# ILLINOIS TECH UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

---

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday November 11, 2025
12:45pm
Online via Zoom
(pdf version available here)

**Attending Voting Members:** Fred Weening (AMAT), Promila Dhar (BME), Braja Mandal (CHEM), Murat Vural (MMAE), Erdal Oruklu (ECE), Kindon Mills (ARCH), Nicole Legate (PSYC), Andy Howard (BIOL), Patrick Ireland (SSCI), Emily Leiner (PHYS), Matthew Bauer (CS), Stephen Kleps (CAEE),  Jeremy Hajek  (ITM), John Twombly (SSB), Victor Perez-Luna (CHBE),

**Chairing Meeting:** Kathir Krishnamurthy

**Also Attending:** Elizabeth Hudson (Provost), Mary Jorgenson Sullivan (ELS), Abby McGrath (Enrollment Services), Nick Menhart (VP Assessment and Accreditation), Melanie Jones (Armour Acad Advisor), Keith Alexander (UGAA), Kevin Cassel (VP Acad Affairs), Michael Arnaudo (Armour Acad Advisor), Pam Houser (INTM), Melisa Lopez (Student Success & Retention), Gabrielle Smith (UGAA), Joe Gorzkowski (UGAA), Leslie Johnson (ARCH), Tracey McGee (ELS), Daniel Bliss (HASS), Jennifer deWinter (Dean LCS), Katherine Quiroa (UGAA), Keigo Kawaji (Armour), Kiah Ong (MATH), Mary Haynes (UGAA), Kyle Hawkins (AMP), Taylor Rojas (UGAA), Carrie Hall (Armour), Gabriel Martinez (Armour), Kelly Roark (CLI), Nicole Novak (Libraries), Ayesha Qamer (Registrar), Karly Kocurek (LCS), Zipporah Robinson (Academic Success), Diane Fifles (Univ Accred), Brian Casario (ELS)

Quorum was reached and the meeting was started at 12:47pm

1. Approval of the proposed meeting agenda. Kathir Krishnamurthy shared the proposed agenda and indicated one change: the Provost, Elizabeth Hudson, would like to give a brief discussion at the start of the meeting on the background for piloting changes to the Core Curriculum. Matt Bauer moved to accept the agenda and this was seconded by Kindon Mills. Kathir asked if there were any additional items or other changes to be made; there were none. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

2. Approval of Meeting minutes. The minutes for the UGSC meeting on October 28 were displayed. These had previously been made available on the UGSC website. Kindon Mills moved to approve the minutes and this was seconded by Matt Bauer. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

3. Kathir turned the floor over to Provost Hudson to give the administration's perspective on making changes to the Core Curriculum. The Provost greeted the committee and also thanked everyone who had contributed to the report to the

Provost's office on suggestions and analysis of possible changes to the Core Curriculum.

She indicated that this is a critical time for the university for a number of reasons including the accreditation visit next Fall and the significant changes that are happening to all of higher education. The piloting program put forth at the last UGSC meeting will allow us to test some of the ideas for making changes to the core, but this does not mean that these will be the ultimate changes made. We should continue to discuss other ideas for modernizing and streamlining the Core to address the needs of our students and to ensure that the Core is aligned with the mission of the University. She expressed that she embraces the importance of these discussions and indicated that the pilot programs will jumpstart some of the discussions.

Kathir thanked the Provost and asked if there were questions for her; there were none.

4.  The next item was [a report from the assessment committee on the communication designation portion of the Core](). Mary Jorgensen Sullivan made the presentation.

    The report, which had been previously made available, was shared on the screen and Mary summarized the contents. She indicated that the C designation is complex to analyze because there are many in-major courses as well as some out-of-major courses that need to be assessed. This report is focused on the out-of-major courses, including 300 and 400 level courses in communications, humanities, philosophy, history, social science, and literature.

    As can be seen in the charts in the report, students performed reasonably well in most of the learning outcomes except for LO3 which concerned students' ability to revise text based on feedback. For many students, there were no artifacts to address this learning outcome. And for those students for which there were artifacts for LO3, their performance in general was not as good as for the other learning outcomes. Of the four remaining LOs, the one other area of concern was in LO1: students' ability to integrate sources to support their own ideas.

    The specific recommendations in the report focus on addressing these two learning outcomes. It was also noted that there were some artifacts that clearly appear to have been AI-generated. Students need to be taught how to use AI effectively and not have AI replace their own production of work.

    Kathir asked if there were any questions for Mary. There were none. Kathir indicated that since this report is rather lengthy we would vote on accepting the report at the next UGSC meeting in order to give members time to look at the report more carefully.

