

Queens College, Faculty Committee on Renumbering

Junyong Choi, Chemistry and Biochemistry

Grace Davie, History

Leslee Grey, Secondary Education and Youth Services

Regine Joseph, European Languages and Literatures

Executive Summary:

The following Resolution on Course Renumbering reflects a wide swath of faculty perspectives. It also represents this Committee's best attempt to present well-informed recommendations to the Academic Senate and CUNY Board of Trustees on changes needed to QC course architecture. The proposed reforms are based on institutional research, internal Committee deliberations, consultations with the Registrar and representatives from Academic Advising, as well as a 32-question survey sent multiple times to all QC faculty and staff in 2025-2026. The Survey on Course Renumbering included a draft version of the Resolution below. 51 responses were collected. Department chairs were asked to consult with their faculty and their curriculum committees. Individual faculty and staff were also encouraged to share their candid concerns. 28 out of 30 department chairs submitted responses.

For more details on the consultations behind the creation of this Resolution, as well as a number of questions, concerns, and recommendations to college administrators regarding the implementation of these reforms, see the enclosed Report of the Faculty Committee on Course Renumbering. The report analyzes the results of the survey and records the raw data.

Contents

Section I – Resolution on Course Renumbering	2
Section II – Justification	5
Section III – Documentation of Consultations with Faculty and Staff	5
Section V – Original Survey and Raw Data	21
Section VI – Overview of Survey Results	33

Section I – Resolution on Course Renumbering

**Academic Senate of Queens College
&
Board of Trustees of the City University of New York (CUNY)**

**RESOLUTION TO
Renumber All Queens College Courses**

Proposed by the Faculty Committee on Course Renumbering
March 30, 2026

(for questions contact the Committee chair Grace Davie, grace.davie@qc.cuny.edu)

RESOLUTION ON COURSE RENUMBERING

1. WHEREAS, Departmental abbreviations at Queens College currently vary between 3, 4, and 5 letters; and
2. WHEREAS, Many departments have run out of 3-digit course numbers; and
3. WHEREAS Our accrediting body, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, under Standard III, expects a consistent, institution-wide course numbering architecture; and
4. WHEREAS, Students are challenged to navigate the existing course numbering systems across departments; and
5. WHEREAS, Employers have difficulty accurately reading Queens College transcripts, given the lack of consistency in numbering and abbreviation protocols from department to department; and
6. WHEREAS, Conducting regular student outcomes assessments will benefit from the creation of course numbers that mark a progression from introductory to advanced, such that departments can assess the competencies of graduating majors as compared to new majors; and
7. WHEREAS, Current student-facing software interfaces at Queens College do not recognize decimal places in course numbers; and
8. WHEREAS, Renumbering will not change General Education (Pathways) course designations; and
9. WHEREAS, Course renumbering will not change course content, credit hours, or learning outcomes goals; and

10. WHEREAS, Course renumbering will not change degree requirements; and
11. WHEREAS, Anti-requisites can be created, and clearly communicated campus-wide, so that students cannot take the same class twice to satisfy degree requirements; and
12. WHEREAS, Course renumbering can be supported by the provision of crosswalk tables mapping out old course numbers compared to new ones.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

1. RESOLVED, That all Queens College academic units (departments, graduate programs, and professional schools) will henceforth create 4-letter abbreviations, except when exceptions are approved by the Academic Senate; and
2. RESOLVED, That academic units will develop proposals to renumber existing courses using 4 digits only, without decimals (unless the Academic Senate in consultation with the Board of Directors suggests the need for 5 digits); and
3. RESOLVED, That zero-level courses consisting of one or two digits (currently used to indicate courses open to non-majors) will become 1000 level courses or, at the discretion of the Academic Senate, may be renumbered using 4 digits and beginning with 00 or 000; and
4. RESOLVED, That 1000 indicates lower-division undergraduate courses, and departments may use this number to indicate introductory-level courses; and
5. RESOLVED, That 2000 indicates lower-division undergraduate courses, and departments may use this number to indicate intermediate-level courses; and
6. RESOLVED, That 3000 indicates upper-division undergraduate courses, and departments may use this number to indicate advanced-level courses; and
7. RESOLVED, That 4000 indicates upper division undergraduate courses, and departments may use this number to indicate advanced-level courses including capstone courses required for certain majors; and
8. RESOLVED, That 7000 indicates courses open to master's students, professional school students, and accelerated MA students only, with academic units empowered to create courses at the 5000 and 6000 level for their own internal purposes (i.e., to designate courses for post-baccalaureate students or required introductory courses meant to be taken at the start of a program); and
9. RESOLVED, That 8000 shall not be used, as that number indicates doctoral-level courses; and
10. RESOLVED, That academic units have maximum flexibility to use the last 3 digits for their own internal purposes; and
11. RESOLVED, That academic units may continue to use a limited number of alpha letters following course numbers (i.e., W for writing courses), barring the Registrar's

Office and/or other Academic Senate providing a simpler method of designating such courses to students and advisors on electronic platforms; and

12. RESOLVED, That academic units may propose new uses of alpha letters following numbers; however, letters should be used sparingly on the basis of one college-wide Inventory of Course Letters to be defined by the Academic Senate based on the following provisional and recommended inventory: W for Writing Intensive, H for Macaulay Honors courses, and L for lab courses; and

13. RESOLVED, That General Education (Pathways) courses, which are intended to reach a broad audience, will henceforth, with a few exceptions, be coded as introductory 1000-level or 2000-level lower-division courses with limited prerequisites; and

14. RESOLVED, That academic units may submit proposals to eliminate inactive courses and to renumber their entire inventory of active courses after the Resolution is approved by the Academic Senate and CUNY Board of Trustees and the college has provided guidance on how academic units can provide a complete list (i.e., in the form of a table or electronic sheet) of current course numbers and titles alongside new 4-digit course numbers; and

15. RESOLVED, That department chairs will only submit inventories of course numbers after good faith consultations with their department curriculum/program committees and/or faculty whose teaching may be affected by the creation of new course numbers; and

16. RESOLVED, That academic units will receive support from the college that includes, but is not limited to, the timely creation of crosswalk tables that can be circulated in official advising materials, departmental handbooks, and the college course catalog to prevent confusion among advisors and students; and

17. RESOLVED, That all academic units, in addition to submitting proposals to renumber their existing inventory of courses, may submit *separate* proposals for major or minor changes (i.e., to change the requirements of a major or to change a course title) using 4-digit course numbers, with no decimals; and

18. RESOLVED, That all academic units, in addition to submitting proposals to renumber their existing inventory of courses, may submit *separate* proposals to create new courses using 4 digits only, without decimals.

Section II – Justification

There are several important reasons for renumbering all Queens College courses. QC's accrediting body, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, under Standard III, expects a consistent, institution-wide course numbering architecture. However, departmental abbreviations at QC currently vary between 3, 4, and 5 letters. Many departments have run out of 3-digit course numbers and cannot propose new courses. Students are challenged to navigate the existing course numbering systems across departments, and employers have difficulty accurately interpreting Queens College transcripts given the lack of consistency in numbering and abbreviation protocols from department to department.

Among the most important justifications is the fact that this reform will enable departments to align course inventories with learning goals. Having the flexibility to renumber, and to create new courses, will facilitate faculty reflection on requirements, as well as efforts to conduct learning outcomes assessments. Departments will have the ability to create a progression of required courses and thus assess the core competencies of graduating majors compared to new majors. If implemented carefully, and with reasonable flexibility, course renumbering will not take away from existing curricular sequences. Rather, it will give academic units the capacity to design their curricula and requirements based on pedagogical best practices.

The following Resolution on Course Renumbering has been extensively revised to reflect a wide swath of faculty and staff voices. It also represents this Committee's best attempt to make informed recommendations to the college community and to the Academic Senate (which will still need to provide leadership regarding certain aspects of implementation).

Section III – Documentation of Consultations with Faculty and Staff

Background

In Spring 2025, QC's Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program surveyed department chairs on course numbering practices. Based on responses from 21 of 31 departments, the WAC Report on Course Renumbering identified both limited availability of new three-digit course numbers and inconsistency across the college. After reviewing practices at comparable institutions, the WAC recommended adopting a four-digit numbering system in which the first digit consistently reflects course level across all divisions and departments.

In October 2025, Provost Patricia Price convened this four-member Faculty Committee to develop recommendations. Its members are Junyong Choi, Chemistry and Biochemistry;

Grace Davie, History; Leslee Grey, Secondary Education and Youth Services; and Regine Joseph, European Languages and Literatures. Drawing on the institutional research of the 2025 WAC Report, plus faculty insights into curriculum, the Committee prepared a Draft Resolution to serve as the point of departure for a college-wide discussion of course renumbering, as well as a Survey on Course Renumbering circulated to all faculty and staff (with a March 16, 2026 closing date).

Before the Draft Resolution and survey were circulated, the members of this Committee met several times to discuss all aspects of the renumbering process. This Committee also consulted with staff members from the Provost's Office, Admissions, the Registrar, and the Coordinator for the Academic Senate, as well as members of the General Education Council. In this way, the draft Resolution represented multiple viewpoints.

Based on the complete results of the Survey on Course Renumbering, the Faculty Committee has substantially revised the Draft Resolution below, drafted a report, and submitted a finalized Resolution on Course Renumbering to the UCC/GCC/Academic Senate and the Provost's Office. With the submission of the final report to the Provost, this Committee will have completed its commission for the year.

