. To review the rigor of UNC's criteria and include comparisons in the BOG report for the first time, the websites from the public higher education authorities in the other 49 states were reviewed to identify similar policies regarding productivity review processes. Of these, policies were identified for 21 states and these were examined to ensure the thoroughness and effectiveness of UNC's review process.[3] It should be noted that the remaining 27 states likely have policies dealing with degree productivity but they were not readily found when searching the systems' websites. For those states where policies were found, corresponding processes provided thresholds for degrees awarded to determine if a given academic program had low productivity and, therefore,

---

[3] The state systems that were reviewed included: Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

should be reviewed. Most of the processes looked at the number of graduates over a period of years, with a range of one to five years. Some of the derived comparative findings include:

- The minimum thresholds for low producing undergraduate programs ranged from 3 degrees per year to 12 degrees per year on average, while UNC's regulations require an average of 10 degrees per year. Only one state of 21, Kentucky, had a higher threshold (12). The average degree threshold for the sample was 6.8; the median and the mode were both 5.
- At the Master's level, the thresholds ranged from 2 degrees per year to 10 degrees per year, with UNC's minimum threshold at 10. North Carolina has the highest threshold regarding Master's level programs with all 21 comparable states (100%) having thresholds less than those of UNC. The average degree threshold for the sample was 4.25; the median was 3.75 and the mode was 3.
- Doctoral programs had thresholds with ranges of 1 to 5 degrees per year and UNC's regulations require 3 per year. Only two states had higher thresholds than UNC, Kentucky with 5 and Rhode Island at 4. The average degree threshold for this sample was 2.4; both the median and mode were 2.
- Additionally, for the fourteen states that either averaged or counted the data over a number of years, half used a three-year time period and half a five-year time period (none of these fourteen review data on a two-year cycle as UNC does).
- Only one state, Virginia, uses a formulaic approach (see examples in the footnote below) in its reviews to account for differences in program size.[4]

UNC has overall, in sum, **the highest thresholds** and **most frequent reviews** (i.e., examining two years' worth of data) for program productivity among the states reviewed. Details of these standards are found in Appendix B.

---

[4] The formula considers student to faculty ratios, full-time equivalent faculty and the number of years needed to complete the degree (four years to complete a Bachelor's degree, three years to complete a Master's/Professional degree, and four years to complete a Doctoral degree).

UNC Academic Program Review Criteria and Process

The productivity criteria and guidelines used to assess academic programs at UNC institutions were established by the BOG's Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs Committee in 1995 and underwent a thorough review by the Academic Planning Review Work Group in 2011. Academic programs at UNC institutions are considered to be low productive if they meet <u>all</u> of the following criteria:[5]

- **Bachelor's degree programs**
  1. Authorized to enroll students for at least <u>eight years</u>
  2. The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are <u>less than 21</u>
  3. Upper division enrollment in the most recent year is <u>less than 26</u>
  4. Degrees awarded in the most recent year are <u>less than 11</u>

- **Master's degrees[6]**
  1. Authorized to enroll students for at least <u>six years</u>
  2. The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are <u>less than 16</u>
  3. Enrollment in the most recent year is <u>less than 23</u>
      a. Education Specialist and Certificate of Advanced Studies programs: Enrollment in the most recent year is <u>less than 10</u>
  4. Degrees awarded in the most recent year are <u>less than 10</u>

- **Research Doctoral degree programs[7]**
  1. Authorized to enroll students for at least <u>ten years</u>
  2. The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are <u>less than 6</u>
  3. Enrollment in the most recent year is <u>less than 19</u>
  4. The number of degrees awarded in the most recent year are <u>less than 3</u>

---

[5] UNC-GA uses the U.S. Department of Education six-digit Classification of Instructional Programs [CIPs] to classify academic programs

[6] This criteria refers to terminal master's degree programs and not non-terminal degrees awarded as part of doctoral programs

[7] Please note that the category "Research Doctoral" replaces the category "Doctoral" used in previous reviews. The criteria for identifying these programs are the same, but the terminology has changed to align with reporting categories that changed in the last few years at the federal and state levels.

