

ILLINOIS TECH UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, February 11, 2025
12:45pm
Online via Zoom and In-person in PS-152
(pdf version available [here](#))

Attending Voting Members: Victor Perez-Luna (CHBE), Jeremy Hajek (ITM), John Twombly (SSB), Kindon Mills (ARCH), Yuting Lin (BIO), Erdal Oruklu (ECE), Fred Weening (AMAT), Patrick Ireland (SSCI), Keigo Kawaji (BME), Erin Hazard (HUM), James Mann (INTM), Stephen Kleps (CAEE), Nicole Legate (PSYC), Emily Leiner (PHYS), Braja Mandal (CHEM), Murat Vural (MMAE)

Chairing Meeting: Kathir Krishnamurthy (FDSN)

Also Attending: Todd Diel (FDSN), Mary Jorgenson Sullivan (ELS), Mary Haynes (UGAA), Taylor Rojas (UGAA), Melisa Lopez (Student Success & Retention), Rich Klein (SSB), Keith Alexander (UGAA), Nick Menhart (CCAC), Ayesha Qamer (Registrar), Kathy Nagle (ARCH), Kyle Hawkins (AMP), Gabrielle Smith (UGAA), Christopher Lee (Registrar), Georgia Papavasiliou (Armour), Eva Kultermann (ARCH), Katie Spink (Pre-Med), Gabriel Martinez (Armour Academy), Cynthia Torres (ARCH Acad Affairs), Pam Houser (INTM), Ray Trygstad (ITM), Nichole Novak (Libraries), Jeff Wereszczynski (UFC), Katherine Leight (CHEM), Zipporah Robinson (Academic Success),

Quorum was reached and the meeting was started at 12:46pm

1. Approval of the Meeting minutes. Kathir Krishnamurthy displayed the [minutes of the UGSC meeting on January 28](#) and noted that these had been distributed previously. Braja Mandal moved that the minutes be accepted and this motion was seconded by Kindon Mills. Kathir asked if there were any additions or corrections to be made; there were none. The motion to accept the minutes was passed without opposition.
2. Approval of the proposed meeting agenda. Kathir displayed the previously distributed [proposed agenda](#). There were no changes to be made. A motion to approve the agenda was made by Kindon Mills and seconded by Fred Weening. The motion passed without opposition.
3. Chemistry proposal (third reading). Based on feedback from the previous meeting, [the Chemistry proposal given at the January 28 UGSC meeting](#) had been modified. Braja Mandal gave a [powerpoint presentation](#) describing [the revised proposal](#).
 - The main part of the proposal — reducing the required credits of the BS in Chemistry program from 127 credits to 120 credits, and complying with ACS requirements — is unchanged.
 - The major change from the previous proposal was the removal of the part of the proposal involving separating the lecture and lab components of several courses. This was done since there were several UGSC members who raised concerns over the updating work that this would require on other departments, and the Chemistry department did not want these concerns to hold up the entire proposal. Braja noted that there will likely be a later proposal from Chemistry to separate these lecture/lab courses, and that the Biology department has their labs and lectures delivered as separate courses.

- In addition, at the request of the Math department, the requirement of {Chem 452 or Math 225 or DS 151} has been moved from the category of Math Requirements to the category of Chemistry Requirements. Also the sample schedule now lists one of these courses as being taken in the Fall semester of a student's third year instead of the Spring semester of their second year. This was done since Math 225 is only offered in the Fall.

Keigo Kawaji pointed out that the substitution of Math 225 or DS 151 (Sophomore or Freshman level courses) for Chem 452 seems odd, and wondered how these could be seen as equivalent classes. Braja responded that there had been significant discussion regarding these courses within the Chemistry department. The mathematical content in Chem 452 is on par with that in Math 225 and DS 151 (the Chemistry component is senior level). The Chemistry department wanted to give students the option to explore data analysis and data science from a non-chemistry focussed course.

Nick Menhart thanked Braja for sending him the updated assessment plan for the BS in Chemistry proposal. He indicated that the content of the plan looks very good, but that it is not in the required format. He indicated that he would convert the plan into the required format. But, for the future, he requests that all assessment plans and assessment reports be made by using the templates that are available on the CLI website. Here is a [link to an email Nick sent](#) after the meeting outlining where to access the templates and how to submit the assessment plans and reports. If the update to an assessment plan is part of a program revision, then it should be submitted through CIM. If a plan is updated without a program revision, it should be submitted by way of the link given in the CLI website. **Nick asks that UGSC reps bring this request and procedure to the attention of those in their departments in charge of submitting Assessment Plans and Reports.**

