UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
A SYSTEM OF HIGHER LEARNING

November 2, 2017 at 3:00 p.m.
University of North Carolina General Administration
Center for School Leadership Development, Board Room
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

AGENDA

Additional Information Available

AGENDA ITEM

B-1. Actualizing Innovations Meant to Scale (AIMS) Presentation .... Junius Gonzales

Situation: The University Librarians Advisory Council (ULAC) obtained one of six small grants awarded through the AIMS initiative. ULAC will provide a brief presentation on the uses and successes of their innovation.

Background: In FY 16-17, UNCGA awarded small competitive grants to five universities and the multi-campus University Librarians Advisory Council to test innovations for scalability in the following broad areas: Deploying Academic Innovations for Affordability; Enhancing Student Success; and/or Utilizing Financial Aid Innovations. Institutions could request up to $35,000 total, with a required institutional match of at least 33% (monetary or in-kind).

Assessment: The ULAC will discuss their innovation for academic affordability by reducing student textbook expenses.

Action: This item is for information only.

AGENDA ITEM

B-2. Review of Licensure Process .... Daniel Harrison

Situation: The Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina is charged under North Carolina General Statutes Section 116-15 with responsibility for licensing nonpublic educational institutions to conduct post-secondary degree activity in North Carolina.

Background: The Licensure and State Authorization Division evaluates applications from nonpublic and external public institutions wishing to conduct post-secondary degree activity in North Carolina. The processes for initial licensure, annual review, additional program licensures, and others have not been reviewed for several years. This review is now underway and periodic reports on progress and recommended policy changes will be provided.

Assessment: The processes for licensure and state authorization have been streamlined to increase efficiency and provide more effective processing and oversight.

Action: This item is for information only.

AGENDA ITEM

B-3.   Laboratory Schools Update ....Sean Bulson

Situation:	Laboratory schools at East Carolina University and Western Carolina University opened in August. As the Laboratory Schools initiative moves into the second year of planning, the most significant change to the process involves the establishment and operation of the Laboratory Schools Subcommittee.
Background:	Updated in June 2017, North Carolina General Statutes 116-239 establishes the UNC Board of Governors Subcommittee on Laboratory Schools to oversee the establishment and operation of Laboratory Schools and includes the following duties and responsibilities:

- Oversee the **establishment** and operation of laboratory schools.

- Consider **proposals** to approve or disapprove laboratory schools.

  o The chancellor of each constituent institution shall adopt and submit to the Subcommittee a proposal to operate a laboratory school in a local school administrative unit, including the governance structure of the laboratory school.

  o The Subcommittee shall evaluate the proposals for approval or disapproval by considering the design components, strategic focus of the laboratory school, other standards, and the location of each laboratory school to ensure a geographically diverse distribution of schools.

  o The Subcommittee shall adopt a **resolution** upon the approval of each laboratory school and **file** a copy of the resolution to approve a laboratory school with the Department of Public Instruction.

- The Subcommittee on Laboratory Schools shall **review and evaluate** the educational effectiveness of the laboratory schools authorized under this Article for both public school students and students enrolled in educator preparation programs according to standards and protocols established by the Subcommittee and **report** each year to the Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee.

By statute, the President shall serve as a member of the Subcommittee. The Board of Governors members who will serve on the Subcommittee are C. Philip Byers (Chair), Ann Maxwell, Wendy F. Murphy, Darrell Allison, and Robert P. Bryan III.

Assessment: The recently-established Subcommittee is in the process of scheduling meetings to conduct the work. Teams at Appalachian State University, UNC Wilmington, and UNC Greensboro are working diligently to open laboratory schools in the fall of 2018. These institutions will present their plans to the Subcommittee on Laboratory Schools later this fall.

Action: This item is for information only.

AGENDA ITEM

B-4.   Princeton's James Madison Program ....Joe Knott/Junius Gonzales

Situation: Briefing on visit to the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions at Princeton University.

Background: In mid-September, a group of UNC administrators and Board of Governors members visited the James Madison Program in American Ideal and Institutions at Princeton University.

Assessment: This brief report will describe the visit to the committee.

Action: This item is for information only.

