

ILLINOIS TECH UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday April 22, 2025
12:45pm
Online via Zoom
(pdf version available [here](#))

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

Chairing Meeting: Kathir Krishnamurthy (FDSN)

Also Attending: Gabrielle Smith (UGAA), Katherine Quiroa (UGAA), Mary Haynes (UGAA), Melisa Lopez (Student Success and Retention), Yasmin Rodriguez-Escutia (Armour Acad Advisor), Taylor Rojas (UGAA), Zipporah Robinson (Academic Success), Rama Sashank Madhurapantula (Dean Acad Discipline), Mary Jorgenson Sullivan (ELS), Nick Menhart (VP Assessment and Accreditation), Jeff Wereszczynski (UFC), Joe Gorzkowski (UGAA), Georgia Papavasiliou (Armour), Michael Arnaudo (Armour Acad Advisor), Kevin Cassel (VP Acad Affairs), Gabriel Martinez (Armour Academy), Norma I Scagnoli (VP Learning Initiatives), Keith Alexander (UGAA), Kathy Nagle (ARCH), Diane Fifles (Univ Accreditation), Katie Spink (Pre-Med), Rich Klein (SSB), Pam Houser (INTM), Nichole Novak (Libraries), Kiah Ong (AMAT), Brian Casario (ELS), Kyle Hawkins (AMP)

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

1. Approval of Meeting minutes. Kathir Krishnamurthy indicated that the [minutes for the UGSC meeting on March 25](#) had been previously distributed. Matt Bauer moved to approve the minutes, this was seconded by Jeremy Hajek. The motion passed without opposition or abstention.
2. Approval of the proposed meeting agenda. Kathir indicated that there were some additions to the previously distributed [proposed agenda](#); the additions were
 - A report from the Core Curriculum Committee
 - An update on the policy on MinorsHe asked whether the items listed as “to be confirmed” (item #5 and #6 on the previously distributed agenda) were ready for this meeting. John Twombly indicated that he would like to postpone those items until the beginning of the Fall semester. Fred Weening moved that the revised agenda be approved, this was seconded by Matt Bauer. The motion passed without opposition or abstention.
3. The next item on the agenda was to set the leadership of UGSC for the 2025-2026 academic year. Kathir mentioned that although it has been UGSC practice for the leadership to serve two-year terms, the faculty handbook indicates that the positions of Chair, Vice-chair, and Secretary are one year terms. He mentioned that the people currently in these positions have indicated their willingness to continue, and asked if any others would like to be considered. No

other names were put forth. Keigo Kawaji moved that the terms of those holding the positions currently be extended to next year. Jeremy Hajek seconded the motion. Katie Spink pointed out that technically the position of Chair of UGSC is appointed by UFC and so for that position the motion should be to recommend a name to UFC. Jeff Wereszczynski indicated that Katie was correct; he also indicated that he fully expects UFC to go along with any name recommended by UGSC. The motion, as amended to being a recommendation for UGSC chair, passed without opposition or abstention.

4. The next item was [a proposal to place the BS in Social and Economic Development Policy program into hiatus status](#). Patrick Ireland presented the proposal. He indicated that this program essentially has been replaced by a track inside of a new program. Katie Spink asked if it would be more appropriate to eliminate this program instead of placing it on hiatus. Patrick indicated that in conversation with Academic Affairs, it had been decided that hiatus status was better since there was a co-terminal degree involving this program and the Business school and there are still some students in this co-terminal program. Matt Bauer moved to accept this proposal. The motion was seconded by Fred Weening. The motion passed without objection or abstention.
5. The next item was an [update on an item from a previous UGSC meeting concerning an inconsistency in the math placement policy](#). Kiah Ong reviewed the situation and then gave the update: He indicated that this inconsistency concerned whether students who had taken the math placement test (which uses an adaptive testing program called Aleks) and been placed into either Math 147 or Math 148 should be allowed to re-take the placement exam at a later date to possibly place into Math 151. Previously, there had been some students who were placed in Math 148, did not pass Math 148, but then did re-take and pass the placement exam at a later date. The math department believed these students should be allowed into Math 151, but Academic Affairs expressed concern that allowing the student to take Math 151 after not passing Math 148 would be a red flag when reviewed by accreditation bodies.

Based on the feedback from the previous meeting, the math department had a sub-committee review the situation. The sub-committee came to the conclusion that the situation described above is quite rare and the policy that Academic Affairs wanted (i.e., not allowing a student to re-take the placement test after taking Math 147 or Math 148) was acceptable to the math department.

Kathir confirmed with the rest of UGSC that this item will be viewed as an informational and no vote will be taken.

6. The next item was [a report](#) from the Core Curriculum Assessment Committee on the assessment of whether the (H) designated courses are meeting the (H) learning objectives. Mary Jorgenson Sullivan shared her screen to display the report. She summarized the highlights of the report:
 - The (H) learning outcomes are
 - i. Students will be able to articulate questions about human expressions and experiences.
 - ii. Students will demonstrate understanding of the language and concepts of the humanities and arts.
 - iii. Students will produce original work of creative expression (e.g., creative writing, argumentative research paper, fine arts.)