- **Professional Doctoral degree programs**[8]
    1. Authorized to enroll students for at <u>least eight years</u>
    2. The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are <u>less than 31</u>
    3. Enrollment in the most recent year is <u>less than 31</u>
    4. The number of degrees awarded in the most recent year are <u>less than 16</u>

2014 UNC Academic Degree Productivity Review Process

The review process consisted of five steps. First, all of the programs in the Academic Program Inventory (API) were reviewed in September 2014 against the productivity criteria previously outlined and those below the productivity threshold were flagged. Second, lists of low productive programs, along with instructions to assist in reviewing the programs, were sent to all campuses in September 2014 and responses were returned in December 2014 (a copy of the instructions sent to campuses is found in Appendix C). The campuses were asked to categorize their responses to ameliorating low producing academic programs in one of six ways:

1. *Retain the program in its present configuration with low enrollments likely to continue.* This response is for programs that are central to the university's mission but may not draw large numbers of majors and graduates or have capacity limitations (e.g., clinical sites for training). For example, lower division physical science courses are required as part of general education for many students and as a gateway for many pre-professional and engineering majors.

2. *Retain the program in its present configuration and include specific steps to increase enrollment.*

---

[8] Please note that the category "First Professional" degree programs used in previous reviews is replaced in this review by "Professional Doctoral" degree programs. The criteria for identifying these programs are the same, but the terminology has changed to align with reporting categories that changed in the last few years at the federal and state levels. Doctoral programs in Audiology and Physical Therapy are included in these professional doctoral programs but were not previously part of the first professional category.

3. *Restructure the program by combining it with one or more other campus programs.* A campus may elect to discontinue low performing programs and add them as concentrations under similar programs (e.g., discontinuing a biology education program and adding a concentration to the bachelor's of biology degree).

4. *Actively investigate collaboration with other UNC campuses in order to conserve program resources and increase course enrollments.*

5. *Discontinue the program while assuring graduation for currently enrolled students.* Campuses that propose to discontinue programs do so for a variety of reasons, including consistently low enrollment and lack of student interest.

6. *Language programs participating in the UNC Language Consortium.* Any programs participating in the UNC Language Consortium received a waiver from the low productivity review process. For a listing of these programs, see Appendix D.

The third step of the process involved the review of campus responses to all 221 low productive programs. A team of UNC-GA six staff across multiple units in Academic Affairs reviewed, analyzed, and discussed each response and plan. The review team met over a period of four weeks in early 2015 to discuss the programs, review past periods of program productivity, and develop a plan for additional interactions with the institutions stemming from the review of their 2014 responses.

The fourth step consisted of individual conversations between UNC-GA senior administrators and all 16 Chief Academic Officers (CAOs). Dr. Junius Gonzales, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Dr. Katharine Stewart, Vice President for Academic Planning and Quality, spoke with each CAO in March 2015, focusing feedback on programs that have been under-producing for more than one two-year cycle. Drs. Gonzales and Stewart emphasized the need to enforce high standards in

program productivity and ensure that if program productivity is not improved, the programs would be considered for closure in forthcoming review cycles.

The final step in the low productivity data collection process was the communication of any campus revisions to their original submissions back to UNC-GA after the conversations between CAOs and Drs. Gonzales and Stewart. Numerous changes were made to campuses' original responses following these conversations and the additional review by the CAOs, resulting in amending responses for 25% of the low producing programs reviewed. These revised plans provided additional details on plans to increase enrollment or combine programs to maximize efficiency of available resources. A summary of changes is included in Appendix E.

2014 UNC Academic Degree Productivity Review Results

The number of bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs flagged in September 2014 as low productive in this biennial review were 221 (12% of all active programs in the API). The following are summaries of campus recommendations for all *221* programs after thorough reviews by faculty and administrators at UNC institutions and a review team at UNC-GA. Table 3 provides details for 56 programs being discontinued or combined (39 bachelor's, 16 master's, and 1 doctorate) and Table 4 provides details for 165 programs being retained (79 bachelor's, 76 master's, and 10 doctorates).

Table 3: Number of Proposed Program Discontinuations or Combinations

	N	Notes
Number of <u>discontinuations</u> or <u>combinations</u>[9]	**56**	**25% of all flagged programs**
Total number of <u>discontinuations</u>	16	
Total number of <u>combinations</u>		
Combining programs <u>requiring BOG vote</u>	30	These will be discontinued and become concentrations in other programs[10]
Combining programs <u>NOT requiring BOG vote</u>[11]	4	These will absorb other low producing programs being discontinued
Programs identified to be <u>combined with other programs later in 2015</u>[12]	6	Campus actions are underway to combine programs and ensure all student and administrative needs are cared for.