AGENDA ITEM

B-5.   Biennial Program Productivity Report ....Junius Gonzales

Situation:	As mandated, academic program productivity is reviewed every two years. Following an analysis of the data and consultations with Chief Academic Officers this report is presented for consideration by the committee.
Background:	The 2016 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review is the eleventh biennial review of programs with low enrollments conducted by the UNC General Administration and UNC constituent institutions. These reviews have been conducted since 1995 applying criteria and guidelines developed by the BOG.
Assessment:	Using the criteria established by the BOG, 186 programs were identified as low productive, representing 10 percent of all active degree programs at UNC institutions. Of these 186 programs, 18 will be discontinued and 26 will be consolidated with other program. UNC guidelines for monitoring low productive programs are among the most rigorous in the country and the 2016 review process added additional elements of UNC-GA involvement that improved the review process by the campuses.
Action:	This item requires a vote by the committee, with a vote by the full Board of Governors through the consent agenda.

2016 Academic Degree Productivity Review
Executive Summary

November 2, 2017

University of North Carolina General Administration
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

2016 Academic Degree Productivity Review

Executive Summary

The 2016 University of North Carolina (UNC) Academic Degree Program Productivity Review is the eleventh 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 graduation rates at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral/first professional degree levels. Using these criteria, 186 out of the 1815 (10 percent) active degree programs at UNC institutions were identified as producing lower than expected.[1]

The 186 low productive programs are fewer than the number identified during the last three biennial reviews: 221 (2014), 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: 48 of the 186 programs (26 percent) 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 in academic year 2015-16 (a non-review year), 69 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 2016 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review. Additional details of the 186 programs reviewed are found in the full report.

Table 1: 2016 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review Summary[1]

		Notes
Total programs flagged and reviewed	**186**	**10% of all active programs**
Number of discontinuations or consolidations	***44***	**24% of all flagged programs**
Total number of discontinuations	18	
Total number of consolidations	26	
Number of programs to be retained	***142***	**76% of all programs**
Retained programs with campus plans to increase enrollments	57	42% were in the fields of Education, Biology, and Physical Sciences.
Retained programs that will continue to have low enrollments due to core mission of program or other campus-specific reasons	78	47% were in the fields of Education, Visual and Performing Arts, and Foreign Languages and Literature.
Retained programs that are participating in the UNC Language Consortium	7	These programs were exempt from full program review.

---

[1] Detailed information on programs being discontinued or consolidated may be found in Appendices C and D of the full Report.

AGENDA ITEM

B-6.   Online Learning Update ....Junius Gonzales

Situation:	Following the recent report of the Task Force on the Future of Online Learning, a search for a new Vice President of Digital Learning was launched and other initiatives are in progress.
Background:	At its May 18 meeting, the EPPP Committee heard the Report on the Task Force on the Future of Online Learning at UNC, presented by Chancellor Mary Grant. The Task Force had several recommendations and much information about the current state of online learning. Following the report, a search was initiated for a new Vice President of Digital Learning. Related initiatives were started and ongoing work continued.
Assessment:	The report will update the Committee on the search and on upcoming initiatives regarding digital learning.
Action:	This item is for information only.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
A SYSTEM OF HIGHER LEARNING

2016 Academic Degree Productivity Review

November 2, 2017

University of North Carolina General Administration
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

2016 Academic Degree Productivity Review

Executive Summary

The 2016 University of North Carolina (UNC) Academic Degree Program Productivity Review is the eleventh 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 graduation rates at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral/first professional degree levels. Using these criteria, 186 out of the 1815 (10%) active degree programs at UNC institutions were identified as producing lower than expected.[1]

The 186 low productive programs are fewer than the number identified during the last three biennial reviews: 221 (2014), 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: 48 of the 186 programs (26%) 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 in academic year 2015-2016 (a non-review year), 69 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 2016 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review. Additional details of the 186 programs reviewed are found in the full report.

Table 1: 2016 Academic Degree Program Productivity Review Summary[1]

		Notes
Total programs flagged and reviewed	**186**	**10% of all active programs**
Number of discontinuations or consolidations	***44***	**24% of all flagged programs**
Total number of discontinuations	18	
Total number of combinations	26	
Number of programs to be retained	***142***	**76% of all programs**
Retained programs with campus <u>plans to increase enrollments</u>	57	42% 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	78	47% 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>	7	These programs were exempt from full program review.

