

Curriculum Management Software

*An Evaluation of Course and Program Management
Software and Processes at Ohio University*

Pete Lawrence, Service Owner
Office of Information Technology

Purpose & Executive Summary

The University Curriculum Council (UCC) has asked the Office of Information Technology (OIT) to assist with finding a replacement for the current Course and Program Management software known as OCEAN as it is no longer meeting the needs of the university. The software is old, not well maintained, and functionally deficient in many areas. Users find the process takes longer than they anticipate and the software to be cumbersome and hard to use. This in turn is stifling innovation and creative course and program offerings. As OHIO seeks to continue to be competitive with other higher education institutions, it is imperative the process to manage curriculum and the technology that supports it be aligned with the university's goals.

A study of OCEAN and the current course and program management process reveals opportunities for improvement in the curricular approval process as well as the software. User stories indicate the following needs:

- More visibility into the process, where their requests are, and what happens after UCC approval.
- Removal of some of the rigid timelines currently imposed to allow for more continuous approvals and reduce approval times.
- Creation of alternate workflows to speed the approval of minor changes.
- Better facilitation of collaboration between curriculum developers and other colleges and content experts
- Expanded training options both on how to create or change curriculum and on the software.

OCEAN is ready for replacement. The software could be replaced by either new custom software or a purchased solution. The cost of either solution is a primary consideration, but the time to implementation is also a key factor in deciding a path forward as the current state of OCEAN is unsustainable. Additionally, long-term support and resourcing of the application and curriculum process should be addressed at this time in order to prevent OHIO from finding itself in this same state again in a few years when the software once again falls out of alignment with then-current needs.

Finally, consideration needs to be taken now to ensure the solution is aligned with other current systems in use and will be aligned with those systems in the future. The catalog, course offerings and the student information system are all tightly related to course offerings and potential future systems such as assessment and accreditation tools and curriculum mapping need to be able integrate with the curriculum management software.

Background Information

OHIO curriculum is currently managed in two separate-but-related versions of OCEAN, known as OCEAN Courses and OCEAN Programs. OCEAN Programs is a custom application developed by OIT approximately 11 years ago. The original application included both program and course management and was implemented to assist with the quarters to semesters conversion. A project was undertaken by OIT approximately five years ago to upgrade OCEAN to a modern software platform, but due to the extremely high effort involved in redeveloping the courses side of the application, once the course management side was complete, the project was halted and the programs side was left in its original state.

OCEAN Courses currently sees approximately 100 items per month, with about 60% of those being course changes and 40% being new courses. OCEAN Programs sees approximately 12 items per month with a 50-50% split between changes and new programs requests. The changes are reviewed on a monthly basis by the Programs Committee (PC) and the Individual Course Committee (ICC) at separate meetings.

The current state of OCEAN no longer meets the needs of the university to manage curriculum. Specifically, the following issues exist:

- The technology stack of OCEAN Programs is no longer supported and presents maintenance and security issues
- The original developers are no longer at OHIO and much of the technical knowledge about the applications has been lost
- The lack of documentation makes training, support, and continuous improvement very cumbersome and expensive
- Many of the features in both versions of OCEAN no longer work, do not work as expected, or are no longer being used.

Objectives and Outcomes

At a minimum, this project will:

- Document the current state issues with OCEAN Programs and OCEAN Courses
- Provide cost analysis of replacement options over a 5-year period
- Provide recommendations on the current business processes used for curriculum management
- Provide recommendations on needed resources and staffing levels to optimally support curriculum management
- Make a recommendation on a path forward for replacement

Alignment with University Strategic Priorities

The project is aligned with the university's strategic priorities, specifically:

- **Reimagine the Academic Enterprise:** Eliminate redundancies, build effective incentive structures, drive operational efficiencies, and rapidly deliver market-responsive programs that call on multiple disciplinary lenses; Redesign curricular processes with a goal towards the ability to pivot—to rapidly launch new programs and to responsibly sunset ineffective and/or end-of-life programs.
- **Realize General Education Reform (and outcomes-based design in general)**
- **Uniting the System: One OHIO Integration Initiative:** Examination of the incorporation/requirements gathering of other related curriculum management activities, like textbook/course material adoption and outputs, like syllabi.
- **Digital transformation:** Increase the efficiency and effectiveness of our workforce by redesigning processes, infusing new ways of working and collaborating into our practice and automating activities that do not directly enhance the student experience.

