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The University of North Carolina at Charlotte adopted Acalog and Curriculog, an “electronic academic program and course approval system for creating, modifying, and accessing degree programs, individual courses, and catalog information” (Acalog and Curriculog Implementation at UNC Charlotte) in the 2014-2015 academic year. J. Murrey Atkins Library’s Usability Lab collaborated with Academic Affairs to test the usability of the two systems. In the spring of 2015, the usability lab conducted a study on Acalog and directly after conducted a study on Curriculog, “a paperless course and curriculum approval process system” (Acalog and Curriculog Implementation at UNC Charlotte).

The goal of the adoption of Curriculog is to “simplify the process of curricular change and create efficiencies for faculty committees” (Acalog and Curriculog Implementation at UNC Charlotte). The usability study of Curriculog was conducted after the usability study of Acalog due to the system’s reliance of the academic catalog. Within Curriculog’s forms, a user can import data directly from Acalog to fill fields associated with a course or program. Curriculog allows proposed modifications and creation of courses and programs to go through an electronic and interactive process that includes the initiation of the proposal to the review and approval from the necessary colleges and university committees, all without any paper. “The program will maintain an electronic history of tracked edits, comments, and approvals. Following all of the necessary approval channels, changes to existing programs will be ready for seamless integration into the next academic catalog through Acalog” (Acalog and Curriculog Implementation at UNC Charlotte).

The study tested a portion of Curriculog’s beta interface prior to the scheduled fall 2015 launch. The study focused on three of ten forms available in Curriculog and the features associated with them. The following forms were tested, Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate, Program Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate, and New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minor, concentration, and undergraduate certificates) and the functions associated with them. Data was collected via tasks-based testing and focused on three participant groups (originators, library liaisons, and reviewers) and their roles in the curriculum approval process.

The objectives of the usability study are as follows:

- Identify the effectiveness of the curriculum approval process system, is the system useful to users and can the system help them achieve their goals accurately.
- Identify the curriculum approval process system’s efficiency, can users complete a task quickly and accurately.
- Identify how engaging the curriculum approval process system is to users, is the system pleasant and satisfying to use.
- Identify how error tolerant the curriculum approval process system is, does the user encounter errors, and how does the system help a user recover from errors that occur.
- Identify the curriculum approval process system’s ease of learning, does the system support the ease of completing a task through initial orientation and continued learning to novice and expert users.
• Identify training opportunities for the user interface related to tasks.
• Identify recommendations for design and functional improvement of the curriculum approval process system.

The study comprised of three distinct participant groups; originators, library liaisons, and reviewers, with 16 total participants. The study utilized tasks-based usability testing, the most effective assessment method to uncover usability issues as it consists of representative users conducting relevant tasks while using the interface.

The study utilized three tasks lists to accommodate the needs of the three participant groups (originators, library liaisons, and reviewers). This approach allows the researcher to compare data across common benchmarks based on the participant groups’ ability to complete each task. The tasks used in this study focused on activities commonly performed by the three participant groups. The study identified several opportunities for improvement to the curriculum approval process system that would result in a more efficient, effective and desirable web interface. While no critical usability issues (problems that made the site unusable or negatively affect its efficiency to multiple users) were uncovered, the study did reveal smaller issues. This report contains a list of recommendations to address these issues. Additionally, the results identified further possibilities of inquiry for future studies to focus on other forms and features in the system. Overall, participant feedback was positive in that Curriculog will be an improvement from the current short form and long form curriculum approval paper process even though the test uncovered usability issues.

Study Design
Tasks-based usability analysis was the methodology used in this study. This methodology allows for accurate and comparable data analysis between multiple participant groups, in this case originators, library liaisons, and reviewers. In addition, the method is a reliable way of gauging usability at any stage of development. The tasks-based analysis helps researchers uncover usability issues as users interact with a web interface by first identifying common tasks performed by the three participant groups and gauging the participants’ ability to complete the tasks. The Director of the Usability Lab and the Usability Assistant developed and finalized the three task lists used in this study.

Curriculog replicated the information from the long form and the short form (Appendix A) and implemented it into forms that are more precise, focusing on the specific proposed curriculum change. The current paper-based system has two forms that represent minor and major implementations to the curriculum; Curriculog has ten forms to represent the specific types of proposed curriculum changes.

Curriculog’s forms include:
• New Course: Undergraduate
• New Course: Graduate
• Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate
• Course Inactivation: Graduate/Undergraduate
• Application to Offer an Accelerated Master’s Program
• Early Entry Graduate Program Application
The current short form and long form paper curriculum process contributed to the three task lists because they are equivalent to the forms in Curriculog. The task lists (Appendix B) were customized to accommodate each participant group’s roles in the curriculum approval process. The task list for each participant group incorporated a different number of tasks and subtasks that pertained to each participant group’s role in the curriculum approval process; the originators consisted of four tasks, the library liaisons consisted of six tasks, and the reviewers consisted of seven tasks. The final task lists highlight typical activities performed by originators, library liaisons, and reviewers when using the curriculum approval process system. The use of three different task lists allows the researchers to conduct a comparative analysis of the data collected and accommodate the needs of the distinct user groups. In addition to the task list, the study incorporated a pre-test and post-test.

Participants’ performances and comments as they attempt the tasks expose usability issues and inform recommendations to improve the system’s effectiveness, efficiency, engagement, error tolerance, and the ease to learn. During the test session, participants were encouraged to verbally articulate their thoughts and actions throughout the tasks in the test session. The think out loud protocol allows researchers to understand the context for user actions and decisions while completing a specific task; making it easier for the researchers to determine the underlying cause of usability issues. Overall, participant feedback was positive in that Curriculog will be an improvement from the current short and long form curriculum approval process even though the test uncovered usability issues.

Each test session included: a facilitator whose role was to greet the participants upon arrival, guide participants through the informed consent process, present the participants with the tasks, answer participant’s questions, and prompt the participants for responses; a note taker whose role was to observe the participant’s body language and to take notes on the participant’s comments and search techniques; and the participant. At times the facilitator acted as both the facilitator and note taker. All the test sessions were conducted in Atkins Usability Lab, using a Dell Desktop computer equipped with Morae software; the software-captured participants’ interaction with Curriculog by recording audio, video, on-screen activity, and mouse input. Following test completion, the notes and recordings were compiled and analyzed as a whole, per participant group, and per individual resulting in recommendations to improve the course and curriculum approval process system and to assist in future training of users. The test sessions ranged from 20-45 minutes.

**Recruitment**

Participants were recruited through email blasts sent to department chairs, curriculum change committee, and library liaisons. The Office of Academic Affairs assisted in recruiting the originators and reviewers, while the Digital Scholarship lab recruited library liaisons. Sixteen participants took part in the study. The sixteen participants volunteered their time to participate.
in the study. Each participant read and signed an informed consent form approved by the university’s Institutional Review Board.

The consent form includes the following information:
- An overview of the test methodology.
- The test session will be recorded, including audio, video, on-screen activity, and mouse input.
- The interface is being tested not the participant.
- The participant’s identity will remain confidential.
- There is no known risk associated with participating in the study.
- The participant is a volunteer and it is their decision to participate in the study.
- Contact information for the researchers involved in the study and the University's Research Compliance Office.

**Participant Demographics**
The participants consisted of six originators, five library liaisons, and five reviewers. The participants from the three participant group’s experience with the current print curriculum approval process varied from novice to expert users depending on the proposal type and the participants’ role in the curriculum approval process. None of the participants had prior experience with Curriculog.

**Recommendations**
The following recommendations are based on analysis of the data collected from the usability test recordings, pre-survey responses, and post-test comments from the three participant groups (originators, library liaisons, and reviewers). The recommendations include justification drawn from the study’s pre-test and post-test survey, participant comments, and notes from each test session.

1. **Conduct further usability testing on Curriculog**

   This study only tested a portion of Curriculog’s beta interface prior to the scheduled fall 2015 launch. The study incorporated the following three forms into the test sessions, Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate, Program Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate, and New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minor, concentration, and undergraduate certificates) and the functions associated with the them. The study only tested three of the ten forms that are currently available in the curriculum approval system. To improve Curriculog’s overall efficiency, effectiveness, engagement, error tolerance, and ease to learn, all of the forms need to be tested for each distinct participant group (originators, library liaisons, and reviewers).
Usability testing is an iterative process and should be used in all phases of development (Figure 1.1). After the hard launch of Curriculog, usability testing should continue as part of its lifecycle to ensure its functionality, desirability, and efficiency.

2. **Ensure Curriculog’s login widget is visible.**

The first task of each task list was to login to Curriculog with specific credentials. Nine of the sixteen participants had a difficult time locating this feature. The login widget on Curriculog’s homepage is located in the upper right corner of the interface (Figure 2.1). Four of the sixteen participants commented that the login’s font size was too small to be visible at first glance.

The comments included:

- “The location is small and confusing.”
- “The login needs to stand out more.”
- “The login is too small.”
- “That is the smallest print ever.”

In the left pane of the interface, there is a help box stating, “You must be logged in to view the proposals” (Figure 2.2). The majority of the participants first read the notification before clicking the login widget in the upper right corner. Two participants attempted to click the notification to login. Three participants commented that they would assume that the notification would have a link for them to login or direct them to the login location. Logging into Curriculog is a crucial feature to the system because it is the first step all users must complete before using the curriculum approval system. Increasing the font of the login widget in the upper right corner or moving the login information to the left pane where the login notification is improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and engagement of the system.
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3. **Condense the information within the forms or break the information into defined sections.**

The three forms that were incorporated into the test sessions included, Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate, Program Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate, and New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minor, concentration, and undergraduate certificates). Five of the sixteen participants commented during the test session or in the post-test question, “is there anything you would like to see improved?” that there was too much text and scrolling within the forms. During the sixteen test sessions, participants overlooked information and/or the section they needed to review, edit, or fill out in their first attempt on at least one task. Three originator participants suggested that the forms required and optional information could be displayed on several pages instead of one. For example, page one of the form could display the “read before you begin” instructions, page two of the form could include the required information, page three of the form could include the optional information, and page four could include proposal review proposal launch and saving/printing options.