More information about this initiative is available here:
<https://www.qc.cuny.edu/provost/course-renumbering/>.

Collecting Faculty and Staff Input on the Draft Renumbering Resolution

In late December 2025, department chairs received a lengthy memo from this Committee along with a link to our survey. Chairs were asked to announce the opening of the Survey on Course Renumbering at their departmental meetings in February 2026, gather input from faculty, and complete the survey by Monday, March 16. Deans were also urged to spread the word about the survey. The main goal of the survey was to receive at least one response from each department, graduate program, and professional school, as well as input from key staff members and administrators.

Starting in December 2025, emails were sent to department chairs and deans asking them to review the Draft Resolution and to complete the survey. A college-wide mailer was sent to all faculty and staff in early February 2026, followed by reminder emails in early March sent to individual department chairs and circulated through another all-faculty/all-staff mailer. Additionally, administrators and program staff received the survey in mid-March and were reminded to share their feedback. Finally, the Committee chair attended a College P&B meeting to solicit feedback.

The survey mailers attempted to alert the QC community to the broad implications of college-wide renumbering for faculty, staff, administrators, and students. The memo suggested that the college might begin planning for the rollout phase of college-wide renumbering as early as late Spring 2026. It was noted that course renumbering would necessarily entail revising numerous campus websites, the TREX transfer evaluation system, and the e-permit system, as well as coordinating with the Financial Aid Office and the student-facing “schedule planner” platform to prevent students from inadvertently registering for newly renumbered courses they have already taken.

After the Survey on Course Renumbering closed on March 17, the Faculty Committee analyzed the data, consulted internally as a Committee, and wrote its report. Based on the findings outlined in the report, the Committee also finalized the Resolution on Course Renumbering.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON COURSE RENUMBERING

[[first circulated Dec 2025]]

1. WHEREAS, Many QC departments have run out of 3-digit course numbers; and
2. WHEREAS, Conducting regular student outcomes assessments will benefit from the creation of course numbers that mark a progression from introductory to advanced, such that departments can assess graduating majors as compared to new majors; and
3. WHEREAS, The Coursedog system does not recognize decimal places; and
4. WHEREAS, Renumbering will not change Pathways designations; and
5. WHEREAS Our accrediting body, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education, under Standard III, expects a consistent, institution-wide course numbering architecture; and
6. WHEREAS, Students are challenged to navigate the existing course numbering systems across departments; and
7. WHEREAS, Employers have difficulty accurately reading QC transcripts given the lack of consistency in numbering protocols from department to department; and
8. WHEREAS, Departmental abbreviations currently vary between 3, 4, and 5 letters,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT

1. RESOLVED, That all QC departments will henceforth develop proposals to renumber existing courses (and to create new courses) using 4 digits only, without decimals; and
2. RESOLVED, That 1000 indicates lower division, introductory, undergraduate courses with no prerequisites, recommended to first-year students or students new to the major

3. RESOLVED, That 2000 indicates lower division, intermediate, undergraduate courses recommended to second-year students; and
4. RESOLVED, That 3000 indicates upper division, advanced, undergraduate courses recommended to third-year students; and
5. RESOLVED, That 4000 indicates upper division, advanced, undergraduate courses recommended to fourth-year students, including required capstone courses for the major; and
6. RESOLVED, That 5000 indicates courses that can be taken only by post-baccalaureate students, accelerated MA students, and certain professional school students; and
7. RESOLVED, That 6000 indicates master's level courses recommended to incoming graduate students, certain professional school students, and accelerated MA students, as well as required introductory courses or prerequisites for the rest of the graduate program; and
8. RESOLVED, That 7000 indicates courses open to master's, professional school students, and accelerated MA only; and
9. RESOLVED, That 8000 shall not be used, as that number indicates doctoral-level courses; and
10. RESOLVED, That zero-level courses currently consisting of one or two digits (used by departments to indicate courses open to non-majors) will become 1000-level courses; and
11. RESOLVED, That departments may use the last 3 digits for their own purposes, in any way they wish, with the second digit serving as the suggested digit for creating numbers to code types of courses that fulfill departmental graduation requirements; and
12. RESOLVED, That divisions and departments may continue to use a limited number of alpha letters following course numbers (i.e., W for writing courses); and
13. RESOLVED, That divisions and departments may propose to the Academic Senate new uses of alpha letters following numbers; however, letters should be used sparingly based on one college-wide Inventory of Course Letters (i.e., W for Writing Intensive; H for Macaulay Honors courses; L for lab courses); and
14. RESOLVED, That Pathways courses, which are courses intended to reach a broad audience that cannot have prerequisites, will henceforth be coded as introductory 1000-level courses or 2000-level lower-division courses with no prerequisites; and
15. RESOLVED, That divisions and departments will create 4-letter abbreviations and use them consistently for all of their courses; and
16. RESOLVED, That departments may submit proposals to eliminate inactive courses and renumber their entire inventory of active courses based on this Resolution as soon as it is approved by the QC Academic Senate, and after the UCC and GCC have provided guidance on how departments should provide, most likely in the form of a table, a complete listing of current numbers alongside their new 4-digit numbers.

Section IV – Report of the Faculty Committee on Course Renumbering

This section analyzes the results of the survey, starting with Question #9 asking for suggestions and concerns regarding a 4-digit numbering system. The italicized text summarizes this Committee’s main take-aways from the survey while also pointing towards recommendations regarding the implications or “roll out” phase of this college-wide reform.

Broad Support for 4-Digit Course Numbers

Out of 51 survey respondents total, including 28 chairs submitting on behalf of their faculties, majority of respondents (55%) indicated full support for all sections of the draft Resolution and offered no additional comments. In response to Q#9, the remaining 45% expressed concerns or a desire for clarification. Within this group, a small number (8%) objected to 4 digits.

The Committee finds that support for a new numbering system outweighed opposition, though the presence of questions and uncertainty indicates a need for communication and refinement.

Among the six respondents who raised concerns, the consistent theme was apprehension about administrative burdens and disruptions. Several departments noted that converting all existing courses to a 4-digit format would create substantial extra work for already overstretched faculty and staff, particularly given current understaffing in the Registrar’s Office and ongoing issues with DegreeWorks. Some departments indicated no shortage of 3-digit numbers. Others worried that renumbering would confuse students—especially transfer students—and potentially complicate equivalencies across campuses. Additional technical concerns surfaced. Some departments use special numbering conventions for remedial courses or non-major offerings, while others use decimals to distinguish variable credit courses, a feature they fear losing under the new structure. Some respondents indicated they would not oppose the new system if implementation required no onerous departmental paperwork—e.g., automatically adding one numeral—but otherwise see the change as a disproportionate burden with uncertain benefits.

Faculty and staff concerns center around a number of important issues including, but not limited to, workload, student advising, the adequacy of current department systems, and skepticism that renumbering will meaningfully solve existing advising and transfer-credit challenges.

Looking at Q#11 and Q#12, the Committee found a very small minority of respondents expressing interest in a 5-digit system. Of the 22 individuals who provided input (following Q#9), just two indicated a preference for this option. Their reasons centered on technical and organizational benefits. One noted that 5-digit numbers would align with existing structures in CourseDog and allow credit values to be encoded within the number (e.g., 79901 for one credit, 79903 for three credits). Another respondent emphasized that a 5-digit system could create space to embed additional shared meanings—such as marking courses connected to professional or

educator preparation programs—by assigning standardized roles to the second digit. Aside from these isolated benefits, however, few arguments were made for 5 digits.

The overwhelming majority of respondents (19 of 22) stated they did not prefer a 5-digit format, suggesting limited interest for a system more complex than the proposed 4-digit structure.

Allowing a Flexible Approach to the Last 3 digits

A strong majority of respondents would like the college to allow a flexible approach to the use of last three digits of course numbers. There is broad agreement that departments should retain autonomy in how they organize their internal numbering. Only two respondents opposed such flexibility, and four had no opinion, suggesting overall low resistance to this aspect of the proposal. Many respondents emphasized that flexibility must be explicit and guaranteed, urging the revised Resolution to clearly state that departments may use the last three digits however they see fit, without mandated coding requirements. Supporters of this approach also suggested simplifying the language around the second digit and removing any implication that departments must align their internal sequences with campus-wide schemas.

At the same time, several concerns emerged. In response to this question, some respondents voiced frustration with the idea of renumbering, noting insufficient communication between the college and the broader campus community while also calling for greater transparency, public discussion, and choice.

Others highlighted operational and technical issues that must be resolved before implementation such as updating DegreeWorks, managing CUNYfirst, enabling transfer equivalencies, clarifying the logic of grade-replacements, creating anti-requisite rules, revising all student advising materials, setting timelines, and other documentation. The need to involve the Registrar and Enrollment Management early and meaningfully was repeatedly underscored.

A small number of respondents argued that a collaborative or more standardized approach to internal digits could enhance consistency across related programs. For example, assigning shared digits to identify student teaching or fieldwork courses could benefit some programs.

Finally, several respondents suggested improvements to the Resolution text itself, including adding more context in the “Whereas” section, clarifying that renumbering will not change course content or credit hours, ensuring that old and new numbers count the same for degree requirements, and explicitly requiring a crosswalk table.

