Northern Illinois University

UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATING COUNCIL
138th Meeting
Thursday, December 1, 2005
Altgeld Hall 203

MINUTES
(Approved)

Present: R. Beatty (BUS), P. Brown (BUS), N. Boubekri (EET), S. Conklin (HHS), L. Derscheid (HHS), A. Doederlein (LAS), J. Gau (EET), W. Goldenberg (VPA), B. Hart (VPA), C. T. Lin (LAS), M. Mehrer (LAS), S. Ouellette (HHS), D. Rusin (LAS), E. Seaver (Vice Provost), L. Townsend (EDU), M. Van Wienen (LAS), P. Webb (LIB)

Absent: J. Corwin (LAS), E. Wilkins (EDU)
Students: K. Eckmann (EDU), D. Kettlestrings (LAS), D. Smith (SA), S. Zondag (BUS)

Guests: Mary Pritchard, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences
Joseph (Buck) Stephen, Associate Professor, Mathematical Sciences, and Faculty Senate Representative
Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

I. Adoption of Agenda

After one addition was made to the agenda, a motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded. The motion carried.

II. Announcements

A. Electronic Approval of Minutes

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

B. Presentation to Faculty Senate - Buck Stephen

Buck Stephen gave an accounting of the report on the investigation of the formation of the Academic Advising Center (AAC) that was presented to the Faculty Senate at the same time that APASC considered the catalog changes related to the AAC. He distributed a copy of the Resolution of the Faculty Senate of November 30, 2005, concerning the APASC report.

He went on to state that the APASC minutes of November 2, 2005, which UCC has received, include discussion about the AAC, but the catalog changes cited in these minutes are in quite an abbreviated form. He drew attention to the bottom of page five and top of page six of the minutes in which the first catalog change, referring to page 41 of the catalog, appears. He stated that the addition of the concluding phrase “or with the Academic Advising Center, if the student has no college affiliation” has been approved at the APASC level.
The question arose as to why UCC had not received this APASC report from the APASC committee prior to hearing B. Stephen’s presentation. B. Stephen said that UCC will be discussing this particular set of APASC minutes later in this meeting and voting to either receive or not receive these minutes. A. Doederlein added that B. Stephen was added to the meeting agenda to make his presentation early in the meeting because he would not be able to stay for the entire UCC meeting. A. Doederlein added that B. Stephen is trying to put into the discussion resolutions from the Faculty Senate and University Council so that the committee has a full plate of facts and ideas when UCC discusses the APASC minutes. B. Stephen noted it was not his intention to participate in UCC’s discussion of whether or not UCC will receive or not receive the APASC minutes; he has merely been charged with delivering this resolution from the Faculty Senate.

B. Stephen reported that the resolution unanimously approved by the Faculty Senate was to refuse to accept the portion of the APASC report concerning the AAC. He explained that the main problem is the particular addition at the beginning, in the introductory part of the paragraph of the section entitled “Academic Regulations,” because it makes the APASC report self-contradictory. He explained that the paragraph which ends with “A student who believes that his or her situation warrants an exception to one of these regulations should consult with the advising dean of his or her college.” That paragraph is considered by the advising deans to be the enacting power to change or waive requirements. By adding “or the AAC” as part of that language, then by consistency of application, that would extend that power to the AAC. He noted that makes that particular addition contradictory of the statement of Vice Provost Seaver on page 4 that that power will not be granted to the AAC. It also contradicts the motion of E. Mogren that the organic composition of the ACC needs to reflect this restriction on power. This is further reinforced by the friendly amendment of David Wade that the policies and procedures manual shall say that the AAC does not have that power. He pointed out that the catalog is our legal document, and the addition referred to then grants the AAC these powers. He said that that addition is not reflective of the expressed faculty intent but is, in fact, a reversal of their intent. He continued, stating that reference is made to what the organic constitution of the AAC and what the operating manual should contain; however, these documents were not considered, and he believes that the AAC should be scrutinized as closely as any other programmatic change that is made. The Faculty Senate also believes that there are serious concerns, and it is their desire that oversight issues and the development and review of internal structural policies must precede the catalog changes necessary for the AAC.