Findings

After interviewing over 35 faculty and staff members, it is apparent OCEAN exhibits a number of issues ranging from functionality bugs, to lack of training and documentation, to lack of flexibility, to failing to align with new processes. Additionally, there is a common perception that OCEAN simply does not work, is hard to use, and impedes the process of course and program management. Some colleges have resorted to creating their own curriculum proposal and approval processes, only involving OCEAN once a proposal needs to be sent outside the college. More importantly, some faculty expressed they are reluctant to update and innovate in their courses because of the barrier the software creates.

There was no desire for a dramatic overhaul of the curriculum management process in that it was feared such a change would remove the curriculum process from faculty control. However, there are opportunities to tweak and improve the current process to reduce the amount of time needed to get proposals through.

Several common themes emerged regarding areas for improvement which are detailed below:

1. System architecture
2. User interface

3. Current bugs and functionality
4. Resources and staffing
5. Process improvement

System Architecture:

- OCEAN Programs and OCEAN Courses are disparate systems with different logins, user interfaces, management interfaces and technology stacks.
- The systems lack the ability to share data between each other as needed, specifically course data and user roles and permissions.
- There is no direct integration with PeopleSoft (Student Information System) or Acalog (Catalog Publishing System). These are currently external processes maintained by OIT.
- User roles and permissions are managed by a single system admin. Users would like to be able to manage users and roles downward, i.e. colleges chairs can manage department chairs, etc.
- The systems appear to be randomly unavailable or will not load, and are slow to load and use at times depending on the type of information accessed.
- Due to the age of the application, some current browsers or browser versions are not supported.
- OCEAN Programs is running on a codebase which is no longer supported and presents potential security issues.

User Interface:

- Users do not like the multi-tab user interface of OCEAN Courses. The tabs are not well named, and they are able to see tabs they don't have access to or are placeholders for functionality never implemented.
- Field validation alerts and error messages are not user friendly. References to other resources are not hyperlinked in the messages shown to users.
- Some same page navigation is broken in both systems.
- The systems don't allow users to see the names of users in the workflow process, only the role name. This leads to users who are no longer part of the process holding up documents.
- There is a lack of logic as to what needs to be checked at each level of the review process. If all data collected is needed, it is not relevant to all levels of review. The data display could be grouped by relevant parties.
- IRB codes should be sticky for a given course or program. The system should not need to repeat this step every time.
- The systems have very limited dashboard and reporting capabilities. Users report it is very difficult to find even basic information such as their items in progress and which step they are on, who is responsible for the next step, how long an item has been at a given step, items in progress in their school or college, items they need to

act on, and items completed. Users would also like to report on courses by pre-req or Gen Ed codes and be able to see dual-listing information in the grid.

- Due to the age of the systems, many of the features are no longer needed and add to confusion.
- There is no way to see how courses and programs interrelate, i.e., users cannot see all programs impacted by a course change.
- Since all learning outcomes must start with default text, the system should default this text into the fields.
- The system lacks any sort of spelling or grammar checking capabilities. This results in changes being sent back for simple changes.
- The system does not handle copy and pasting from Microsoft Word and similar editors. Illegal characters are transformed in “upside down question marks” causing proposals to be send back for correction.
- Users noted the text fields are often not large enough for the content required and would like the text fields to automatically expand when typing.
- There is no record of other users or other colleges collaborating on a program or course. This information is currently exchanged outside of OCEAN.
- The system currently does not require the prerequisite description field and the list of prerequisites to be in sync. The description may indicate there are required courses, but the list can be blank, and vice-versa.
- The worklist in OCEAN Courses is overwhelming for users with multiple roles. It shows more than they need to deal with and should be separated into multiple lists.
- Users strongly prefer the audit log in OCEAN Programs to the history in OCEAN Courses. They struggle to find the correct change history information in OCEAN Courses.
- There is no way to differentiate if a course for a program is required or is an elective.
- There is no way to differentiate a prerequisite from a co-requisite course requirement.
- The system should auto-link course numbers referenced in course descriptions.
- The system generates too many emails. Notifications are sent to everyone in the workflow for every change, which diminishes the impact they have. Users are often creating mail rules to file these messages away because they are unable to determine which are important or need action.

