I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by Snow, seconded by Wiemer, to approve the agenda. The motion carried.

II. Announcements

A. Electronic Approval of Minutes

Minutes of the September 1, 2011, meeting of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council were approved electronically.

B. New Member Introductions

Birberick welcomed new members to the committee and asked them to introduce themselves.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

Birberick provided an overview of the May 4, 2011, meeting of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee. The major topic of discussion at this meeting was the proposed plus/minus grading system. Birberick reported that an ad hoc committee comprised of members of both APASC and the Faculty Senate is being formed to further discuss this issue.
Schlabach made a motion, seconded by Wiemer, to receive the May 4, 2011, minutes of the Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee meeting. The motion carried.

B. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

There was no report.

C. Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment

Schlabach provided an overview of the April 12, 2011, meeting of the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment Committee. The committee reviewed proposed changes to the guidelines and timelines of the Undergraduate Special Opportunities in Artistry and Research (USOAR) presented by Julia Spears, Coordinator of Engaged Learning. The committee also received a presentation and overview of the Office of Orientation and First-Year Experience by Denise Rode, Director of Orientation.

Schlabach made a motion, seconded by Aase, to receive the April 12, 2011, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment meeting. The motion carried.

D. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum

Najjar reported on the September 8, 2011, meeting of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum. The committee reviewed various working rules, guidelines, and procedures related to curriculum development and the approval process. The committee also approved numerous catalog changes and discussed the idea of an Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM) workshop.

Schlabach made a motion, seconded by Snow, to receive the September 8, 2011, minutes of the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum meeting. The motion carried.

E. General Education Committee

There was no report.

F. University Honors Committee

Goldenberg reported on the May 6, 2011, University Honors Committee meeting, noting that the committee heard reports from the directors and coordinators and was provided an update on the status of the search for a new director of the Honors Program. The committee also approved several Enhancing Your Education (EYE) grants.

Goldenberg made a motion, seconded by Snow, to receive the May 6, 2011, minutes of the University Honors Committee meeting. The motion carried.
IV. **Other Reports**

A. **University Assessment Panel**

Birberick pointed out that the notes of the September 16, 2011, meeting of the University Assessment Panel are provided to UCC members for informational purposes only.

V. **Old Business**

A. **Selection of UCC Faculty Representative to the University Assessment Panel for 2011-2012**

Birberick called for a volunteer to serve as a substitute for Jeanne Isabel as UCC representative on the University Assessment Panel for the fall 2011 semester. Anyone who is interested should contact either Dr. Birberick or Mollie Montgomery.

B. **Academic Integrity Language Update**

Birberick provided the committee with an update on the status of the academic integrity catalog language revision issue. She reported that Alan Rosenbaum, Executive Secretary, University Council, had contacted her regarding this issue. He directed her to language in the University Council Bylaw 14.5.5. A portion of that language reads “Substantive changes in policies under the jurisdiction of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council must be reported to the University Council.” Dr. Rosenbaum explained that he felt that reporting did not mean simply forwarding minutes or giving an annual summary to University Council. In response, Birberick sent Rosenbaum an official letter, dated September 27, 2011, containing the specifics he requested about the revisions to the policy regarding academic misconduct. She enclosed documents containing both the old version and new version of the misconduct policy language, the revised version, showing highlighted changes, of the “Procedures for Appealing Allegedly Capricious Semester Grades,” and a copy of the March 3, 2011, UCC minutes.

Birberick reported that the misconduct language did go to both Faculty Senate and University Council for discussion. She said that also in Bylaw 14.5.5 it states that the University Council has to take action to disapprove the proposed policy within six consecutive weeks of fall or spring semester classes after receipt of the proposal from the UCC. As there was some uncertainty as to what constituted receipt in this case, Birberick felt that the reasonable date to begin counting the six weeks would be Wednesday, October 5, 2011, which was the date of the next scheduled University Council meeting.