---

[1] Detailed information on programs being discontinued or consolidated may be found in Appendices C and D.

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

4

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

5

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."

6

UNC Academic Program Productivity

Currently, UNC offers 1815 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 July 30, 2017

	# Established	# Discontinued
Bachelor's	380	426
Master's	338	299
Doctoral	124	42
Total	**842**	**767**

Between July 1, 1972 and June 30, 2017 the BOG approved the establishment of 842 new academic degree programs. Over the 45-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. 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]

Institution Mission Review

In March of 2013 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".

Office of State Budget and Management Review

The Office of State Budget and Management conducted an analysis in 2015 of the effectiveness of

---

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

the review findings between the 2012 and 2014 reviews. This study tracked the changes in findings from 2012 to 2014 and examined the status in 2014 of programs that had been deemed low producing in 2012. The review concluded that "The UNC Program Productivity Process is meeting the purpose of balancing academic programs and improving productivity. While there was overlap of programs between the two reviews analyzed, the majority of programs were continuing to increase enrollment or improve productivity through restricting or discontinuation." The OSBM review also conducted a survey of other university system criteria nationally and found that overall UNC has "the highest thresholds and most frequent reviews for program productivity among the states reviewed."

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 and again in 2015. Academic programs at UNC institutions are considered to be low producing if they meet all of the following criteria:

Bachelor's degree programs

- Authorized to enroll students for at least eight years
- The number of degrees awarded in the last five years is less than 35

Master's degrees

- Authorized to enroll students for at least six years
- The number of degrees awarded in the last five years is less than 35

Research Doctoral degree programs

- Authorized to enroll students for at least 10 years
- The number of degrees awarded in the last five years are less than 10

Professional Doctoral degree programs

- Authorized to enroll students for at least eight years
- The number of degrees awarded in the last five years are less than 40

2016 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 November 2016 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 December 2016

9

and responses were returned in February 2017 (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, highly specialized programs such as poultry science, Native American Studies, or soil sciences may fall into this category. Other examples of programs vital to the mission of the university and to its regional communities include education, fine arts, and security studies.

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

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. *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.

5. *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 186 low productive programs. A team of UNC-GA staff across multiple units in Academic Affairs and including one faculty fellow reviewed, analyzed, and discussed each response and plan. The review team met over a period of four weeks in mid-2017 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 2016 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. Kimberly van Noort, Vice President for Academic Programs, Faculty, and Research, spoke with each

10

CAO,, focusing feedback on programs that have been under-producing for more than one two-year cycle. Drs. Gonzales and van Noort 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.

2016 UNC Academic Degree Productivity Review Results

The number of bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs flagged in September 2016 as low productive in this biennial review were 186 (10% of all active programs in the API). The following are summaries of campus recommendations for all *186* programs after thorough reviews by faculty and administrators at UNC institutions and a review team at UNC-GA. Table 3 provides details for 44 programs being discontinued or combined (24 bachelor's and 20 master's) and Table 4 provides details for 142 programs being retained (79 bachelor's, 76 master's, and 10 doctorates).

Table 3: Number of Proposed Program Discontinuations or Consolidations

	N	Notes
Total programs flagged and reviewed	**186**	**10% of all active programs**
Number of discontinuations or consolidations	***44***	**24% of all flagged programs**
Total number of discontinuations	18	
Total number of combinations	26	

Table 4: Number of Program to be Retained

Number of programs to be retained	***142***	**76% of all programs**
Retained programs with campus plans to increase enrollments	57	42% were in the fields of Education, Biology, and Physical Sciences.
Retained programs that will continue to have low enrollments due to core mission of program or other campus- specific reasons[3]	78	47% were in the fields of Education, Visual and Performing Arts, and Foreign Languages and Literature.
Retained programs that are participating in the UNC Language Consortium	7	These programs were exempt from full program review.

---

[3] As outlined in the instructions for the academic degree reviews, Appendix F, 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 if discontinuing them would be detrimental. See Appendix E for these instructions.