In the reviewer and library liaison participant groups test sessions, the participants had to enter “edit proposal” to review the proposed curriculum change. The two participant groups expressed concern in the sessions that they have access to editing the proposal when that is not their role in the curriculum approval process. The reviewers and library liaisons can view a “process summary” of the proposal in the right pane of the dashboard (Figure 3.1). The process summary does not include all the information that these two participant groups would need for their roles. For example, the process summary states the prospective curriculum “has 2 core courses and 10 courses” (Figure 3.2) but does not include which courses they are. If a user wanted to view the specific curriculum for the proposal, they must go into “edit proposal” (Figure 3.3). In addition to reviewing the proposal, library liaisons also must complete an evaluation of the library’s holding in regards to the proposal. Currently the librarian liaisons section is housed at the bottom of the editable proposal form. Having the library liaison’s evaluation separate from the “edit proposal” would reduce confusion and improve the efficient and effectiveness of their review process. It would be more efficient, effective, error tolerant, and engaging when a proposal has reached the reviewers and library liaisons if they could view the proposal in an format that cannot be edited and that displays all the information that was included in
the proposal. For example, the viewable proposal would leave out optional fields and sections that were not filled out.

Figure 3.1

Figure 3.2
4. Create training and instructions to distinguish the difference between the “Add” feature and the “Import” feature.

Each task list asked the participants to add a course to a proposal’s curriculum or prerequisites. When the participants attempted to complete the task, they had the option to “Add Course” or to “Import Course.” Importing the course allowed the participant to import the course and its details from Acalog, the academic catalog. Adding a course, requires the participant to fill out the course’s prefix, code, and name (Figure 4.1). Two of the ten participants that used the “Add Course” feature instead of the “Import Course” feature typed the prefix as “cegr” instead of “CEGR.” After the two participants clicked “Add Course” the course they entered displayed as “cegr-5126-Codes, Loads, and Nodes” and not as “CEGR-5126-Codes, Loads, and Nodes” (Figure 4.2). The “Add Course” feature allows for human error and inconsistency from the format specified in the academic catalog. Adding training about the difference of the features and including instruction in the proposal on when to use each feature will reduce inconsistencies of the course identity in the proposals. Another option is to remove the “add” feature, which only give users one option, importing from the academic catalog, which ensures that course information matches the information in the current academic catalog. Removing the “add” feature or inserting training and instruction of the “add” and “import” feature will improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and error tolerance of the curriculum approval process.
5. Improve the import search function to ensure efficiency, effectiveness, and engagement.

The six originators were asked to complete two subtasks associated with the import function. The subtasks were “Import the following graduate course, NURS 6160 Research in Nursing and Health Professions” to the Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate proposal and “Import the following courses to the User Experience curriculum: ENGL 4182: Information Design and Digital Publishing and ITIS 3130: Human-Computer Interaction” to the New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate proposal. None of the participants completely either task on their first attempt. Two of the six participants needed assistance from the facilitator to complete the first subtask so they could move onto the next subtask. To import a course into a proposal, a user must click the import widget and then select the “external system from which you would like to import curriculum data” (Figure 5.1). After selecting the external system, the participants are directed to the import search (Figure 5.2).
a. **Remove irrelevant filters to improve the import search’s efficiency, effectiveness, and engagement.**

The import search caused confusion among the six originators. All six participants commented that the labels were confusing in the “Filter by Field” dropdown (Figure 5.3). The participants did not know which fields to select and commented that the fields are not identical to the terms used in the academic catalog to identify a course. Several participants stated they were looking for prefix, course number, and course name as filters. In addition, participants expressed confusion
in differentiating terms. For example, participants questioned the difference between catalog id, item id, and code. Two participants questioned why a start date and end date was included as a search field. Removing irrelevant filters would reduce the confusion of users and increase the import search function’s efficiency, effectiveness, and engagement.

**Figure 5.3**

b. **Add a basic search field to the import search function.**
After a participant selects a filter, a search box appears that they can type in (Figure 5.4). It would be beneficial to users if there were a basic search box initially, allowing participants to search broader and not have to rely solely on filters to locate a course. In addition, the search states “Search all courses” and there is no general search box to search all courses; directly below “Search all courses” the “or add filter” dropdown is available. The word “or” is a conjunction, “a conjunction connects words, phrases, or clauses and** can also indicate the relationship between the elements it connects**” (Alred 98). The “or add filter” dropdown emphasizes that there should be a search element prior to it.
Adding a basic search field to the import search function will improve its efficiency, effectiveness, engagement, and the ease to learn.

![Search 2014-2015 Undergraduate Academic Catalog](image)

**Figure 5.4**

---

c. **Remove the “Sort Results By” filter to improve the search’s effectiveness, efficiency, error tolerance, engagement, and the ease to learn.**

When a participant first sees the search function, they see the field, “Sort Results By:” which automatically includes prefix, code, and name (**Figure 5.5**). Three of the six participants attempted to add filters from the “Sort Results By:” field. When a participant clicks within the box, they can select a filter to be added. It is noted that when a participant adds a filter from the “or add filter” dropdown it is not added to the “Sort Results By:” section. This field is repetitive of the “or add filter” dropdown field, it should be removed to reduce confusion among users.
6. **Create training and tutorial videos for “Edit Proposal” feature.**

Having tutorial videos and including training for the “Edit Proposal” feature will increase the efficiency, effectiveness, engagement, and the ease to learn for the three participant groups (originators, library liaisons, and reviewers). The sixteen participants expressed confusion towards the “Edit Proposal” feature and how to use it properly. Each participant group uses the “Edit Proposal” feature in the curriculum approval process. To edit a proposal, the originators must hover over the proposal in the dashboard and click the second icon, “Edit Proposal” (*Figure 6.1*). The library liaisons and the reviewers must hover over the proposal in the dashboard and click the second icon, “Edit Proposal” (*Figure 6.1*) to review the whole proposal.
When a participant clicks on the proposal in the dashboard, the proposal’s summary appears in the dashboard’s right pane (*Figure 6.2*). All sixteen participants initially clicked on the proposal in the dashboard in attempt to open the proposal. The majority of the library liaisons and reviewers questioned if the “Edit Proposal” feature was the correct option to view the proposed proposal. Numerous participants from the two participant groups commented that they do not want to edit the proposal; they only want to review it, which lead the participants to look for an icon related to reviewing not editing. In addition, the two participants groups commented that their roles are not to make changes to the proposal. The “Edit Proposal” features effectiveness, efficiency, the ease to learn, and engagement will increase with training and tutorial videos.

*Figure 6.2*

7. **Add a search function to the “personal message” feature.**
   The library liaisons and the reviewers were asked to send a message within Curriculog specifically about a proposal they were reviewing. When the participants were on the messaging page (*Figure 7.1*), they have to use the left pane to select the person/people they want the message to send to. After locating the individual, the participants then must hover over the individual’s name and click the “send message” icon to insert their email in the “To:” section (*Figure 7.2*).

*Figure 7.1*
In the right pane, the “To:” section states, “click the email icon next to the user you want to add to this message” (Figure 7.3).

The left pane, lists ten users’ names at a time. The list of names can be sorted by name, role type, or entity. In addition, the list of users can be refined by the first letter of their last name (Figure 7.4).
Seven of the ten participants commented about the current personal messaging feature, they included:

- “It is a little annoying to scroll through all the users.”
- “This is a lot of steps to send a message, it is easier to email.”
- “A user search would be so much easier than scrolling.”
- “Being able to type in the user’s last name in the “To:” field like the University’s email would be more efficient” (Figure 7.5).

Having a search option in the personal messaging feature will improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and engagement of the feature.

Findings

Findings are broken into three major sections to identify the different participant groups tested, originators, library liaisons, and reviewers. Each section’s findings are grouped by the individual task and subtasks along with a description of the success rate, ease of completion, errors, and participants’ comments.
Originators

**Task 1: Log into Curriculog**

The task was designed to determine if users could locate where and how to login to Curriculog. The participants were given a predetermined username and passwords to login with. All six originators completed the task. To complete this task, participants must locate where and how to login from Curriculog’s homepage. Five of the six participants did not locate the login at first glance and then commented on the location and size of the login.

The participant’s began the task on the homepage of Curriculog (Figure 8.1). Several different approaches were taken to complete the task.

![Figure 8.1](image)

One of the six participants clicked “Login” immediately, located in the upper right of homepage (Figure 8.2). The participant then entered the given credentials (Figure 8.3) to complete the task.

Four of the six participants did not locate the login widget at first glance. The four participants looked in the middle of the homepage for a login widget under the “You must be logged in to view proposals” statement (Figure 8.4). The four participants then clicked “Login” located in the upper right of homepage. The participants then entered the given credentials to complete the task. The four participants all commented on the location and the size of login widget. The participants commented that the widget could be larger and in a different color that would stand out better.

The remaining participant began the task by reading the right pane of the homepage. The participant read, “to access the system, click ‘Login’ at the top right side of your screen and enter your NinerNET username and password” (Figure 8.5). The six participants clicked “Login”
located in the upper right of homepage. The participant then entered the given credentials to complete the task.
Task 2: Begin the following proposal, “Testing--Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate.”

a. Turn on the help text
b. Import the following graduate course, NURS 6160 Research in Nursing and Health Professions.
c. Generate an impact report for the course and copy it into the proposal.
d. Designate the School of Nursing as the school the proposal is originating from.
e. Who is the first person that will review the proposal after it has been submitted by you.
f. Add NURS 6101 Theoretical Basis for Nursing practice as a prerequisite course.
g. Request the proposed course revision become effective term Fall 2016
h. You have completed your proposal, how would you print a copy of it for your records.

