The University of North Carolina
Program Review and Recommendations Form
(Complete this form for each program identified in Attachment 2.)

Date:
UNC Institution:
CIP Discipline Number:
Title of the Program:
Degree Abbreviation (e.g. B.S., B.A., M.A., M.S., Ph.D):

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?

_____Retain the program in its present configuration with low enrollments likely to continue.

_____Retain the program in its present configuration with specific steps to be taken to increase enrollments.

_____Restructure the program by combining it with one or more other campus programs.

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

_____Discontinue the program while assuring graduation for any currently enrolled students.

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.

3. Name/e-mail/phone of department contact person:
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? 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?

NOTE: Attachment #2 identifies those degree programs identified for low productivity review both in 2008 and 2010 with a double asterisk.