

### Response to FAST TRACK concerns

After review and discussion within the committee and our respective departments we have come to a consensus.

1. The words "minor re-wording". The policy has minor re-wording for CLOs, description, objectives, and topics. Who defines minor? Minor could be interpreted differently among a proposer and approvers. Minor re-wording should be deleted from all statements. Users should be able to modify CLOS, description, objectives and topics for clarity/correctness, system-alignment, or updating outdated content overall. Minor re-wording should not be the determination of modifying these items.

### Response

"minor re-wording" should be defined on a case by case basis by the CRC and those individuals that approve Fast Track submissions. It is an important part of the policy that the rewording of the CLOs, description, objectives and topics cannot be altered so significantly that it changes the original nature of the course.

2. If the content is outdated it maybe a major change and are we saying we are going to have the user submit its mod through regular curriculum if say they are only modifying CLOs? This could take a year out for it to be effective versus having it effective right before a semester starts because its needed for assessment.

### Response

Our understanding is that part of the Fast Track Policy was intended to serve our programs and courses that center around rapid changing technology and/or rapid changing content to stay relevant to current issues, for example, courses in electronics or programming and nursing. We believe "updating outdated content" should be left as part of the Policy.

3. Addition of course objectives is repetitive to the already specified modification, "minor re-wording of course objectives for clarity correctness, system alignment, or updating outdated content." Addition of course objectives should be removed. If a user is modifying, adding, deleting course objectives it should be specified in one statement.

4. Addition of course topics is repetitive to the already specified modification, "minor re-wording of course topics for clarity correctness, system alignment, or updating outdated content." Addition of course topics should be removed. If a user is modifying, adding, deleting course topics it should be specified in one statement.

### Response

As we have decided that "minor re-wording" should be unchanged in the policy, we do not feel that these statements are repetitive. The purpose of only allowing "minor re-wording" is that changes to these items are not significant enough to completely change them, creating new COs or course topics.

5. Addition and deletion of recommended prior course work. Is the user only able to add, delete, and not edit the existing recommended prep if any? The previous recommended preparation was not specific. A user was able to add, delete, or edit its existing recommended prep. Addition and deletion should be removed. Recommended Prep should just be general whether adding, deleting, or editing.

Response

Addition and deletion is analogous to edit. If a user wishes to edit the Recommended Prep they can use Fast Track to delete and then add the new/edited Recommended Prep.