11

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 2016 lists represented 24% of the flagged programs in 2016. These 44 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 44 repeated programs, 14 (32%) are to be discontinued or restructured/combined, 19 (43%) will continue with low enrollment due to their importance to campus strategy and mission, and 4 (9%) are participants in the UNC Language Consortium. The remaining 7 (16%) 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.

UNC Academic Degree Productivity Review: Considerations Going Forward

The processes for review this cycle included components initiated for the 2014 review: UNC-GA team reviews (including a faculty fellow), 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 criteria approved by the EPPP Committee. The process began in November 2016 with the initial review of data by UNC-GA staff and culminated in November 2017 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. One challenge of the 2016 Report was the change in how program data is reported. This change resulted from the conversion of all student data to the Student Data Mart (SDM). The SDM provides for a very high level of specificity in the codes attached to degree programs for reporting purposes that did not exist prior. After the initial data run, it was discovered that some programs' codes needed to be modified. In order to ensure consistency, it was necessary to review each program on the list to ensure that it was properly designated.

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. Looking forward to the next review it is recommended that additional information be sought during the process, including the number of part-time students in programs, the most current enrollment at the upper-division level, and concrete enrollment projections for the next five years.

12

Appendix A - UNC Board of Governors Approvals
Program Establishments

	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Total
2016-2017	9	5	4	15
2015-2016	7	4	5	16
2014-2015	6	5	0	11
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	**182**	**152**	**69**	**403**

Program Discontinuations

	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Total
2016-2017	3	7	1	11
2015-2016	48	11	10	69
2014-2015	39	19	4	62
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	**274**	**183**	**26**	**483**

13

Appendix B - Language programs participating in the UNC Language Consortium

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 *186* programs reviewed during this biennial reporting process, *7* programs have elected to participate in the UNC Language Consortium. These programs are:

Institution	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title
ASU	Master's	16.0999	Romance Languages
FSU	Bachelor's	16.0905	Spanish
UNCA	Bachelor's	16.0501	German
UNCA	Bachelor's	16.1200	Classics
UNCP	Bachelor's	16.0905	Spanish
UNCW	Bachelor's	16.0501	German Studies
WSSU	Bachelor's	16.0905	Spanish

14

Appendix C - Low Productivity Program Recommendations for Discontinuation

Campus	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title
ECU	B	131303	Business Education
	B	131303	Business and Marketing Education
	M	131316	Science Education
	M	131399	Career and Technical Education
NCAT	B	520201	Business Administration
	M	130501	Instructional Technology
NCSU	B	230101	English
	B	400601	Geology
	B	450401	Criminology
	M	130403	Human Resource Development
UNC-CH	MA	422805	School Psychology
	MEd	422805	School Psychology
UNCC	B	511005	Biology, Medical Technology
	M	520201	Sport Marketing and Management
UNCG	B	240101	Special Programs in Liberal Studies
	M	131324	Drama
UNCP	B	131203	Middle Grades Education (6-9)
	B	510913	Athletic Training

15

Appendix D - Low Productivity Programs Recommended for Consolidation

Campus	Degree Level	CIP	Program Title	2016 Campus Response
ECU	B	450701	Geography	3a
NCCU	M	310301	Recreation Administration	3a
	M	310501	Physical Education	3b
UNCC	M	130301	Curriculum and Supervision	3b
	M	131001	Special Education	3b
	M	131004	Special Education, Academically Gifted	3a
	M	131209	Child and Family Studies: Early Education	3a
UNCG	B	131317	Political Science, Secondary Education	3a
	B	131317	Psychology, Secondary Education	3a
	B	131317	Sociology, Secondary Education	3a
	B	131324	Theater Arts Education	3a
UNCP	B	131305	English Education	3a
	B	131311	Mathematics, Secondary Education	3a
	B	131312	Music Education	3a
	B	131316	Science Education	3a
	B	131318	History: Social Studies Education	3a
	B	261201	Biotechnology	3a
	B	270101	Mathematics	3b
	B	500901	Music	3b
	B	500903	Musical Theatre	3a
	M	131203	Middle Grades Education (6-9)	3a
	M	131302	Art Education	3a
	M	131305	English Education	3a
	M	131311	Mathematics Education	3a
	M	131316	Science Education	3a
	M	131318	Social Studies Education	3a

16

Appendix E - The University of North Carolina

2016 Biennial Program Productivity Review Recommendations Form[4]

Date (mm/dd/yyyy):	Click here to enter text.
UNC Institution:	Click here to enter text.
CIP (6 digits)	Click here to enter text.