The task was designed to determine if users could begin a “Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate” proposal and use and edit features within the proposal. All participants
completed the tasks and subtasks, but it is noted, participants needed guidance starting the proposal. To complete this task, participants must demonstrate a successful technique for each sub-task. This task requires the participants to complete multiple steps to originate a proposal for a graduate course revision.

The six participants clicked the “New Proposal” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane to begin the task (Figure 9.1). The six participants then clicked “Course Revision: Undergraduate/Graduate” from the left pane (Figure 9.2). When the participants clicked “Course Revision: Undergraduate/Graduate,” the right pane of the page updates with the process summary of the future proposal and highlights the proposal name in the left pane (Figure 9.3). The participants looked at the widget options for the proposal, but did see any relevant to initiating the proposal process. All six participants needed guidance from the facilitator to start the proposal. The facilitator guided the six participants to click the “Start Proposal” widget (Figure 9.5). The six participants commented that the word edit was confusing and misleading for starting a proposal.

Figure 9.1
Figure 9.2
a. Turn on the help text.

After starting the proposal, the six participants were asked to turn on the help text. One of the six participants completed the task on their first attempt. This participant, immediately hovered the “i” widget in the upper right of the proposals left pane and saw “Show Help Text,” the participant then clicked the widget (Figure 9.7).

The remaining five participants did not complete the subtask on their first attempt. All five participants clicked the “i” icon in the upper right corner of the interface (Figure 9.8). When the participants clicked the icon, the “Curriculog Help” key opened (Figure 9.9). The five participants then clicked the ‘i’ icon in the upper left of the proposals right pane. Two of the five participants commented that having the same icon represent two different things is confusing and misleading.
b. Import the following graduate course, NURS 6160 Research in Nursing and Health Professions.

The six participants were asked to import a specific graduate course into the proposal. Importing a course into a course revision proposal allows users to import details of the current course into the proposal from Acalog, the electronic course catalog. Five of the six participants completed the task successfully, but it is noted none of the participants completed the task easily. All six participants began the task with the same technique. The six participants read the “Import” section of the directions listed at the beginning of the proposal (Figure 10.1). The import directions state, “Bring in the current information from the catalog. To import, use the arrow icon at the top of the form.” The six participants then clicked the down arrow icon at top left of the proposal’s left pane (Figure 10.2), which opens a secondary window titles, “Import Data Into Your Proposal” (Figure 10.3). The six participants then click “Acalog: Graduate Catalog 2014-2015 and then are redirected to the graduate catalog search page (Figure 10.4).
All five participants needed guidance from the facilitator to complete the task. The import search caused confusion among the six originators. All six participants commented that the labels were confusing in the “Filter by Field” dropdown. The participants did not know which fields to select and commented that the fields are not identical to the terms used in the academic catalog to identify a course. Several participants stated they were looking for prefix, course number, and course name as filters. In addition, participants expressed confusion in differentiating terms. For example, participants questioned the difference between catalog id, item id, and code. Two participants questioned why a start date and end date was included as a search field. The facilitator guided each participant so they could complete the task. Three of the five participants selected prefix from the dropdown and then typed “NURS” in the filter. The three participants then clicked “Search Available Curriculum” and then looked through the results and selected NURS 6160 and then clicked import.

**Read before you begin**

Please turn on the help text before starting this proposal by clicking on the information icon at the top of the form.

For any proposals revising courses or programs, there are five (5) major steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Import</td>
<td>Bring in the current information from the catalog. To import, use the arrow icon at the top of the form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complete</td>
<td>Complete all the required fields. All fields with an * are required. You will not be able to launch the proposal without completing required fields. Attachments may be added to the proposal at any time by using the files icon at the top of the form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Launch</td>
<td>Before you make any edits, LAUNCH the proposal. To launch, use the triangle icon at the top of the form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Edit</td>
<td>Make all proposed changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Approve</td>
<td>As the originator, you have to approve the proposal to send it onto the next step. To approve, use the decisions icon at the top of the form.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 10.1*
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c. *Generate an impact report for the course and copy it into the proposal.*

The participants were asked to generate an impact report and copy it into the proposal. Originators of course revision proposals will be required to generate an impact report and include it in the proposal to submit. All six participants completed the task successfully. Two different techniques were used to complete the task. Four of the six participants scrolled through the proposal until they reached the “Consultations, Resources, and Documentation” section. The first sub-section stated, “You must run an Impact report on the course you are proposing to revise” and then had directions for running an impact report. Three of the four participants scrolled to the top of the proposal to see the icon in top left of the left pane. Two of the three participants had to return to the “Consultations, Resources, and Documentation” section to reread the directions before the clicking the icon. They commented that this was frustrating and not user-friendly because the directions are in a different area from the feature in the proposal. The three participants then clicked the impact report icon and a secondary pages pops up (Figure 10.5). The three participant’s click the “Graduate Catalog 2014-2015” option and then the impact report is generated (Figure 10.6). The three participants then select the text of the “Impact Report for NURS 6160,” and right click to “copy” the report. The three participants then paste the report into the required impact report section of the proposal. The remaining participant looked for the impact report widget to be in that section. It took this participants several attempts before locating the widget in the upper left of proposal’s left pane. The participant commented the instructions to run an impact report are misleading because it states click the impact report icon above, but the icon is not in this section. After locating the location of the widget, the participant clicked the impact report icon and a secondary page appeared. The participant clicked the “Graduate Catalog 2015-2016” option and then the impact report is generated (Figure 10.6). The participant then selects the text of the “Impact Report for NURS 6160,” and right clicks to “copy” the report. The three participants then pasted the report into the required impact report section of the proposal.

Two of the six participants immediately clicked the “Run Impact Report” widget in the upper left of the proposal’s left pane, the two participants hovered over the widget prior to this task. The two participants clicked the “Graduate Catalog 2015-2016” option and then the impact report was generated. The two participants then select the text of the “Impact Report for NURS 6160,” and right click to “copy” the report. The two participants then paste the report into the required impact report section of the proposal.
d. Designate the School of Nursing as the school the proposal is originating from.

The six participants were asked to locate and add the School of Nursing as the school that NURS 6101 is a part of. All originators must add the department/school/program that a course is associated with when proposing a course revision. All six participants completed the task. The six participants clicked the department/school/program “Add Item” icon under the “Course Content Section (Figure 10.7), which opens a secondary window, allowing the participants to select the “School of Nursing” under the “College of Health and Human Services” and then clicking done (Figure 10.8). The “School of Nursing” is listed as the Department/School/Program (Figure 10.9).
e. Who is the first person that will review the proposal after it has been submitted by you?

The six participants were asked to determine who the first reviewer of the NURS 6160 course revision proposal is after they have submitted it as the originator. All six participants completed the task successfully. The participants read the department chair name from the right pane of the proposal that is titled “Approval Steps.” The department chair is listed under the originator’s information.
f. **Add NURS 6101 Theoretical Basis for Nursing practice as a prerequisite course.**

The six participants were asked to request NURS 6101 as a prerequisite for NURS 6160. All six participants completed the task successfully. All six participants began the task with the same technique. The participants scrolled through the proposal until they reached “Prerequisite Courses” *(Figure 11.1)* under the “Course Content” section. Four of the six participants typed “NURS 6101” into the prerequisite section. The remaining two participants typed “NURS 6101 Theoretical Basis for Nursing Practice.” One participant commented that the prerequisite section was hard to locate because the proposal has a lot of content within one page.

![Figure 11.1](image)


g. **Request the proposed course revision become effective term fall 2016.**

The six participants were asked to request the course revision to be effective for the fall 2016 semester. In all course revision proposals, originators are required to request an effective term. All six participants completed the task successfully. The participants scrolled through the proposal until they reached the “Requested Effective Term” within the “Course Content” section *(Figure 11.2)*. The six participants clicked the “Add Item” icon and then select “Fall 2016” from the secondary window and clicked “Done” *(Figure 11.3)*.

![Figure 11.2](image)
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h. You have completed your proposal, how would you print a copy of it for your records.

The six participants were asked to show how they would print a copy of their proposal to have for their records. All six participants completed the task successfully. Five of the six participants clicked the print icon in the upper right of the proposal’s right pane (Figure 11.4). One of the participants looked for a print option at the end of the proposal, but was no successful. The participant then used the keyboard short cut “CTRL+P” to print the proposal. The participant commented that they used the keyboard shortcut because getting back to the top of the proposal would take to long and using the shortcut is more efficient.

![Figure 11.4](image)

**Task 3: Begin the following proposal, “Testing-- New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minors, concentrations, and undergraduate certificates).”**

The task was designed to determine if users could begin a “New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minors, concentrations, and undergraduate certificates)” proposal and use and edit features within the proposal. All participants completed the task and subtasks. This task requires the participants to complete multiple steps to originate a proposal for an undergraduate minor. The six participants completed the task successfully. The six participants began the task using the same technique. The participants clicked the “New Proposal” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane to begin the task (Figure 11.5). The six participants then clicked “New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minors, concentrations, and undergraduate certificates)” (Figure 11.6). When the participants clicked “New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minors, concentrations, and undergraduate certificates)” in the right pane of the page updates with the process summary of the future proposal and highlights the proposal name in the left pane. Three of the six participants questioned how they began the proposal in task two. The six participants clicked the
Start Proposal” widget to the right of the proposal title. One participant commented that the checkmark icon is not intuitive.

A. Propose that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Computing and Informatics add the following undergraduate minor, “User Experience.”