5. The next agenda item was a continuation of the discussion of [the document on the framework for piloting some ideas for changes to the Core](). Nick Menhart displayed the document which had been introduced at the last UGSC meeting. He summarized the document and gave some rationale for some of the items as he scrolled through the document. Some of the points he highlighted were:
   a. This is a two-term pilot
   b. Students in the pilot classes will receive credit for classes in the current core which are reasonably similar
   c. The pilot classes will be assessed on
      i. Their effectiveness at delivering on their learning outcomes
      ii. Student satisfaction.
      iii. Faculty satisfaction
      iv. Financial feasibility
   d. The pilot proposal contains
      i. One policy change (allowing double counting of courses for meeting core and major requirements — currently this is not done uniformly in the core)
      ii. Two curricular changes
         1. A two course component to the communications area of the core: COM 100 and COM 200
         2. A design course pilot

Kathir asked if there were any questions for Nick. Some of the questions and answers included the following.

Kindon Mills asked how the students would be selected for the courses in the pilot program. Nick indicated that the students would self select to take these courses when registering for courses.

Matt Bauer wanted to clarify that the decision process about whether to make actual changes to the Core will ultimately require UGSC approval. Nick responded yes, that is absolutely correct.

Nicole Novak asked whether the design course (which is given the IPRO 397 number for now) and the COM 100 class would be piloted in spring 2026. Jennifer deWinter indicated that the answer was yes to both.

Kathir asked Nick if he would like a vote on this proposal at this meeting or at the next meeting. Nick indicated that voting at the next meeting would be fine and that this would let him get a few typo corrections and updates made to the document.

6. The next item was on a [proposal / discussion document entitled "Streamlining the Core Curriculum to Support Student Success."](#) Jennifer deWinter made the presentation. She indicated that currently this is not a proposal to implement a change, but it is rather a presentation for discussion and feedback.

   With the powerpoint displayed, Jennifer discussed the current parts A, B, and C of the Core which entangle courses designated as (C), (H), and (S). She noted that it is overly complicated and confuses both students and faculty. Currently students must take a total of 36 (C) credits with at least 12 credits within their own major and 12 credits outside of their own major. Enrollment data shows that most students take 24 credits of (C) courses outside of their major from courses in the Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences department. This puts a lot of burden on the HASS department which has enrollment limits on (C) courses.

   There are also requirements in the Core which require a number of (H) and (S) courses the 300+ level which limits the number of transfer credits students can bring into Illinois Tech and requires that Illinois Tech have the most carve-outs of any institution in the Illinois Articulation Initiative (IAI).

   The proposal currently under discussion would
   - Remove the (C) requirement for the list of Core requirements. However, it would not remove the (C) designation from courses — the (C) designation has a lot of other uses.
   - Replace the COM 101 and HUM 2XX requirements with the courses COM 100 and COM 200  (this change will be credit neutral to the Core).
   - Replace the (H) and (S) requirements which total 18 credits in the Core, with a new single category designation (SHI) requiring 15 credits in the Core.  (this change will reduce the credits needed in the Core by 3)
   - Renumber some of the 300+ level courses in the current (H) and (S) to be lower level in (SHI) to align the courses with IAI.
   - Enable double counting of courses in the (SHI) designation with requirements of students' majors (currently this is not allowed in (H) and (S) designations).

   Jennifer outlined a number of benefits these changes would provide, including considerable cost savings to the HASS department.

   Kathir asked if there were any questions for Jennifer.

   Nick Menhart asked if there were learning outcomes written for the (SHI) designation? In addition, would the current list of 5 learning outcomes for the (C) designation still apply to the COM 100 and COM 200 courses?

Jennifer replied that based on the data from the (C) assessment, there needs to be a revision of the LOs. Also there should be an LO regarding use of AI technology. These LOs are being developed and will be coming forward soon.

Murat Vural indicated that he liked the fact that the proposal would make it easier for transfer students to get credit for courses they are bringing in with them. He wondered if it might be possible to bring the total number of credits in Com and (SHI) down from 21 to perhaps 18. He asked how these numbers compare with our peers. Jennifer indicated that 21 credits is by far the most common. If we were to go down to 18, that would be notably less than our peers.

7.  Since the meeting was running late, Kathir asked the remaining presenter, Carly Kocurek, if she would mind postponing until the next meeting. She had no objection.

8.  Other Business. There was no other business.

Jeremy Hajek moved that the meeting be adjourned and this was seconded by Andy Howard. There was no objection.


The meeting adjourned at 1:56 pm.