Keigo moved to recommend approval of the Chemistry proposal and this was seconded by Braja. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

4. The next item was regarding [changes to the requirements of the minor in Food Sciences and Nutrition](#). Todd Diel described the changes: When the original minor in Food Sciences and Nutrition was created, the Food Sciences and Nutrition department offered five undergraduate courses and all of these were required for the minor. The courses were created to provide a specialization for a Psychology program. Since that time, several additional undergraduate Food Sciences and Nutrition courses have been created and the new requirement for the minor gives students more choices. They are still required to take two of the original five courses, but for the remaining three courses making up their minor there are an additional six courses that they can select from (i.e., they can choose any three of nine courses). The details are spelled out in the above link. Although changes to a minor have usually been treated as informational items and do not require a vote, Kathir asked that we hold a vote for record keeping purposes. Braja Mandal moved that we accept this proposal and this was seconded by Fred Weening. The motion passed without objection or abstention.
5. The next item was a [proposal to revise the Bachelor in Industrial Technology and Management program](#). James Mann made the presentation of the proposal. He explained that the changes were relatively small adjustments of what courses are required for the major and what courses are electives for the major. Two electives are being moved into the list of required courses, and

one required course is being moved into the list of elective courses. He explained the rationale for the changes as addressing the evolving needs of the profession: increasing emphasis on leadership skills and digital technology for all students, and decreasing emphasis on supply chain management (although there is a specialization on supply chain management that students can elect to fulfill).

There was some discussion related to the fact that the INTM program only accepts students into the program when they have 60 or more credits that meet their admissions transfer requirements. Typically these are students who have earned an associates degree at a community college. Although the students need not have an associate's degree and can earn all of the "transfer credits" at Illinois Tech. After meeting these admission requirements, students then must take a minimum of 66 additional credits to get the INTM degree. Nick Menhart suggested that in certain circumstances it seems that some of the credits students are transferring in are in essence being counted as free electives, and questioned whether there would be a way to bring the program down to 120 credits instead of 126 credits. James indicated that the department will take a look at possibly reducing the program to 120 credits in the future. Pam Houser commented that one obstacle to doing this is that for students that do transfer more than 60 credits from an associates degree (IIT will accept up to 68 credits), reducing the number of credits in the program to 120 would compromise the ability of these students to graduate with honors at Illinois Tech since at least 60 credits need to be earned at IIT in order to be eligible for honors.

Kathir indicated that since the changes in the proposal are minor, a second reading of the proposal is not required. James moved that the proposal be put to a vote and this was seconded by Braja Mandal. The motion passed without opposition or abstention.

6. The next item was a [proposal for a new program in the Humanities department](#). Erin Hazard presented the proposal. Erin indicated that the current BS in Humanities degree program is very loosely defined and has problems with assessments. The intention is that the proposed new program would be more structured and would eventually replace the current program. The program would require a new 100 level course that is currently being developed. The program would also require a practical experience course with variable credit hours (possibly in the form of either a co-op/internship, or teaching practicum, or research practicum), and a capstone course.

After her presentation, Nick Menhart asked whether this is being proposed as a new program or a revision of the current program. Erin responded that it would be a new program and the existing BS in Humanities program would eventually be eliminated. Nick indicated that if it is a new program, then it cannot have the same (or a similar) name as a program previously offered. He suggested that it may be better to propose this as a modification of the current BS in Humanities program. He indicated that the regulatory process with the accreditation bodies is vastly different for new programs than for revised programs. He also asked about how the credit hours for the practical experience course would be determined for an individual student. This needs to be well defined and should involve a calculation based on contact hours. He indicated he and the registrar's office could work with Erin on this.

7. The next item was a [proposal to eliminate the Applied Physics Program](#). Emily Leiner made the presentation. She reminded the committee that a new program, BS in Engineering Physics, was approved last Fall. The intention was that this new program would replace the Applied Physics program, and so this proposal is "tidying up the books". There are currently two students in the

Applied Physics program one of whom is graduating this semester. The other student will be given the option to finish under the Engineering Physics program or the Applied Physics program.

Kindon Mills moved to accept this proposal and Braja Mandal seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

8. The next item was [a proposal to include a new specialization in the Bachelor of Architecture program](#). Kindon Mills made the presentation; she indicated that the specialization will be in Building Technology. Students will have several required courses in the specialization and then three elective courses chosen from a list of nine courses that are offered on a rotating basis. This proposal was viewed as a minor change and as such could be voted on at this meeting. Fred Weening moved to accept the proposal and the motion was seconded by Stephen Kleps. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

The meeting time had run out and so the final agenda item will be moved to the Feb 25 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:49 pm.