Program Title:		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	

Every degree program selected for biennial review must be categorized in one of the response categories designated below. The following pages of this form contain the corresponding questions that must be answered for each category. Respond to every question for your selected category. NOTE: BEFORE selecting your response category, please review and consider each of the questions for all response options. This process should help inform your selection.

1. ☐ Retain the program in its present configuration with limited enrollments likely to continue
   a. ☐ Program is niche / high value ("Yes" to one or more of questions 1-4)
   b. ☐ Program is necessary duplication ("Yes" to question 5)

2. ☐ Retain the program in its present configuration with specific steps to be taken to increase enrollments
   a. ☐ This is the 1st time program has selected this response category
   b. ☐ This is the 2nd consecutive time program has selected this response category
   c. ☐ This is the 3rd consecutive time program has selected this response category

3. ☐ Restructure the program by combining it with one or more other campus programs
   a. ☐ This program will be discontinued as a degree-awarding program and <u>will be absorbed by another program as a minor or concentration</u>
   b. ☐ This program will continue as a degree-awarding program and <u>will absorb another program</u>

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

5. ☐ Program is participating in the UNC Language Exchange and is exempt from review. Participation is defined as: 1) having offered a single course; 2) or having a student from that program enroll in a course through the language exchange.

---

[4] Institutions were required to submit this form for each program identified as low producing.

Response Category 1

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

<u>You must answer "yes" to at least one of the first five questions to be eligible for this category.</u>

1. Is the program unique in the UNC system?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    - If yes, provide evidence of its distinctive situation occupied by the program. If appropriate, make sure to explain how your program differs from each of the other programs with the same 6-digit CIP in the UNC system.

    - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

2. Is the program central to the institutional mission?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    - If yes, explain the distinctive situation occupied by the program.

    - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

3. Is this program serving a profession with a critical employment shortage in NC or does this field of employment experience high turnover?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    - If yes, please provide evidence that the program is linked to a critical shortage or that the profession experiences high turnover in the labor market (e.g., NCSEAA Forgivable Education Loans for Services Approved Education Programs, Burning Glass, NC Commerce Department, etc.).

    - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

18

4. Is the majority of your program cost (over 75%) supported by external funding?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

- If yes, please describe.

5. Are the majority of program credit hours associated with requirements in or gateways to other degrees (e.g. BA/BS), or other majors on campus, or serve as curricular options within interdisciplinary curricular structures?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

- If yes, explain why the program cannot be integrated within another department or scaled back to a minor.

6. Is the program graduating an appropriate number of students each year (i.e., degree conversion ratio)?
   - "an appropriate number" of graduates each year is deemed to be:
     i. approximately one-half of the upper division undergraduate majors
     ii. approximately one-half of the students in master's level program of study
     iii. approximately 12% of the students in doctoral programs

☐ Yes   ☐ No

- If no, please also address the following questions and provide relevant and specific details:
  - Are courses being scheduled and offered in a timely way?
  - What are the barriers that impact progress to degree, e.g., high fail courses, high number of pre-requisites, course rotation, etc.?
  - For undergraduate programs provide a four-year plan (five-year plan if a five-year program) and evidence that the program has offered courses that would allow for a four- (or five-) year graduation.
  - Have summer school or online course offerings been considered to decrease time to degree? If yes, provide details. If not, why not?
  - How many credit hours in your program are offered that do not count as a major requirement? Explain.
  - What are your specific plans to improve your degree conversion ratio? Make sure to include how and when you plan to track progress (i.e., your evaluation plan)?

19

7. Does your program experience physical capacity limitations?

☐ Yes   ☐ No

- If yes, explain the nature of the program's equipment, laboratory, space, or other physical requirements that mandate limited enrollments for effective delivery.

- If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

20

Response Category 2a

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

<u>If you select YES to one of the first four questions, consider selecting Category 1 for this program</u>.