B. Stephen went on to state that this will not delay the operation of the AAC as both Vice Provost Seaver and the Faculty Senate have agreed upon a set of provisional rules which reflect the faculty’s intent. What UCC’s return of the APASC report may mean is that this language will not make it into the catalog, however, during orientation all of the students in the 709 category, undecided colleges, are immediately made aware of the AAC. He said this is not depriving the students of the opportunity of this advising system, but it is the intent that in doing this to make sure it is done right. He stated that we should be careful about our language and what power that is granted to the AAC. He also noted that it is not unreasonable that the oversight issue be addressed and that there be an internal structural policy that the faculty can understand and access before approving relevant catalog changes. He concluded by stating that is the feeling of the Faculty Senate and the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. He then offered to answer any questions UCC members may have.

E. Seaver thanked B. Stephen for taking the time to attend this meeting and communicate the information from the Faculty Senate. He also expressed appreciation to him for his honest pursuit of wanting to have a quality curricular process for our students. B. Stephen commented that he supported any actions the university could take to improve retention and performance; and he feels that once the AAC is online and done in a way that everyone’s happy with this will be a good step in that direction. He stated that Faculty Senate is actually
in support of the idea and were appreciative of the work that had been done by Vice Provost Seaver.

M. Van Wienen noted that the text given to the committee is new to them, and, in large part, Faculty Senate is asking UCC to reject minutes which might otherwise have simply slipped through. M. Van Wienen continued stating, as B. Stephens noted, there is a friendly amendment stating that the AAC cannot initiate or approve exemptions to curricular requirements - in effect, this friendly amendment is trying to iron out the difference. He asked why that motion was not sufficient to deal with the concern that Faculty Senate has. B. Stephen answered because the addition of the “or” phrase to the paragraph that he referred to on page 41 is an enabling move in our legal document with the student. His main point was that, if nothing else, that particular addition on page 41 should be rejected because it has already been agreed on all sides that that power of waiver and exemptions should not lie in the AAC. He added that it may have been just an oversight or a misunderstanding of what that introductory paragraph deals with.

M. Van Wienen confirmed that, at this point, B. Stephen’s suggestion is that UCC reject that piece of the minutes, which would change that part of the catalog, so that in the contract with the student, which the catalog represents, it’s reflected accurately that we do not intend, at this point, to grant the power of exemption to the AAC. B. Stephens said exemptions and waivers should be granted after the student reaches his or her program. He again stated that this may have been just an oversight, however, or a misunderstanding by the members of APASC of what the empowering meaning of that paragraph is. He noted that the recommendation of Faculty Senate is to return all of the portions of the report on the AAC, however, their main concern was that particular phrase.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee - E. Seaver

E. Seaver reported on the APASC meeting of November 2, 2005. He reported that undergraduate catalog changes to the “Satisfactory Academic Progress Section” of the catalog that came to the committee by way of the college advising offices were approved. He also stated that this issue of Satisfactory Academic Progress will probably come back to the committee again because there are some issues as it relates to Student Financial Aid. The college advising office representatives are waiting for some language from Student Financial Aid as to what is needed for newer process, so an additional form of this will probably come through after the first of the year.

APASC also reviewed and approved undergraduate catalog changes that were submitted to APASC regarding the Academic Advising Center which were developed by the college advising offices. E. Seaver announced that he asked Mary Pritchard, Associate Dean, College of Health and Human Sciences, to attend the UCC meeting today as a reference or resource from APASC representing the college advising deans.

