Northern Illinois University
UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATING COUNCIL
189th Meeting
Thursday, May 3, 2012
Altgeld Hall 203

MINUTES

APPROVED


Absent:  W. Goldenberg/VPA, N. Lindvall (Student/Honors), O. Najjar/LAS, J. Stafstrom/LAS, K. Wiemer/LAS

Guest:  D. Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by Ballantine, seconded by Azad, to approve the agenda. The motion carried.

II. Announcements

A. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Schlabach, seconded by Braun, to approve the minutes of the April 5, 2012 UCC meeting. The motion carried.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

Ballantine highlighted the three main items covered in the March 7th meeting. The first item was the change in the incomplete to an F from 200 to 120 days. The main reason for the change was administrative ease. He pointed out that the faculty member has control over the grade and the incomplete is not an incontrovertible F.

Second item discussed was the resubmission of renewals for limited retention programs from the College of Business. There were some concerns in the language regarding the effect on underrepresented minorities and those were sent back to the College.

The third item was the plus/minus grading. There was a lot of discussion at the meeting regarding the proposal submitted by the Faculty Senate. The faculty representatives from the Senate were invited to the next meeting, which was last week.

Ballantine made a motion to accept the minutes of the APASC committee held March 7, 2012, seconded by Snow. Motion carried.
B. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Birberick reported that the committee made the determination for the Award of Excellence in Undergraduate Instruction, Matt Swan received that. They also had the discussion about the Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching Awards. Prior to the meeting everyone evaluated the material independently.

Aase made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 19, 2012 CIUE meeting, seconded by Conklin. **Motion passed.**

C. Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment

No minutes to approve for this meeting.

D. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum

Aase explained the four documents submitted. The minutes, Section A, which is recorded for inclusion in the Undergraduate catalog, Section B – recorded but further approval needed for inclusion and Section C, items previously in Section B now recorded for inclusion.

Referring to the minutes, much of it was on the consent agenda. The College of Education proposed a name change for the Department of Literacy Education to the Department of Literacy, Learning and Culture. Liberal Arts & Sciences #9 a new course that had been discussed over some period of time was approved. Liberal Arts & Science #10 – the Division of Public Affairs will become the Department of Public Affairs and will move to a new school as will the Department of Political Science and the Center for Non-Governmental Organization Leadership and Development. These are pending various approvals.

He reported the ongoing discussions regarding the APPM. A lot of the language in the procedural manual hasn’t been updated for decades. Anything having to do with the electronic age isn’t addressed in there. The plan is to have the chairs of UCC, CUC, GEC and APASC work together other the summer and next fall and pick apart those issues and bring them to the table.

Aase made a motion to approve the April 12, 2012 CUC minutes, seconded by Ballantine. **Motion passed.**

E. General Education Committee

Keddie reported that there were two candidates for the General Education Coordinator and they were about to interview. She mentioned that there was discussion of the questions that would be asked of the candidates. There will be a coordinator in July and we will hear about that in the fall.

She reported on resubmissions. There were 29 resubmissions from the social sciences – 9 were approved, 15 needed additional information that was mostly assessment data. Departments were given staggered terms beginning with fall 2012 and going through fall 2013 to submit what was requested. Sociology had no assessment data but they had a good assessment plan. She mentioned it was
suggested that a good example be posted on the website and she indicated that Psychology had several that could be posted. There were four new submissions from the Department of Leadership, Educational Psychology and Foundations, 2 were submitted in Humanities & Arts, 1 in Social Sciences and 1 in Interdisciplinary – they were all 300/400 level courses. They were all approved but again a problem with assessment. The department will be asked for clarification on how they will be assessing general education goals.

She said there was a little discussion on the submission form, which has been revised to make it similar to the resubmission form. Reference should be made to the APPM guidelines for the submission of 300 or 400 level courses.

There was also discussion about revisions to the bylaws and APPM. She stated that the General Education Committee doesn’t seem to have any teeth. She spoke about the rejected resubmissions or if a department doesn’t abide by their recommendations -can they remove the course from gen ed and it doesn’t specifically say that they can. It was suggested that this topic be revisited.

The last item was the GEC assessment of goals B, C and D. With the Higher Learning Commission coming on campus in 2014, assessment data must be provided for these goals.

Ballantine made a motion to accept the minutes of the General Education committee from March 22, 2012, seconded by C. Snow. Motion passed.

F. University Honors Committee

Ballantine reported the minutes reflected the activities of the Honors director, Chris Jones. The March meeting consisted of discussions regarding the awards that were going to be made for University Scholars, Summer scholars program, and there was also a substantial amount of money to be awarded in scholarships for continuing students. Discussion regarding the distribution of those funds took place. Ballantine explained that the Summer Scholars program in particular is modeled after one from the College of William and Mary, in which support is given to students doing research over the summer and whether or not guidelines should be put on them. One matter he mentioned that caused controversy was if a student was funded and did not complete their capstone would the student be asked to return the funds. The committee also discussed the outstanding alumni award of which there were five nominees. The deadline information was given to committee members.

Snow made a motion to accept the minutes of the March 2, 2012 of the University Honor Committee, seconded by G. Nicolosi. Motion passed.
IV. Other Reports

A. University Assessment Panel

S. Conklin reported on the April 20th meeting of the panel. The revised vision and mission of the institution was approved and a couple items were added after being submitted to the Board of Trustees. One was student success is supported through academic and co-curricular programs and activities and the other was a system of shared governance that incorporates input from faculty, staff and students in decision and policy making.

A draft report put together by Carolinda Douglass to revise the assessment plan for the university was discussed. It was meant to update the plan with initiatives that are currently being done but are not reflected in the old plan and to eliminate those that are no longer taking place. The report is open for input from members and will be finalized in Fall of 12 and then to implementation. In general the suggestions were to condense and simplify – to retain figure 1, which was a diagram about closing the feedback loop and using assessments to make program changes and improvements and then figure 2, which was a list of things with arrows that was difficult to understand was to be omitted. She said outside comments were also solicited.

The third item was the report on Collegiate Learning Assessment that has to do with how our students fare against other institutions on the same tests. This is mostly writing, but also has to do with problem solving, writing mechanics, writing effectiveness and analytic reasoning and evaluation. Our students do better than the average of all the other schools in some areas and do worse in some areas. The interesting thing she pointed out was an area where our students do consistently better is in problem solving. In some cases they do better in analytical reasoning and evaluation. They do pretty much the same or worse than other schools in writing effectiveness and writing mechanics.

V. Adjournment

On a motion by Aase, seconded by Ballentine, the meeting was adjourned @ 1:32 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne E. Ratfield