Northern Illinois University

UNDERGRADUATE COORDINATING COUNCIL
207th Meeting
Thursday, October 2, 2014
Altgeld Hall 203

MINUTES

APPROVED

Present: G. Aase/BUS; T. Atkins/LAS; M. Ayers/LIB; A. Birberick/Vice Provost; P. Braun/HHS; C. Campbell/EDU; K. Gill Student/LAS; W. Hung/EDU; H. Joung/HHS; M. Kolb/ Associate Vice Provost; M. Konen/LAS; J. Kot/LAS; L. Matuszewski/BUS; M. Shokrani/HHS; J. Stafstrom/LAS; C. Thompson/LAS;

Absent: J. Gau/EET; L. Guo/ EET;

Guest: D. Smith, Catalog Editor/Curriculum Coordinator; J. Ratfield, Vice Provost’s Administrative Assistant

I. Adoption of Agenda

A motion was made by M. Shokrani, seconded by C. Thompson, to adopt the agenda. The motion passed unanimously.

II. Announcements

A. Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by C. Thompson, seconded by L. Matuszewski to approve the minutes of the September 4, 2014 meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

III. Reports/Minutes from Standing Committees

A. Admissions Policies and Academic Standards Committee

No minutes to review.

B. Committee on the Improvement of Undergraduate Education

No minutes to review.
C. **Committee on the Undergraduate Academic Environment**

No minutes to review.

D. **Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum**

T. Atkins said the meeting was mainly informational. He said the main topic was the CUC’s jurisdiction. CUC is the curricular body for interdisciplinary undergraduate curricular materials not located in an academic college/colleges, specifically UNIV 101 and curricular offerings from the Division of International Programs and the Center for Black Studies including usual curricular activity (new, revised and deleted courses as well as other catalog changes), general education submissions/resubmissions, and review of these units’ overall curricular offerings.

C. Thompson made a motion to receive the September 11, 2014 CUC minutes seconded by T. Atkins. *Motion passed unanimously.*

E. **General Education Committee**

No minutes to review.

F. **University Honors Committee**

M. Shokrani talked about what was covered in the minutes. He talked about their efforts to increase the numbers. He pointed out that the enrollment information is included in these minutes.

T. Atkins questioned the minutes where it mentioned an Honors student in a graduate course and receiving Honors credit, however he pointed out that there didn’t seem to be any resolution. Shokrani said it was discussed and will be discussed again. Atkins said his opinion is that it should be reviewed on a case by case basis. Birberick added that both the Graduate School Dean and the Vice Provost would have to approve any such request.

Shokrani talked about the in-course contract for Honors students. He said that in the past an Honors student would approach an instructor and they would come to an agreement about what the student would do to receive Honors credit, however beginning Spring 2015 any such request will need to be preapproved by the Honors committee. He said there is more of a push for students to enroll in Honors courses instead of in-course contracts.
Stafstrom asked about the item in the minutes regarding Honor students in financially precarious situations that were not going to be able to return. Shokrani said they talked about that and are trying to develop ways to assist the students.

G. Aase made a motion to receive the minutes for the March 7, 2014, April 4, 2014, April 25, 2014 seconded by C. Thompson. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Birberick opened the discussion about the Honors Faculty Status Proposal which Shokrani distributed to committee members. W. Hung asked if the faculty status would include adjunct faculty (non tenure-track faculty) and graduate assistants teaching courses. Shokrani said that they would not; their intention was specifically for regular, tenure-track faculty. There was discussion regarding the proposal and the definition of “faculty.” Committee members voiced concerns about the wording in the proposal. Thompson brought up the disparity in the requirements for provisional vs. full honors status. Atkins pointed out that some items for criteria were outside a faculty member’s control. Kolb reiterated some of Atkins’ points and stressed the importance of supervising Capstone projects. He added that typically students seek faculty based on their expertise. Aase added that he felt the document was very conflicting. He questioned whether the intention was to be an honor or a requirement. Among other points he felt the best person to decide who should teach Honors courses would be the department chair. Shokrani suggested that J.D. Bowers be invited to the next meeting to address questions the committee has. Birberick added if not Bowers then perhaps members of the sub-committee who developed the proposal.

Aase asked if the proposal were approved where it would go from here and where would it be placed, the APPM? Birberick indicated that Honors is a committee that rolls up to the UCC so if they submitted a proposal it would come through UCC but as far as placement in the APPM, she was unsure – she didn’t think it would go into the APPM.

Campbell asked about the evaluation rating sited in the full Honors faculty status. Birberick indicated that Honors wanted to have a standard evaluation for Honors courses.

D. Smith found that the proposal was mentioned and included in the February 7 2014 Honors minutes. Those minutes had been received by the UCC.

L. Matuszewski commented that she thought the proposal could have unintended consequences of limiting students access to Honors. She mentioned that her department didn’t have Honors courses and only in-course contracts.
IV. Other Reports

A. University Assessment Panel

No notes provided. M. Ayers announced that October 17th there are two assessment seminars: 1) Building a Culture of Assessment Working to Enhance Student Success (from 8:30 –noon) in the Skyroom and 2) Bridging the Assessment Gap-Collaborating and Communicating to Ensure Student Success (12:30 – 4).

V Old Business

Birberick mentioned the repeat policy discussion will continue. Alex Martin the Student Association Academic Affairs Director wants to bring this issue back to the committee. Birberick has been asked by Faculty Senate President, Bill Pitney to revisit the issue as well.

The committee welcomed a student member from Liberal Arts and Sciences, Kiran Gill.

Aase asked if an update on the PLUS discussion from Senate could be given without discussion. Stafstrom reported it was a topic for discussion and there was quite a bit of discussion but ultimately it was tabled. So no vote was taken. Some areas of concern are: science courses with labs; scheduling for English instructors and TAs related to the proposed expanded writing requirement; how advisors would be trained and informed; and the impact the change would have on transfer students. Implementation is a major concern as well.

Birberick announced that she, Kolb, along with another faculty colleague and a student presented the PLUS information at the Association of General and Liberal Studies Annual meeting and it was very well received; it was referred to as brilliant and innovative.

VI Adjournment

G. Aase made a motion, seconded by T. Atkins to adjourn @ 2:10 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeanne Ratfield
Administrative Assistant
Office of the Provost