E. Seaver reported that at the November 30, 2005, APASC meeting (no minutes are yet available for that meeting), the two issues that were brought to the attention of UCC today were brought up to that committee. Brought up was the issue of the wording on page 41 and how that relates to the second motion that talks about the AAC not being able to initiate waivers or exemptions. He clarified that “initiate” is the proper term because the AAC does not approve waivers - the approval process for any kind of a waiver occurs or is initiated in the college offices and then sent on to the Provost’s office where the approval is given or denied. APASC’s discussion regarding the wording issue focused on clarifying that the term “approve” should really be “consult.” From the committee’s perspective, consult was the term that is
more appropriate because this is a way to tell students that if they think they are entitled to something they can come and talk to them about it, but it is not an automatic approval. He repeated that the college advising offices are the ones to initiate any waivers. The response from APASC during this second discussion on wording was that the term is consult, not approve, with the idea of providing a way for students to know where to go to ask the questions, with the AAC essentially telling students that they will need to take up the issue with their major college when they get into their major. In the APASC discussion of the issue, what led to the discussion of the firmer language was that E. Seaver had placed into the minutes his statement that the AAC would not initiate as it would be inappropriate, as a student can not graduate as an undecided. APASC, at that time, felt they wanted stronger language that would be in the documentation from APASC, but, at his recommendation, would be included in the materials that are used for training advisors. APASC wanted that language in terms of operating procedures for the AAC. E. Seaver also noted that, in addition, the issue of an advisory committee for the AAC and its role and function were discussed.

M. Pritchard, a member of the Advising Deans, stated that the Advising Deans group has been talking about this issue for over two years, so this was not a mistake or an oversight. The group looked at the word consult and viewed that section of the catalog as an information source that students could consult. The Advising Deans talked about the issue, and this was approved by the group of advising representatives, with one objection and one abstention. This issue was not taken lightly by the group, and, on behalf of that group, she reaffirmed what E. Seaver had stated.

E. Seaver stated that the concern about the AAC initiating the waiving of university requirements was a significant discussion. However, the other major piece of concern was about the operation of the AAC, as to how it operates, who it was, etc., and about faculty oversight. There was a concern because the AAC was not located within a college where there would be faculty oversight as it related to this particular group. He stated that twenty months ago when this was first formulated by way of memorandums to all the advising offices and all the deans of the colleges, in those initiating memoranda, there was cited a plan to have a faculty advisory committee, so this had been the plan all along. In the eleven meetings that were held during the last nineteen months, there were discussions in this group, APASC, and with the deans, to use APASC as the faculty oversight committee. The Constitution and By-Laws says that APASC has responsibility for monitoring advising on campus. He said that APASC rejected that idea; they did not want to be the faculty oversight committee, so they drafted the language that came from the Faculty Senate.

M. Van Wienen said that he wanted to make sure that the adding of the phrase “or with the Academic Advising Center, if the student has no college affiliation” was in the correct place on page 41 in the catalog. E. Seaver stated it would be added at the end of the paragraph.

M. Van Wienen asked which paragraph. D. Smith said that it would be at the end of the first paragraph. M. Van Wienen then went on to read from the catalog, “A student who believes that his or her situation warrants an exception to one of these regulations should consult with the advising dean of his or her college or with the Academic Advising Center, if the student has no college affiliation.” E. Seaver said that was correct and clarified that the advice of the Advising Deans was to add on “if there is no college affiliation,” this variation may have been just an add-on after that to say “or the Academic Advising Center.” M. Van Wienen stated that the advising dean does make the decision.

E. Seaver explained that this is a two-step decision making process; there clearly is a decision made at the level of the college because whoever has the responsibility in the college advising office must prepare a waiver form and forward it to the Office of the Provost for approval by the Vice Provost. However, because the college office signs off it does not mean a guarantee, as the Vice Provost may not give approval. Final approval of any graduation requirements
resides in the Vice Provost office, which has been the practice for years. M. Van Wienen stated that it does give cause about approving this wording because as E. Seaver said, a student cannot graduate without a major, and, in most of the decisions about exemptions, there are decisions in which the context of what the student’s major is at least part of the picture. He went to say that it seems unusual to suggest that a student would be able to seek an exemption with advice from the AAC which could then be imposed upon whomever major that person got. E. Seaver said that’s what the language that was approved by APASC was meant to be, that the AAC cannot initiate any of these requirements. E. Seaver said that was the language that B. Stephens went through in terms of 1, 2, 3 and 4, in the Faculty Senate document because they wanted it clear.