The six participants were asked to propose a “User Experience” undergraduate minor be added to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Computing and Informatics. To complete this subtask, the participants must complete the departments and colleges that the minor will affect, the program type, and the title of the proposed user experience minor. All six participants scrolled to the “New Program Content” section to complete the subtask. The participants first clicked “Add Item” widget associated with the “Department/School/Program” subsection (Figure 11.7) and a secondary window appeared with a list of the schools, departments, and programs at UNC Charlotte (Figure 11.8). Three of the six participants selected both the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Computing and then clicked “done” (Figure 11.9). Two of the three participants commented that it was great that they could select more than one at once. The remaining three participants selected the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and then clicked done, the participants then repeated to the add process and selected the College of Computing and Informatics and then clicked done. After selecting the two colleges, they appeared in the proposal (Figure 12.1).
The six participants then select the “Undergraduate Minor” radio button in the “Choose the appropriate level and program type” subsection directly under the “Department/College/Program” subsection (Figure 12.2).
The six participants scrolled down two subsections to the “Title” section and then entered the “User Experience” (Figure 12.3).

![Figure 12.2]

The six participants were asked to import two courses into the proposed minor’s curriculum. The six participants located the “Building Programs” section of the proposal. Four of the participants had a difficult time locating this information, and looked over it several times. Two of the four participants used the keyboard shortcut “CTRL+F” to search the proposal for “curriculum.” Four of the six participants clicked “Add Course” (Figure 12.4) and a secondary page appeared (Figure 12.5). The participants filled out the prefix, code, and name for ENGL 4182 and then clicked “Add Course” (Figure 12.6). The three participants then repeated the technique to add ITIS 3130 to the curriculum. Two of the four participants commented that manually entering the course’s information could lead to human error mistakes.

1. **ENGL 4182: Information Design and Digital Publishing**
2. **ITIS 3130: Human-Computer Interaction**

![Figure 12.3]

**i. Import the following courses to the User Experience curriculum:**

- ENGL 4182: Information Design and Digital Publishing
- ITIS 3130: Human-Computer Interaction
The remaining two participants clicked “Import Course” (Figure 12.7) and a secondary window appeared titled, “Import Data into Your Proposal” (Figure 12.8), the two participants clicked the undergraduate catalog. From the two participants experience from task 2b, the participants added the selected the “prefix” filter and typed “ENGL” (Figure 12.9) and clicked “Search Available
Content.” The two participants looked through the first page of results that was ordered by the course number and clicked “Next” widget at the bottom of the page until they located ENGL 4182. The two participants clicked the course and it then was highlighted in yellow and then the two participants clicked “Add Course to Proposal” widget at the bottom of the page (Figure 13.1). The two participants repeated this process but searched the prefix IT IS instead of ENGL.
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ii. Attach the following file to your proposal from Local Disk (C:), User Experience, Supporting Documents.

The six participants were asked to add an attachment to the proposal. Three of the six participants completed the task. The three participants that completed the task did not complete the task on their first attempt. All three participants scrolled through the proposal looking for a way to attach a file. One of three participants commented that they thought at the bottom of the proposal there would be a way to attach files. The three participants scrolled back to the top of the proposal and hovered over the icons in the proposal’s dashboard in the left and right panes. The participants clicked the icon that stated “Add” when the cursor hovered over it (Figure 13.2). The three participant’s clicked “Choose File” and selected the “User Experience, Supporting Documents” file from (C:) drive. The three participants then clicked “Upload” (Figure 13.3) to complete the subtask. The three participants that did not complete the task could not locate where to attach files and asked the facilitator to move onto the next task.
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**Task 4: You have decided not to submit the User Experience minor proposal, how would you delete it.**

This task was designed to determine is users could delete a proposal they had drafted. Five of the six participants completed the task successfully. This task requires participants to complete multiple steps to delete a draft proposal. This task requires participants to navigate to Curriculog’s dashboard and then delete the proposal draft.
The six participants began their technique the same way. The six participants looked in the proposal’s dashboard for a way to delete it and had no success. One of the six participants asked the facilitator to move onto the next task when they didn’t locate a way to delete the proposal within the proposal. Four of the six participants clicked “My Proposals” and were redirected to a page that listed their active proposals. The four participants hovered the cursor over the “User Experience” proposal and clicked the “X” icon (Figure 13.4). When the participants hovered over the “X” icon, it read “Delete Proposal.” After the four participants clicked the delete icon, a warning message appeared stating, “deleting this proposal will permanently remove it from Curriculog. Are you sure you want to delete this proposal?” (Figure 13.5), the four participants then clicked “Delete Proposal” to complete the task.

One of the six participants clicked “My Tasks” in the top navigation (Figure 13.6) and was directed to a page that said “No Proposals Found” (Figure 13.7). The participant then clicked “My Proposals” in the left pane navigation. The participant hovered the cursor over the “User Experience” proposal and clicked the “X” icon. The participant then clicked the “X” icon and a secondary warning page appeared. The participant then clicked “Delete Proposal” to complete the task.
Library Liaisons

Task 1: Log into Curriculog

The task was designed to determine if users could locate where to login to Curriculog. The participants were given a predetermined username and passwords to login with. All five library liaisons completed the task. To complete this task, participants must locate where and how to login from Curriculog’s homepage. The five participants did not locate the login at first glance and then commented on the location and size of the login.

The participant’s began the task on the homepage of Curriculog (Figure 13.8). Several different approaches were taken to complete the task.

The five participants looked in the middle of the homepage for a login widget under the “You must be logged in to view proposals” statement (Figure 13.9). The five participants then clicked “Login” located in the upper right of homepage (Figure 14.1). The participants then entered the
given credentials (14.2) to complete the task. Two of the five commented that the login’s placement was confusing and too small.
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**Task 2: Send Rachael Winterling a message about the Energy Infrastructure Concentration proposal stating that, “will review by the end of the week.”**

This task was designed to determine if users could efficiently locate and use Curriculog’s internal messaging feature. All five participants completed the task. None of the participants completed the task on their first attempt. This task requires participants to complete multiple
steps to send an internal message about a specific proposal. This task requires participants to navigate to the internal message system, locate the recipient’s name, and send a message.

Two search techniques were used by the five participants to complete the task successfully. Four of the five participants began the task by clicking “My Tasks” in the left pane navigation (Figure 14.3). The four participants clicked the “Energy Infrastructure Concentration” proposal, and the right pane refreshed to show the process summary. The four participants moved the cursor over the different icons by the proposal’s name (Figure 14.4), until they saw the mail icon. The four participants clicked the mail icon and were directed to a messaging page (Figure 14.5). All four of the participants attempted to click the “To:” section, which did not do anything. This section stated “Click the email icon next to the user you want to add to this message” (Figure 14.6). Two of the four participants looked through the first page of names and clicked the “Next 10” widget and repeated this process for several pages before determining and alternate search route. The two participants then clicked the “W” from the A-Z list at the top of the left pane (Figure 14.7). The two participants looked through the first page of results and had to click the “Next 10” widget six times to reach the correct recipients names. The two participants commented that this process takes too long and they would use their Gmail account to send the message because it would be more efficient. The two participants then click the name which highlights in blue and then click the mail icon, that when hovered over “Add to Message” (Figure 14.8). After, the participants clicked the mail icon, the right pane; “Send Personal Message” has updated to include the recipient’s name in the “To:” field (Figure 14.9). The two participants’ add, “will review by the end of the week” to the message’s text and then click “Send Message.” The remaining two participants immediately clicked the “W” from the A-Z list at the top of the left pane. The two participants looked through the first page of results and had to click the “Next 10” widget six times to reach the correct recipients names. The two participants then click the name which highlights in blue and then click the mail icon, that when hovered over “Add to Message”. After, the participants clicked the mail, the right pane; “Send Personal Message” has updated to include the recipient’s name in the “To:” field. The two participants’ add, “will review by the end of the week” to the message’s text and then click “Send Message.”
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The remaining participant took a different approach while completing task 2. The participant looked through the dashboard and could not locate anything about internal messaging. The participant clicked “Accounts” in the main navigation (Figure 15.1). The participant is directed to a page where the right pane has a list of names and right pane is “My Dashboard.” The participant then clicks the “W” from the A-Z list at the top of the left pane. The participant looked through the first page of results and had to click the “Next 10” widget six times to reach the correct recipients names. The participant then click the name that highlights in blue and then click the mail icon, that when hovered over “Add to Message.” After, the participant clicked the mail, the right pane; “Send Personal Message” has updated to include the recipient’s name in the “To:” field. The two participants’ add, “will review by the end of the week” to the message’s text and adds “Energy Infrastructure Proposal” to the subject and then clicks “Send Message” to complete the task.
**Task 3: Begin the review process for Energy Infrastructure concentration proposal.**

a. **Turn on the help text.**

b. **What are the concentrations core courses?**
   i. Add course CEGR 5126, “Codes, Loads, and Nodes” to the curriculum.
   ii. Print curriculum with mark-ups.

c. **Indicate that the holdings are “inadequate.”**
   i. Provide the following reasoning:
      1. “Usability Test”

d. **You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.**

The task was designed to determine if users could begin the review process for submitted Energy Infrastructure concentration proposal. All five participants completed the task and the subtasks, but it is noted that the participants needed guidance from the facilitator to start the review process. To complete this task, participants must demonstrate a successful technique for each sub-task. This task requires the participants to complete multiple steps to review a submitted concentration proposal. The subtasks were chosen to mimic tasks library liaisons would complete in a review process as well as general tasks to test the efficiency and functionality of Curriculog’s features.

