Northern Illinois University
UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATING COUNCIL
152nd Meeting
Thursday, October 4, 2007
Altgeld Hall 203

MINUTES

Approved

Present: A. Azad (EET), R. Beatty (BUS), D. Ballantine (LAS/Substitute for A. Doederlein), S. Conklin (HHS), J. Corwin (LAS), W. Goldenberg (VPA), D. Gorman (LAS), J. Hansen (BUS), B. Hart (VPA), Amber Keyes (Student/LAS), C. T. Lin (LAS), C. Malecki (LAS), S. Ouellette (HHS), E. Phillips (Student/SA), F. Sciammarella (EET), E. Seaver (Vice Provost), C. Snow (LIB), J. Stephen (LAS), E. Wilkins (EDU)

Absent: A. Doederlein (LAS), J. Isabel (HHS), D. Shernoff (EDU)

Guest: Raymond W. Alden, III, Executive Vice President and Provost
D. Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by C. Snow, seconded by E. Wilkins, to approve the agenda. The motion carried.

II. Announcements

A. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the September 6, 2007, Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting were electronically approved.

B. Committee Member Introductions

As there were two new committee members in attendance, Dr. Seaver asked committee members to introduce themselves.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee – W. Goldenberg

W. Goldenberg reported that at the September 5, 2007, APASC meeting the committee approved catalog changes regarding a statement on assessment and medical withdrawal from a course and received an update on the new student information system.
W. Goldenberg made a motion, seconded by S. Conklin, to receive the September 5, 2007, minutes of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee meeting. The motion carried.

B. General Education Committee – D. Gorman

There was no report, however, D. Gorman mentioned that at the first GEC meeting, there were not yet student representatives, and the committee expressed concern about this. E. Seaver noted that this is probably just a timing issue. He explained that the colleges identify students through their student advisory committees, and those groups are just now having their first meetings of the year and are in the process of nominating students for committees at these meetings. E. Phillips suggested that information be publicized more in order to reach a broader group of students.

C. Honors Committee – J. Hansen

J. Hansen reported that the Honors Committee received graduation numbers, Taft Retreat survey results, and information relating to Honors House requirements. E. Seaver also noted that the committee further discussed the Honors Program Strategic Plan which will be received at the next Honors meeting.

C. Malecki asked how the number of Honors graduates reconciles with the total number of Honors students. E. Seaver explained that there is a transition point from lower division to upper division where the program loses students that move on into the major and don’t go into an honors program in that particular major which is not affiliated with the Honors Program at Northern. He explained that historically it is difficult to record those numbers because, up until last year, students could stay in the Honors Program for a number of semesters and not really be participating by taking honors courses. There was suspicion that this was happening because Honors students are given priority registration; this is no longer the case.

J. Stephen asked if the Honors Program was going to be considering more closely aligning itself with the departmental and college honors systems. E. Seaver responded that is one of the elements of the strategic plan, and, if the plan is approved, the decision will be how to move forward on those major goals.

J. Stephen also stated that it was his understanding that an Honors student is required to take six hours of courses at the 400 level outside his/her department of study. A. Keyes answered that an honors student is required to take three credit hours outside his/her department of study, and there is a list of seven or eight specific seminar courses set aside each semester for Honors students to choose from. She noted that the seminar courses are usually the ones Honors students take outside their major.
J. Hansen made a motion, seconded by J. Stephen, to receive the September 7, 2007, minutes of the University Honors Committee meeting. The motion carried.

D. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education – E. Seaver

E. Seaver reported that the September 10, 2007, CIUE meeting was an organizational meeting to familiarize new members with the work of CIUE and to discuss the revisions to the various CIUE grant proposal forms and to the nomination forms for the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching and Instruction awards.

J. Stephen asked if the committee examines the teaching philosophy statement of each of the nominees for the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Award. E. Seaver answered that it is not part of the policy but he noted that the committee reviews all materials submitted with each nomination. He said that the committee has been attempting to make it easier to obtain consistent data from the colleges by utilizing the online format and that the committee uses a standard rubric so that everyone is dealing with the same criteria.

E. Seaver made a motion, seconded by J. Corwin, to receive the September 10, 2007, minutes of the Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education meeting. The motion carried.

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

There was no report.

F. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum – R. Beatty

R. Beatty reported on the September 20, 2007, meeting of the CUC.

R. Beatty made a motion, seconded by C. Snow, to receive the September 20, 2007, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum meeting.