M. Pritchard added that the Advising Deans wouldn’t even consider sending one of these through for an undeclared person, it’s always within the context of a major. She reiterated that this was informational for students who need to know where they should go to ask a question, and they would go to the college office. If a student is undeclared in their college, the college would advise them to get their major first.

M. Van Wienen noted that this is an issue of parallelism then because if the word consult is used in one piece then it becomes a way in which the appeal can be initiated. The question would be what is the best way to actually resolve the issue. E. Seaver stated that he thinks that is part of the issue as it was discussed in the advising group and also with APASC. He continued by using the example of a freshman student who comes here and assumes that because E. Seaver is a native speaker of German that he should be able to give a waiver on the B.A. for German. That student is going to look at the catalog and say “where am I going to go?” He wants to see about getting a waiver, and, going along with the discussion in APASC, which simply said if a student has a question about this, go to your major; if you don’t have a major, go to the AAC. He said APASC said that wasn’t good enough for them; they didn’t want the Vice Provost’s word, because the individual serving as Vice Provost could change, and a new Vice Provost might say fine. Regardless of what it says in the minutes, what APASC said is that they want policies that will be used by the AAC in their training and their checklist for training and policies that say that the AAC cannot initiate a waiver. The student needs to be told that he/she has to wait and discuss the issue once they have selected a college or major. E. Seaver said that’s what the committee discussed. He indicated that he was not surprised when APASC, at its November 30, 2005, meeting, suggested the wording change to “consult.” No discussion was generated at APASC on the use of the word “consult.”

C. T. Lin asked if there might be confusion caused for the student if he/she goes to the AAC for a waiver, and AAC tells the student that they cannot make a decision on it, after the student has been advised to go there. E. Seaver said that making a decision about a waiver like that would not likely happen or relate to these students as most of these students are freshmen or sophomores in which case making a decision about a waiver would be very rare instance. These waivers are originated by the college office in the context of the major, and what might be appropriate for one major may not be appropriate for another major. He pointed out that most of these waivers aren’t initiated until the student is in his/her senior year, and it would be a disservice to the student to allow something like this. In the instance of a transfer issue, the Advising Center is not to be handling that as it is up to the academic department of the major to make those kinds of decisions, so the word when the student comes to the AAC is, “get your major chosen”. As soon as they get majors chosen, then that is discussed with their major advisor in their college office. E. Seaver went on to say that he was delighted by the fact that APASC wanted to put that language in the wording as a way to have stronger language and that it passed unanimously. He said he didn’t feel a disservice was being done, but that it would be a large disservice by making those decisions too soon.

L. Townsend asked if the Faculty Senate was suggesting that UCC reject the APASC minutes. A. Doederlein answered that Faculty Senate is suggesting that UCC return this to APASC. E. Seaver confirmed that was what B. Stephen had stated. A. Doederlein said that he was in
favor of that since, with the excerpting, he isn’t sure what is being changed. L. Townsend said it could be read in the catalog. A. Doederlein agreed that it could be read in the catalog, but since UCC didn’t get this information until a few days ago, he has not had time to do go through the catalog and read the language that is being changed. He said that he knows that what was presented to APASC was a document that included what was being struck from the paragraph, what was being added to the paragraph, and why. He noted that we are not getting the full textual analysis that we insist upon from committees like the CUC. E. Seaver commented that “why” was not included in the documents provided to APASC. A. Doederlein went on to say that he is really confused by the minutes.

S. Conklin commented that it seems to her that APASC had a good long time addressing the concerns that are forwarded from the Faculty Senate and included motions indicating how they were addressing those, and that this is a process that’s been going on for more than two years. E. Seaver said that the process actually has taken approximately twenty months.