These survey responses reveal strong desires among faculty for maximum departmental flexibility in the use of the last three digits, transparent communication, and careful coordination regarding the many technical procedures needed to make renumbering successful.

The Committee also wishes to amplify the concerns raised here regarding implementation. There is a real need for careful planning and adequate staffing to address a number of systemic challenges: updating DegreeWorks, managing CUNYfirst, enabling transfer equivalencies, clarifying the logic of grade-replacements, creating anti-requisite rules, revising all student advising materials, setting timelines, the creation of a crosswalk table, and other documentation. The Office of the Registrar, Student Advising, and several other key campus offices will need to be actively involved in the implementation process.

Renumbering Undergraduate Courses

In response to Q#15, opinions varied on how to renumber undergraduate courses. 6 out of 51 total respondents expressed opposition to the approach outlined in Lines 3–6 of the Draft Resolution. 6 respondents were neutral. Of the 6 opposed, several of the comments indicated revisions and amendments, not outright rejection

When asked (Q#16) to share concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions, respondents, echoing some of the points made above, asked for as much flexibility as possible. The need for the 0000 level option among some departments was again justified on the basis of existing course sequences. The need for cross listing was also noted.

Most notably, some chairs strongly rejected “any implicit prerequisites based on class standing.” Another chair recommended the Resolution remove any mention of the students' year and speak instead about "introductory, intermediate, and advanced" level courses, and/or the types of skills learned at each level—e.g. "basic comprehension.”

Similarly, another respondent wrote: “Level of courses should not be linked to student year status because it is too variable generally at QC. In addition, some juniors or seniors may need to take lower level courses to fulfill their major or minor requirements. Likewise, we should not discourage freshmen or sophomores from taking upper level courses if they can manage these.” Moreover, one respondent, concerned about students needing flexibility to take courses at all levels, said: “frame these descriptions more tentatively, in terms of what courses at a given level generally represent, rather than presenting them as absolute requirements.”

Some departments have developed an internally coherent undergraduate course numbering system that may be undermined by the proposed four-levels system. One respondent wrote:

“Our department has 3 levels of courses, and does not correlate them with class standing. We have intros, electives, and capstones. While the intros would correspond to the proposed 1000-level courses and capstones would correspond to the 4000-level courses, we encourage students in their second through fourth year to take electives. The 4-tier

designations wouldn't fit our 3-tier curriculum. Adjusting to it would be difficult. If we used both 2000 and 3000 levels, that would misleadingly imply some are more advanced than others. If we used 2000 levels but not 3000-level ones, students might mistakenly perceive those electives to be easier than other departments' 3000-level courses. If we used 3000 levels but not 2000-level ones, students might mistakenly perceive those electives to be harder than other departments' 2000-level courses.”

Taken together, these results suggest that support vastly outweighs opposition to the proposed reform of undergraduate course numbers. Yet this may be a case in which more communication is needed to explain the benefits of course numbers progressing from 1000 to 4000. To address a number of important concerns, the revised Resolution will remove all references to the students' year and speak tentatively about departments using numbers to convey a progression of levels. No language suggestive of prerequisites will be included in these descriptions of the four levels.

Renumbering Graduate Courses

In response to Q#17, 9 out of 22 were in favor, 11 had no opinion, 3 were opposed. Of those 3, 1 wanted to retain the current 3-digit system. The other 2 offered revisions. Respondents offering comments stressed the need for flexibility in the use of 5000 level courses in some programs. The proposed language was found to be confusing and overly complex.

Given that most graduate courses at QC currently use 700 numbers only, yet some programs and professional schools rely on 500 and 600 numbers, the Resolution will provide a simplified set of guidelines providing for more flexibility in the use of 5000-7000.

Regarding the Use of Alpha Letters

In response to Q#19 regarding the use of alpha letters following course numbers, 14 were in favor, 6 had no opinion, and 2 were opposed.

Those who made suggestions in response to Q#20 suggested alpha letters for the following kinds of courses: virtual, student teaching, programmatic Key Assessments, fieldwork, and Pathways.

However, others worried that “introducing additional letters would be even more confusing to students and advisors.” One department had “mixed opinions.” However, that department disfavors other letter “inflation,” beyond the existing use of “W.” Similarly, another chair wrote: “The system as outlined above is getting even more confusing and students will likely experience difficulties navigating this. Please keep it simple - only W designations (and maybe L for the sciences).”

Based on these responses, the Committee will recommend very limited use of alpha letters based on an inventory of course letters to be defined by the Academic Senate.

Pathways (General Education) Courses

8 survey respondents commented on the renumbering of Pathways (General Education) courses (Q#23). One person advocated for department's retaining the right to require prerequisites for any potential future 2000-level Pathways courses and allowing existing Pathways courses to continue to have prerequisites. 2 respondents suggested the addition of "P" alpha letters for Pathways courses in the college-wide Inventory of Course Letters. However, another respondent wrote "the majority of us do not support the 'P' letter for pathways." One respondent suggested carving out Gen Ed courses from the renumbering process so that pathways courses may "be coded 100 or 200, as opposed to 4-digit levels."

Meanwhile, one department chair objected to the proposed limits on the levels for these courses: "We have 300-level literature electives in our major that fulfill the College Option Literature designation. Neither lowering the number of these courses nor losing the CO designation for them will work for us." Another respondent reported: "Changing course numbers to utilize only 1 or 2 as the first digit of Pathways makes a little bit of sense, again, if the proposal is adopted. Perhaps even limiting Pathways to 1000 would be helpful."

When asked (Q#24) about making all Pathways courses 1000 and 2000 level only, with no pre-requisites, one respondent asked "Classes of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. How can they be separated for students to get their proper level of instruction?" This question can only be addressed by the General Education Council and the departments proposing or reforming course offerings in keeping with the goals of pathways courses. It is beyond the scope of the renumbering Resolution to address this valid concern. Another respondent points out that pathways courses that already require ENGL 110 as a prerequisite: "Would these courses be excluded from Pathways if they are at the 1000 or 2000 level, or would they instead need to be coded as 3000-level courses?"

When asked to share additional concerns, suggestions, or questions (Q#25), one respondent pointed out that limiting pathways courses to the 1000 and 2000 level, without pre-requisites, may conflict with QC's required one foreign language course. This person expressed a concern related to upper level language courses. "A large percentage of our students are heritage speakers or native speakers with substantial educational experience in their home language, for these students it can be appropriate to take courses with students in the major at the 300 level." The implication of this comment seems to be that some Pathways courses may need to be 3000 level.

Also, in response to Q#25, one department chair objected "strongly" to the language in line #14 in the draft Resolution and proposed the following language instead "Pathways courses, which are courses intended to reach a broad audience, will henceforth be coded as introductory

1000-level courses or 2000-level lower-division courses with **limited** prerequisites.” The rationale for this change was: “Again, many of our first year courses have prerequisites (e.g. calculus requires precalculus and precalculus requires algebra).” For this department, flexibility with pre-requisites will be needed to continue to offer all Pathways classes.

Based on this input, the Resolution will omit any recommendation for the letter “P” to be added to the list of recommended alpha letters for the “Inventory of Course Letters.”

Additionally, the Committee will modify the language in the Resolution regarding levels and prerequisites. Given this variety of viewpoints, and the fact that the faculty Committee was not appointed to advise on the structure of General Education requirements (only course renumbering) we recommend the Gen Ed Council issue guidance on how to renumber Pathways courses, the issue of prerequisites for these courses, and on the potential use of “P” letters.

Standardizing Departmental Abbreviations

Of the 22 respondents who responded to Q#26 (“Do you agree that each QC department should have 4-letter abbreviations?”), 12 agreed, 5 had no opinion, and 5 disagreed. When asked to share concerns and questions in Q#27, 5 respondents gave comments. 2 commenters agreed on the wisdom of standardized abbreviations for departments. 1 person disagreed because: “There is no rational purpose for this.” Another disagreed on the grounds that departments should have flexibility. SEYS indicated the desire to keep their (hard-won) SEYSL prefix for literacy courses. The Art Department noted that they have four subsections: “ART DESIGN, ART HISTORY, ART PHOTOGRAPHY, ART STUDIO.” That department feels that “4 letter abbreviations may not be sufficiently informative: ARTD, ARTH, ARTP, ARTS.” Similarly, another chair writes: “There is already some confusion between MES and MEDST so limiting the department's abbreviation to four letters - such as MEDS -or- MEST would exacerbate that issue.”

Though some departments may need to be creative in how they amend their departmental abbreviations (as well as proactive in their communications with students), this Committee recommends a 4-letter standardization for all departments. Departments with a valid need for 3 or 5 letters request flexibility from the Academic Senate when renumbering their courses.

Implementation and Roll Out: Suggestions on the Submissions of Course Inventories

21 respondents commented on Q#28 “Do you have any questions or suggestions on the submission of renumbered course inventories?” Given the important and detailed feedback offered in response to this question, responses are quoted in full below.

No respondents who declined to be quoted were quoted here (or anywhere in this report).