---

[9] See Appendix F

[10] When combining programs, the program being subsumed by the other is discontinued, teach out plans are provided to all students, and the discontinued program is often offered as a concentration in the other program.

[11] See Appendix G. These programs will remain degree programs and absorb other programs that will discontinue and become a concentration.

[12] See Appendix H

Table 4: Number of Retained Programs

	N	Notes
Number of programs to be retained	**165**	**75% of all flagged programs**
Programs with <u>plans to increase enrollments</u>	103	51% were in the fields of Education, Biology, and Physical Sciences
Programs that <u>will continue to have low enrollments</u>[13]	53	70% were in the fields of Education, Visual and Performing Arts, and Foreign Languages and Literature
Programs participating in the <u>UNC Language Consortium</u>[14]	9	

Among the initial data provided to campuses was an indicator for programs flagged as low productive dating back to 2008. These programs that were on the 2008 low productivity lists as well as the 2014 lists represented 30% of the flagged programs in 2014. These 66 programs were of particular import to this process as they indicate programs that have failed to attract the necessary number of majors and produce a sufficient number of graduates for a number of years. Of these 66 repeated programs, 19 (29%) are to be discontinued or restructured/combined, 20 (30%) will continue with low enrollment due to their importance to campus strategy and mission, and 6 (9%) are participants in the UNC Language Consortium. The remaining 21 (32%) will be retained for the next two years under detailed plans and strict timelines for increasing productivity. UNC-GA will monitor these programs' progress towards their stated enrollment and degree goals.

---

[13] As outlined in the instructions for the academic degree reviews, programs are eligible to make this choice if their degree programs are key to the core mission of the program or other campus-specific reasons and discontinuing them would be detrimental.

[14] See Appendix D for a full list of these programs.

UNC Academic Degree Productivity Review: Considerations Going Forward

The processes for review this cycle were different from previous years, beginning with UNC-GA team reviews, more targeted foci on specific actions in calls with the CAOs, exploration of the history of the academic degree productivity review processes and procedures going back to 1995, and the streamlined comparative analysis of other states' approaches. The entire process began in July 2014 with the initial review of data by UNC-GA staff and culminated in May 2015 with the presentation of this report to the BOG. This has provided valuable insights into academic programs at UNC institutions as well as areas for improvement in the UNC Academic Degree Productivity biennial review process.

UNC-GA Academic Affairs, led by Dr. Gonzales, has already begun an in-depth review of the academic degree productivity guidelines and procedures in anticipation of adjustments for the 2016 biennial review. A few of the efforts already identified as priority areas for improvement include soliciting campus expertise and promising practices to improve program productivity, adjusting the guidelines and instructions for responses to low productive programs by creating more definitive action steps for program improvement (see Appendix D for the current version), and strengthening the review process to allow for more focused, specific, and improved evaluations.

UNC's academic degree productivity reviews are among the strongest in the nation and UNC-GA is committed to working closely with all institutions to improve the rigorous and responsive review process. Involving policy makers and practitioners will ensure UNC continues to provide high-quality academic programs across a variety of disciplines efficiently while complying with state statutes, UNC policies, and promising practices in the field of higher education.

Appendix A

Actions by the UNC Board of Governors
July 1, 2001 - February 27, 2015

Established

	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Total
2014-2015	4	2	0	6
2013-2014	3	5	3	11
2012-2013	5	7	8	20
2011-2012	9	13	3	25
2010-2011	6	9	3	18
2009-2010	13	15	5	33
2008-2009	0	1	0	1
2007-2008	14	11	5	30
2006-2007	21	13	5	39
2005-2006	33	19	4	56
2004-2005	15	11	9	35
2003-2004	19	11	5	35
2002-2003	10	16	8	34
2001-2002	12	7	2	21
Total	164	140	60	364

Discontinued

	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Total
2014-2015	7	2	0	9
2013-2014	9	12	1	22
2012-2013	34	21	0	55
2011-2012	13	3	0	16
2010-2011	39	23	2	64
2009-2010	1	5	0	6
2008-2009	40	30	5	75
2007-2008	1	3	0	4
2006-2007	4	2	1	7
2005-2006	20	18	2	40
2004-2005	6	4	0	10
2003-2004	3	19	0	22
2002-2003	5	2	0	7
2001-2002	9	4	0	13
Total	191	148	11	350