Nicolosi, Faculty Senator, reported that Faculty Senate did hold a discussion on whether to recommend to University Council that the issue be sent back to UCC. Faculty Senate’s debate resulted in approximately 60% of senators in favor of letting University Council make a decision and approximately 40% in favor of sending it back to UCC.

University Council also discussed the language at its October 5, 2011, meeting. Birberick reported that she received the following email notification from Alan Rosenbaum late on the afternoon of October 5, 2011:
“This is to notify you (and the UCC) that, consistent with article 14.5.5 of the
Bylaws, the University Council, at the October 5th meeting, voted to not approve the
academic misconduct catalog language and grade appeal policy modifications
reported to it by the UCC. I have attached a description and explanation of the
University Council’s actions. The options available to the UCC are articulated in that
same article. On behalf of the Council, I want to thank the UCC for all of the effort
that went into developing the policy. I am hopeful that the end product of this will
be a clear, consistent, equitable academic misconduct policy that will well serve the
university going forward. Let me know if I can be of any assistance or provide any
clarification to the UCC.”

Birberick went on to read the following explanation of the University Council’s action which
was attached to Rosenbaum’s email as stated above:

Action of the University Council- October 5, 2011

The UC voted to send the catalog language regarding the academic misconduct
policy back to the Undergraduate Coordinating Council with the recommendation
that the UCC hold off on the policy until the University Council either approves or
re-writes the policy on appeals of grade penalties resulting from an academic
misconduct finding.

Although the UCC has authority to change Undergraduate Catalog language, the
University General Counsel concurs that the UCC does not have the authority to
modify the grade appeal policy. This authority resides with the University Council.
Since several stakeholders have raised concerns both about the language of the
grade appeal policy and whether the appeal of a penalty assigned as a result of
academic misconduct should even be incorporated into the grade appeal process,
the UC voted to send the issue to the Academic Policy committee of the UC for
reconsideration. Since the proposed catalog language references a policy that does
not exist (i.e., the proposed grade appeal process), it cannot be approved.

Once the UC has passed a policy for appeals of grade penalties assigned as a result
of academic misconduct, I will send the policy to the UCC so that they can revise the
Undergraduate Catalog language accordingly.

In the meantime, the on-line catalog language should be reverted back to the
currently approved (old) policy language.

Birberick summarized that, according to Bylaw 14.5.5, University Council has returned the
issue back to UCC and, as is clearly stated in Rosenbaum’s response above, have voted to
not approve the misconduct catalog language. The argument is that University Council
does not feel it is within the jurisdiction of the UCC to amend the language, so, this issue
has been referred to the Academic Policy committee of the University Council. Birberick
stated, according to the above language, UCC has three options, as noted in the Bylaw
14.5.5 language below:

The Undergraduate Coordinating Council shall reconsider the policy changes in
question and either:

1) agree with the University Council and rescind its prior action;
2) modify the policy change and notify the University Council of its action; or

3) reaffirm its policy decision. If the Undergraduate Coordinating Council reaffirms its policy position, it shall report that action to the University Council, together with a written statement of its rationale. The policy proposal shall take effect unless disapproved by a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the University Council. The University Council shall have no authority to alter, amend, or otherwise modify a policy decision of the Undergraduate Coordinating Council. Policy changes reported by the Undergraduate Coordinating Council to the University Council shall be considered approved by the University Council unless that council takes action to disapprove the proposed policy within six consecutive weeks of fall or spring semester classes after receipt of the proposal from the Undergraduate Coordinating Council.

Birberick also reported that Alan Rosenbaum has asked that UCC not make a decision and hold off taking any action on this as he wants to send it to the University Council subcommittee. She clarified that the position of University Council is that making the modification in the grade appeal process language was not within the purview of UCC to make that change.