A. Doederlein added that the items that B. Stephen distributed included what Faculty Senate did yesterday because of being confused by the minutes that he finds confusing, too. He noted that B. Stephen also passed out findings of a report by the Faculty Senate which leads to issues that are now excerpts in the phrases in the APASC minutes; that handout includes what went from the Faculty Senate to the University Council. He noted that University Council, at the bottom of the reverse side of said handout, talks about the fact that what is said here is, in fact, that approval of the University Council is necessary for the actual constitutional creation of the AAC and for its operation. He stated that he is feeling uncomfortable about the idea that UCC may adopt the APASC minutes about the AAC when, in fact, the Faculty Senate said please return it and have it clarified. We are, in turn, then going to send our approval of the APASC minutes on to the University Council for their scrutiny and their approval. He stated he doesn’t think that that’s a wise idea. He said that, ultimately, they, the University Council, have oversight of the language of the AAC and the powers of operation. He went on to say that he doesn’t think that we’re particularly following the various proposals that they sent to us; they are, finally, the ultimate decision-making in the university.

R. Beatty questioned whether, compounded with the fact that we’re talking about this oversight organization with not a lot of detail, as well, this will be compounded in our next point that’s going to come up that we don’t have enough information. E. Seaver answered that APASC has stipulated that they want an advisory committee established, and they would establish guidelines. He said that discussion was started at the meeting of APASC on November 30, 2005. He indicated that his recommendation was that APASC, because it is constitutionally within their requirements to have oversight of advising on campus, should require of the oversight committee periodic reporting on the things stipulated as it relates to what’s happening. APASC presently gets reinstatement reports from all the colleges, however, the Academic Advising Center is not going to be involved in reinstatement. He said that he suggested that they should ask for periodic reporting from that advisory committee as to the operation of the Academic Advising Center -- how many dismissals, how many appeals, how many appeals granted, how many withdrawals, all of the activities, also the effectiveness. He is hoping that, because they will require that of the AAC, we might start asking the colleges for the same type of data, as well as departments. Those are the kinds of data, other than reinstatements, that the committee might want to see. He thinks one thing we might like to do is increase the importance of what our faculty do in advising.

R. Beatty questioned, with reference to E. Seaver’s point about the constitution stating that APASC is responsible for all advising, how they can say that we’re not going to be responsible for the oversight of this. E. Seaver answered that they felt that there might be faculty on campus that would be better versed and have more experience in advising than some of the members of APASC (faculty don’t have to have experiences on APASC to be a good advisor), and APASC is comprised of faculty who are elected to that committee for various reasons. He said they felt that a stronger advisory committee could be established by going outside
APASC, and they did lay out guidelines. This advisory committee would be reporting to APASC. E. Seaver noted that discussion was held at APASC on November 30, 2005, and would be reflected in the next set of APASC minutes.

S. Conklin clarified that under “Concerns” in the findings report, #2, which states that at the present time there is no mechanism in place for faculty oversight of the AAC, that was actually addressed by APASC. E. Seaver stated that APASC took the exact wording that the Faculty Senate recommended from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, which is shown in the attachment at the back of the APASC minutes. He said this is the Faculty Senate concern. Referring to that attachment, he said that APASC adopted the second item (#2), word for word.

A. Doederlein said that the Faculty Senate resolution from November 30, 2005, says that the Faculty Senate believes that the oversight issues and the development and review of internal structural policies must precede the catalog changes

E. Seaver made a motion, seconded by S. Conklin, to accept the November 2, 2005, minutes of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee meeting.

The motion failed: 8 Yes - 8 No

In further discussion, A. Doederlein indicated that he felt that UCC should accept all portions of the APASC minutes not related to the catalog wording for the Academic Advising Center but reject that portion of the minutes relating to the proposed catalog wording relating to the Academic Advising Center. E. Seaver recapped that what A. Doederlein was suggesting was that UCC send this back to APASC and ask them to resubmit the information that they looked at as a part of their vote, which would include the vote totals. He said that there was no “why” included in their documents. A. Doederlein stated that he feels that UCC is more likely to get the approval of Faculty Senate and University Council, and UCC is more likely to make an informed decision, if the committee gets a complete discussion of what, in fact, is their call. E. Seaver reiterated that if such a motion passes, then APASC would be asked to send information back to UCC for review at the next meeting. A. Doederlein confirmed that he would support sending this back to APASC for a full clarification of what the excerpts really actually meant.