The five participants clicked the “Proposals” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane to begin the task (Figure 15.2). The five participants then clicked “Energy Infrastructure” proposal from the left pane (Figure 15.3). When the participants clicked “Course Revision: Undergraduate/Graduate,” the right pane of the page updates with the process summary of the proposal and highlights the proposal name in the left pane (Figure 15.4). The participants looked at the widget options for the proposal, but did see any relevant to reviewing the proposal. All five participants needed guidance from the facilitator to start the review process of the proposal. The facilitator guided the six participants to click the “Edit Proposal” widget (Figure 15.5). The six participants commented that the word edit was confusing and misleading for reviewing a proposal that has already been submitted by an originator. In addition, the participants commented that their role is to review not to edit.

![Figure 15.2](image-url)
After starting the approval process the five participants were asked to turn on the help text. Four of the five participants completed the task on their first attempt. The four participants immediately hovered the “i” widget in the upper right of the proposal’s left pane and saw “Show Help Text,” the participant then clicked the widget (Figure 15.6). One of the four participants commented that widget symbol
should be a “?” instead of the “i” to be more intuitive to users to represent help and not the universal symbol for information.

![Figure 15.6](image1.png)

The remaining participant clicked the “i” icon in the upper right corner of the interface (Figure 15.7). When the participants clicked the icon, the “Curriculog Help” key opened (Figure 15.8). The participant thought that they had completed the task.
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b. **What are the concentrations core courses?**

   i. *Add course CEGR 5126, “Codes, Loads, and Nodes” to the curriculum.*

The five participants were asked to add a course to the proposal’s curriculum and then print the concentration’s curriculum with mark-ups. Library Liaisons will not be completing this task in their role in the curriculum change process.
The five participants located the “Building Programs” section of the proposal. Three of the five participants had a difficult time locating this information, and looked over it several times. One of the three participants used the keyboard shortcut “CTRL+F” to search the proposal for “curriculum.” Three of the five participants clicked “Add Course” (Figure 15.9) and a secondary page appeared (Figure 16.1). The participants filled out the prefix, code, and name for CEGR 5126 and then clicked “Add Course” (Figure 16.2). Two of three participants commented that the terminology used was confusing. The suggested code become number and the labeling are consistent with the terms used in Acalog, the academic catalog. The remaining two participants clicked “Import Course” (Figure 16.3) and a secondary window appeared titled, “Import Data into Your Proposal” (Figure 16.4), the two participants clicked the graduate catalog. The two participants then used the drop-down to select prefix, searched “CEGR,” and clicked “Search Available Curriculum” (Figure 16.5). The two participants then looked through the results, selected “CEGR 5126,” and clicked “Add to Courses to Proposal” (Figure 16.6).
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ii. *Print curriculum with mark-ups.*

The five participants were asked to print the Energy Infrastructure Concentration’s curriculum with mark-ups. Four of the five participants completed the task successfully.

Four of the five participants clicked the “preview curriculum” icon, one of the three icons listed under the curriculum subheading (*Figure 16.7*). The four participants then click the red pencil icon “Show Curriculum Preview with Markup” (*Figure 16.8*), the participants then click the print icon to complete the subtask. The remaining participant could not locate the print option for the curriculum, but scrolled to the top of the proposal and clicked the print icon in the upper right of the left pane (*Figure 16.9*).
c. **Indicate that the holdings are “inadequate.”**

   i. **Provide the following reasoning:**

      1. **“Usability Test”**

The five participants were asked to indicate that the library’s holdings for the Energy Infrastructure Concentration as inadequate. The subject librarian’s role in the approval process will be to evaluate the holdings and provide a summary of those holdings. All five participants completed the task successfully. The five participants scrolled through the proposal until they reached the last section “To be completed by the Subject Librarian” (*Figure 17.1*). The five participants selected the “Holdings are inadequate” radio button. The five participants then typed “Usability Test” into the “Librarian’s Comment” section to complete the subtask. One participant commented that this section should not be within the proposal and that other user groups should not have access to this section.
d. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.

The five participants were asked to show how they would approve the Energy Infrastructure Concentration proposal and send it on to the next reviewer. The subject librarians in every proposal will complete this subtask. All five participants completed this subtask. All five participants looked for a way to approve the proposal under their section, which was the last section of the proposal. When the five participants could not locate a way to approve the proposal at the bottom of the proposal they scrolled to the top dashboard. The participants looked through the icons in the left pane and then the right pane. The five participants clicked the “Decisions” icon in the proposal’s dashboard in the right pane. The participants then selected the “Approve” radio button and then say they would click the “Make My Decision” widget (Figure 17.2).
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**Task 4: Begin the review process for GEOG-4600-Geography Professional Seminar proposal.**

b. Change “Have electronic textbooks, textbook rentals, or the buyback program been considered and adopted?” to no.
c. View the Geography Professional Seminar’s syllabus.
d. Indicate that the holdings are adequate.
e. Ensure your edits have been applied by viewing the current proposal with markup (edits will appear in red).

f. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.

The task was designed to determine if users could begin the review process for submitted Energy Infrastructure concentration proposal. All five participants completed the task and the subtasks. To complete this task, participants must demonstrate a successful technique for each sub-task. This task requires the participants to complete multiple steps to review a submitted concentration proposal. The subtasks were chosen to mimic tasks library liaisons would complete in a review process as well as general tasks to test the efficiency and functionality of Curriculog’s features.

The three of the five participants clicked the “My Tasks” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane to begin the task (Figure 17.3). The three participants then clicked “GEOG-4600-Geography Professional Seminar” proposal from the left pane (Figure 17.4). When the participant clicked the proposal the right pane of the page updates with the process summary of the proposal and highlights the proposal name in the left pane. The participants looked at the widget options for the proposal and click the “Edit Proposal” icon. Two of the five participants clicked “My Proposals” from the left pane navigation and are directed to the “My Proposals” page, which has no results. The two participants then click “My Tasks” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane. The two participants then clicked “GEOG-4600-Geography Professional Seminar” proposal from the left pane. The participants looked at the widget options for the proposal and click the “Edit Proposal” icon.
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b. **Change “Have electronic textbooks, textbook rentals, or the buyback program been considered and adopted?” to no.**

The five participants were asked to edit the electronic textbook, textbook rentals, or the buyback program been considered and adopted section to no. All five participants completed the task successfully. Library liaisons will not complete this task in their role in the approval process. Four of the five participants looked through the proposal and located the subsection under the “Resources required to support proposal” section. It is noted that two of the four participants looked over the section several times before locating it. The four participants clicked the radio button “No.” The four participants had to click the radio button twice for the option to select and save. The remaining participant used the keyboard shortcut “CTRL+F” to search “textbook” to locate the correct section. The participant clicked the “No” radio button twice to save their response and to complete the subtask.

c. **View the Geography Professional Seminar’s syllabus.**

The five participants were asked to locate and the proposal’s syllabus. All five participants completed the task successfully. The library liaisons most likely will review a proposal’s syllabus in the approval process, to determine if the library’s holdings are adequate. All five of the participants looked for the syllabus within in the proposal. Three of the five participants thought the syllabus would be near the curriculum. The five participants eventually
clicked the “Files” widget in the proposal’s right pane navigation (*Figure 17.5*). The participants then clicked the syllabus attachment. One participant commented that the widget image should be changed to a paperclip, because the paperclip is what they are used to representing attachments.

![Proposal Toolbox](image)

*Figure 17.5*

d. **Indicate that the holdings are adequate.**

The five participants were asked to inadequate that the library’s holdings for the Geography Professional Seminar’s proposal as adequate. The subject librarian’s role in the approval process will be to evaluate the holdings and provide a summary of those holdings. All five participants completed the task with ease. The five participants scrolled to the bottom of the proposal until they reached the last section “To be completed by the Subject Librarian” (*Figure 17.6*). The five participants selected the “Holdings are adequate” radio button to complete the task.

![To be completed by the Subject Librarian](image)

*Figure 17.6*

e. **Ensure your edits have been applied by viewing the current proposal with markup (edits will appear in red).**

The five participants were asked to view the current proposal with markups to ensure their edits were made. Only one of the five participants completed the task. Library Liaisons may use this feature for their individual use.

Three of the four participants that did not complete the task successfully looked through the features in the navigation and turned on the help text. The
participants read through the help text and did not see anything related to the task. The participants looked through the proposal for several minutes before asking the facilitator to move onto the next task. One of the four participants that did not complete the task left the proposal page by clicking “My Tasks” in the left pane navigation.

The one successful participant clicked the “User Tracking” icon in the proposal’s right pane navigation. The participant then selected “Show current with markup” from the dropdown (Figure 17.7). The participant then scrolled through the proposal to ensure that the markups were shown.

f. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.

The five participants were asked to show how they would approve the Geography Professional Seminar’s proposal and send it on to the next reviewer. The subject librarians in every proposal will complete this subtask. All five participants completed this subtask. The five participants clicked the “Make my Decision” icon in the proposal’s dashboard in the right pane (Figure 17.8).

Task 5: Add GEOG-4600-Geography Professional Seminar proposal to your watch list.

The five participants were asked to add the Geography Professional Seminar proposal to their watch list. All five participants completed this task. The five participants clicked “My Tasks” from the left pane navigation (Figure 17.9). The participants then clicked the Geography Professional Seminar proposal and then clicked the star (Add to watch list) icon to complete the
task (Figure 18.1). Four of the five participants then clicked “Watch List” from the left pane’s navigation to ensure the task was completed.
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**Figure 17.9**

**Figure 18.1**

**Task 6: How would you generate a report for the number of new programs revisions you have completed for the college of engineering?**

The five participants were asked to generate a report to include the number of new program revisions they had completed for the College of Engineering. Only one of the five participants completed this task, it is noted that the successful participant did not complete the task with ease. Three of the five participants clicked “Reports” in the interface’s main navigation (Figure 18.2). The three participants looked through the different options of detail reports, proposal detail report, proposal progress report, impact report, and historical change report. The three participants clicked “Proposal Detail Report” from the left pane and looked at the options in the right pane (Figure 18.3). Two of the three participants were overwhelmed by the options and asked the facilitator to move onto the next task. The remaining participant selected the “College of Engineering” from the “Found Under” dropdown and then selected “Program Revision: Undergraduate/Graduate from the “Process Type” dropdown (Figure 18.4). The participant then checks “Completed” in the “Proposal Status” (Figure 18.5). To complete the task, the participant clicked “Submit Report” at the bottom of the right pane. When the participant submitted, a secondary window appeared asking the participant to confirm the submission (Figure 18.6). The remaining two participants looked through the interface, did not see anything relevant, and then asked the facilitator to
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**Figure 18.2**
move on to the next task.
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Reviewers

Task 1: Log into Curriculog.

