The following is feedback gathered from UCC college representatives and faculty in response to new and earlier approval deadlines proposed by the Registrar’s office. The proposed plan is below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Year</th>
<th>Program Planning ‘C’ Proposals Due</th>
<th>Current Curricular Change ‘A &amp; B’ Proposals Due</th>
<th>Proposed Curricular Change ‘A &amp; B’ Proposals Due</th>
<th>The shift in proposal C deadlines necessitates a change in the A&amp;B proposals to balance UCC agendas.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2018</td>
<td>October 1, 2017</td>
<td>December 15, 2017</td>
<td>October 1, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2019</td>
<td>November 1, 2017</td>
<td>December 15, 2018</td>
<td>May 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2020</td>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
<td>December 15, 2019</td>
<td>May 1, 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2021</td>
<td>November 1, 2019</td>
<td>December 15, 2020</td>
<td>May 1, 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The feedback fell into two categories: A) Concerns about May 1 deadlines on programs, initiatives, enrollment and recruitment; and B. Questions about the efficiency of the curricular approval process.

A) Concern about May 1 deadlines on programs, initiatives, enrollment and recruitment
   a. Delays in implementing necessary changes in response to Program Prioritization and Assessment cycles and data
   b. Lag time in fulfilling national and regional accreditation expectations for timely and continuous program improvement
   c. Loss of potential enrollment in new programs because of slow two-year rollout
   d. Loss of competitive advantage in region for new programs and curricula
   e. Impediments to students who could immediately benefit from curriculum changes
   f. Impediments to curriculum changes necessitated by college or unit reorganization
   g. Delay in integrating new hires into programs and curricula
   h. Incompatibility with other spring faculty workload cycles

B) Questions about the efficiency of curricular approval processes
   a. Do all A and B items need to be approved through UCC and General Faculty, or could most A items and some B items changes be made between unit/college and the Registrar’s Office, with periodical all-university notification? (requires change in FSH)
   b. Are there bottlenecks in the systems, e.g. stacks of changes waiting for manual entry or routine approvals? How much of the manual work could be digitized?
   c. Can workflow software system replace some manual work? Do we need two systems, Banner plus a separate catalog publishing system?
   d. Items A & B that are associated with items C should have C category deadlines
   e. Professional programs need frequent and timely updates
   f. Could a Nov. 15 deadline for A & B items be sufficient if the system were streamlined?