1. Is the program unique in the UNC system?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, provide evidence of its distinctive situation occupied by the program. If appropriate, make sure to explain how your program differs from each of the other programs with the same 6-digit CIP in the UNC system.

   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

2. Is the program central to the institutional mission?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, explain the distinctive situation occupied by the program.
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

3. Is this program serving a profession with a critical employment shortage in NC or does this field of employment experience high turnover?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, please provide evidence that the program is linked to a critical shortage or that the profession experiences high turnover in the labor market (e.g., NCSEAA Forgivable Education Loans for Services Approved Education Programs, Burning Glass, NC Commerce Department, etc.).
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

4. Is the majority of your program cost (over 75%) supported by external funding?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, please describe.

5. Are the majority of program credit hours associated with requirements in or gateways to other majors on campus, or serve as curricular options within interdisciplinary curricular structures?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

21

- If yes, explain why the program cannot be integrated within another department or scaled back to a minor.

6. Is the program graduating an appropriate number of students each year (i.e., degree conversion ratio)?

  - "an appropriate number" of graduates each year is deemed to be:
    i. approximately one-half of the upper division undergraduate majors
    ii. approximately one-half of the students in master's level program of study
    iii. approximately 12% of the students in doctoral programs
        ☐ Yes   ☐ No

  - If no, please also address the following questions and provide relevant and specific details:
    o Are courses being scheduled and offered in a timely way?
    o What are the barriers that impact progress to degree, e.g., high fail courses, high number of pre-requisites, course rotation, etc.?
    o For undergraduate programs provide a four-year plan (five-year plan if a five-year program) and evidence that the program has offered courses that would allow for a four- (or five-) year graduation.
    o Have summer school or online course offerings been considered to decrease time to degree? If yes, provide details. If not, why not?
    o How many credit hours in your program are offered that do not count as a major requirement? Explain.
    o What are your specific plans to improve your degree conversion ratio? Make sure to include how and when you plan to track progress (i.e., your evaluation plan)?

7. Has enrollment (i.e., number of upper division undergraduate majors or students in program of study), Student Credit Hours, and number of graduates been on the decline for more than 2 years?
        ☐ Yes   ☐ No

  - If yes, what are the reasons for the low enrollment/low productivity of the program?
  - If no, explain the current drop in upper division enrollment (i.e., number of majors), Student Credit Hour, and/or number of graduates.

8. Have you set upper division enrollment (i.e., number of majors) and degree targets?
        ☐ Yes   ☐ No

  - If yes, what are they for each semester/year? Provide evidence the targets are reasonable. Describe specific actions that will be taken to meet targets and include how you plan to track progress (i.e., your evaluation plan).
  - If no, why not?

22

Response Category 2b

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

If you select YES to one of the first four questions, please consider selecting Category 1 for this program.

1. Is the program unique in the UNC system? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, provide evidence of its distinctive situation occupied by the program. If appropriate, make sure to explain how your program differs from each of the other programs with the same 6-digit CIP in the UNC system.
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

2. Is the program central to the institutional mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, explain the distinctive situation occupied by the program.
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

3. Is this program serving a profession with a critical employment shortage in NC or does this field of employment experience high turn-over? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, please provide evidence that the program is linked to a critical shortage or that the profession experiences high turn-over in the labor market (e.g., NCSEAA Forgivable Education Loans for Services Approved Education Programs, Burning Glass, NC Commerce Department, etc.).

4. Is the majority of your program cost (over 75%) supported by external funding?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, please describe.

5. Are the majority of program credit hours associated with requirements in or gateways to other majors on campus, or serve as curricular options within interdisciplinary curricular structures?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No
   - If yes, explain why the program cannot be integrated within another department or scaled back to a minor.