Regarding the submission process, respondents wrote:

- We should wait for approval of the Resolution by the CUNY Board of Trustees so that we don't waste our time working on this on the chance that BoT approval is delayed or does not happen.
- I think it would be best to have a single form (one for grad, one for undergrad) to change course numbers, and that there should be no other curricular changes on that form to keep this as simple as possible.
- How does this numbering strategy align with university wide (CUNY) policies on numbering?
- The last digit should indicate the number of credits for that course
- Submissions should be in bulk and expedited. There should be an opportunity for shedding older / unused courses, or repurposing courses during this unique opportunity, so we come out with a clean / state of the art, reliable course catalog.
- Keep all MA courses with the same first digit.
- Submitting as a single table would be nice for numbering. For courses where it impacts other departments, send the new numbers to the other departments as soon as possible so that changes to majors and minors that are impacted can be done at the same time. Use the justification of: Change and standardization of numbering system. Submission of the changes to the minor and major in the same document under the same justification.
- Our department would like to complete this on a mutually-agreed upon timeline.
- A table from the dept curriculum Committee makes the most sense.
- More hours for academic advising to explain the course changes and confirm if students are on track to graduate
- I noticed the example of ENGL 170W being proposed as ENGL 1170W. From my knowledge, Queens College is one of the only institutions that adds a "W" after a course that would fulfill a Writing Intensive requirement. All other CUNY institutions identify a Writing Intensive by the course attribute in CUNYfirst. For example, this is on Lehman's

site - "A Writing Intensive section is identified by a Writing Intensive Course Attribute in CUNYfirst. To search for Writing Intensive sections, select the "Writing Intensive" option under the "Course Attribute" drop down menu in the CUNYfirst class search page". Is the plan to keep the "W" for all writing intensives in this rollout?

- We have concerns as noted earlier in the survey regarding questions of labor within departments. We also have concerns about clarity and coordination across campus.

- We would like to use the opportunity to revamp some of our course numbers - changing some 100 levels to 200 levels, etc. Our concern is that courses will be automatically updated to the new system and we would rather provide our changes before that happens. Will that be possible?

- It would seem that a spreadsheet for each department with current course numbers and then space to add the new course numbers would be meaningful. That spreadsheet would need to remain available, as many majors (if not all) use courses from other departments and will need to change all advisement-related documents to the new numbers.

- The concern, if the proposal is adopted, would be with the roll out, in other words how this would be implemented in a fashion that minimizes the potential disruptions to registration, advising and transfers.

- I am Director of Honors in the Humanities. Do I need to submit a list of renumbered courses for Honors in the Humanities? When do you need that list? Where should I send it?

Given these important concerns and suggestions regarding implementation, the Committee recommends the following actions from the appropriate college leaders:

- 1) provide information regarding any possible or pending CUNY-wide renumbering and whether there is a need to coordinate with CUNY central*
- 2) ensure that adequate staff and resources are be provided to enable an efficient, transparent, equitable roll-out of the renumbering process*
- 3) address labor issues within all departments, including the question of the responsibilities of department chairs versus faculty curriculum committees*
- 4) clarify that no course numbers will be automatically renumbered without departments having the opportunity to determine the appropriate course level*
- 5) explain how the roll-out phase can be implemented with minimal disruptions to registrations, advising, financial aid, and transfers*

- 6) *in consultation with the Registrar's office, create a communication system so that students (and all faculty advisors) can easily decipher transcripts, identify anti-requisites, use TREX, and rely on DegreeWorks*
- 7) *appoint a single point-person in each division (i.e., a "renumbering coordinator") to liaison with departments and programs in that division regarding how to prepare to submit course inventories, while also facilitating communication across departments (and supporting department chairs) regarding changes to course numbers that may affect majors and minors in other departments (i.e., SEYS co-majors)*
- 8) *ensure that M&T fees associated with courses are automatically transferred to the new course numbers (and no fees are lost) by altering all people responsible for M&T fees to all aspects of the renumbering process.*
- 9) *clarify the responsibilities of program directors regarding course numbers*
- 10) *clarify the timeline for submissions to the UCC/GCC as well as the advisability of either a synchronous or a staggered approach to submission:*

*Hypothetical Scenario A (synchronous): the college could offer departments flexibility in the timing of departmental submissions (i.e. as early as September 2026 and as late as *December 2026) with the goal of all new course numbers coming online at once, college-wide, in July 2027. This is ambitious yet feasible if the staffing needs are met and communication systems in place.*

Hypothetical Scenario B (staggered): the college could allow departments ready to renumber to submit their course inventories to the UCC/GCC by November 2026 (with the new 4-digit numbers for just those departments only coming online in July 2027). After this first batch of submissions, and allowing for "course corrections," all departments would be required to submit proposals for renumbering by November 2027, with new numbers coming online in July 2028.

Given additional pressing concerns and suggestions regarding implementation, the Committee recommends the following actions by the Academic Senate and others:

- A) communicate to QC departments the approval (or non-approval) the Resolution on College-Wide Renumbering that accompanies this report by the CUNY Board of Trustees so that department chairs know when to begin work on their submissions (or know to delay their plans for renumbering)*
- B) provide detailed instructions on how department chairs and/or curriculum committees can renumber their entire inventory of courses together, or via separate graduate and undergraduate submissions, based on a clear timeline*

C) provide to each department and program spreadsheets with existing course numbers and titles, as well as space to populate the new numbers (any new titles) as well as an easy way to indicate the need to eliminate inactive courses

*D) discourage highly complex proposals that will delay renumbering (i.e. the creation of new courses), with the following **caveats**:*

- *allow academic units, with no justification, to eliminate inactive courses as part of their submissions;*
- *discourage the inclusion of proposals for new courses with renumbering submissions (those should be separate proposals); and*
- *unless departments make a valid pedagogical case to the Academic Senate for combining changes to their major with their inventory of proposed new course numbers, discourage proposals for major changes (such as program changes) as part of bulk submissions.*

More Suggestions on Implementation and Roll Out

There were 24 responses to Q#29 on the “roll-out phase” of this college-wide proposal. Survey results pointed to the need for the college to provide support in various departments, ranging from Student Advising to IT interfaces to the Registrar’s Office. Questions were asked about timing and the start date for the new course numbers, how to manage student transcripts, TREX codes, and the college’s “plan for antirequisites.”

Q#30 asked for suggestions regarding communication. Of the 21 responses collected, some chairs pointed to the need to revise course catalogues. Both old and new course numbers will need to be posted at the Provost’s website, departments’ websites, and fliers, etc. Respondents stressed the need for sufficient time during the implementation phase, including to ensure communication across departments. Many asked about advising students and how these changes will affect transfer students seeking course equivalencies. Suggestions were heard for spreadsheets to solve some of the issues above.

Of the 26 who responded to Q#31, respondents queried the bureaucratic implications of this reform and the attendant timeframe for completion in light of the need for Academic Senate approval, Provost signatures, and state approval. Here too concerns were heard about the timeline for the roll-out of the new numbers and the need for collaboration among the administration and staff, as well as the need for college-wide support. Calls were heard for more academic advising hours and legible spreadsheets, etc. Finally, concerns about a possible CUNY-wide renumbering process were repeated with questions raised about whether this was really a good time for QC to renumber at all. The 2 opposed to implementation expressed strong concerns about the current state of the budget, understaffing, and the cost of renumbering.

While this Committee cannot address most of these important yet varied concerns and questions via the renumbering Resolution, we wish to amplify them here. The Provost's Office is asked to respond in writing to all these concerns, and to explain in a timely and transparent fashion how any approved or amended renumbering Resolution can be effectively and fairly implemented; the roles and responsibilities involved; and according to what timeline and workload expectations. To that end, we have assembled, based on various sections of this survey analysis, the following recommendations directed at top college leaders, academic offices, and divisional deans.

Recommendations Regarding Implementation

Based on this analysis of the Survey on Course Renumbering, and with appreciation to the faculty and staff who provided their candid responses, as well as the many college staff who generously assisted this committee in its work, the Faculty Committee wishes to make the following recommendations.

1. Communication Within CUNY

The Committee asks the Provost's office to provide information regarding any possible or pending CUNY-wide renumbering and whether there is a need to coordinate with CUNY central.

2. Improve Infrastructure and Staffing in Key Administrative Units

Allocate temporary or permanent staffing support to the Registrar's Office and any units responsible for implementing the renumbering and maintaining systems like DegreeWorks. Multiple respondents questioned whether current staffing levels are adequate to manage such a significant change.

3. Address Transfer and Equivalency Impacts Prior to Implementation

Develop college-wide communication tools before rolling out renumbering. Provide students and advisors with information (e.g., crosswalk tables, DegreeWorks updates) to interpret old and new course numbers. Transfer confusion was one of the most commonly cited concerns, especially given existing issues with DegreeWorks and staffing shortages in the Registrar's Office.

4. Clarify Timeline for Implementation

The Committee recommends that all course numbers become 4 digits by Fall 2028. The Committee debated the merits of various approaches to implementation and agreed that a staggered approach is best, ideally extending over the following 2-year period:

- Pending guidance from the Academic Senate, the recommended target deadline for departments to submit their course number inventories is March 2027.
- Pending guidance from the Academic Senate, the Committee recommends that departments submit course inventories by a March 2028 deadline.

A staggered implementation timeline will allow the campus to identify administrative issues, student confusion points, and implementation challenges before requiring a full transition.