Current Bugs and Functionality Deficits:

- User input is not proactively saved, and data is lost when their session times out. This is often caused by users working on a document for an extended period of time without saving their work.
- The system does not prevent creating a course using an existing course number.
- The system does not provide robust ways to prevent course duplication or identification of similar courses, especially across colleges.

- Document comments and learning objectives are often not saved or truncated due to fixed character limitations in the database.
- End users cannot initiate changes themselves in OCEAN Programs. A system admin must add it to their work list.
- The system does not provide notification to other colleges or users when a course is flagged for consultation from other college.
- Programs that are under revision cannot have courses added or removed from them until the process is complete.
- Replies to comments added to the system generate a notification to the original author, even if they are no longer a user in the system. This should be sent to the person currently in the same role.
- There is no convenient way for users to see changes made or needed in a side-by-side or redlined view. This makes determine what has changed difficult.
- There is no easy way to create agendas for review meetings such as UCC, ICC and PC.
- The systems do not handle courses with different modalities well (online vs in-person), in particular this is for course caps.
- Online only courses and programs do not need to go through UCC and therefore need a different workflow.
- The systems do not handle dual-listed courses well. It is difficult to see the related courses and programs.
- There is no visibility into the process that happens post-UCC approval. Provost, Board of Trustees, State of Ohio, HLC and Registrar steps are not accounted for in the workflows.
- There is no easy way to abandon or delete changes in progress without system admin intervention. This blocks future changes from being made to these programs and courses. When users leave the university, documents can be “orphaned” in the system with no ability to retrieve them.
- There is no way to export the catalog or current or proposed course information to a PDF. Users would like to be able to download and share these with colleagues.
- There is no way to add reviewer-specific comments or notes, i.e. a note for a department chair or the college curriculum committee that isn't visible to ICC or UCC.
- OCEAN Programs seems to lose documents or versions of documents in some cases.
- Program documents must be manually named when uploading into the system. If they are not named correctly, it is confusing what version is current and what program they apply to.
- Users cannot edit comments in OCEAN Courses.
- It is hard to view concentrations within a program. These groupings may become majors at some point.
- When a proposal is sent back, it is hard to find the reason why in the comments.

- Certificates can be “stacked” and the system does not account for this nor how certificates can be applied to a graduate degree.
- The system does not allow courses and programs to be associated with assessment criteria to facilitate curriculum mapping. Nor is there an easy way to export this data for easier manual reporting.
- There is no option for indicating if a course offers affordable learning materials or ways to report on this.
- There is no field to describe the “reason” for the course, used for internal reference, and not part of the catalog information.
- There is no report for users to see courses which have not had any enrollments for a given period of time. This would be used to help determine which courses could be retired.
- Temporary courses, entered directly into SIS, won’t load in OCEAN to be edited.
- There is no way to see and indicated OTM courses in OCEAN.
- There is no method for all faculty and staff members to see what is happening in OCEAN. They must be granted access and assigned a role to see into the systems.

Resources and Staffing:

- Lack of documentation and training has led to many users not knowing how to use the system or use the system correctly.
- Since most faculty do not routinely request curricular changes or additions, they are often intimidated by the process and are unsure how to proceed.
- When working on certain changes, the systems do not facilitate coordination with content experts such as OII for online and Graduate College for graduate level work.

Process Improvement:

- There are no expedited workflows for minor changes. Users should be able to flag when minor changes such as spelling corrections are needed or submitted and bypass a certain subset of steps to return to the level it was previous in. These expedited paths are needed at all levels of approval.
- The UCC guidelines and help text are not integrated with the system. The help system should incorporate specific text from the UCC guidelines related to the field currently being worked on. Currently the “Help” button just links to the UCC website.
- There should be guidelines integrated into the systems regarding how to assign a course number to a new proposal.
- The systems do not offer templates or examples for each type of change.
- Cross-college consultations for prerequisites or required courses are not handled smoothly in the systems. The systems do not send an email for this and it must be performed manually now.

- The systems do not handle certificate offerings properly as they may not require the same rigorous review of standard program offerings and may require a different workflow.
- The systems do not handle temporary and experimental courses correctly as they need a different workflow for rapid approval.
- The systems may not be collecting the right information based on current requirements. This includes information which is no longer needed and information that is not being used.
- There is no automated way to invite the originator(s) of a request to the ICC or PC meetings when their request is added to a meeting agenda.
- The process for managing program proposals with new, unapproved courses is confusing.
- Many aspects of course information are too dynamic for this process unless it is easy to update these data points. Grading logic, class topics and textbook are values that change regularly or can be different across sections.
- There is no “expiration date” on the data causing faculty to review and update this on a semi-regular basis.