23

6. Is the program graduating an appropriate number of students each year (i.e., degree conversion ratio)?
   - "an appropriate number" of graduates each year is deemed to be:
     i. approximately one-half of the upper division undergraduate majors
     ii. approximately one-half of the students in master's level program of study
     iii. approximately 12% of the students in doctoral programs

     ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If no, please also address the following questions and provide relevant and specific details:
     a. Are courses being scheduled and offered in a timely way?
     b. What are the barriers that impact progress to degree, e.g., high fail courses, high number of pre-requisites, course rotation, etc.?
     c. For undergraduate programs provide a four-year plan (five-year plan if a five-year program) and evidence that the program has offered courses that would allow for a four- (or five-) year graduation.
     d. Have summer school or online course offerings been considered to decrease time to degree? If yes, provide details. If not, why not?
     e. How many credit hours in your program are offered that do not count as a major requirement? Explain.
     f. What are your specific plans to improve your degree conversion ratio? Make sure to include how and when you plan to track progress (i.e., your evaluation plan)?

7. Did the steps implemented to increase enrollment (i.e., number of upper division undergraduate majors or students in program of study) since the prior review result in meeting your targets?

   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, describe past actions and provide evidence for the success of these actions (either your own or attempts by others).
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

8. Is more time needed to fully implement the steps proposed in the last review?

   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, provide targets and explain why you believe it is likely that the steps can be implemented in time to affect targets for the next review cycle.

9. Have there been notable, documented increases in student demand for the program since the last review cycle that have not yet resulted in increased enrollments and graduates (e.g., increases in pre-major enrollment)?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, please describe and list specific plans (existing and new) to attract and retain these students (e.g., pre-majors).

24

10. Have there been notable changes in the demand for program graduates since the last review?

            ☐ Yes   ☐ No

- If yes, please describe and provide appropriate evidence of graduate school and/or workforce demands for your graduates.

11. Have additional steps beyond those already described and implemented as a result of the last review been taken to increase enrollments/graduates?

            ☐ Yes   ☐ No

- If yes, please describe and provide outcomes of those efforts.
- If no, why not?

25

Response Category 2c

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

<u>If you select YES to one of the first four questions, please consider selecting Category 1 for this program</u>.

1. Is the program unique in the UNC system? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, provide evidence of its distinctive situation occupied by the program. If appropriate, make sure to explain how your program differs from each of the other programs with the same 6-digit CIP in the UNC system.
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

2. Is the program central to the institutional mission? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, explain the distinctive situation occupied by the program.
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

3. Is this program serving a profession with a critical employment shortage in NC or does this field of employment experience high turn-over? ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, please provide evidence that the program is linked to a critical shortage or that the profession experiences high turn-over in the labor market (e.g., NCSEAA Forgivable Education Loans for Services Approved Education Programs, Burning Glass, NC Commerce Department, etc.).

4. Is the majority of your program cost (over 75%) supported by external funding?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No

   - If yes, please describe.

5. Are the majority of program credit hours associated with requirements in or gateways to other majors on campus, or serve as curricular options within interdisciplinary curricular structures?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No
   - If yes, explain why the program cannot be integrated within another department or scaled back to a minor or eliminated.

26

6. Is the program graduating an appropriate number of students each year (i.e., degree conversion ratio)?
   - "an appropriate number" of graduates each year is deemed to be:
     i. approximately one-half of the upper division undergraduate majors
     ii. approximately one-half of the students in master's level program of study
     iii. approximately 12% of the students in doctoral programs
     ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If no, please also address the following questions and provide relevant and specific details:
     a. Are courses being scheduled and offered in a timely way?
     b. What are the barriers that impact progress to degree, e.g., high fail courses, high number of pre-requisites, course rotation, etc.?
     c. For undergraduate programs provide a four-year plan (five-year plan if a five-year program) and evidence that the program has offered courses that would allow for a four- (or five-) year graduation.
     d. Have summer school or online course offerings been considered to decrease time to degree? If yes, provide details. If not, why not?
     e. How many credit hours in your program are offered that do not count as a major requirement? Explain.
     f. What are your specific plans to improve your degree conversion ratio? Make sure to include how and when you plan to track progress (i.e., your evaluation plan)?

7. Did the steps implemented to increase enrollment (i.e., number of upper division undergraduate majors or students in program of study) since the prior review result in meeting your targets?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, describe past actions and provide evidence for the success of these actions (either your own or attempts by others).
   - If no, explain why the program should not be restructured through consolidation (integrated within another department/scaled back to a minor or concentration) or discontinued.

8. Is more time needed to fully implement the steps proposed in the last review?
   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, provide targets and explain why you believe it is likely that the steps can be implemented in time to affect targets for the next review cycle.