5. Issues Requiring System-Level Solutions

The Committee recommends the college allocate sufficient staffing resources to establish a structured implementation team to address:

- DegreeWorks updates
- Coursedog updates
- CUNYfirst anti-requisites
- Transfer equivalency changes
- Timeline coordination
- Grade change logistics
- Interdisciplinary program updates
- Impacts to financial aid
- Impacts to M&T fees

6. Provide Support to Departments with Submission and Coordination

The Committee recommends the appointment of a single point-person in each division (i.e. a “renumbering coordinator”) to liaison with departments and programs in that division.

7. Workload Within Departments

With the support of the divisional deans, the Committee recommends college-wide clarification regarding labor issues within all departments, including the question of the responsibilities of department chairs versus the duties of faculty elected to department curriculum committees.

8. Faculty and Department Management of Renumbering

Clarify that no course numbers will be automatically renumbered without departments (in conversation with faculty) having the opportunity to determine the appropriate course level.

9. Streamlining the Submission of Course Inventories

- Provide to each academic unit spreadsheets with existing course numbers and titles, as well as space to populate the new numbers
- Given this Resolution’s justification for college-wide course renumbering, waive the need for departments to write justifications for minor changes (of new numbers).
- discourage highly complex proposals that will delay renumbering

10. Communication

- In response to an overwhelming number of survey responses expressing concerns about communication, the Committee asks college leaders to provide updates on renumbering in one central location.
- The Committee seeks clear communication on the responsibility of program directors regarding course numbers.
- The Provost’s Office is asked to respond in writing to the many important concerns and questions from faculty and staff compiled in this report, and to explain in a timely and transparent fashion:
 - how any approved or amended approach to renumbering can be effectively and fairly implemented;
 - the roles and responsibilities involved;
 - the recommended timeline for implementation; and
 - the workload expectations.

Section V – Original Survey and Raw Data

December 19, 2025

Dear Colleagues,

The Faculty Committee on Renumbering has developed a set of recommendations for creating a 4-digit course numbering system (please see the overview provided in your email invitation for further details). We invite you to review our “Draft Resolution on Renumbering” before its submission to the UCC, GCC, and Academic Senate in Spring 2026.

For more information on the renumbering process, please visit the Provost's website and look under "Initiatives."

<https://www.qc.cuny.edu/provost/course-renumbering/>

Please share your feedback on the draft Resolution by completing this survey. You will be asked to state your support for the draft Resolution as a whole, or for each major section of the Resolution. There will also be opportunities for you to provide feedback with your own ideas.

Department chairs should consult with their faculty members and their department's curriculum Committee before submitting their responses. This will help ensure that the draft Resolution is widely reviewed before we revise and submit a finalized Resolution to the UCC, GCC, and Academic Senate on March 30, 2026.

This form will take 10-20 minutes to complete. You may save and return to your survey answers at a later time. The deadline to submit is TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 2026. If you feel there are additional individuals who should receive the survey, we invite you to forward our email invitation.

Thank you, in advance, for contributing to this important effort!

Jun Choi, Chemistry and Biochemistry, junyong.choi@qc.cuny.edu
Grace Davie, History, grace.davie@qc.cuny.edu
Leslee Grey, Secondary Education and Youth Services, lgrey@qc.cuny.edu
Regine Joseph, European Languages and Literatures, regine.joseph@qc.cuny.edu

Section 1

Your Role at Queens College

1.
Please share your full name.
Required to answer. Single line text.

Enter your answer

2.
Please share your role.

Required to answer. Single choice.

Dean

Chair

Faculty member

Staff member

3.

**Faculty: Please share your academic department.
Single choice.**

Select your answer

4.

**Staff: Please share your administrative office.
Single choice.**

Select your answer

Section 2

Individual vs. Group Submissions

Department chairs are strongly encouraged to submit one set of survey responses on behalf of their entire department. However, individual responses are also welcome.

5.

**Did you discuss the draft Resolution with colleagues?
Single choice.**

Yes

No

6.

Are you submitting responses on behalf of a group (e.g., department, Committee, etc.)?

Single choice.

Yes

No

7.

If you are submitting responses on behalf on a Committee, please share the Committee name:

Single line text.

Enter your answer

Section 3

Global Agreement

Note: Respondents that indicate global agreement will skip the survey questions about specific sections of the Resolution.

8.

Do you support all sections of the Draft Resolution on college-wide renumbering?

Required to answer. Single choice.

Yes, I support the Draft Resolution in its current form. (*Skips to the end of the survey.*)

No, I have concerns, questions, or suggestions on at least one section. (*Proceeds to section specific items.*)

Section 4

Draft Resolution: Line #1

1) All QC departments will develop proposals to renumber existing courses (and to create new courses) using 4 digits only, without decimals;

9.

Do you support the creation of a 4-digit course numbering system, as outlined above?

Single choice.

Note: The Coursedog system does not recognize decimal places.

Favor

No opinion

Oppose

10.

If you are opposed to a 4-digit system, please share your concerns below:

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

11.

Would you prefer a 5-digit system?

Single choice.

Yes

No

12.

If you would prefer a 5-digit system, please explain its advantages below:

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 5

Draft Resolution: Line #2

2) Departments may use the last 3 digits for their own purposes, in any way they wish, with the second digit serving as the suggested digit for creating

numbers to code types of courses that fulfill departmental graduation requirements;

13.

Do you support a flexible approach to the last three digits of course numbers?

Single choice.

Favor

No opinion

Oppose

14.

Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 6

Draft Resolution: Lines #3-6

3) 1000 indicates lower division, introductory, undergraduate courses, with no prerequisites, recommended to first-year students or new majors;

4) 2000 indicates lower division, intermediate, undergraduate courses recommended to second-year students;

5) 3000 indicates upper division, advanced, undergraduate courses recommended to third-year students;

6) 4000 indicates upper division, advanced, undergraduate courses recommended to fourth-year students, including required capstone courses for the major;

15.

Do you support this approach to undergraduate courses, as indicated in Lines 3 through 6 above?

Single choice.

NOTE: Zero-level course numbers will convert into 1000-level numbers.

Favor

No opinion

Oppose

16.

Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 7

Draft Resolution: Lines #7-9

7) 5000 indicates courses that can be taken only by post-baccalaureate students, accelerated MA students, and certain professional school students;

8) 6000 indicates master's level courses recommended to incoming graduate students, certain professional school students, and accelerated MA students, as well as required introductory courses or prerequisites for the rest of the graduate program;

9) 7000 indicates courses open to accelerated MA, master's, and professional school students only;

17.

Do you support this approach to graduate-level courses, as indicated in Lines 7 through 9 above?

Single choice.

Favor

No opinion

Oppose

18.

Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 8

Draft Resolution: Lines #12 and 13

12) Divisions and departments may continue to use a limited number of alpha letters following course numbers (i.e. W for writing courses);

13) Divisions and departments may propose to the Academic Senate new uses of alpha letters following numbers, however letters should be used very sparingly, based on one college-wide *Inventory of Course Letters* [i.e., W for Writing Intensive; H for Macaulay Honors courses; L for lab courses]

19.

Do you support this approach to alpha letters, as indicated in Lines 12 through 13 above?

Single choice.

Favor

No opinion

Oppose

20.

If you have suggestions for other alpha letters that should be included in a college-wide *Inventory of Course Letters*, please share below:

Single line text.

Enter your answer

21.

Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 9

Draft Resolution: Line #14

14) Pathways courses, which are courses intended to reach a broad audience, will henceforth be coded as introductory 1000-level courses or 2000-level lower-division courses with no prerequisites;

22.

Do you agree that Pathways courses must be 1000 and 2000 level only?

Single choice.

Agree

No opinion

Disagree

23.

Do you recommend any specific approach to the designation of (Gen-Ed) Pathways courses in your department, or college wide, as part of the renumbering process?

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

24.

Question

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

25.

Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 10

Draft Resolution: Line #15

O) Divisions and departments will create 4-letter abbreviations and use them consistently for all of their courses;

26.

Do you agree that each QC department should have 4-letter abbreviations?

Single choice.

Agree

No opinion

Disagree

27.

Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

Section 11

Draft Resolution: Next Steps

16) That departments may submit proposals to eliminate inactive courses and renumber their entire inventory of active courses based on this Resolution as soon as it is approved by the QC Academic Senate, and after the UCC and GCC have provided guidance on how departments should provide, most likely in the form of a table, a complete listing of current numbers alongside their new 4-digit numbers.

Next Steps: The roll-out phase will involve preparing to change many campus websites, the TREX transfer evaluation system, and the e-permit system, as well as coordination with the financial aid office and changes in the student-facing “schedule planner” platform in order to prevent students from registering for newly re-numbered courses they have already taken.

28.

Do you have any questions or suggestions on the submission of renumbered course inventories?

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

29.

Do you have any questions or suggestions regarding the roll-out phase?

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

30.

Do you have any questions or suggestions for the steps involved in communicating new course numbers to all departments, offices, and students?

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

31.

Do you have any other concerns, questions, or suggestions on the renumbering Resolution?

Multi Line Text.

Enter your answer

32.

Does the Faculty Committee on Renumbering have your permission to quote one or more of your responses anonymously, without identifying your name or department?

Single choice.

Yes

No

Section 12

Thank you!

Thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback.

We will read your responses carefully and incorporate them into our report.

Jun Choi, Chemistry and Biochemistry

Grace Davie, History

Leslee Grey, Secondary Education and Youth Services

Regine Joseph, European Languages and Literatures

<https://www.qc.cuny.edu/provost/course-renumbering/>

33.