J. Stephen stated that Item #4, “Effective Dates for Curricular Changes,” is an action item listed under the “Announcements” section of the minutes. He said that, according to the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM), this has to be forwarded as an action item and go through the approval process of the APPM committee and not enacted as an announcement. He clarified that this is an action item because it is a change of the language of an item in the APPM that has been authorized previously for inclusion in the APPM. He said that this change does affect things outside the purview of the CUC; it affects colleges’ advising policies, and he suggested that this be returned to the CUC and be made an action item.
E. Seaver provided clarification regarding the issue. He explained that this was an item generated by the curricular deans. He said that the Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator was charged by the curricular deans, with all the college curricular deans present, to draft the language which then was circulated to the curricular deans. He noted that it was his understanding that the language was to have been circulated to the faculty by the curricular deans.

E. Seaver also added, in order to clarify, that the language that has been crossed out (“A new major . . . .”) is confusing language because, after talking with Virginia Cassidy, Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Development, who works with new program requests, it is true that, after going through IBHE approval, we can say yes, we do have that major and can recruit students to that major; however, that doesn’t make it effective for the catalog. The catalog only becomes effective relative to the catalog date. In essence, when talking about implementing policies and procedures as it relates to students’ degree requirements, then that has to be in the catalog before the language can be implemented, which is not new; that has always been the case at this institution. He went on to say that the confusion as it relates to this is that the implementation of auditing by the students and the students' records is all driven by the catalog not by the fact that IBHE says yes you now consider that you have a degree go through them. He said all of these issues have created some misunderstanding, as he was under the assumption that the curricular deans had been discussing this with faculty.

J. Stephen noted that another issue with this is that in the past when curricular changes were made there was a date effective and a catalog effective. He said that date effective changes would be accepted for things that enlarge students capabilities to meet the programmatic needs, but, if we restricted their choices that might be catalog effective. E. Seaver said that there was no such policy. J. Stephen said that advising faculty take actions based on date effective and catalog effective.

E. Seaver said his recommendation would be to send this item back to CUC for further discussion. He noted that the catalog can not be changed as the current catalog is running, and there would not be a way to audit students.

J. Stephen added that there were other points to return for further discussion as well. He said that, in responding to President Peters’ State of the University address comments of 2005, 2006, 2007, we are charged to become more responsive and more rapidly responsive to the needs of students. He said, however, under this proposed revision regarding effective dates there might be a new program that no one will see for possibly eighteen months to two years, which is not being more responsive.

E. Seaver asked if he was suggesting that the entire set of minutes be returned to the committee. J. Stephen made a friendly amendment to the previous motion made by R. Beatty and seconded
by C. Snow. Both Beatty and Snow approved the revised motion to include the friendly amendment as follows:

R. Beatty, made a motion, seconded by C. Snow, to receive the September 20, 2007, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum meeting WITH THE EXCEPTION of Item #3 under “Announcements” concerning revisions to Section III, Item 5, of the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual, which is to be returned to the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum for further consideration with particular attention be paid to how to make the process more expeditious. The motion carried.

IV. Other Reports

A. University Assessment Panel

C. Snow reported on the September 21, 2007, meeting of the University Assessment Panel. The meeting was the first of the year and was generally organizational. Meeting topics included a recap of the past year and discussion of the University Writing Project. He also reported the panel learned that the follow-up report to the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) was submitted and accepted with positive feedback. Expectations were met, there were no concerns, and the institution is fully accredited until the next site visit in 2014.

In addition, he noted that the panel is working on revising the rubric for assessment for academic support units. He explained that, originally, there was one rubric being used for everything, and it didn’t fit very well. It is hoped that by the end of this academic year a new rubric will be in place.

C. Snow made a motion, seconded by J. Corwin, to receive the September 21, 2007, notes of the University Assessment Panel meeting. The motion carried.

V. Old Business

A. Representatives of Standing Committees for 2007-2008

E. Seaver asked for volunteers to serve as UCC representatives on CIUE and GEC for 2007-2008. A. Azad was approved by the committee to serve as the CIUE representative. R. Beatty said he would look more closely at his schedule to see if he would have availability to attend the GEC meetings.

VI. New Business

A. University Strategic Plan

Raymond W. Alden, III, Executive Vice President and Provost, gave an overview and lead a discussion with regard to the University Strategic Plan.
VII. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m. The next UCC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 1, 2007, beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Altgeld Hall 203.

Respectfully submitted,
Mollie Montgomery