Northern Illinois University
UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATING COUNCIL
175th Meeting
Thursday, September 2, 2010
Altgeld Hall 315

MINUTES

Approved

Present: W. Baker (LAS), D. Changnon (Acting Associate Vice Provost), V. Demir (EET), W. Goldenberg (VPA), B. Henry (HHS), C. Jones (LAS), M. Lilly (LAS), K. Mantzke (BUS), S. Morris (HHS), O. Najjar (LAS), G. Nicolosi (BUS), G. Schlabach (EDU), H. Schwartz (HHS), E. Seaver (Vice Provost), C. Snow (LIB), P. Stoddard (LAS), S. Wallace (EDU), K. Wiemer (LAS)

Absent: A. Azad (EET)

Guest: D. Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by K. Mantzke, seconded by G. Schlabach, to approve the agenda. The motion carried.

II. Announcements

A. Introductions

E. Seaver welcomed everyone and asked committee members to introduce themselves and state which college and/or department they represented.

B. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by C. Snow, seconded by G. Schlabach, to approve the minutes of the May 6, 2010, Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting. The motion carried.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

E. Seaver explained that UCC representatives are needed to serve as voting members on each of the six standing committees of UCC. He provided committee members with an overview of the roles and responsibilities of each of the standing committees and asked anyone interested in serving on one of the standing committees to contact Mollie Montgomery.
A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

W. Goldenberg reported on the May 5, 2010, APASC meeting. The committee reviewed, discussed, and approved a catalog language change under the heading of

Academic Integrity. He explained that this issue had been brought forward from Faculty Senate due to inconsistencies in wording in the student handbook and the grievance procedures. He explained that if a student is accused of dishonesty, the student may go before the Judicial Hearing Board. The Judicial Hearing Board would then hear the case and make a ruling as to the student’s innocence or guilt and, possibly, impose a penalty. Goldenberg clarified that the Judicial Hearing Board had power to alter the penalty given to a student because of academic misconduct in a class; faculty believed the grading power remains with the faculty member. Faculty Senate, in order to clarify the role of the Judicial Hearing Board and the responsibility for assigning a course grade, developed and approved wording to be added to the present Academic Integrity Language. Also included in the new language was a sentence describing means for a student who disagrees with a penalty given to appeal a penalty imposed by the faculty member. Goldenberg said that APASC did approve the changes to the language as it reads in the May 5, 2010, APASC minutes.

E. Seaver clarified that, if the May 5, 2010, APASC minutes are accepted by UCC, there would be two different policies approved by UCC. He explained that on May 6, 2010, UCC changed the recommendation from APASC by removing the last sentence of the language approved by APASC without consulting with APASC. The wording that was changed and revised by UCC is what went forward to the catalog, so, the last line of the language shown in the APASC minutes does not exist in the catalog. He added that, normally, if UCC disagreed with APASC, UCC would send the minutes back to APASC for reconsideration, and an attempt would be made to try to come to an agreement between the two groups.

As the situation now stands, the APASC minutes reflect the catalog language which includes the last line added by Faculty Senate, but UCC approved the language that removed the last sentence.

E. Seaver noted that there are a couple of concerns to be considered. The last line of the wording is one concern. APASC felt that there should be a clearly defined appeal process relative to the penalty, however, the committee wasn’t sure that the College Council was the appropriate body to appeal to. The other concern is that there is a lack of clarity in this policy about what happens if the student is found innocent; there is no language included to say what should happen.
W. Goldenberg made a motion, seconded by S. Morris, to receive the May 5, 2010, minutes of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee meeting. The motion was NOT APPROVED.

Further discussion resulted in the following motion:

W. Goldenberg made a motion, seconded by S. Morris, to receive the May 5, 2010, minutes of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee meeting WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SECTION IV, NEW BUSINESS, ITEM A, Catalog Change - Academic Integrity. The motion carried.

P. Stoddard recommended that an ad hoc committee be formed to draft language on academic integrity that would be acceptable to both the APASC and UCC committees. E. Seaver suggested that the committee develop wording to clarify the grade appeal process and also incorporate that wording into the academic integrity language.

**P. Stoddard made a motion, seconded by S. Morris, to form an Ad Hoc Committee comprised of members of both APASC and UCC for the purpose of developing catalog language on Academic Integrity, which would also include clarification of the grade appeal process, that would be acceptable to both the APASC and UCC committees. The motion carried.**

P. Stoddard and O. Najjar volunteered to serve on the Ad Hoc Committee as UCC representatives. E. Seaver will contact David Wade, APASC Faculty Chair, to request APASC faculty representatives for this ad hoc committee.

**B. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education**

There was no report.

**C. Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment**

There was no report.

**D. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum**
There was no report.

E. **General Education Committee**

There was no report.

F. **Honors Committee**

There was no report.

IV. **Other Reports**

A. **University Assessment Panel**

S. Morris reported on the April 16, 2010, meeting of the University Assessment Panel. The committee heard a status report on the University Honors assessment plan, approved two funding requests, and received an overview of the Voluntary System of Accountability (College Portrait). The committee also was provided a history of the University Writing Project.

S. Morris made a motion, seconded by C. Snow to receive the April 16, 2010, minutes of the University Assessment Panel meeting. **The motion carried.**

V. **Old Business**

There was no old business.

VI. **New Business**

A. **Representatives for UCC Standing Committees for 2010-2011**

E. Seaver asked anyone interested in serving on one of the standing committees to contact Mollie Montgomery.
B. **Selection of Student Representative to the University Assessment Panel**

Postponed until a future meeting.

C. **Introduction of Acting Associate Vice Provost**

E. Seaver announced that, due to some re-organization within the Provost’s Office, he will be taking over the strategic planning responsibilities previously held by Harold Kafer, who recently retired. Seaver introduced David Changnon, newly appointed Acting Associate Vice Provost. Seaver informed the group that Dr. Changnon will be assisting him with numerous duties and will have chair responsibilities for the UCC standing committees.

VII. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 1:47 p.m.

The next UCC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 7, 2010, beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Altgeld Hall 203.

*Respectfully submitted,*
*Mollie Montgomery*