9. Have there been notable, documented increases in student demand for the program since the last review cycle that have not yet resulted in increased enrollments and graduates (e.g., increases in pre-major enrollment)?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

   - If yes, please describe and list specific plans (existing and new) to attract and retain these students (e.g., pre-majors).

27

10. Have there been notable changes in the demand for program graduates since the last review?

☐ Yes ☐ No

- If yes, please describe and provide appropriate evidence of graduate school and/or workforce demands for your graduates.

11. Have additional steps beyond those already described and implemented as a result of the last review been taken to increase enrollments/graduates? ☐ Yes ☐ No

- If yes, please describe and provide outcomes of those efforts.
- If no, why not?

12. How much tuition revenue did the program (not the department) generate each year for the last two years?

13. What are the direct costs of the program (not the department) each year for the last two years?

14. Does the program have under-enrolled courses? Provide details.

15. Which program options or concentrations can be consolidated or eliminated?

16. Which courses in the program are duplicated in other programs/departments?

17. Assume program is restructured through consolidation (i.e., it will continue as a degree-awarding program and will absorb another program): make a list of courses that would be discontinued by the program addressed in this review and assign a dollar amount to those courses. Also provide a list of courses that will still be taught as part of the general curriculum, as opposed to major courses.

18. Assume program is restructured to become a minor/concentration of another program: make a list of courses that would be discontinued and assign a dollar amount to those courses. Also provide a list of courses that will still be taught as part of the general curriculum, as opposed to major courses.

19. Assume program is discontinued: make a list of courses that would be discontinued and assign a dollar amount to those courses. Also provide a list of courses that will still be taught as part of the general curriculum, as opposed to major courses.

28

20. For each of the following scenarios 1) consolidation, 2) move to minor/concentration, and 3) discontinued, calculate and provide the saving estimates for the following:
    o Space
    o Courses
    o Human Resources: Redirecting/reallocating partial FTE from program direction and advising responsibilities to teaching/scholarship/service.

29

Response Category 3a

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

1. Make a list of courses that would be discontinued by the program when it becomes absorbed by another program as a minor or concentration.

2. Assign a dollar amount to those courses.

3. Provide a list of courses that will still be taught as part of the general curriculum, as opposed to major courses.

4. Calculate and provide the saving estimates for the following:
   - Space
   - Courses
   - Human Resources: Redirecting/reallocating partial FTE from program direction and advising responsibilities to teaching/scholarship/service.

Response Category 3b

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

1. Make a list of courses that would be discontinued as a result of this degree program absorbing another program, e.g. as a minor or concentration.

2. Assign a dollar amount to those courses.

3. Provide a list of courses that will still be taught as part of the general curriculum, as opposed to major courses.

4. Calculate and provide the costs and/or savings associated with the following:
   o Space
   o Courses
   o Human Resources: Redirecting/reallocating partial FTE from program direction and advising responsibilities to teaching/scholarship/service.

31

Response Category 4

Directions:

Please answer all of the following questions. Please note: Data must reflect only those students and faculty who are explicitly connected with the program under scrutiny.

1. Is the program unique in the UNC system?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    - If yes, are there other programs outside of the UNC System providing this program? If yes, provide list.
    - If no, what is the impact of closing this program to North Carolina citizens?

2. Is the program central to the institutional mission?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

8. If yes, explain the distinctive situation occupied by the program and the impact of closing the program on your institutional mission and other programs offered at your institution.

3. Is this program serving a critical employment shortage profession or does employment area experience high turn-over in North Carolina?   ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    - If yes, please provide evidence that the program is linked to a critical shortage or experiences high turnover in the labor market (e.g., NCSEAA Forgivable Education Loans for Services Approved Education Programs, Burning Glass, NC Commerce Department, etc.) and explain why program is being closed and the potential impact of the closure on your institution, other programs offered at your institution and the North Carolina labor market.
    - If no, how do you know it is not serving a critical employment shortage or employment area experiences high-turnover in North Carolina?

4. Is the majority of your program cost (over 75%) supported by external funding?
                                                                    ☐ Yes   ☐ No

    - If yes, please describe impact of closing program (legal, foundation relations, etc.).

32