What Peer Institutions Use:

A sampling of universities similar to OHIO are using the following solutions:

University	Solution
University of Cincinnati	Custom Software
Ohio State University	Custom Software (exploring other options)
Miami University	Leapfrog CIM
Ball State University	Watermark Smart Catalog
Bowling Green State University	Paper Process (manual)
Kent State University	Custom Software
Arizona State University	Custom Software
Marshall University	Paper Process (manual)
Florida State University	Custom Software

Additionally, several of the universities listed above have a team or resource serving as a functional owner for the application. Their responsibilities include system administration

and being a liaison between the strategy owners (the curriculum council and provosts) and the technical owners (either IT or the vendor). In this capacity, they are the experts on the operation of the software, understand the strategy, prioritization and high-level goals, translate the business requirements into technical requirements, and understand the impact changes made to the system will have on its ability to meet the needs of the university.

Budget Considerations

Consideration of the costs involved in replacing or repairing both OCEAN systems is described below. These are rough estimates based on the information currently known and may change as requirements are fully defined. A rough timeline for each option is also included for consideration. The intent here is to be able to evaluate the tradeoffs of each possible solution for initial cost, ongoing costs, and implementation time.

Purchased Software:

A cursory review of three leading software providers in the curriculum management space shows these systems are potentially capable of meeting the university's needs and may offer long-term benefits including integrations with other business solutions. The three products reviewed were Watermark SmartCatalog, DigArc Curriculog, and Leapfrog CourseLeaf. While a detailed fit-gap analysis was not performed and firm price quotes were not obtained at this stage, all of the systems appeared to meet OHIO's core needs and have a large number of the features currently not in OCEAN. These solutions are priced on a per-year subscription basis of approximately \$60,000 which includes initial implementation and setup from the vendor. However, some resource costs for implementation and testing will be incurred by OHIO, primarily from OIT and UCC members, estimated at \$20,000. Minimum contract lengths were not determined at this stage.

Finally, the cost of the software does not include ongoing operational costs for a resource to be the functional owner and system administrator of the application. This is likely at least 0.5 FTE, estimated at a cost of \$50,000 per year and is included here. Refer to the "Recommendations" section below for additional information.

Because the software is already developed, all the vendors indicated typical implementation timelines, including testing and training, ranging from 3-9 months. This also includes the time to customize the software, forms and workflows to OHIO's specific needs.

Total Projected One-Time Costs: \$20,000

Total Projected Ongoing Costs: \$60,000 / year

Total Projected Ongoing Resource/Operational Costs: \$50,000 / year

Five-year Projected Total Cost: \$570,000

Custom Software:

The software engineering team in OIT has reviewed the OCEAN Programs software and has estimated the effort to merge the Programs and Courses versions of OCEAN at \$64,500. This work only merges the systems and resolves most of the known architecture and system communications issues. Implementation of the bulk of the bug fixes and functionality deficits are roughly estimated at \$100,000. These one-time costs are in addition to ongoing annual support and maintenance costs by the software engineering team and others in OIT of approximately \$50,000 (based on the previous 3-year average effort plus anticipated resources costs for service level enhancements) and server and hosting costs of approximately \$6,500 per year. Finally, any yet-to-be-determined functionality enhancement would incur additional expenses with the cost being dependent on the scope of the change.

Again, the cost of the software development and maintenance does not include ongoing operational costs for a resource to be the functional owner and system administrator of the application, likely at least 0.5 FTE. As with the purchased software solution above, a cost of \$50,000 per year is included here. Refer to the "Recommendations" section below for additional information.

The initial development timeline to complete the merging of the systems and the additional functionality is approximately 12 months. In addition to this development timeline, a robust testing, training and implementation period of approximately 6-9 months would be needed, but the length of time would be dependent on availability of other stakeholders to participate in the process. In total, the timeline is expected to be approximately 18-21 months.

Total Projected One-Time Costs: \$164,500

Total Projected Ongoing Costs: \$6,500 / year

Total Projected Ongoing Resource/Operational Costs: \$100,000 / year

Five-year Projected Total Cost: \$697,000

Outsourced Custom Software:

A third option exists to engage with an external software development vendor to build the custom software. While this may shorten the timeline for a custom solution estimated above, the increased expense likely makes this option unviable. However, if only a custom software solution will meet OHIO's needs, this option may be worth revisiting due to the shortened timelines and reduced opportunity cost.