Appendix B
Academic Degree Productivity Thresholds for Selected States

State	Thresholds				Frequency of Review
	Bachelor's	**Master's**	**Research Doctoral**	**Professional Doctoral**	
North Carolina	• The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are fewer than 20 • Upper division enrollment in the most recent year is fewer than 26 • Degrees awarded in the most recent year are fewer than 11	• Degrees awarded in the last two years, fewer than 16 • Enrollment in most recent year fewer than 23 • (Education Specialist and • Certificate of Advanced Studies programs: Enrollment in most recent year fewer than 10 • Degrees awarded in current year are fewer than 10)	• The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are fewer than 6 • Enrollment in the most recent year is fewer than 19 • The number of degrees awarded in the most recent year are less than 3	• The number of degrees awarded in the last two years are fewer than 31 • Enrollment in the most recent year is fewer than 31 • The number of degrees awarded in the most recent year are fewer than 16	• 2 years
Alabama	• 7.5 graduates per year	• 3.75 graduates per year (Education specialist degree program, 3 graduates per year)	• 2.25 graduates per year		• Annually
Arizona	• 24 (3-year degree total)	• 9 (3-year degree total)	• 6 (3-year degree total)		• 7 years
Arkansas	• Average of 4 per year (for bachelor's degrees in science, mathematics, engineering, foreign languages, middle school education, and secondary education programs for licensure in science and mathematics) (3 year average)	• Average of 4 graduates per year (for master's, specialist and first-professional programs (3 year average)	• Average of 2 graduates per year (3 year average)		
Colorado	• 20 (3 year total) OR • 10 (Most recent year total)	• 5 (3 year total) OR • 3 (Most recent year total)	• 3 (3 year total) OR • 1 (Most recent year total)		• Annually
Florida	• Average of less than 6 degrees	• Average of less than 4 degrees	• Average of less than 3 degrees		• Annually

18

	awarded per year over a 5 year period	awarded per year over a 5 year period	awarded per year over a 5 year period		
Georgia	• Less than 10 graduates	• Less than 5 graduates (Specialist in Education programs: Less than 5 graduates)	• Less than 3 graduates	• First Professional programs: Less than 3 graduates	• First initiated in 2013
Hawaii Note – data from University of Manoa)	• Enrollment of 10 • 15 degrees across 5 years				
Kentucky	• Average of fewer than 12 degrees awarded during a 5-year period	• Average of fewer than 7 degrees awarded during a 5-year period	• Average of fewer than 5 degrees awarded during a 5-year period		• 4 years
Louisiana	• 8	• 5	• 2		
Maryland	• 5	• 2	• 1		• 2 years
Mississippi	• 15 (3 year period)	• 9 (Specialist 5) (3 year period)	• 5 (3 year period)		• Annually
Missouri	• Fewer than an average of 10 students enrolled over the 3 previous years	• Fewer than an average of 5 students enrolled over the 3 previous years	• Fewer than an average of 3 students enrolled over the 3 previous years		• Reviews done in 2011 at the request of the Governor. Follow up in 3 years
Nebraska	• 7 (5-year average)	• 5 (5-year average)	• 3 (5-year average)		• 7 years
Oklahoma	• Degrees 5	• Degrees 3 • Majors 6 head count	• Degrees 2 • Majors 4 head count		• 5 years
Rhode Island	• Fewer than eleven degrees awarded for three consecutive years	• Fewer than six degrees awarded for three consecutive years	• Fewer than four degrees awarded for three consecutive years		
South Carolina	• Degrees 5 • Majors 12.5 • (5-year average)	• Master's/Specialist /1st Professional Degrees 3 • Majors 6 (5-year average)	• Degrees 2 • Majors 4.5 (5-year average)		• 2 years
Texas	• Less than 25 graduates in 5 years	• less than 15 graduates in 5 years	• less than 10 graduates in 5 years		• 5 years
Vermont	• Fewer than 25 declared majors in baccalaureate programs, including full and part-time students • Significant numbers of upper-level courses in	• fewer than 15 declared majors in graduate programs • fewer than 5 graduates in any of the preceding three years			