E. Seaver said the one question he raises is that A. Doederlein mentions approval by University Council and Faculty Senate of the actions of this group. From E. Seaver’s understanding, in discussion with Paul Stoddard, Faculty Senate President and University Council Secretary, that is not true. A. Doederlein said that in the catalog it states that regulations in this catalog represent the policies adopted by the faculties and administration of NIU. E. Seaver stated that that would be this body, the UCC. D. Rusin commented that this body has certain powers, such as final say over the catalog and things like that, and we expect our decisions to be accepted by the Council in full. In the same way, we ordinarily trust, for example, APASC to review all matters in the area of advising or academic standards, and, ordinarily, UCC accepts them which is to say that we trusted their judgment, and whatever they put into their minutes we pass on up to the next level. He continued stating that, in this case, Faculty Senate is actually sort of advisory, but they have significant overlap with the membership of University Council.

A. Doederlein stated that in the findings report it is found that the formation of the Academic Advising Center and the assignment of powers to said center were in violation of the shared governance of NIU as outlined in the constitution of the university. In particular, the formation of the AAC is in conflict with the primary charge that the faculty, as stated in the preamble to the constitution of NIU, and in various bylaws (particularly those in section 13) of the constitution. While formation of the AAC was presented to faculty through APASC and UCC,
no vote was ever taken in these bodies. A. Doederlein stated that they are quoting section 13 of the constitution and the preamble to the constitution. He went on to say that in the resolution submitted to the University Council from Faculty Senate, they talk about the reaffirmation of the confidence in shared governance; they say that the University Council of Northern Illinois University adjures that no officer of the university, the various colleges or departments shall alter, create or transfer responsibilities, nor shall they alter policies which are reserved or assigned to the faculty without or before completing the requirements necessary for such changes through the shared governance process.

E. Seaver stated that UCC is in the middle of the shared governance process to approve the catalog language for the Academic Advising Center. A. Doederlein reiterated that this is a major change in the way business is conducted at this university at the highest level of shared governance which is the University Council; he said that's what University Council told us in passing this resolution on November 9, 2005. E. Seaver again stated that we are in the middle of the shared governance.

M. Van Wienen asked when the catalog copy would be finalized and coming off the presses, and, if this is not approved today, would there be printing issues for the 2006-2007 catalog. D. Smith answered that the online catalog learning/training process is still underway. E. Seaver said that likely this will not be in the 2006-2007 catalog in the sense that APASC does not meet again until February 2, 2006, and UCC meets within a day or two of that, so UCC will not see this again until March, 2006. He stated that even though it would not appear in the 2006-2007 catalog, it would still be date effective.

S. Conklin stated that it seems to her that what the Faculty Senate was objecting to had to do with governance, and the governance issue was addressed in the description of the faculty oversight committee that was described in detail by APASC. She indicated she was not sure what else UCC could ask them to do. A. Doederlein responded stating that the Faculty Senate’s resolution from November 30, 2005, said that they would like to see such a committee established.

A. Doederlein made a motion, seconded by D. Rusin, to accept the November 2, 2005, minutes of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee meeting, with the exception of the entire portion of the minutes which contains or relates to the proposed catalog language changes regarding the Academic Advising Center; to send that entire portion of the November 2, 2005, minutes which contains the proposed wording changes relating to the Academic Advising Center back to the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee requesting full clarification of the contents of each of the excerpts with exact wording; and to request the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee to resubmit to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council the information and exact documents used by the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee as a part of their vote, including the exact vote results for each of catalog wording change items relating to the Academic Advising Center.

The motion passed: 8 Yes - 6 No - 2 Abstentions

B. General Education Committee - D. Rusin

D. Rusin reported that the main topic of discussion at the October 27th meeting of the General Education Committee was the possibility of bringing in a guest speaker to talk to the committee about the assessment of general education. The speaker the committee is considering will also be conducting a workshop at NIU on March 24, 2006.
D. Rusin made a motion to accept the October 27, 2005, minutes of the General Education Committee. The motion carried.