Software Recommendations

When considering the current urgency to replace OCEAN and increase functionality to align with the university's needs, it is recommended OIT and UCC continue with an investigation into a purchased software solution. The 5-year cost of ownership is lower and the time to implement the solution is faster, making it an obvious choice *if* it meets OHIO's needs.

A full list of functional requirements will be needed for any solution and this can be used to determine if any purchased software will truly meet OHIO's needs or if custom software is the only solution. Using the information gathered for this report will speed up this process tremendously.

Process Improvement Recommendations

Several areas for high-impact improvement were identified, both in terms of software functionality and process improvement. Many of the bullet points below address the most prevalent issues presented in the Findings.

- Remove the rigid timelines for proposals to be voted on in committees.
 - Allow committee members to comment on, approve or reject proposals directly in the software. This would speed the approval process for standard or simple changes where there is no need for intensive review. Once a proposal receives a quorum of approvals, it is automatically moved to the next step in the process. This shortens the meetings for these committees. College of Fine Arts Dean Matthew Shaftel indicated this was implemented at Florida State University and it dramatically reduced approval times because the issue with meeting deadlines for scheduled committee meetings was effectively removed and proposals could be approved on a continual basis.
 - Allow for a default response of "approve" when no action is taken by a role in the workflow for a specified period of time. This encourages users to be more engaged in the process.
- Implement alternative workflows for certain types of proposals and changes.
 - Create a workflow for when minor changes (i.e. spelling, tense, etc.) are needed in a proposal that allows the originator to make these changes and immediately return the proposal to its previous step in the process. Currently these changes require the proposal to be returned, and then work

its way back through the original workflow which may involve multiple levels of re-approval for inconsequential changes.

- Create sub-workflows for processes such as Graduate Council approval, OII review, etc.
- **Improve the process of including other colleges and curriculum creators in proposals.**
 - Define what “consultation” between colleges means and who has the final say in resolving course conflicts. ICC/UCC doesn’t seem to want to be this voice, pushing the handling of this back to the colleges. This is acceptable but needs to be clearly documented that this is what is required, what impact a pending conflict has on a course or program being approved, and what “closure” of the conflict means. The current guidelines require consultation, not approval, from other colleges, so if another college objects, does it have any impact? Additionally, the system needs to document these conversations and subsequent resolutions.
 - Develop process and functionality to facilitate coordination with the content experts. For example, OII for online courses and programs, Library for research courses, and Graduate College for graduate level work. Currently, these groups are often included late in the process requiring rework and causing delays.
- **Improve training, functional management and support for the software and the approval process.**
 - Provide additional resources and time for training and support of the software and the curriculum process. Establish additional resources at the college or university level to serve as a central point of contact for such help. Utilizing grad students to facilitate the process may be an option.
 - Increase training opportunities by:
 - Requesting Provost funding or course releases for software training for faculty serving on curriculum committees.
 - Provide workshops for bulk user training or implement a “train the trainers” methodology.
 - Implement an “Academic Systems” team to serve as functional owners or product owners of the software and assure it is in alignment with the policies and needs of UCC and other stakeholders. This role would be 60% technical and 40% administrative in that they would:
 - Perform the daily operational tasks of the system.
 - Understand the strategy, vision, and larger process and scope of curriculum management at OHIO.

- Gather and translate user requirements into actionable requests for either OIT or a software vendor.
- Determines priority of changes and enhancements to the system.
- Understand how the software works and what impacts changes made will have to all aspects of the system and process.
- Understand the tightly-related nature of other applications the curriculum management software impacts and interacts with.

Where this position lives and reports to was not determined. Logical choices would be OIT, the Registrar's Office or the Provost's Office. Reporting though OIT would allow the service management team there to provide leadership in the practice of product ownership and supplement the service management approach.

It is estimated curriculum management would require at least 0.5 FTE to perform the duties above. Opportunities exist for this role / team to perform a similar function with other OIT software currently owned by units across the university.

