Degree Productivity Analysis Overview
August 29, 2023

HISTORY

Board of Governors Regulation 8.004, Academic Program Coordination, outlines the Council of Academic Vice Presidents' (CAVP) role in system-wide academic program coordination. The CAVP Academic Coordination Group (CAVP ACG), comprised of each university's senior academic staff, was created to work with Board staff to ensure collaboration, articulation, and coordination of academic program delivery across the State University System as required by Board regulation. Since 2011, the CAVP ACG has conducted a triennial productivity review of all current degree offerings to determine which programs fall below a five-year threshold for degrees granted.

The first productivity review the CAVP ACG conducted was in 2011. There were 492 programs identified as below certain thresholds as determined by the CAVP ACG. Institutions were asked to make decisions about the viability of programs that fell below a threshold. Some were determined to be essential because they fulfilled a small but important niche in the university offerings or addressed a specific workforce demand. Others were required to implement an improvement action plan, and 73 were deemed candidates for termination.

In 2015, a total of 200 programs were identified as below the threshold, resulting in terminations or improvement plans for 54% of these programs. The 2019 review identified 155 programs below the System's threshold. Table 1 provides a history of the degree productivity analysis results.

Table 1. 2011-2023 Below Threshold Total Program Counts

Year of Review	Number of Degrees Below the Thresholds	Number of Degrees Terminated
2011	492	73
2015	200	16
2019	155	18
2023	145	23

2023 PRODUCTIVITY REVIEW

In 2023, the fourth system-wide assessment of academic programs was conducted. Thresholds that each program must meet to be identified as a productive program were determined by the CAVP ACG. Table 2 details the thresholds determined.

Table 2. CAVP ACG Productivity Thresholds

Degree Level	Threshold
Bachelor	<30
Master	<20
Specialist	<10
Doctorate	<10

Board staff reviewed the number of degrees awarded for each of the 1,691 degree programs in the State University System Academic Program Inventory database. The data for degrees awarded were analyzed by degree level and by six-digit CIP codes assigned for all program levels – baccalaureate, master, specialist, and doctorate – for each institution. The review examined the total degrees awarded between Academic Years 2016-17 and 2020-21.

Programs implemented in the fall of 2016 or after were marked as "new" and were not included in the final counts of below-threshold programs because they were still within the five-year maturation period expected for new programs. Similarly, programs that were terminated during the past five years were eliminated from the analysis. Programs suspended from accepting new enrollments were included in the below-threshold count because a university can reactivate the program to accept new students at any time.

There were 145 identified programs below the set thresholds, with 45 at the bachelor level, 77 at the master level, two at the specialist level, and 21 at the doctorate level. A summary is provided in Table 3. No programs were identified below the thresholds for New College of Florida and Florida Polytechnic University.

Table 3. 2023 Below Threshold Program Counts

Level	FAMU	FAU	FGCU	FIU	FSU	UCF	UF	UNF	USF	UWF	Total
Bachelor	14	3	1	0	12	0	3	8	1	3	45
Master	11	8	2	4	20	3	21	3	5	0	77
Specialist	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Doctorate	7	0	0	3	5	1	4	0	1	0	21
Totals	**32**	**11**	**3**	**7**	**38**	**4**	**29**	**11**	**7**	**3**	**145**

Source: Board Office Analysis of State University System Database (SUDS) data.

The list of below-threshold programs provided to the CAVP ACG noted programs that did not meet the thresholds during the past three review cycles. In total, 56 programs appeared on the 2015, 2019, and 2023 below-threshold lists.

All institutions received a list of below-threshold programs and a program action template to indicate their proposed plan for each program. For programs institutions

planned to continue, a plan for increasing enrollments, removing barriers to graduation, and/or increasing degree production was required. Once the completed program action template was submitted to the Board office, the Board of Governors' staff reviewed each institution's response and each program's enrollment and degree numbers. For programs that were below the thresholds for the third time, Board staff evaluated these with more scrutiny to ensure the viability and need of the programs. This included staff reviewing workforce demand data, enrollment trends, specialty, and duplication in the System for these programs.

The following summarizes the university actions resulting from the 2023 system-wide academic program productivity review.

- **145** degree programs were found to be below the thresholds.
- **111** were continued with a credible rationale for the program's existence for some of the following reasons.
    - The program is an "opportunity program," an interdisciplinary program comprising existing courses.
    - The program is recovering from a major personnel transition.
    - The program serves as an exit degree for students formerly enrolled in a doctoral program.
    - The program shows improving enrollment and degree completions due to recent curricular changes.
    - The program is a unique field of study offered by only one or a few System institutions.
- **23** active programs were identified for termination.
- **Seven** met thresholds once 2022 enrollment data was considered due to recent programmatic changes.
- **Four** active programs were identified for suspension of new enrollments pending programmatic improvements.

Conclusion

As a result of comprehensive reviews at regular intervals, fewer programs were identified as below the thresholds in this most recent review than any other time the CAVP ACG conducted the review. In addition, some universities have incorporated similar reviews into their academic program review processes and are making programmatic changes between the CAVP ACG reviews. It is evident that the periodic reviews by the CAVP ACG and the interim reviews by individual universities effectively address program efficiencies.