

Appendix 1: Comparison Of Prior Process To Improvements With New Design

| PROCESS PRIOR: | REVISED PROCESS (see flowchart in Appendix II) |
|--|---|
| <p>Academic Unit: Chair or Designate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Download in Rich Text Format from the Web, current calendar entry; ▪ Download in RTF the calendar submission template; ▪ Departments fill in the template (proposals/explanations, etc) and update the calendar entry as needed in MS Word; ▪ Unit head (Chair) signs off on the template and sends it via interoffice mail to the Dean. The calendar entry revisions and the template are sent via e-mail to the Undergraduate Program Committee (UPC). <p>Academic Unit: Dean</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Deans have a workgroup review all Faculty submissions and recommend either changes or approval; ▪ If approved, the Dean signs the template then forwards a hard copy via interoffice mail to UPC as well as an e-mail copy of the template and the revised calendar entry. <p>Undergraduate Program Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committee work groups review each submission in detail and recommend changes that may result returning it to the Academic Unit for re-editing, or approve the submission; ▪ When UPC approves a submission, it then submits a report to Senate, in PDF format, which includes all proposed changes to the signed submissions. <p>Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Senate reviews the report and either approves it or returns the report to UPC for further follow-up or review if changes are challenged. <p>Publication of Calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Calendar for publication (Web only as of 2009) produced using Adobe PageMaker since 1994; ▪ When a paper copy was produced, the RTF files were imported into a single PageMaker document to be formatted as per calendar design; ▪ For the Web, each RTF file is imported into separate PageMaker documents, where it is then exported to HTML and e-mailed to a web space for automatic pick up into the web calendar. There are additional controls for parsing and releasing the web calendar for public viewing. | <p>Academic Unit: Chair or Designate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Edit access with track changes - logged with date, time, change and user login; ▪ Sign off, triggers removal of edit access and move of the file to Dean’s list for review and approval; ▪ Progress status bar. <p>Academic Unit: Dean</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sign off control. Approval moves the submission into the UPC level or rejection returns the file to the Academic unit queue and restores edit access. Return of the file is accompanied by a reason; ▪ Progress status bar. <p>Undergraduate Program Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have edit access with track changes. All edits require an explanation which will be visible to the academic unit. Logged with date, time, changes made and user login; ▪ Sign off control. Approval moves the submission into the Senate level. Rejection returns the file to the Academic unit and restores edit access. Return of the file is accompanied by a reason; ▪ Progress status bar. <p>Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sign off control, once approved by Senate – Registrar signs off which moves submission to publication. Rejection returns the file to the UPC level and restores edit access. Return of the file is accompanied by a reason; ▪ Progress status bar. <p>Publication of Calendar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Edit access without track changes: Logged with date, time, change and user login; ▪ Changes approved after copy has been through Senate implemented only at this level; ▪ Progress status bar. |

Appendix 1: Comparison Of Prior Process To Improvements With New Design

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Challenges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Downloads to RTF format are not always clean. HTML code is sometimes downloaded in the file. Components of formatting are frequently lost.▪ Process is dependant on the track changes facility in MS Word. Sometimes changes are accidentally submitted without track changes identification or formatting.▪ No way to tell where a submission is in the review process without making phone calls.▪ Sign offs paper based.▪ Use of desktop application (PageMaker)<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Software no longer supported by Adobe.✓ The upload process from PageMaker to Web is very sensitive to formatting codes. Text is frequently lost or not handled correctly by the systems.▪ Costly<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Cumbersome semi-manual process at all levels.✓ Extensive time spent on format and design cleaning by the Editor.✓ Required often multiple printed copies of the submission at various stages of the process, enormous amount of paper usage and photocopy expenses. | <p>Enhancements/Improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Designed a system by which all editing and document travel is electronic.▪ No longer downloading the entry to edit only to upload it again once approved - All editing designed now to happen at the server level with appropriate <u>login</u> access and <u>logging</u>.▪ Removal of desktop applications (PageMaker and MS Word).<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ No longer download.✓ No longer produce a printed copy.✓ No longer need this program to 'push' copy up to the server.▪ Elimination of download flaws reduces the time spent by the editor on formatting.▪ Built in design controls. (i.e., on proposal layout, course description layout, etc)▪ Electronic sign off process with edit lockout stages.▪ Built-in track changes. No 'off' or 'accept changes' buttons.▪ Submission status available on-line at each level of access.▪ Reduced need for hard copy printing at various stages of the submission process. |
|--|--|