Northern Illinois University

UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATING COUNCIL

191st Meeting
Thursday, October 4, 2012
Altgeld Hall 203

MINUTES

APPROVED


Absent:  V. Demir/EET, J. Bottenberg/Student/LAS

Guest:  D. Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator

I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by C. Snow, seconded by M. Lilly, to approve the agenda with the addition of two items under new business: Guest Speakers and Retreat. The motion passed.

II. Announcements

A. Approval of Minutes

On a motion by S. Conklin, seconded by K. Wiemer, the minutes of the September 6, 2012 meeting were approved. Motion passed.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

Birberick recapped the minutes from the May 9th APASC meeting. They approved the plus/minus grading and that issue will be moving forward. There were a couple of curricular items referred by CUC, one having to do with limited admission related to GPA that was approved, as well as a course revision. They voted to wait to select a chair until the beginning of the Fall semester.

G. Aase made a motion to receive the minutes of the APASC committee held May 9, 2012, seconded by A. Keddie. Motion passed.
B. **Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education**

There were no minutes from CIUE.

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

Birberick explained that there was no record of the March 20, 2012 minutes being accepted by UCC so they are being brought up at this time. She highlighted the minutes. Dana Gautcher, Director of Student Academic Success, did a presentation on MAP-Works. MAP-works is a survey that launches three times during the academic year. It launches in the 3rd week of the semester, the 10th week of the semester, and then once in the Spring. It asks the students a series of questions; it is basically a self-evaluation. Topics include such things as: what is your perception of how you are doing in your coursework, how much time are you spending studying, are you going to class. They ask if they are feeling homesick, and whether they feel a connection with the university. It also asks if they will return next semester. The system shows areas of concern in color codes – green, yellow, red or double red. Advisors across campus have access to the data and can refer students to appropriate resources if needed.

Birberick reported that after several years of running MAP-Works, they have found a difference between the students that take MAP-Works and the students who don’t. The profile of the students who take the survey and those that don’t is roughly the same - the same GPA, same class rank, same ACT. The students who take the MAP-Works survey tend to have a higher GPA, higher rate of returning and they also seem to take more credit hours even after only one or two semesters of participation.

Keddie asked what percent of students participate. Birberick indicated that they are trying to reach 60% participation. The first year was a pilot and used a select group of individuals, then it was opened up to all freshmen. Last year included first year transfer students as well. They are seeing a difference in reaction to the university between freshman and first year transfer students. The ultimate goal will be to reach almost 90% of the student population doing one, if not more, of the three surveys. They have enlisted the help of Residential life as a way of reaching that goal. J. Isabel asked about whether or not there were reports because not everyone has access to the system. Birberick explained that they would like to take MAP-Works on the road to faculty and various groups to explain how beneficial MAP-Works is in order to expand its usage. One of the groups the data has been presented to is CUAE. She indicated they would like to have faculty advisors be able to access the information because it is a useful tool.
An update on the baccalaureate review process was also given by Birberick.

The committee also discussed meeting topics for the upcoming year, as well as their purpose and function.

M. Lilly made a motion to receive the March 20, 2012 CUAE minutes, seconded by K. Wiemer. The motion passed.

C. Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum

G. Aase reported on the VIBE system. It is a repository for documents. It is like a blog. It allows comments and a lot of work to be done prior to the actual meeting. D. Smith added right now it is just being used for the curricular approval process.

Aase reported issues with the COE certificate that needed clarification; it was sent back to APASC. The College of LA&S #11, needed clarifications that APASC is going to take care of. VP&A had a couple new courses, confirmed non-duplication and approved.

With regard to Old Business, several people including the chair, are on a committee that is looking at some APPM (Academic Policies and Procedures Manual) revisions. He stated they are working on bringing that document up to the current times. Birberick indicated that she and Donna Smith are also on that committee.

Under New Business, all the Black Studies courses were previously designated as interdisciplinary (IDSP) and will now be listed as BKST.

G. Aase made a motion to receive the minutes of the September 13, 2012 CUC meeting, seconded by Snow. Motion passed.

E. General Education Committee

There were no minutes from GEC.

F. University Honors Committee

W. Baker noted the meeting consisted of summaries of what the Director and Assistant Director had accomplished since the prior meeting.
W. Baker made a motion to receive the minutes of the April 27, 2012 meeting of the University Honors Committee, seconded by M. Lilly. **Motion passed.**

IV. **Other Reports**

A. **University Assessment Panel**

J. Isabel informed the committee that the Assessment Expo will be March 1, 2013. She also reported the Higher Learning Commission site visit will be March 3-5, 2014. They are also interviewing candidates for the coordinator position.

V. **New Business**

A. **Guest Speakers**

Lin had indicated that in the past, guest speakers were invited. In addition the Provost had a retreat for the committee chairs, typically over a lunch to discuss what they wanted to accomplish during the year. Lin said that the committees were expected to accomplish certain things and when UCC read the minutes they could see that they were accomplishing the goals. Other committee members commented that the UCC representative to the various committees was basically responsible for that. Isabel commented that a retreat is time consuming and it is difficult to find a day or half a day for the members to hold a retreat.

Isabel indicated that she liked the idea of guest speakers and would be interested in having a MAP-Works presentation. She related that at the assessment meeting they had a presentation on college portraits, which she didn’t know anything about. She mentioned that everyone gets wrapped up in their own courses/projects that they sometimes miss out on what the big picture is and what the university is doing. Aase asked if that was something that they should be sponsoring for the advising people. He views his role as doing the tasks assigned to the committee and learning what he needs to in order to make good decisions. He doesn’t want to sit in another meeting listening to what someone else is doing unless it helps him to either do his job better or serve the committee better. Birberick pointed out that there was an advising summit last week which had 80+ attendees, some were advisors, some faculty, some undergraduate directors. It included breakout sessions. She said she would be happy to take the information back to the director of OSAS (Office of Student Academic Support) and indicate that people want to hear about MAP-Works.

Lin expressed that it was important for the other committees be held accountable for what they were doing during the semester. Stafstrom indicated it may help if the committees could include in their minutes – for each action item – either a sentence or a short paragraph explaining what the background is – what is known up until that point. Typically, minutes are explaining what was done but often exclude the background as to
why it was done or what the context was. Birberick indicated the minutes themselves are only to reflect what transpires at the meeting so perhaps it could be the job of the UCC rep for these committees to provide necessary background information.

A concern was voiced regarding whether the committee simply “rubber stamps” the decisions of the other committees. Birberick said that was not her understanding of this committee. She brought up the Academic Misconduct Policy. She said this committee accepted the APASC minutes but bracketed out the part on academic misconduct and sent that back to APASC to work out with Faculty Senate. She said Alan Rosenbaum and others have spoken to this committee to provide additional information when needed. She also pointed out that when a substantive change is made, she must send a notification to University Council which is what was done for the Academic Misconduct change and the plus/minus grading.

B. Retreat

Lin explained the retreat he was talking about was a question/answer type meeting where the important issues of the university were discussed. He said the Provost spoke about his objectives and what he wanted to see accomplished. There was a brief discussion.

VI. Adjournment

On a motion by W. Baker, seconded by G. Aase the meeting was adjourned @ 2:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne E. Ratfield