The task was designed to determine if users could locate where to login to Curriculog. The participants were given a predetermined username and passwords to login with. All five reviewers completed the task successfully. To complete this task, participants must locate where and how to login from Curriculog’s homepage. Three of the five participants did not locate the login at first glance.

The participant’s began the task on the homepage of Curriculog (Figure 18.7). Several different approaches were taken to complete the task. Two of the five participants clicked “Login” immediately, located in the upper right of homepage (Figure 18.8). The participants then entered the given credentials (Figure 18.9) to complete the task. One of the two participants commented that login widget is very small.
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Three of the five participants did not locate the login widget at first glance. The three participants looked in the middle of the homepage for a login widget under the “You must be logged in to view proposals” statement (Figure 19.1). The three participants then looked “Login” located in the upper right of homepage (Figure 19.2). The participants then entered the given credentials (Figure 19.3) to complete the task. The three participants all commented on the location and the size of login widget. The participants commented that the widget could be larger and in a different color that would stand out better. One participant commented that the login should be by the phrase “you must be logged in to view proposals.”
Task 2: Send Rachael Winterling a message about the “NURS-6160- Research in Nursing and Health Professions” proposal stating, “will review by the end of the week.”

This task was designed to determine if users could efficiently locate and use Curriculog’s internal messaging feature. All five participants completed the task. None of the participants completed the task on their first attempt. This task requires participants to complete multiple steps to send an internal message about a specific proposal. This task requires participants to navigate to the internal message system, locate the recipient’s name, and send a message.

The five participants began the task by clicking “My Tasks” in the left pane navigation (Figure 19.4). The five participants clicked the “NURS-6100-Research in Nursing and Health Professions” proposal, and the right pane refreshed to show the process summary. The four participants moved the cursor over the different icons by the proposal’s name, until they saw the mail icon. The four participants clicked the mail icon and were directed to a messaging page (Figure 19.5). All five participants attempted to click the “To:” section, which did not do anything. This section stated, “Click the email icon next to the user you want to add to this
message” (Figure 19.6). Two of the five participants looked through the first page of names and clicked the “Next 10” widget and repeated this process for several pages before determining and alternate search route. The two participants then clicked the “W” from the A-Z list at the top of the left pane (Figure 19.7). The two participants looked through the first page of results and had to click the “Next 10” widget six times to reach the correct recipients names. The two participants then click the name which highlights in blue and then click the mail icon, that when hovered over “Add to Message” (Figure 19.8). After, the participants clicked the mail, the right pane, “Send Personal Message” has updated to include the recipient’s name in the “To:” field (Figure 19.9). The two participants’ add, “Will review by the end of the week” to the message’s text and then click “Send Message.” The remaining three participants immediately clicked the “W” from the A-Z list at the top of the left pane. The three participants looked through the first page of results and had to click the “Next 10” widget six times to reach the correct recipients names. The three participants then click the name which highlights in blue and then click the mail icon, that when hovered over “Add to Message”. After, the participants clicked the mail, the right pane; “Send Personal Message” has updated to include the recipient’s name in the “To:” field. The two participants’ add, “Will review by the end of the week” to the message’s text and then click “Send Message.”
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*Figure 19.4*
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Task 3: Begin the review process for NURS-6160- Research in Nursing and Health Professions proposal.

a. Turn on the help text.
b. How many credit hours is the proposed course?
c. Update the course’s grading mode to be standard.
d. Edit the courses instructional method to reflect distance learning.
e. Ensure your edits have been applied by viewing the current proposal with markup (edits will appear in red).
f. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.

The task was designed to determine if users could begin the review process for submitted for the Research in Nursing and Health Professionals proposal. All five participants completed the task and the subtasks. To complete this task, participants must demonstrate a successful technique for each sub-task. This task requires the participants to complete multiple steps to review a submitted graduate course proposal. The subtasks were chosen to mimic tasks reviewers would complete in a review process as well as general tasks to test the efficiency and functionality of Curriculog’s features.

The five participants clicked the “My Tasks” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane to begin the task (Figure 20.1). The five participants then clicked “NURS-6160-Research in Nursing and Health Professionals” proposal from the left pane (Figure 20.2). When the participant clicked the proposal the right pane of the page updates with the process summary of the proposal and highlights the proposal name in the left pane. The participants looked at the widget options for the proposal and do not see any options relevant to reviewing. The facilitator had to give guidance to the five participants to click the “Edit Proposal” widget (Figure 20.3). All five participants commented that “edit proposal” was not intuitive to their role in the approval process. Their role is to review proposals not to edit them.
a. *Turn on the help text.*

After starting the approval process the five participants were asked to turn on the help text. Three of the five of the participants completed the task successfully. The three successful participants completed the task on their first attempt. The three participants immediately hovered the “i” widget in the upper right of the proposals left pane and saw “Show Help Text,” the participant then clicked the widget (*Figure 20.4*). One of the three participants commented that widget symbol should be a “?” instead of the “i” to be more intuitive to users to represent help and not the universal symbol for information.

![Image](image_url)

*Figure 20.4*

The remaining two participants looked through the process summary in the right pane and did not see anywhere to turn on the help text. After the participants looked for several minutes, they asked the facilitator to move on to the next task.

b. *How many credit hours is the proposed course?*

The five participants were asked to locate and review the proposed course’s credit hours. Reviewers will review this information during the review process. All five participants completed the task successfully. Two different techniques were used to complete the task.

Four of the five participants scrolled through the proposal and read off the “Credit Hours*” subsection under the “Course Content” section (*Figure 20.5*). The remaining participant found the credit hours in the process summary in the right pane of the “My Tasks.” One participant commented that it would be more intuitive if the options were a drop-down not a manual fill in.

![Image](image_url)

*Figure 20.5*
c. **Update the course’s grading mode to be standard.**

The five participants were asked to edit the course’s grading mode to be standard. The reviewer user group could edit in the proposal to suggest changes to the originator before approving the proposal. The five participants locate the “Grade Mode*” subsection in the “New Course Content” section. The participants click “Add Item” (Figure 20.7) and a secondary window appears. The five participants then click “Standard Letter (A, B, C, D, F)” and then click done (Figure 20.8) to complete the task. The proposal’s grade mode is reflected as “S-Standard Letter (A, B, C, D, F) (Figure 20.9).

![Figure 20.7](image)
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![Figure 20.9](image)

d. **Edit the course’s instructional method to reflect distance learning.**

The five participants were asked to edit the course’s instructional method to distance learning. The reviewer user group could edit in the proposal to suggest changes to the originator before approving the proposal. The five participants locate the “Instructional Method*” subsection in the “New Course Content” section. The
participants click “Add Item” (Figure 21.1) and a secondary window appears. The five participants then click “Online Instruction (100% online)” and then click done to complete the task (Figure 21.2). The proposal’s grade mode is reflected as “Online Instruction (100% online) (Figure 21.3).
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e. Ensure your edits have been applied by viewing the current proposal with markup (edits will appear in red).

The five participants were asked to view the current proposal with markups to ensure their edits were made. Three of the five participants completed the task. Reviewers may use this feature for their individual use.

The three successful participants clicked the “User Tracking” icon in the proposal’s right pane navigation. The participant then selected “Show current with markup” from the dropdown.

![Figure 21.4](image)
The participant then scrolled through the proposal to ensure that the markups were shown.

The two participants that did not complete the task successfully looked through the features in the navigation and turned on the help text. The participants read through the help text and did not see anything related to the task. The participants looked through the proposal for several minutes before asking the facilitator to move onto the next task.

**f. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.**

The five participants were asked to show how they would approve the NURS-6160-Research in Nursing and Health Professions proposal and send it on to the next reviewer. The reviewers in every proposal will complete this subtask. All five participants completed this subtask. All five participants looked for a way to approve the proposal at bottom of the proposal. When the five participants could not locate a way to approve the proposal at the bottom of the proposal they scrolled to the top dashboard. The participants looked through the icons in the left pane and then the right pane. The five participants clicked the “Decisions” icon in the proposal’s dashboard in the right pane. The participants then selected the “Approve” radio button and then say they would click the “Make My Decision” widget (Figure 21.5).

**Task 4: Log out of Curriculog.**

The five participants were asked to log out of Curriculog. All five participants completed the task with ease. The five participants click the user name in the upper right corner of the navigation (Figure 23.6) and a drop down appears with the options to view the user’s settings or to logout. The five participants click “Logout” to complete the task.
**Task 5: Log into Curriculog.**

The task was designed to determine if users could locate where to login to Curriculog. The participants were given a predetermined username and passwords to login with. All five reviewers completed the task with ease. To complete this task, participants must locate where and how to login from Curriculog’s homepage.

The participants began the task on the homepage of Curriculog (*Figure 23.7*). The five participants clicked “Login” immediately, located in the upper right of homepage (*Figure 23.8*). The participants then entered the given credentials (*Figure 23.9*) to complete the task.

*Figure 23.7*

*Figure 23.8*
Task 6: Begin the review process for the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S., program revision proposal.

