

Summary of Comments on Expedited Curriculum Review Process

Faculty Senate Governance Committee

April 20, 2026

Overview

This document provides a short summary of the feedback received by the Faculty Senate Governance Committee (FSGC) concerning the expedited curriculum review process used during the Spring 2026 semester.

Background

The University Curriculum Committee (UCC) plays a crucial role in the stewardship of the curriculum. The UCC “reviews and acts on – either approves or disapproves – all substantive curricular proposals involving undergraduate courses or programs.” ([University Policy 2.04](#)) The approval timetable for substantive changes given in the Curriculum Review Process Information Handbook schedules this review for the UCC during September and October, with approved proposals moving forward for approval with the University Faculty Senate. Full details of the curriculum review process can be found at the [Provost’s page for Curriculum Review](#).

During the Spring 2026 semester, a pilot program for “expedited review” was used for three curriculum proposals that were deemed “high priority” (Business Analytics Major, Certificate in Applied AI for Business, Special and Inclusive Education Major). These proposals were approved unanimously by the UCC on February 9, 2026, and subsequently approved by the Faculty Senate (25-1-0) on February 23, 2026.

Process Feedback

After the pilot program for the expedited review, the Faculty Senate Governance Committee (FSGC) was asked to gather and disseminate feedback on the program. Members of the UCC and representatives from the Provost’s Office met with members of the FSGC on March 9, 2026 and March 10, 2026. In total, feedback was gathered from three UCC voting members and one ex officio member. A summary of the comments and themes are given below.

Strengths

Several UCC members felt that the system worked “fairly well” and expressed their full support for it. It was noted that it is advantageous to have a mechanism to allow some curriculum proposals to be adopted quicker than the current system. This mechanism can be useful where there is an urgent need for a particular program to be implemented, such as when the discipline is experiencing fast growth and demand, or when there is a first-mover advantage for a particular program.

Future Considerations

There were many constructive criticisms and concerns raised to help determine the future of this process. A major concern of several members was ensuring a clearly-defined and consistent process for labeling a curriculum proposal as “high priority” so that the process was not overused or abused. If this

process is to be repeated, it was suggested that the high priority designation be determined by the UCC. It would be desirable for there to be some concrete evidence supporting a program's high priority designation.

Another consideration was the added workload of this process. Several felt that the UCC had a full workload already, meaning that UCC members had little time to properly review these expedited proposals and receive careful and thoughtful faculty input. The expedited process also causes increased workloads for several other stakeholders, including the Registrar's Office.

Finally, it was suggested that this process could include a better mechanism for advertising the proposals to all faculty so that full review from faculty is possible.