C. Honors Committee - W. Goldenberg

L. Derscheid reported the Honors committee heard reports from the Director, Assistant Director and Program Coordinator. In addition, she and W. Goldenberg, on behalf of UCC, requested from the Honors Committee a breakdown of the honors students by major. This information should be provided in the next set of Honors Committee minutes.

L. Derscheid made a motion to accept the November 4, 2005, minutes of the Honors Committee. The motion passed.

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

There was no report.

E. Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment - C. T. Lin

C. T. Lin reported that a committee chair had been elected. The committee also reviewed the Undergraduate Special Opportunities in Artistry and Research (USOAR) guidelines, and it was pointed out that two USOAR workshops are being offered for interested students.

The committee discussed and established goals for 2005-2006. Three important areas were identified: 1) obtain an overview and background from Student Affairs and the office of the Ombudsman; 2) comprise a student focus group to provide a student perspective; and 3) explore in more depth the City of DeKalb/university relationship.

Vice Provost Seaver presented to the committee an overview and description of each of the Academic Support Services units which report to the Vice Provost. Vice Provost Seaver reported to the committee that one large issue facing the university at the present time is improvement of the university’s retention rate. Two areas which are key in the university retention efforts are the academic side and the student life/activity side.

C. T. Lin went on to say that Vice Provost Seaver addressed questions from the CUAE committee regarding the increase in the size of the Honors Program. The number of students enrolled in Honors has almost doubled over the last five years. The increase is due not to the lowering of our standards but to the fact that more students are becoming aware of the program, becoming interested and taking advantage of the program. It was also pointed out that there seemed to be a lack of science majors in the Honors program, and Vice Provost Seaver indicated that numbers and representation of the program are being looked at, as well as a plan of what an honors college would look like.

N. Boubekri asked for information regarding the funding of the USOAR grants. E. Seaver explained that, in the past, this program was funded by Pepsi funds. He reported that the funding from the Pepsi source has been stopped in order to use that money to build up scholarship funds to use when the Pepsi contract runs out. The last awarding of the scholarships will be in 2007. In addition to about $200,000 per year of the Pepsi funds that are used for new freshmen, the small grants have been stopped in order to bankroll that money to keep that scholarship program going longer in the event that a renewal on that type of a contract is not made. The Office of the Vice Provost is picking up the funding of $25,000 per year for the funding USOAR grants. Presently, student proposals are being submitted to the colleges, with a due date of December 2, 2005. The number of proposals submitted last year
was more than in past years, due in part to faculty members who are aware of the program and begin contacting students to start working on proposals. There is a maximum stipend per project that a student can receive. It is a fairly competitive program and not everything gets funded. Other opportunities to fund this program are being explored.

C. T. Lin made a motion to accept the October 11, 2005, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment. The motion passed.

F. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum – W. Goldenberg

W. Goldenberg reported that a good portion of the discussion items in all three sets of minutes being received involve referral to appropriate committees such as APASC, GEC or CITC. He indicated that, because some of the items need to be considered by those committees, those items would not be included in his report. He also reported that there were many non-duplication questions raised; those items were tabled or postponed for non-duplication of course checks.

In the October 20, 2005, CUC minutes, the College of Education, item #10, involved the course, EPS 304, being proposed as a gateway course, a course that a student would take right before he/she is admitted to the elementary education program. The change in prerequisite was for a 2.5 GPA rather than a 2.0. It was noted that this is a course that is only taken by education students. The college representatives said that the general feeling was that if a student was as close to entering the program as this and the GPA was below 2.5, the student wouldn't be admitted to the education program anyway. CUC approved this change.

The College of Education, item #13, which is very similar to the previous instance, involved changing the prerequisite GPA for EPS 300 from 2.0 to a 2.5. This course is needed to be taken by students from other departments outside of education. This item was sent back to the college and later denied by CUC.

Referring to the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, item #2, W. Goldenberg pointed out that if a department wishes to change its name, the president of the university must give approval for such a change.

W. Goldenberg reported that in the minutes it was also noted that the university is going to an online catalog, and Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator, is presently in the process of being trained on this.