The task was designed to determine if users could begin the review process for submitted for the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S., proposal. All five participants completed the task and the subtasks. To complete this task, participants must demonstrate a successful technique for each sub-task. This task requires the participants to complete multiple steps to review a submitted undergraduate concentration proposal. The subtasks were chosen to mimic tasks reviewers would complete in a review process as well as general tasks to test the efficiency and functionality of Curriculog’s features.

The five participants clicked the “My Tasks” widget in the upper left corner of the left pane to begin the task (Figure 24.1). The five participants then clicked “Economics, Business Concentration, B.S.” proposal from the left pane. When the participant clicked the proposal, the right pane of the page updates with the process summary of the proposal and highlights the proposal name in the left pane. The five participants clicked the “Edit Proposal” widget (Figure 24.2).

a. What revision does the originator propose to be made to the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S. program?

The five participants were asked to locate and review the proposed course’s credit hours. Reviewers will review this information during the review process. All five participants completed the task successfully. Two different techniques were used to complete the task.
Four of the five participants scrolled through the proposal and read off the “Brief statement as to why the change being proposed: *” subsection under the “Course Content” section to complete the task; the section states, “The department requests MGMT 3143 be added to the Economics, Business Concentration.” The remaining participant found the proposed change in the process summary in the right pane of the “My Tasks” to complete the subtask.

b. Besides the Economics department, what other department will be affected by the proposed revision?

The five participants were asked to identify the academic departments that will be affected by the proposed course revision. All five participants completed the task successfully. Reviewers will view this information in the approval process. All course revision proposals have to include an impact report and letters from the department’s that will be affected. The five participants viewed pasted consultations in the “consultations, resources, and documentation” section (Figure 24.3). The department of management wrote a memo to approve the proposed change.

c. What are the concentrations core courses?
   i. Add course MKTG 3228, “Marketing Analytics” to the curriculum.
   ii. Print curriculum with mark-ups.

   The five participants were asked to add a course to the proposal’s curriculum and then print the curriculum with mark-ups. Reviewers will not be completing this task in their role in the curriculum change process.

   The five participants located the “Building Programs” section of the proposal. Four of the five participants had a difficult time locating this information, and looked over it several times. One of the four participants used the keyboard shortcut “CTRL+F” to search the proposal for “curriculum.” Four of the five participants clicked “Add Course” (Figure 24.4) and a secondary page appeared (Figure 24.5). The participants filled
out the prefix, code, and name for MKTG 3228 and then clicked “Add Course” (Figure 24.6). Three of the four participants commented that the terminology used was confusing. The suggested code become number and the labeling be consistent with the terms used in Acalog, the academic catalog. The remaining participant clicked “Import Course” (Figure 24.7) and a secondary window appeared titled, “Import Data into Your Proposal” (Figure 24.8), the two participants clicked the undergraduate catalog. The participant then used the drop-down to select prefix and searched “MKTG” and clicked “Search Available Curriculum” (Figure 24.9). The two participants then looked through the results and selected “MKTG 3228” and clicked “Add to Curriculum”.

![Figure 24.4](image)
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iii. *Print curriculum with mark-ups.*

The five participants were asked to view the current Economics, Business Concentration, B.S proposal with markups to ensure their edits were made.
Only one of the five participants completed the task. Reviewers may use this feature for their individual use.

Three of the five participants that did not complete the task successfully. The participants looked through the proposal and dashboard options and did not see anything related to the task. The participants looked through the proposal for several minutes before asking the facilitator to move onto the next task.

The two successful participants clicked the “User Tracking” icon in the proposal’s right pane navigation. The participant then selected “Show current with markup” from the dropdown (Figure 30.1). The participant then scrolled through the proposal to ensure that the markups were shown.

d. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.

The five participants were asked to show how they would approve the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S., program revision proposal and send it on to the next reviewer. The reviewers in every proposal will complete this subtask. All five participants completed this subtask. The five participants clicked the “Make my Decision” icon in the proposal’s dashboard in the right pane (Figure 30.2).

**Task 7: Add the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S. proposal to your watch list.**

The five participants were asked to add the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S. proposal to their watch list. All five participants completed this task. The five participants clicked “My Tasks” from the left pane navigation (Figure 30.3). The participants then clicked the Economics,
Business Concentration, B.S. proposal and then clicked the star (Add to watch list) icon to complete the task. When the participants clicked the star, it filled in with blue. Three of the five participants clicked “Watch List” (Figure 30.4) from the left pane navigation to ensure the task was completed.

Figure 30.3

Figure 30.4

Conclusion
The Curriculog usability study focused on the effectiveness, efficiency, error tolerance, engagement, and ease of use of the electronic curriculum approval process through the analysis of common tasks associated with three of the ten forms. Although limited in scope, the study revealed opportunities for improvement to the electronic course approval system to improve the targeted participant groups’ experience with the system. In addition, the study identifies opportunities for further studies such as a deeper study of the seven forms that were not included in this initial study, forms’ content, and site navigation and hierarchy of the system.

The study concludes that participants had difficulty completing the tasks initially, but with some guidance and further clarification from the facilitator, the participants eventually could complete the task. The three participant groups utilized the current short form and the long form curriculum approval process frequently each semester; the types of proposals varied from each semester. Participants experience with the paper process varied from none to twenty years. None of the participants had experience with Curriculog.

Targeting training and tutorials for the three participant groups will ensure a successful implementation and adoption of Curriculog for the upcoming academic year. To further the effectiveness of Curriculog, training documentation should be made available for users before Curriculog is launched. Orientation training and tutorials should focus on the specific participant groups’ roles in the curriculum approval process. In addition, orientation training and tutorials should address the issues uncovered and the recommendations in this initial study and should be made available to users before the fall 2015 launch. If the recommendations cannot be made prior to the fall 2015 launch they should be addressed in training and additional instruction should be provided to the users.

The following recommendations need to be addressed:
  - Ensure the login widget is visible.
• Condense the information within the forms or break the information into defined sections.
• Create training and instructions to distinguish the difference between the “Add” feature and the “Import” feature.
• Improve the import search function to ensure efficiency, effectiveness, and engagement.
• Create training and tutorial videos for the “Edit Proposal” feature.
• Add a search function to the “personal message” feature.

The University of North Carolina Charlotte adopted Curriculog, the academic program and course approval system to “simplify the process of curricular change and create efficiencies for faculty committees” (Acalog and Curriculog Implementation at UNC Charlotte) from the current short form and long form paper based curriculum approval process. To ensure this goal, usability testing should be conducted on Acalog on a regular basis to ensure continued functionality, efficiency, and desirability.
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Appendix A

Procedures to Implement Major Changes (Long Form)

Examples of major changes can include:

**Undergraduate:** Major changes include new undergraduate degrees, minors, concentrations, certificates, and changes to more than 50% of an existing program

**Graduate:** Major changes include new graduate courses, major changes to an existing graduate course or major changes to an existing graduate program

---

**Approval Process for Long Form (routing procedures):**

1. Originating department needs to initiate consultation with library and other affected departments (and with Honors Council if proposal involves Honors courses or programs)
2. Within two weeks library returns Consultation on Library Holdings form
3. Follow all departmental review procedures (as appropriate)
4. Originator – Sign and date all original forms/sheets, forward to Dept. Chair for approval (NOTE: paper AND electronic copies are necessary)
5. Dept. Chair – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved. Forward to Chair of the College Curriculum Committee.
6. Chair of the College Curriculum Committee – Brings forward to Course and Curriculum Committee for review, sign and date signature sheet if approved, forward to College Faculty Chair (if applicable) for approval
7. College Faculty Chair (if applicable) – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved. Forward to College Dean.

**Undergraduate Proposals Only:**

8. College Dean (or designee) – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved. Does the proposal have implications for General Education and/or involve Honors courses or Honors programs?
• If YES to General Education: College Dean forward to the chair of the University College Faculty Council. Chair of the University College Faculty Council – brings forward to the University College Faculty Council for review, sign and date signature sheet if approved, forward via email to Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs and via campus mail to Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese
• If YES to Honors: College Dean forward to the Executive Director of the Honors College. The Executive Director of the Honors College reviews, signs and dates signature sheet if approved, forwards via email to Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs and via campus mail to Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese
• If YES to both: College Dean forward to the chair of the University College Faculty Council. The Faculty Governance Assistant will ensure that it goes to the Executive Director of the Honors College after approval by the University College Faculty Council.
• If NO: College Dean forward via email to Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs and via campus mail to Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese

9. Faculty Governance Assistant logs proposal, verifies proposal is complete, and forwards to Chair of the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee
10. Chair of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee will bring forward to Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee for review and either:
   • A. Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved, and forward the proposal to the Faculty Governance Assistant; OR
   • B. If revisions are required, contact the originator
11. Faculty Governance Assistant will place the proposal on the Faculty Council Consent Calendar.
   • If two weeks after the Consent Calendar is sent out there are no comments from faculty, a memorandum will be sent notifying the College Dean (or designee) that the proposal has been approved. A copy of the memorandum is posted on the Academic Affairs web page and is sent to relevant faculty and staff (e.g. department chair, advisors, Office of the Registrar, University Catalog, etc.)
   • If within two weeks after the Consent Calendar is sent out there are comment(s) from faculty, the proposal will be placed on the agenda for the next Faculty Council meeting as a motion for discussion and vote.