Baker asked if there was a time factor involved. He feels that discussion on this issue should be postponed until the next UCC meeting in order to give committee members an opportunity to review the procedures and re-examine all pertinent materials. Birberick responded that there does not appear to be a time limit on UCC, but a time constraint will be on the University Council if this is pushed back to them. She pointed out that, since UCC had simply asked for an update on the status of this issue, the information being presented at this time is in response to that request. She added that postponing discussion would allow time for copies of all relevant materials to be provided to committee members to review prior to further discussion.

Wiener asked if Birberick’s impression of the main concern being expressed is about the rewording of the language or about who has the right to make what changes. Birberick answered that, although she has not yet had a conversation with Alan Rosenbaum about this, her sense is that it is both. One issue has to do with the wording, and the other issue is related to which body has the authority to make what changes. She said that UCC oversees what goes in the undergraduate catalog, and the University Council addresses what goes into the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM).

Aase commented that he does not feel well enough acquainted with all of these processes to be able to make an immediate decision, so, his suggestion would be to ask for guidance from the Provost’s Office with regard to some direction as to where the power does lie and how to move forward. Conklin agreed and added that, because there are many new members on UCC this year who were not involved with the committee when the original decision on this wording was made or a vote taken, it would be beneficial to be able to review relevant materials to become familiar with the history of the issue.

Birberick clarified that her role is to look at the situation from a procedural standpoint and make sure that the procedures are followed properly. Based on the comments of the committee, she agreed that it would be wise to look into this a little further and postpone additional discussion until the November meeting.
Snow made a motion, seconded by Baker, to table for further discussion at the November 3, 2011, Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting the academic integrity catalog language issue to allow committee members time to be provided with, read, and review a packet of materials and documents (minutes/history, bylaws, correspondence, etc.) relevant to this issue. The motion carried.

Birberick went on to say that there is much confusion surrounding this issue, because there are different versions of the language in the printed catalog and the online catalog. She explained to Alan Rosenbaum that the official catalog is the online catalog, and the online catalog contains the language revised and approved by UCC. Per her conversation with Rosenbaum, Birberick stated that she would like, unless there is strong objection from members of UCC, to instruct Donna Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator, to remove the sentence in the language in the online catalog related to the student penalty appeal through the grade appeal process in order to align the online catalog language with the printed catalog. She also noted that the grade appeal process language has not been changed in the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (APPM) because University Council has not yet approved the proposed language changes.

Aase questioned if making a change in the online catalog now would take effect immediately or have to wait to be reflected in next year’s catalog. He said this may be going outside the guidelines and procedures set for catalog revisions as it was his understanding that any changes made now will not be seen in the online catalog until next year. Birberick asked Smith if it were possible to make changes in the online catalog. Smith responded that it is possible to make mechanical changes; however, changes do not take effect until the following fall. Conklin concurred with Aase’s statements. She said she feels that is the true rationale, because, even if the change could be made, it would not be effective until the time that official catalog changes are made. She also favors the idea of reverting this issue back to University Council. Aase also suggested contacting University Legal Services to seek advice as to how to address this issue.

Birberick agreed that changing the online catalog might not be possible at this time. She said she would again discuss this with Alan Rosenbaum. Birberick speculated that the response from him will be that this change was placed in the catalog inappropriately by not following the correct official procedures.

Further discussion resulted in the following motion:

Aase made a motion, seconded by Azad, to make no changes to the academic integrity language currently in place in the 2011-2012 online Undergraduate Catalog; to inform Alan Rosenbaum that the current catalog language cannot be rescinded as the change will be not reflected in the online catalog until fall 2012; to table further discussion on the academic integrity catalog language issue until the November 3, 2011, Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting; to request that Alan Rosenbaum address this issue in an expedited manner in order to allow the Undergraduate Coordinating Council adequate time to formulate a response to Rosenbaum’s conclusion during further discussion on this issue at the November 3, 2011, Undergraduate Coordinating Council meeting. The motion carried.
VI. **New Business**

There was no new business.

VII. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:08 p.m. The next UCC meeting is scheduled for Thursday, November 3, 2011, beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Altgeld Hall 203.

*Respectfully submitted,*  
*Mollie Montgomery*