	the degree program with enrollment lower than accepted course minimums. • fewer than 5 graduates in any of the preceding three years				
Virginia	• 5 degrees	• 3 degrees	• 2 degrees		• 5 years
West Virginia	• 5 degrees • 12.5 students enrolled	• 3 degrees • 6 students enrolled	• 2 degrees • 4.5 students enrolled		• 2 years
Wisconsin	• If offered by less than 50% of UW institutions: Campus determines monitoring process • If offered by more than 50% of UW institutions: 25 grads over 5 year period, or average of 5 per year				If productivity expectations are not met, monitored for five years. After five years, if no significant change, program may be: • Combined • Offered in collaboration with another institution • Suspended enrollment • Eliminated

Appendix C

The University of North Carolina
Program Review and Recommendations Form

Date (mm/dd/yyyy):	Click here to enter text.	
UNC Institution:	Click here to enter text.	
CIP Discipline Number:	Click here to enter text.	
Degree Abbreviation (B.A., B.S., M.A., M.S., Ph.D.):	Click here to enter text.	
Department contact person	Name	Click here to enter text.
	Phone number	Click here to enter text.
	Email	Click here to enter text.

1. The accompanying guidelines list questions about centrality to mission, quality, faculty and physical resources, demand, costs, duplication, and consequences of deletion. After considering those issues, which of the following does the campus recommend? (Please click on the box next to the appropriate answer to record your response.)

   A. ☐ Retain the program in its present configuration with low enrollments likely to continue

   B. ☐ Retain the program in its present configuration with specific steps to be taken to increase enrollments

   C. ☐ Restructure the program by combining it with one or more other campus programs

   D. ☐ Actively investigate collaboration with other UNC campuses in order to conserve program resources and increase course enrollments

   E. ☐ Discontinue the program while assuring graduation for any currently enrolled students

Notes:
- If the decision is the restructure the program by combining it with one or more other campus programs (option 1.C above), please be aware that one program must be officially discontinued as it will no longer be awarding degrees. Be sure to submit [Appendix D: Request for Authorization to Discontinue a Degree Program](#) for the discontinued program. Combinations that result in a new program title and/or CIP will require additional paperwork.

- If the decision is to discontinue the program entirely (option 1.E above), please provide a teach-out plan and submit [Appendix D: Request for Authorization to Discontinue a Degree Program](#).

2. Explain the above response—either the rationale for leaving the program in its current configuration or specific steps proposed to increase enrollments and/or conserve resources.

> Click here to enter text.

Guidelines for Program Productivity Review

In reviewing the degree program and completing the form accompanying these guidelines, please consider the following questions. A response to each question is not required, but please address these issues in your review wherever relevant.

1. Centrality to University's Mission
- How important to the mission of the institution is this program?
- Can this program be combined with a similar or related program in the present department or in another department?

2. Quality of the Program
- What is the quality of the program and what indicators are used to assess the quality?
- Is the program accredited or has accreditation been sought?

3. Faculty Involved

- How many faculty members are teaching in this program?
- What is the average teaching load of the faculty in the department?

4. Facilities/Equipment
- Are available space and equipment adequate and appropriate for the program?

5. Demand
- Is the program serving the predicted number of students?
- What are the job prospects for these graduates?
- Are there courses in the program that are essential supporting courses for other programs?

6. Costs
- Could some program options or concentrations be consolidated or eliminated?
- What is program productivity as it is reflected in course enrollments?
- Does the program have under-enrolled courses?
- Would the department rather spend those dollars on other programs/activities?

7. Duplication
- Can this program's objectives be accomplished equally well through another program?
- Are courses in the program duplicated in other programs/departments?
- Could enrollment be increased by sharing some courses through distance education?
- Is this program distinctive in the UNC system?

8. Critical Mass
- What would be the impact on departments or programs if the program under review were eliminated?

9. Recommendation about the Program
As a result of this review, your institution is to make recommendations that address these major questions:

- Should the program be continued as a separate degree program? If continuation is recommended, provide a sound and compelling reasons.

- If the recommendation is to continue the program, can it be made more productive? If so, how? What steps would be taken to strengthen the program and make it more productive? Should the program be consolidated or merged with other existing programs? If so, which ones?

- Should the program be discontinued or combined with another campus program? If so, on what timetable? If the program is discontinued, would there be any savings of funds or resources that could be reallocated to other programs and activities of greater productivity or higher priority? If so, what would be the savings?