D. Rusin asked if when there is an online catalog would that mean that it can be updated as necessary whenever and would that mean there will still be a moment of record. E. Seaver responded that the online catalog can not be updated as needed; it will stand for a year. He confirmed that students will still be under one particular catalog. W. Goldenberg commented that one nice feature of the new online catalog is that notations of actions taken by committees can be added to the database for reference even though the actions may not be in effect yet. E. Seaver added that the online catalog is actually a content manager, different than what is thought of as a publishing tool. Records of actions by colleges and curricular committees will be included in the database. Another factor is that it is anticipated that deadlines that have been used in the past will be much more flexible because changes can be made in a working document as needed and then a date set for the new version to be rolled over for use. Past catalog versions will then be archived. Paper catalogs will continue to be printed in addition to the online version although the quantity will be greatly reduced.

D. Rusin asked for clarification on effective dates for changes in prerequisites. E. Seaver said that prerequisite changes can be date effective, next semester effective or effective with the publishing of the new catalog, but, generally, most changes are effective the next semester.
The exception to that would be the addition of a new limited admission or limited retention program. Specific language is in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual as to how much time must be given students.

**W. Goldenberg made a motion to accept the October 20, 2005, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum. The motion passed.**

Reporting on the November 10, 2005, minutes of the CUC committee, W. Goldenberg noted that an extended discussion took place surrounding the College of Business, item #5, a proposal for a new course, MKTG 099. This course consists of a student putting together a portfolio which is a representative summary of their work throughout their coursework during their fourth year at NIU. The purpose of the portfolio is for the department to assess the work they’ve been doing. There was much discussion about the numbering of the course as 099 because the course is taken right at the end of the student’s career at NIU, and 099 is somewhat of a remedial number. He said that the outcome, which will be indicated in later minutes, was that this will be listed in the catalog as 99, however, for the purposes of the registration and records computerized system, a zero will show at the beginning.

The committee also discussed the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology, item #4, in which the college was requesting that credit be granted for individuals in the process of completing the A.A.S. degree but that had not yet completed the degree work - to get credit granted ahead of time. The committee felt that to be inappropriate. One other issue with this proposal was that hours had been added up incorrectly in the printed material submitted to the committee. This item was sent back to the college for modification, and, as will be reported in minutes from a later meeting of CUC, the department accepted the changes that were suggested and the corrected hours.

W. Goldenberg went on to report that in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, item #2, there were two courses which the committee questioned because there were very extensive changes to the course descriptions. The committee questioned whether these should be submitted as new courses. The committee sent them back to the College for clarification, and further action will be reflected in the next set of committee minutes.

**W. Goldenberg made a motion to accept the November 10, 2005, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum. The motion passed.**

W. Goldenberg reported that the November 17, 2005, CUC minutes reflect the outcomes of discussions he reported on from the previous CUC meeting minutes.

The MKTG 099 item was approved as amended. CUC did not approve the College of Education EPS 300 issue of requiring different GPA’s for students within the College of Education versus those not within the college. CUC accepted the College of Engineering and Engineering Technology #4 catalog changes as amended.

The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, item #2, HIST 493H and HIST 494H was sent back to the college requesting modifications to correct the inconsistency in the numbering of the courses.

CUC recommended that the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, item #2, SOCI 280, a course in which Sociology majors need to complete with a grade of C or better, be sent to APASC for approval.

**W. Goldenberg made a motion to accept the November 17, 2005, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum. The motion passed.**
IV. Other Reports

A. University Assessment Panel - P. Webb

P. Webb reported that the November 4, 2005, meeting of the University Assessment Panel was devoted to revising a survey that was used to assess graduates.

V. Old Business

A. Selection of UCC Student Representative to the University Assessment Panel

E. Seaver stated that a student is still needed to serve on this committee; this will be kept on the agenda for the next UCC meeting.

VI. New Business

There was no new business.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m. The next meeting of UCC is scheduled for Thursday, February 2, 2006, beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Altgeld Hall 203.

Respectfully submitted,
Mollie Keller