I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion to approve the agenda was made by M. Mehrer and seconded by S. Conklin. The motion carried.

II. Announcements

A. Electronic Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the March 3, 2005, meeting were electronically approved.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee – C. Malecki

A motion to accept the APASC minutes of March 2, 2005, was made by C. Malecki. The motion passed.

C. Malecki reported that APASC continued to discuss the grading process regarding the option of going to a plus/minus system. The committee is now working on drafting a memorandum that will be sent to student organizations to solicit their feedback. Also discussed was the change in degrees of distinction criteria, which had previously been reported to UCC. Lastly, APASC reviewed several requests from the School of Family, Consumer and Nutrition Sciences for grade requirement changes that the department wants to make in their catalog language. The Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum felt the proposed changes were a limited admissions request, but the department did not agree. APASC reviewed and discussed the issue and then referred the proposals back to the department with a request for further clarification. If the department does not believe this is a limited retention proposal, additional information needs to be provided as to why it does not fit the criteria for a limited retention program.
B. General Education Committee – E. Wilkins

E. Wilkins made a motion to accept the February 17, 2005, minutes of the General Education Committee. The motion passed.

E. Wilkins reported that the meeting consisted of review of resubmissions and interim reports for various courses.

K. Van Mol noted that, referring to page four of the February 17, 2005, minutes, since the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology was not going to bring forward a resubmission request for IENG 335, GEC needs to take formal action to delete this course from the catalog. She indicated that this course will not be removed from the catalog simply because it’s not being brought forward.

C. Honors Committee – M. Mehrer

M. Mehrer made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 4, 2005, Honors Committee meeting. The motion passed.

M. Mehrer reported that the Honors Committee reviewed and approved an EYE Grant Proposal from a student requesting funding to support his attendance at a national conference at which the student will make a presentation. The proposal is based on the Honor student’s capstone project.

M. Mehrer also reported that in past Honors Committee meetings, significant concern has been expressed and discussed regarding the steady increase in the number of honors students. The program has grown above the normal cap to 1220 students, which is an 18% increase over last year at this time. In addition to the increase in the number of students, at the same time, there has been a decrease in the planned honors courses for next fall. M. Mehrer noted also that there is a notable loss in the number of faculty, as many faculty positions have not been refilled due to budgetary constrictions. A. Doederlein affirmed that one of the problems the university is facing is that there are more students but there has not been an increase in budget to hire additional faculty or to pay overloads; as a result, the honors work can not offered.

D. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education – M. Van Wienen

M. Van Wienen made a motion to accept the minutes of the February 21, 2005, meeting of the Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education. The motion passed.

M. Van Wienen reported that the main business of the February 21st meeting was the revision of the CIUE grant proposal guidelines. He noted changes were approved which included: 1) language added clarifying that purchase and expenses for the awards must submitted to the business manager by May 15; 2) a requirement added that a financial report be included with the final report which is due in the fall; 3) a requirement added that all proposals have a letter of recommendation; 4) to make all the headings in the guidelines consistent with each other as some of the documents were written at different times; 5) to change the title of the project to “Summer Projects for Improvement of Undergraduate Education” to clarify the intended timeline of the project; and 6) to add a statement regarding multi-phase projects as the old wording implies that multi-phase projects were not only a good thing but that the approval of one summer grant for a multi-phase project might imply that this was an advantage for obtaining a second award. The committee wanted to make clear that that was not the case – that the committee welcomes multi-phase projects, but each application will be considered on its own merit.
A. Doederlein asked if the committee had considered broadening the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching award to include non-tenured instructional staff. M. Van Wienen answered that a subcommittee was formed at the meeting and is continuing to gather information from department chairs who have been asked to consult with professors and instructors or the various representatives of the department about feedback on the motions passed at UCC: the first of which was to investigate broadening the existing EUTA to include non-tenure track faculty as potential nominees, and the second, to create a second award similar to EUTA dedicated exclusively to non-tenure track instructors.

M. Van Wienen made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 21, 2005, meeting of the Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education. The motion passed.

M. Van Wienen reported that the main business of March 21st meeting was to select the winners of the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Awards of which there were ten nominees. Selected as winners were Julie Hillery, School of Family, Consumer and Nutrition Sciences; Lee Shumow, Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundation; and Alan Zollman, Department of Mathematical Sciences.

Reporting on the committee’s old business, M. Van Wienen said that the committee has taken up further examination of the language of the CIUE grant proposals. The committee changed the eligibility for the computer software grant and the summer grants (up to $1,000) to cover either faculty or staff who wish to conduct activities contributing to the improvement of undergraduate education. In addition, another minor change made was that the committee approved the removal of the wording “within discipline” from the guidelines with the notion that some projects might be of an interdisciplinary nature or of cross-disciplinary applications.

E. Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment – P. Webb

P. Webb made a motion to accept the minutes of the February 8, 2005, meeting of the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment. The motion passed.

P. Webb said that he was not in attendance at the February 8, 2005, meeting, and that the March 24, 2005, meeting of CUAE had been cancelled. Since several committee members were absent from the February meeting, no action items had been taken, and selection of a chair for 2005-2006 has been postponed until the April 12, 2005, meeting.

A. Doederlein noted that at one time there was an attempt to merge the CUAE and CIUE, but CIUE was not in favor of such a merge. He questioned if, in light of so many budget cuts, the CUAE committee could be abolished.

D. Rusin remarked that the role of UCC is to coordinate the actions of the other committees. He added that he thinks it’s not a matter that the CUAE doesn’t have matters to examine but that the committee doesn’t have authority to make decisions for changes.

M. Mehrer made motion, seconded by E. Wilkins, to recommend that the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment be dissolved.

D. Rusin suggested that UCC review the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual to clarify what the charge of the CUAE committee is. He said that if CUAE doesn’t have power to implement improvements, that could be the change that needs to be made, possibly a change in the university structure to give the CUAE committee actual oversight of specific matters. He noted, however, that before action can be taken on this, UCC needs to examine what the actual charge of the committee is.
K. Van Mol remarked that a lot of subcommittees do not necessarily have power; if CUAE is aware of something that needs to be done, that matter would need to be brought to UCC, and UCC would then have the power to initiate action be taken to implement the recommendation. She suggested that UCC refer to the UCC minutes from February, in which E. Seaver reported on the activities of the CUAE.

K. Van Mol added that in those minutes E. Seaver indicated that the next CUAE meeting would be designated as a “finding the way” meeting, as this committee has struggled over the last year trying to develop some focus. Since UCC has one more meeting in May, K. Van Mol suggested that UCC postpone voting on the above motion until E. Seaver is present as he may have additional information or further feedback to share as a follow-up for UCC.

S. Conklin suggested that perhaps a more appropriate approach would be for P. Webb to take the concern of UCC back to CUAE and let the committee work on finding their way. If focus and purpose are not established, then CUAE may request that UCC, via a report from P. Webb, act to disband CUAE based on the committee’s own request.

A. Doederlein asked M. Mehrer, who had made the initial motion, and E. Wilkins, who had seconded the said motion, if they would agree to the above recommendation rather than to recommend disbanding the CUAE unless a way can be found to focus the committee.

M. Mehrer asked to rescind the motion as he observed that it is clear that UCC has a concern about this issue. He also noted that there might be several ways and several individuals that should have the opportunity to consider this issue. A. Doederlein added that rescinding the motion doesn’t prohibit UCC from acting on making a recommendation.

M. Van Wienen suggested tabling the motion until the next UCC meeting which would keep the item on the UCC agenda, since it’s been seconded, and it discussion has taken place.

M. Van Wienen made a motion, seconded by P. Webb, to table the motion made by M. Mehrer to recommend dissolving the Committee on the Academic Environment until the May 5, 2005, UCC meeting, pending the outcome of and discussion at the next CUAE meeting. The motion passed.

F. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum – D. Gough

A motion was made by D. Gough to accept the minutes of the March 10, 2005, Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum meeting. The motion passed.

D. Gough reported that agenda items for this meeting were basically minor changes and cleaning up some small changes in catalog copy. A change was made in Undergraduate Physical Education to set a higher GPA requirement in order to be admitted into KNPE 343, changing from a GPA of 2.5 to 2.75. She noted, however, that before action can be taken on this, UCC needs to examine what the actual charge of the committee is.

IV. Other Reports

A. University Assessment Panel

P. Webb reported that there have been no recent meetings, however, the committee has been involved with reviewing files of applicants for the position of University Assessment Coordinator.
V. **Old Business**

A. **Enrollments**

A. Doederlein noted that the committee agreed to keep the data analysis on enrollments on the agenda, however, he said he didn’t have anything new to add to what has already been distributed at previous meetings. He did note that the university has more students than ever and fewer faculty which is continuing to be more problematic.

D. Rusin asked if A. Doederlein wished to propose an action item on this matter. A. Doederlein answered that he did not want to propose an action item at this time, but he would like to leave this on the agenda for the next meeting. He indicated that an additional report may be forthcoming from the Advising Deans meeting about enrollment patterns that could be added to the information UCC has now. He also noted the possibility that there could be something at APASC that could enlighten what UCC has now. A. Doederlein said that he thought E. Seaver has been thinking about this and may have some ideas about it, so discussion would not necessary at today’s meeting. He added that the next step might be an action item or this information could be added to the files for future reference.

VI. **New Business**

There was no new business.

VII. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:43 p.m. The next UCC meeting is scheduled for May 5, 2005, beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Altgeld Hall 203.

Respectfully submitted,

Mollie Keller