Appendix D

Language programs participating in the UNC Language Consortium exempt from academic program review

Please note that programs formally electing to participate in the UNC Language Consortium Pilot, a productivity initiative intended to provide more efficient and broader delivery of world languages system-wide, were exempted from responding to the low productivity program review should they be identified by the specified criteria. Of the *221* programs reviewing during this biennial reporting process, *9* programs have elected to participate in the UNC Language Consortium. These programs are:

Institution	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title
UNCA	Bachelor's	16.0501	German
UNCG	Bachelor's	13.1325	French, Secondary Education
	Bachelor's	13.1330	Spanish, Secondary Education
	Bachelor's	16.0501	German
	Bachelor's	16.0901	French
	Master's	16.0999	Romance Languages and Literatures, French Education
UNCP	Bachelor's	16.0905	Spanish
UNCW	Bachelor's	16.0501	German Studies
WSSU	Bachelor's	16.0905	Spanish

Appendix E
Changes in Campus Program Responses

Low Productivity Categories	Initial Response Count	Amended Response Count	% Change
Retain the program in its present configuration with low enrollments likely to continue.	38	53	39.5%
Retain the program in its present configuration and include specific steps to increase enrollment.	128	103	-19.5%
Restructure the program by combining it with one or more other campus programs.	32	40	25.0%
Actively investigate collaboration with other UNC campuses in order to conserve program resources and increase course enrollments.	0	0	0.0%
Discontinue the program while assuring graduation for currently enrolled students.	16	16	0.0%
Language programs participating in the UNC Language Consortium.	7	9	28.6%
	221	**221**	

Appendix F

Low Productivity Program Recommendations for Discontinuation by Campus

Campus	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title
ASU	B	131308	Family and Consumer Sciences, Secondary Education
	B	131309	Technology Education
	M	131311	Mathematics, Education
ECSU	B	131001	Special Education, General Curriculum
	B	131203	Middle Grades Education
	B	131305	English, Secondary Education
	B	451001	Political Science
ECU	B	131325	French K-12
	B	131326	German K-12
	B	131330	Hispanic Studies Education
	B	160501	German
	B	160901	French
	B	540105	Public History
	M	131006	Special Education, Intellectual Disabilities
	M	131319	Vocational Education
FSU	B	131302	Art Education
	B	131312	Music Education
	B	261201	Biotechnology
NCAT	B	131316	Comprehensive Science Education
	M	131314	Physical Education
NCCU	B	500501	Theatre
	B	500910	Jazz
NCSU	B	50201	Africana Studies
	B	50207	Women's and Gender Studies
	B	131310	Business and Marketing Education
	RD	260901	Physiology
UNCC	B	190701	Child and Family Development
	M	131099	Special Education, Adapted Curriculum
	M	131305	English Education
	M	131311	Mathematics Education
UNC-CH	B	260910	Human Biology

Campus	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title
UNCG	B	131311	Mathematics, Secondary Education (BA)
	B	131311	Mathematics, Secondary Education (BS)
	B	131317	Economics, Secondary Education
	B	131322	Biology, Secondary Education (BA)
	B	131322	Biology, Secondary Education (BS)
	B	500904	Composition
	M	131399	Latin Education
	M	260202	Biochemistry
UNCSA	M	500699	Film Music Composition
UNCW	B	131314	Physical Education and Health
	B	500903	Music Performance
WCU	B	510706	Health Information Administration
WSSU	B	261201	Biotechnology
	M	131202	Elementary Education
	M	131401	Teaching English as a Second Language and Linguistics

Appendix G
Low Productivity Programs Absorbing Other Discontinued Programs

Campus	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title	Notes
ECSU	B	540101	History	Will add discontinued Political Science program as a concentration
FSU	B	500901	General Music	Will add discontinued Music Education program as a concentration
UNCG	M	400501	Chemistry	Will add discontinued Biochemistry program as a concentration
WSSU	B	500901	Music	Will add discontinued Music Education program as a concentration

Appendix H

Low Productivity Programs In Process of Combining – To Be Completed in 2015

Campus	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title
ECU	B	131307	School Health Education
	B	400801	Physics
	B	500703	Art History and Appreciation
	M	131305	English
	M	500904	Theory-Composition
UNC-CH	M	309999	Folklore