- **Improve visibility to processes which take place post-UCC approval**
 - Add steps to the primary workflow for approval steps which take place after UCC approval. The current system stops there, but several, often time-consuming processes must take place before a course or program can be offered to students. This includes Provost approval, Board of Trustees approval, HLC accreditation approval and State of Ohio approval. Process and functionality must be built to track these steps in the system and store dates and artifacts as needed.
- **Improve the process for approvals of new programs with new courses**
 - Create process and functionality to better handle the approval of new programs which also include proposals for new courses. With the two current versions of OCEAN operating independently, there is no method to handle scenarios where a program is approved by UCC, but it contains new courses that have been sent back to the originator for further work. Since courses may be altered significantly when going back through the process or may never be approved, this leads to scenarios where the PG and UCC are potentially approving programs in a non-final state. Additionally, this causes confusion by downstream steps including HLC and State approvals because the courses to be submitted are not available. The system should recognize the status of all courses within a program and potentially create a new status indicating "Approved pending course approvals" and a method to

review these programs to handle cases when courses have changed significantly.

Projected Timelines

Major Milestones:

- Information Gathering / Discovery: October 1, 2019 – February 28, 2020
- Findings Report Generation: February 1, 2020 – February 29, 2020
- Evaluation by the One OHIO Workstream: March 1, 2020 – May 30, 2020
- Functional Requirements Documentation: June 1, 2020 – June 30, 2020

For Purchased Software:

- RFP and Vendor Selection: July 1, 2020 – August 30, 2020
- Implementation and Training: September 1, 2020 – April 30, 2021
- Rollout: May 1, 2021

For Custom Software:

- Software Development: July 1, 2020 – June 30, 2021
- Implementation and Training: July 1, 2021 – December 31, 2021
- Rollout: January 1, 2022

Appendix A: Participants

The following faculty and staff members participated in the findings and research collected in this report:

Name	Title	School / Department
Sara Helfrich	UCC Chair; Co-Chair One OHIO Course/Program Approval Process Redesign Workstream	College of Education
Bob Bulow	Associate Registrar for Technology and Communication	Office of the Registrar
Angela Brock	Administrative Services Associate	Office of the Provost
Cherise Olmo	Associate Registrar for Operations	Office of the Registrar
Kristi Barnes	Co-Chair One OHIO Course/Program Approval Process Redesign Workstream	RHE, Southern
Sally Marinellie	Individual Course Committee Co-Chair	College of Health Sciences and Professions
Beth Quitslund	Individual Course Committee Co-Chair	College of Arts and Sciences
Connie Patterson	Programs Committee Chair	College of Education
Loralyn Taylor	Associate Provost for Institutional Research	Institutional Research
Howard Dewald	Associate Provost for Faculty and Academic Planning	Office of the Provost
Elizabeth Sayrs	Dean, University College; Senior Vice Provost for Undergrad Ed and Student Success	University College
Deborah Benton	University Registrar	Office of the Registrar
Kelly Broughton	Former Programs Committee Chair	Library
Sarah Poggione	College Curriculum Committee Chair	College of Arts and Sciences
David Koonce	Associate Dean for Graduate College; Associate Vice President of Research	Graduate College



Jennifer Van Nostran	Project Manager/Business Analyst	Office of Instructional Innovation
Silvia Mickunas	Project Manager/Business Analyst	Office of Instructional Innovation
Hans Kruse	College Curriculum Committee Chair	Scripps College
Heather Lawrence	Associate Dean, Graduate and Professional Programs	College of Business
Travis Davidson	College Curriculum Committee Chair	College of Business
Andrew Fodor	Chair of Finance	College of Business
Luke Pittaway	Chair of Management Department	College of Business
William Young	Director of OMBA	College of Business
Ana Rosado Feger	Associate Professor of Operations	College of Business
Neil Littell	Associate Professor	College of Engineering
Zaki Kuruppallil	Individual Course Committee	College of Engineering
Sherleena Buchmann	College Curriculum Committee Chair	College of Health Sciences and Professions
Jody Lamb	College Curriculum Committee Chair	College of Fine Arts
Lesli Johnson	College Curriculum Committee Chair	Voinovich
Katie Hartman	Co-Chair General Education Reform Initiative	College of Business
Kathy Spicer	Assistant Dean for Academic Assessment	College of Health Sciences and Professions
Jean Rettos	College Curriculum Committee Chair	Heritage College of Medicine
April Loudnet-Maffin	Curriculum Manager	Heritage College of Medicine
Jody Gerome Zuchowski	Office of Academic Affairs	Heritage College of Medicine