Please provide your QC email address
Required to answer. Single line text.

Enter your answer

Section VI – Overview of Survey Results

The Survey on Course Renumbering remained open for 92 days. 51 responses were collected. 28 out of 30 department chairs submitted responses on behalf of their faculty. In addition, 9 faculty members and 11 staff members submitted responses. The remaining 2 respondents identified as “other.” The two departments that did not submit a response were Accounting and Elementary & Early Childhood Education.

Among staff, 2 responses came from the Registrar, 2 came from the office of Institutional Effectiveness, and 2 came from Academic Advising. 82% of respondents reported discussing the draft Resolution with colleagues before responding. 65% reported they were submitting on behalf of a department or their department’s curriculum Committee.

Following a number of questions asking respondents to identify themselves, respondents were asked (Q#8) about support for “all” sections of the draft Resolution. 28 (55%) answered “yes.” Those participants did not give any further comments.

While the 45% who said “no” might suggest significant opposition to renumbering, in fact, only a small minority (8%) of all respondents objected to the proposed use of 4-digit course numbers. Among the 45% of all respondents who said “no,” that group used the survey to offer specific and constructive suggestions. Their comments are documented and analyzed below, question by question and issue by issue. Each section ends with the Committee’s recommendations on how to revise the Resolution to reflect survey input.

Finally, looking at all of the survey results together, and in preparation to submit a revised version of the Resolution to the UCC, GCC, and Academic Senate, this report concludes with a number of recommendations on the implementation of renumbering. The recommendations contain a number of significant questions and concerns from faculty that are not reflected in the Resolution and deserve the attention of college leaders.

The Raw Data

Questions #9 and #10 collected responses from the 22 people (45%) who said: “No, I have concerns, questions, or suggestions...”

Q#9: “Do you support the creation of a 4-digit course numbering system as outlined above?” this group of 22 answered:

- 13 were in favor
- 5 had no opinion
- 4 were opposed

Q#10 “If you are opposed to a 4-digit system, please share your concerns below”

#	Support	Concerns
	opinion	Department had concerns about the outlined system because no provision was made for dual classes or classes that can be taken by non majors (these classes are currently offered in our system starting with a zero or as a single or double digit: eg. MUSIC 1 or MUSIC 73, MUSIC 74). There were also concerns about the amount of time such changes would make and the inconvenience.
	opinion	Department uses decimals to indicate credit variability. For example, we use 7990 to designate variable topics/courses in testing. These courses can carry 1, 2, or 3 credits, which designate with a decimal. 7990.1 indicates a variable topics course for one credit. We are not opposed to a four digit course numbering system if there is some other way to designate credit value.
	oppose	We do not currently have a shortage of three digit options for new courses. What we do have is a shortage of faculty members who are not already over burdened by Service and administrative commitments. We have lost nearly half of our full-time faculty in the last few years. If the Resolution entails automatically adding a zero digit to every existing course so that there is no paperwork for the department, then we would not oppose. If this resolution requires paperwork for changing every single one of our three digit courses to four digits that would be a horrific workload burden that we would oppose. We have no objections to departments who would benefit from four digits, changing their own course numbers, but we do not wish to have this rule imposed upon us unless the register’s office or some other unit will be handling adding a zero to each of our course numbers. This resolution also addresses the need for each department to have numbers 100, 200, 300 400 correspond to level of difficulty and the 10,20 30 series indicate the type of subject matter within each level —and we already have that mostly in place.

se	Faculty raised concerns about the extent to which the renumbering will actually reduce student confusion, particularly as it affects transfer students and equivalencies. We already have significant problems with DegreeWorks and the understaffing of Registrar. How can we have reassurances that the already existing problems will be addressed along with the undertaking of labor that renumbering will require? How will renumbering address transfer issues? My faculty do not have a lot of faith that renumbering will address existing problems much less address future ones. I am reporting to you what my faculty said in a recent department meeting.
se	I believe our numbering system is fine as-is and it may cause confusion and problems for students and faculty to implement a whole new system
se	The proposal was discussed by the department's Curriculum Committee and brought to the full faculty. The concern expressed was twofold. Obviously the significant amount of extra administrative work and advising was an issue. Advising is already difficult for students to navigate and we were concerned that it would be confusing and create more inadequacies in that regard. In addition, we were apprehensive about how this would impact transfers from other CUNY schools. Perhaps there might be a system wide standard in the future?

Q#11. When asked about preference for a 5-digit system, 2 respondents said “yes” and gave the following reasons:

[Note: the numbers in the tables below refer to the number of responses collected for each question. They are not numbers identifying the respondent. Readers may ignore the numbers.]

1	yes	This would align with the current numbering in CourseDog, eg, 79901 could indicate one credit, 79903 three credits
2	“blank”	I do not know what the advantages of such a system would be.
3	yes	A 5-digit system would provide an opportunity for the college and departments to encode additional sets of common digits across the catalog. Whereas the first digit represents the level of the course (1000, 2000, ...8000), the second digit can represent a course's association with a professional program, as an example, a course that is part of the Educator Preparation Provider.

Q#12: 19 of 22 respondents indicated they would *not* prefer a 5-digit system.

Q#13. “Do you support a flexible approach to the last three digits of course numbers?”

- 16 were in favor
- 4 had no opinion
- 2 were opposed

Q#14. “Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions”

Support Responses

oppose	<p>You have not done a sufficient job of explaining these issues to the campus community before making such a substantive change to what is in the catalogue. You need to do a better job of having public discussion about this issue before you make such a huge change to all of the course numbers. You should not be in charge of remembering these courses, there should be two options for departments and you should make that clear.</p>
for	<p>It is important that this language about the second digit remains optional and that Depts remain free to use the last three digits in any way that we decide. "with the second digit serving as the suggested digit for creating numbers to code types of courses that fulfill departmental graduation requirements..."</p>
no opinion	<p>I have presented the concerns for the Dept. of Media Studies</p>
for	<p>We believe this Resolution line should be rewritten as the latter clause is confusing. We believe it should just read: Departments may use the last 3 digits for their own purposes, in any way they wish.</p>

	opinion	<p>uggestion: involve Enrollment Management/Registrar sooner rather than later, as the following practicalities (and probably others) will need to be considered: 1. What is the change timeline? Department by department? Program by Program? Or all at once? 2. New course #s will need to be added into Degree Works plans as “either/or” so that they work along with old course numbers for all students. 3. New courses need to be described to CUNYfirst as “anti-requisites” to prevent repeat course registration. For example, student has taken History 102 and now sees History 1102 being offered. We want to prevent students from taking “same” course again. If not, it will happen if we do not put preventative measures in place). 4. How will system handle CUNY Grade Replacement policy with new numbering system? 5. All transfer credit equivalencies will need to be updated. 6. Interdisciplinary changes: every major/program would need to be updated to account for new course numbers.</p>
	purpose	<p>A collaborative approach would provide opportunities for additional consistency across departments, as an example within Education, a common use of a digit across departments can identify that the course is a student teaching section, contains mandatory fieldwork, or has a key assessment attached to it.</p>
	concern	<p>Classes of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. How can they be separated for students to get their proper level instruction?</p>

or	<p>add to the WHEREAS section (the Resolution dives right into details and bullet points may help to provide quick context for a general audience): The current course numbering structure developed incrementally and is no longer consistent. The renumbering does not substantially alter course content or learning outcomes. Renumbering courses will improve clarity for students, advisors, faculty, and transfer institutions and align courses with university numbering conventions. To add to the RESOLUTIONS section (I may be wrong but I did not see these topics raised): The renumbering does not change course titles, credit hours, descriptions, or learning outcomes unless separately approved through the curriculum process. Courses completed under their previous numbers will continue to satisfy the same program and prerequisite requirements. A student cannot take both the old and new versions for double credit. The Registrar's Office will maintain equivalencies between the previous and new course numbers to ensure accurate degree audits and transcripts. Departments will work with the Registrar to maintain transfer equivalencies and update articulation records to ensure that students transferring from partner institutions are not adversely affected by the renumbering. That advising materials and program documentation will be updated prior to the effective term of implementation. The renumbering will take effect beginning in [term and year]. Lastly, I think the last bullet point alludes to a crosswalk table, but I think such a table is absolutely necessary and could be made more explicit in the Resolution (I personally would vote to remove the "most likely)": "...after the UCC and GCC have provided guidance on how departments should provide, most likely in the form of a crosswalk table that includes a complete listing of current course numbers alongside their new 4-digit numbers."</p>
or	<p>flexibility for each department to customize the numbering according to majors, minors and concentrations is a must if this system is adopted.</p>

#15. When asked: “Do you support this approach to undergraduate courses, as indicated in Lines 3-6 above?”

- 10 were in favor
- 6 had no opinion
- 6 were opposed

#16. “Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.”