- There were 19 (H) courses offered in Fall 2024. Students were randomly sampled in courses containing more than 50 students, while artifacts of all students were used in courses with 50 or less students.
- For each learning outcome instructors worked with CCAC members to identify artifacts that could be assessed on a scale 0 - 2: as to whether the work does not meet expectations (0), meets expectations (1), proficient in outcome (2)
- The results of the assessment were generally that students are achieving all three learning outcomes. The percentage of students not meeting a learning outcome was about 6% for each of the learning outcomes. A much more detailed analysis can be found in the report.
- There was a fairly high percentage of classes (about 30%) which did not supply data. The CCAC will be working on improving compliance in the future, particularly by making sure that new and part-time faculty are clear on the assessment process. Giving greater awareness of what the learning outcomes are, and what the time-lines are for the assessment. The CCAC is also working on trying to integrate the assessment process into Canvas.
- Given the generally positive assessment results, the CCAC is not recommending any specific changes be made to courses in the (H) designation.

Fred Weening moved to accept the report as presented. This motion was seconded by Jeremy Hajek. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

7. The next item was an [updated version of the policy on minors](#). Gabe Smith gave the update, displaying the revised document outlining the policy. She indicated that the revisions included
 - Taking out the language which restricted getting minors from within the same department as the major.
 - Clarifying and simplifying some of the language of the other policies.

The “rule of 4”, that a student can obtain at most 4 majors degrees + minors, is still central to the policy. Students can petition to have more, but the petition would need to be decided on a case-by-case basis. Some of the rules concerning timeliness of submitting requests for minors is to prevent some students (especially international students) from extending their stay at Illinois Tech to just get another minor in addition to their major degree whose requirements may have already been fulfilled.

Nick Menhart asked a question about the wording and intent of the first rule in the policy:

#1. A minor consists of at least five courses (minimum of 15 credit hours), of which at least four courses (minimum 12 credit hours) are not required for a student’s degree program. Minimum credit hour requirements for the degree must be satisfied, that is, if one three-credit-hour course satisfies degree and minor requirements, then the student must take an additional three credit hours toward the degree.

Would this mean that a student in a 120 credit program would have to take 123 credits to get their degree and a minor which had a one course overlap of requirements with the major?

Mary Hanes indicated that, yes, this is what the policy would require.

Nick asked the UGSC: Do we really want to make the student do this? Isn't this contrary to our goal of reducing the number of credits a student has to take to graduate to 120 in most programs?

Katie Spink made a suggestion in reference to rule #1 and rule #6:

#6 For majors without a required minor, minor courses can be shared freely with core electives, free electives, and technical electives (along with the major course that can count toward the minor). Minimum credit hour requirements for the degree must be satisfied.

Her suggestion was to word #1 like #6, eliminating in #1 the discussion of if a course satisfies both a degree requirement and a requirement of the minor:

#1. A minor consists of at least five courses (minimum of 15 credit hours), of which at least four courses (minimum 12 credit hours) are not required for a student's degree program. Minimum credit hour requirements for the degree must be satisfied, ~~that is, if one three credit hour course satisfies degree and minor requirements, then the student must take an additional three credit hours toward the degree.~~

Katie said that with this change there won't be the issue that concerned Nick.

There was considerably more discussion on the wording of the rules, the intent of the rules, and the rules that we may need to satisfy according to accreditation bodies.

Fred Weening asked whether a Stats major could get a CS minor. It is a fact that every CS minor requires two classes which are also required by a Stats major. So it seems that rule #1 would prevent getting a Stats major and a CS minor. Gabe explained that this isn't what occurs in practice, although there is this overlap, students can get this major/minor combination by taking additional courses in the major or minor. Fred indicated that if this is the case then rule #1 should be reworded.

Ultimately it was decided that a subcommittee should be formed to work on language that would hopefully satisfy all concerns being raised.

Due to time constraints the item on the Standard Operating Procedures of UGSC was postponed until the first meeting of UGSC in Fall 2025.

As for the item on Other Business, Kindon Mills asked if UGSC is going to get a proposal from the group working on overhauling the Core Curriculum. She expressed concern as she has heard there is going to be a piloting of some classes in the Fall semester.

Jeff Wereszczynski indicated that his understanding was that it was more of a piloting of a modality of course offering (eg. a 6 credit course) than a change with the Core Curriculum standards and learning outcomes.

Kevin Cassel indicated that the modality of offerings is what is being piloted, although not necessarily in the format of a 6 credit course offering. There is a plan to get more integration among faculty teaching multiple courses. However, one reason that this plan has been slow to roll

out is because of our upcoming assessment by the HLC. While the HLC encourages innovative ideas, they don't want to see wholesale changes right before a visit.

After a bit more discussion it was time to adjourn the meeting.

Jeff Wereszczynski thanked everyone at the meeting for the productive discussions this year.

Kindon Mills moved to adjourn and this was seconded by Jeremy Hajek. There was no objection or abstention.

The meeting adjourned at 1:57 pm.