Graduate Proposals Only:

8. College Dean (or designee) – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved.
   • College Dean forwards to Chair of Graduate Council.
9. Chair of Graduate Council will bring forward to Graduate Council for review and either:
   • A. Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved, and forward the proposal to Executive Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School, 210 Cato Hall; OR
   • B. If revisions are required, contact the originator
10. Executive Assistant to the Dean logs the approved proposal and sends it on to the Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese
11. Faculty Governance Assistant will place the proposal on the Faculty Council Consent Calendar.
   • If two weeks after the Consent Calendar is sent out there are no comments from faculty, a memorandum will be sent notifying the College Dean (or designee) that the proposal has been approved. A copy of the memorandum is posted on the Academic Affairs web page and is sent to relevant faculty and staff (e.g. department chair, advisors, Office of the Registrar, University Catalog, etc.)
   • If within two weeks after the Consent Calendar is sent out there are comment(s) from faculty, the proposal will be placed on the agenda for the next Faculty Council meeting as a motion for discussion and vote.
### Materials:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Long Form and Signature Sheet (required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Consultation on Library Holdings (required)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Graduate Long Form Checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Boiler Plate for New/Revised Graduate Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>&quot;W&quot; and/or &quot;O&quot; Designation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>&quot;SL&quot; Designation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Report Template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Academic Plan of Study Instructions for Undergraduate Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Academic Plan of Study Template for Undergraduate Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Course Numbering Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Flow Chart for Major Changes - Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Flow Chart for Major Changes - Graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional questions can be directed to the [Faculty Governance Assistant](mailto:faculty.governance@university.edu) who will, as needed, forward them to the appropriate chair.

### Procedures to Implement Minor Changes (Short Form)

Examples of minor changes can include:

**Undergraduate:** Minor changes include new undergraduate courses, course numbering, change in pre-requisites, editorial changes to course description, and/or minor program changes

**Graduate:** Minor changes include course numbering, change in pre-requisites, editorial changes to course description, and/or minor program changes
Approval Process for Short Form (routing procedures):

1. Originating department needs to initiate consultation with library and other affected departments (and with Honors Council if proposal involves Honors courses or programs)
2. Within two weeks library returns Consultation on Library Holdings form (applies to new course only)
3. Follow all departmental review procedures (as appropriate)
4. Originator – Sign and date all original forms/sheets, forward to Dept. Chair for approval (NOTE: paper AND electronic copies are necessary)
5. Dept. Chair – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved. Dept. Chair forward to Chair of the College Curriculum Committee for approval.
6. Chair of the College Curriculum Committee – Brings forward to Course and Curriculum Committee for review, sign and date signature sheet if approved, forward to College Dean (or designee) for approval

Undergraduate Proposals Only:

7. College Dean (or designee) – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved. Does the proposal have implications for General Education and/or involve Honors courses or Honors programs?
   - If YES to General Education: College Dean forwards to the chair of the University College Faculty Council. Chair of the University College Faculty Council – brings forward to the University College Faculty Council for review, sign and date signature sheet if approved, forwards via email to the Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs, and via campus mail at: Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese
   - If YES to Honors: College Dean forwards to the Executive Director of the Honors College. The Executive Director of the Honors College reviews, signs and dates signature sheet if approved, forwards via email to the Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs, and via campus mail at: Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese
   - If YES to both: College Dean forwards to the chair of the University College Faculty Council. The Faculty Governance Assistant will ensure that it goes to the Executive Director of the Honors College after approval by the University College Faculty Council.
   - If NO: College Dean forwards via email to the Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs, and via campus mail at: Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese
8. Faculty Governance Assistant logs proposal, verifies proposal is complete, and forwards to Chair of the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee
9. Chair of the Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Committee will either:
   - A. Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved, and forward the proposal to the Faculty Governance Assistant; OR
   - B. If revisions are required, contact the originator
10. Faculty Governance Assistant sends an approval memo to appropriate parties

Graduate Proposals Only:

7. College Dean (or designee) – Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved.
   - College Dean forwards to the Chair of Graduate Council.
8. Chair of Graduate Council will either:
   - A. Review proposal, sign and date signature sheet if approved, and forward the proposal to the Executive Assistant to the Dean; OR
B. If revisions are required, contact the originator

9. Executive Assistant to the Dean logs approved proposal and forwards via email to the Faculty Governance Assistant in Office of Academic Affairs, and via campus mail at: Faculty Governance Assistant, Office of Academic Affairs, 501 Reese

10. Faculty Governance Assistant sends an approval memo to appropriate parties

---

### Materials for Existing Courses:

1. Short Form and Signature Sheet (required)  
2. "W" and/or "O" Designation Form  
3. "W" and "O" Best Practices  
4. "SL" Designation Form  
5. Flow Chart for Minor Changes - Undergraduate  
6. Flow Chart for Minor Changes - Graduate

### Materials for New Courses:

1. Short Form and Signature Sheet (required)  
2. Consultation on Library Holdings (required)  
3. "W" and/or "O" Designation Form  
4. "W" and "O" Best Practices  
5. "SL" Designation Form  
6. Course Numbering Policy  
7. Flow Chart for Minor Changes - Undergraduate  
8. Flow Chart for Minor Changes - Graduate

► Additional questions can be directed to the Faculty Governance Assistant who will, as needed, forward them to the appropriate chair.

---

**Appendix B**

**Originator Task List**

*Pre-test questions*
1. What is your primary role in the curriculum change process?
2. How often do you perform that role?
3. How long have you been performing that role?
4. What task do you predominantly perform?

**Task List**

2. Log into Curriculog:
   a. Username: rwinterl@uncc.edu
   b. Password: curriculog
3. Begin the following proposal, “Testing--Course Revision: Graduate/Undergraduate.”
   a. Turn on the help text
   b. Import the following graduate course, NURS 6160 Research in Nursing and Health Professions.
   c. Generate an impact report for the course and copy it into the proposal.
   d. Designate the School of Nursing as the school the proposal is originating from.
   e. Who is the first person that will review the proposal after it has been submitted by you.
   f. Add NURS 6101 Theoretical Basis for Nursing practice as a prerequisite course.
   g. Request the proposed course revision become effective term Fall 2016
   h. You have completed your proposal, how would you print a copy of it for your records.
4. Begin the following proposal, “Testing-- New Program: Graduate/Undergraduate (including major, minors, concentrations, and undergraduate certificates).”
   a. Propose that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the College of Computing and Informatics add the following undergraduate minor, “User Experience.”
   b. Import the following courses to the User Experience curriculum:
      i. ENGL 4182: Information Design and Digital Publishing
      ii. ITIS 3130: Human-Computer Interaction
   c. Attach the following file to your proposal from Local Disk (C:), User Experience, Supporting Documents.
5. You have decided not to submit the User Experience minor proposal, how would you delete it.

**Post-Test Questions**

1. Were there tasks as an originator that were not covered in this session?
2. What feature was the most useful/helpful?
3. Are there any functions that should be added to aid the curriculum change process?
4. Is there anything you would like to see improved?
5. Do you have any additional comments?

Library Liaison Task List

Pre-test questions

1. What is your primary role?
2. How often do you perform that role?
3. How long have you been performing that role?
4. What task do predominantly perform?

Task List

2. Log into Curriculog:
   a. Username: jmcadam3@uncc.edu
   b. Password: curriculog
3. Send Rachael Winterling a message about the Energy Infrastructure Concentration proposal stating that, “will review by the end of the week.”
4. Begin the review process for Energy Infrastructure concentration proposal.
   a. Turn on the help text.
   b. What are the concentrations core courses?
      i. Add course CEGR 5126, “Codes, Loads, and Nodes” to the curriculum.
      ii. Print curriculum with mark-ups.
   c. Indicate that the holdings are “inadequate.”
      i. Provide the following reasoning:
         1. “Usability Test”
   d. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.
5. Begin the review process for GEOG-4600-Geography Professional Seminar proposal.
   a. Change “Have electronic textbooks, textbook rentals, or the buyback program been considered and adopted?” to no.
   b. View the Geography Professional Seminar’s syllabus.
   c. Indicate that the holdings are adequate.
   d. Ensure your edits have been applied by viewing the current proposal with markup (edits will appear in red).
   e. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.
6. Add GEOG-4600-Geography Professional Seminar proposal to your watch list.
7. How would you generate a report for the number of new programs revisions you have completed for the college of engineering?

Post-Test Questions

1. Were there tasks as a subject librarian that were not covered in this session?
2. What feature was the most useful/helpful?
3. Are there any functions that should be added to aid the curriculum change process?
4. Is there anything you would like to see improved?
5. Do you have any additional comments?

**Reviewer Task List**

*Pre-test questions*

1. What is your primary role?
2. How often do you perform that role?
3. How long have you been performing that role?
4. What task do you predominantly perform?

**Task List**

e. Log into Curriculog:
   a. Username: dbaldwi5@uncc.edu
   b. Password: curriculog

f. Send Rachael Winterling a message about the “NURS-6160- Research in Nursing and Health Professions” proposal stating, “will review by the end of the week.”

g. Begin the review process for NURS-6160- Research in Nursing and Health Professions proposal.
   a. Turn on the help text.
   b. How many credit hours is the proposed course?
   c. Update the course’s grading mode to be standard.
   d. Edit the courses instructional method to reflect distance learning.
   e. Ensure your edits have been applied by viewing the current proposal with markup (edits will appear in red).
   f. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and send it on to the next reviewer.

h. Log out of Curriculog.

i. Log into Curriculog:
   a. Username: artie.zillante@uncc.edu
   b. Password: curriculog

j. Begin the review process for the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S., program revision proposal.
   a. What revision does the originator propose to be made to the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S. program?
   b. Besides the Economics department, what other department will be affected by the proposed revision?
   c. What are the concentrations core courses?
      i. Add course MKTG 3228, “Marketing Analytics” to the curriculum.
ii. Print curriculum with mark-ups.
   d. You have completed your evaluation, how would you approve the proposal and
      send it on to the next reviewer.
   k. Add the Economics, Business Concentration, B.S. proposal to your watch list.

Post-Test Questions

1. Were there tasks as a reviewer that were not covered in this session?
2. What feature was the most useful/helpful?
3. Are there any functions that should be added to aid the curriculum change process?
4. Is there anything you would like to see improved?
5. Do you have any additional comments?