Support Responses

	No opinion	We would like as much flexibility as possible in departmental determination of the structure, relationships among, and prerequisites for the 2000, 3000, and 4000 level courses. We also oppose any implicit prerequisites based on class standing.
3	oppose	My department was strongly opposed to the removal of the 0000 level option. We have long course sequences that require the zero level to make sense (0072, 1072, 2072, 3077, etc.). Shifting to this new system would create a lot of confusion.
4	oppose	History generally supports the 1000-4000 numbering, but we have concerns about framing these as a year-by-year progression. So many students transfer in and don't follow a standard four-year march through the major (or the college). We favor wording this instead in terms of "introductory, intermediate, and advanced" courses - leaving out "first-year," etc. Language about the types of skills at each level could also be helpful - e.g. "basic" comprehension of texts, formulation of an analytical argument, crafting an advanced piece of original writing, etc.
5	oppose	Our department has 3 levels of courses, and does not correlate them with class standing. We have intros, electives, and capstones. While the intros would correspond to the proposed 1000-level courses and capstones would correspond to the 4000-level courses, we encourage students in their second through fourth year to take electives. The 4-tier designations wouldn't fit our 3-tier curriculum. Adjusting to it would be difficult. If we used both 2000 and 3000 levels, that would misleadingly imply some are more advanced than others. If we used 2000 levels but not 3000-level ones, students might mistakenly perceive those electives to be easier than other departments' 3000-level courses. If we used 3000 levels but not 2000-level ones, students might mistakenly perceive those electives to be harder than other departments' 2000-level courses.
5	oppose	Level of courses should not be linked to student year status because it is too variable generally at QC. In addition, some juniors or seniors may need to take lower level courses to fulfill their major or minor

		requirements. Likewise, we should not discourage freshmen or sophomores from taking upper level courses if they can manage these.
7	oppose	We already have the type of system you suggest, within the three digit numbers
8	favor	We are just concerned that for smaller programs or programs with no emphasis on pre-requisites, the 200-300 differentiation might not apply or be that helpful. We discussed that we would use higher 3000s to signify tasks or courses students would do later in their college progression, such as internships, experiential learning, special topics, etc.
9	favor	As long as we can still cross-list 3000/4000 courses with 6000 level courses... this has become important to our ability to run courses at the size needed to avoid last minute cancellations.
10	favor	We would like the following edit: 3) 1000 indicates lower division, introductory, undergraduate courses, with **no** prerequisites, recommended to first-year students or new majors; => 3) 1000 indicates lower division, introductory, undergraduate courses, with **limited** prerequisites, recommended to first-year students or new majors; The reason we need this change is that our department's first year courses generally have prerequisites (e.g. calculus requires precalculus).
11	oppose	would like to keep the system as is with 100, 200, 300, and 400 classes
12	favor	Classes of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. How can they be separated for students to get their proper level of instruction?
13	favor	While this plan seems broadly good, my department has concerns about the details of its implementation, including the data-entry labor needed to change all our catalog listings and the timing and process for such matters as creation of 400-level courses (as currently our numbering ends at 399).

5	'?	Another colleague commented: "I'm a bit uneasy about some of the categorical language/verbiage. For example, a statement mandating that 2000-level courses be free of prerequisites definitionally (RESOLVED 3) could box departments in more than intended when freshman courses carry prerequisites (e.g., Freshman Calc 1 is a prerequisite for Freshman Calc 2, but the latter will have to be a 2000-level course...recommended for sophomores (RESOLVED 4) in the proposed model, potentially creating tension. I would personally prefer to frame these descriptions more tentatively, in terms of what courses at a given level generally represent, rather than presenting them as absolute requirements."
6	'?	If the system is adopted, then the proposed approach to the four numeral assignments is feasible.

Q#17. “Do you support this approach to graduate-level courses, as indicated in Lines 7 though 9 above?”

- 9 were in favor
- 11 had no opinion
- 3 opposed

Q#18. “Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.”

	Support	Responses
1	No opinion	We are fine with a four digit system, but for reasons given would have problems with the four-tier undergraduate course system.
2	No opinion	Some master's students need to take 5000 level courses for some programs.

4	oppose	These three categories are unclear. We also do not agree with the current language which seems to disallow undergraduates from enrolling in 5000+ courses. A student should not have to be an accelerated/MA student to enroll. We also would suggest that 7000 courses should be for advanced masters courses.
5	oppose	Similarly, I would like to keep the system of 3-digit courses: 500, 600, and 700
6	favor	Classes of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. How can they be separated for students to get their proper level of instruction?
7	??	This seems too complicated. Two of these and not three would be preferred.

#19. “Do you support this approach to alpha letters, as indicated in Lines 12 though 13 above?”

- 14 were in favor
- 6 had no opinion
- 2 opposed

#20. “If you have suggestions for other alpha letters that should be included in a college-wide Inventory of Course Letters, please share below:”

The following suggestions were provided:

	Support	Responses
1	favor	Student Teaching, programmatic Key Assessments, fieldwork
2	favor	V - Virtual
3	favor	Please keep W as alpha lettering, but introducing additional letters would be even more confusing to students and advisors.

21. “Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.”

ponses

	have mixed opinions. However, we all agree that we are not in favor of other letter flation”
	sses of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. w can they be separated for students to get their proper level of instruction?
	e system as outlined above is getting even more confusing and students will likely experience difficulties navigating this. Please keep it simple - only W designations (and ybe L for the sciences).

#22. “Do you agree that Pathways courses must be 1000 and 2000 level only?”

- 11 agreed
- 8 had no opinion
- 3 disagreed

#23. Do you recommend any specific approach to the designation of (Gen-Ed) Pathways courses in your department, or college wide, as part of the renumbering process?

1		No, but we do not agree with line 14 above. We would like to retain the right to require prerequisites for any potential future 2000-level Pathways courses we might develop. There are currently courses at the college that are both Pathways courses and have prerequisites. We would like to see this Resolution limited to the new 4-digit system, not Pathways.
2		Adding a P after the number of Pathways courses would make sense.
3		Media Studies currently does not offer any Pathways courses.

4		It would be nice to have a consistent numbering system collegewide for the pathways courses. But the majority of us do not support the "P" letter for pathways (cf. res. #13).
5		There should be a letter indicating it is a Pathways course (P) -- similar to W for Writing Intensive.
6		I believe pathways classes should be coded as 100 and 200 level as opposed to 4-digit levels
7		We have 300-level literature electives in our major that fulfill the College Option Literature designation. Neither lowering the number of these courses nor losing the CO designation for them will work for us.
8		Changing course numbers to utilize only 1 or 2 as the first digit of Pathways makes a little bit of sense, again, if the proposal is adopted. Perhaps even limiting Pathways to 1000 would be helpful.

#24. Asked about making all Pathways courses 1000 and 2000 level only, with no pre-requisites

1		Classes of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. How can they be separated for students to get their proper level of instruction?
2		See above.
3		If 1000 and 2000 level courses are intended to be introductory and have no prerequisites, how should writing intensive courses that require ENGL 110 be handled? Would these courses be excluded from Pathways if they are at the 1000 or 2000 level, or would they instead need to be coded as 3000-level courses?

25. “Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.”

Responses

1	QC requires one foreign language course for every student. A large percentage of our students are heritage speakers or native speakers with substantial educational experience in their home language, for these students it can be appropriate to take courses with students in the major at the 300 level.
2	We feel strongly about the following edit: 14) Pathways courses, which are courses intended to reach a broad audience, will henceforth be coded as introductory 1000-level courses or 2000-level lower-division courses with **no** prerequisites; => 14) Pathways courses, which are courses intended to reach a broad audience, will henceforth be coded as introductory 1000-level courses or 2000-level lower-division courses with **limited** prerequisites; Again, many of our first year courses have prerequisites (e.g. calculus requires precalculus and precalculus requires algebra).
3	Classes of 1000 level students are being taught with students at 2000 level and above. How can they be separated for students to get their proper level of instruction?
4	See above.

#26. “Do you agree that each QC department should have 4-letter abbreviations?”

- 12 agreed
- 5 had no opinion
- 5 disagreed

#27. Please share any concerns, suggested alternatives, edits, or questions below.

ID	agree?	Responses
1	disagree	There is no rational purpose for this.
2	disagree	In SEYS, we have an SEYSL prefix for literacy courses that we want to keep, as it was difficult to obtain originally.

3	agree	This standardization works for our acronym, but might now work cleanly for others.
4	disagree	I believe that course section names should remain flexible
5	disagree	Art Department has sub sections ART DESIGN, ART HISTORY, ART PHOTOGRAPHY, ART STUDIO. 4 letter abbreviations may not be sufficiently informative: ARTD, ARTH, ARTP, ARTS
6	??	There is already some confusion between MES and MEDST so limiting the department's abbreviation to four letters - such as MEDS -or- MEST would exacerbate that issue.
7	??	All abbreviations should have the same number of characters.

#28. “Do you have any questions or suggestions on the submission of renumbered course inventories?”

22 responses (responses “NO” were deleted)

sponses

	we should wait for approval of the Resolution by the CUNY Board of Trustees so that we don't waste our time working on this on the chance that BoT approval is delayed or does not happen.
	I think it would be best to have a single form (one for grad, one for undergrad) to change course numbers, and that there should be no other curricular changes on that form to keep this as simple as possible.
	Do you have any questions or suggestions on the submission of renumbered course inventories? - How does this numbering strategy align with university wide (CUNY) policies on numbering?
	The last digit should indicate the number of credits for that course
	at this time

	<p>missions should be in bulk and expedited. There should be an opportunity for adding older / unused courses, or repurposing courses during this unique opportunity, so we come out with a clean / state of the art, reliable course catalog.</p>
	<p>Keep all MA courses with the same first digit.</p>
	<p>Submitting as a single table would be nice for numbering. For courses where it impacts other departments, send the new numbers to the other departments as soon as possible so that changes to majors and minors that are impacted can be done at the same time. Use the justification of: Change and standardization of numbering system. Submission of the changes to the minor and major in the same document under the same justification.</p>
	<p>Our department would like to complete this on a mutually-agreed upon timeline.</p>
	<p>Yes; a table from the dept curriculum Committee makes the most sense.</p>
	<p>More hours for academic advising to explain the course changes and confirm if students are on track to graduate</p>
	<p>Noticed the example of ENGL 170W being proposed as ENGL 1170W. From my knowledge, Queens College is one of the only institutions that adds a "W" after a course that would fulfill a Writing Intensive requirement. All other CUNY institutions identify a Writing Intensive by the course attribute in CUNYfirst. For example, this is on Lehman's site - "A Writing Intensive section is identified by a Writing Intensive Course Attribute in CUNYfirst. To search for Writing Intensive sections, select the "Writing Intensive" option under the "Course Attribute" dropdown menu in the CUNYfirst class search page". Is the plan to keep the "W" for all writing intensives in this rollout?</p>
	<p>We have concerns as noted earlier in the survey regarding questions of labor within departments. We also have concerns about clarity and coordination across campus.</p>
	<p>We would like to use the opportunity to revamp some of our course numbers - changing some 100 levels to 200 levels, etc. Our concern is that courses will be automatically updated to the new system and we would rather provide our changes before that happens. Will that be possible?</p>

		no
		no
24		It would seem that a spreadsheet for each department with current course numbers and then space to add the new course numbers would be meaningful. That spreadsheet would need to remain available, as many majors (if not all) use courses from other departments and will need to change all advisement-related documents to the new numbers.
25		The concern, if the proposal is adopted, would be with the roll out, in other words how this would be implemented in a fashion that minimizes the potential disruptions to registration, advising and transfers.
26		I am Director of Honors in the Humanities. Do I need to submit a list of renumbered courses for Honors in the Humanities? When do you need that list? Where should I send it?

#29. “Do you have any questions or suggestions regarding the roll-out phase?”

17 responses (responses “NO” were deleted)

Responses

	hope the college provides the necessary personnel so that this roll out can be done an efficient way, given all of the different systems affected by the change.
	ow long would this take, and in what semester would it be available? Would the numbering be retroactive on transcripts?
	ake sure we know which semester begins the new number. ls.
	ould we continue to use the old system in course modifications that are completed Sp26 before this goes into broader use?

	<p>would say to roll it out as soon as possible. However, if you know that the academic curriculum Committee cannot approve this during the April and May meetings, then suggest that the department submit at a specific time during summer or first meeting of Fall 2026. If they can get to it this semester, give departments a deadline to get the info to the college Committee for April meeting consideration and May meeting consideration.</p>
	<p>For transfer credits, renumbering should be instantly coded into TREX. * We also would like a phased rollout where some departments should rollout first, etc. * The rollout should be done in collaboration with the advising center, degreeworks, registrar, etc. * The rollout should also have a plan with antirequisites.</p>
	<p>Assuming the new numbers are due from depts this semester (SP26), when would the actual changes go into effect? The FA26 schedule is already live in CUNYfirst and SP27 budget proposals already submitted.</p>
	<p>More hours for academic advising to explain the course changes and confirm if students are on track to graduate</p>

17		No
18		No
19		No.
20		Looks like fall 27 would be the earliest possible, and the new numbers would have to be known by end of spring 27, to adjust all the materials. Somebody will have to adjust all the course listings. I'm sure that's an AI task, but will need careful checking by each program director or so.
21		Lots of advance notice and frequent communication with all stakeholders. If possible, some sort of phased introduction.
22		More flexibility in departmental submission timelines. Some departments have multiple programs which requires more time and coordination.
23		If the renumbering can be rolled out by school or department that would be appreciated.
24		Yes, when will the renumbering actually be posted in CUNY First?

#30. Do you have any questions or suggestions for the steps involved in communicating new course numbers to all departments, offices, and students?

21 Responses

1		You need to do a better job of widely communicating this and not just in mass emails. It has literally never been discussed outside of the Senate in any of the college wide bodies.
2		I'd suggest that the Provost website, as well as the course catalog, include a lookup table for all courses that includes both the old course number and the new course number.
3		No
4		no
5		It would be helpful to have times on the implementation phase
6		No.
7		Yes quite a few. These questions relate to overall QC advising and departmental advising. How will renumbering affect transfers and course equivalencies?
8		no
9		The departments know which majors use the courses as prereqs or coreqs. The departments also know which courses are liberal arts courses. The liberal arts designations can be done at the same time and in same table as the new numbers. The departments are suppose to contact other departments when making changes to courses that impact other departments. That should remain policy. Departments can post list of new course numbers on website and in departments near where course schedule is posted for student

		information. Departments can also hand out fliers to students about changes in numbers if that is best for individual departments.
10		No
11		na
12		No.
13		This is going to be perhaps the most difficult part. Some faculty/advisors have been using the same course numbers for decades, and it will be a matter of constant, steady, and patient correction to get everyone on the same page. Will likely take a few years, if the switch from Quasar to CUNYfirst is any indicator.
14		More hours for academic advising to explain the course changes and confirm if students are on track to graduate
15		No
16		No
17		No.
18		Using the spreadsheet where we enter the new numbers seems a good way for departments and offices. Students will need "translation" of their advisement sheets. I can't come up with an easy way to automate that, but will think about that more, for the program I direct.
19		A thorough rationale would be beneficial. It's somewhat clear now why this might be adopted, but even greater clarity would be appreciated.
20		No
21		Yes. I think the entire CUNY First list of all classes in the Bulletin has to be updated and the update has to be explained to students and faculty.

#31. “Do you have any other concerns, questions, or suggestions on the renumbering Resolution?”

19 responses (responses “NO” were deleted)

) responses

	<p>istory has done a lot of work on our own proposal to renumber our undergraduate courses, so once this college-wide proposal goes through, we intend to move quickly with our own. We appreciate the work of this Committee and look forward to having a more comprehensible framework!</p>
	<p>ur program revised our numbering system last year, so undergoing another overhaul would be a hard sell for me as a new chair. That said, the proposed changes are not far off from what we are using now, so as a department I believe we are in support overall.</p>
	<p>we may need some guidance about the second, third, fourth digits.</p>
	<p>he college is in the midst of a budget crisis, and as part of cost reduction departments are being asked to sacrifice course reassignments given to faculty members involved in substantial administrative tasks. It is not advisable to impose a time-consuming process to understaffed departments who have no need for a change in the numerical system. In addition, the register’s office is also understaffed, and there seems to be no good reason to impose additional work on those staff members to work with departments who are satisfied with the current system.</p>
	<p>o. I have received no further feedback from faculty in my dept after we reviewed in dept meeting and I asked them to share any concerns they have. This will work fine for our dept.</p>
)	<p>ly department operates a sensible 3-digit scheme. If the College wants to make a cosmetic change to have all departments use a 4-digit scheme, I am willing to make the academic decisions required to produce new numbers for all of our courses. However, I do not want to go through any required purely bureaucratic processes (eg senate approval, Provost signature, State approval etc.). I hope that the Provost’s office would collect a list showing only old and corresponding new course numbers from each department and deal with whatever bureaucratic nightmare is needed, sparing the departments that work.</p>

5	his will make older transcripts significantly harder to properly evaluate, especially after some faculty/staff turnover, or when folks have forgotten what the old numbers used to be. There should be a dedicated and permanent section in the bulletin with tables of all old and new numbers, to reference as needed. A note in the course descriptions akin to "Formerly listed as SEYS XXX.X" would also be good for a few years, but could be phased out eventually.
6	his opportunity to renumber courses should seek input and collaboration from Administration and staff who frequently query academic enrollment across courses, programs, and departments. Adopting a more common framework for course numbering will provide additional sets of primary keys enabling program planners and institutional researchers streamlined queries.
7	lore hours for academic advising to explain the course changes and confirm if students are on track to graduate
8	think this is long overdue! In my role as one of QC's Transfer Explorer Ambassadors have done work around transfer. Including creating 2+2 transfer maps with QCC and GCC. The course renumbering changes would obviously change that maps that have been worked on, which is fine. However, I have also heard that Executive Vice Chancellor, Alicia Alvero may eventually implement universal course numbering system for all CUNY institutions. I do not know the timeline when this will be implemented, but I imagine it will take a long time to implement a change of this magnitude. It might be a good idea for QC to coordinate these efforts with CUNY central and to get a timeline for if/when CUNY will launch this universal course numbering system. If this change was happening in the near future, what would that mean for this project?

9	e are concerned about the cost of implementing the course renumbering given the financial situation of the college.
	lease see the comments I included already.
?	p.

3	wonder if using 5 digits wouldn't be more helpful, to avoid future chaos.
4	o, noted in prior responses.
5	o
6	think it might be better to wait until Spring 2027 to start these changes, since the students have already started pre-registration. To renumber the courses in midstream could be very confusing and time consuming for all concerned-- students, faculty and those working in the Registrar's Office.

#32 8 respondents declined to be quoted. Except for one comment on M&T fees, none of those respondents made comments or offered suggestions