ILLINOIS TECH UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday February 24, 2026
12:45pm
Online via Zoom
(pdf version available here)

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

Chairing Meeting: Kathir Krishnamurthy

Also Attending: Taylor Rojas (UGAA), Nicole Beebe (Dean COC), Bo Rodda (HASS), Zipporah Robinson (Academic Success), Gabrielle Smith (UGAA), Daniel Bliss (HASS), Nicole Novak (Libraries), Abby McGrath (Enrollment Services), Jeff Wereszczynski (VP Acad Affairs), Joe Gorzkowski (UGAA), Michael Arnaudo (Armour Acad Advisor), Kevin Cassel (VP Acad Transformation), Gurram Gopal (ITM), David Minh (CHEM), Ayesha Qamer (Registrar), Katie Spink (Pre-Med), Pam Houser (INTM), Gabriel Martinez (Armour), Carrie Hall (Armour), Kiah Ong (AMAT), Rich Klein (SSB), Brent Stephens (CAEE), Ray Lemming (CAEE), Katherine Quiroa (UGAA), Saran Ghatak (HASS), Melisa Lopez (Student Success & Retention), Yasmin Rodriguez-Escutia (Armour Acad Advisor), Tracey McGee (ELS), Nick Menhart (VP Assessment and Accreditation), Melanie Jones (Armour Acad Advisor), Norma Scagnoli (CLI), Mary Jorgenson Sullivan (ELS), Cynthia Torres (Acad Affairs), Diane Fifles (Univ Accred), Keith Alexander (UGAA), Brian Casario (ELS), Kathy Nagle (ARCH)

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

1. Approval of the proposed meeting agenda. Kathir Krishnamurthy shared the proposed agenda which had been previously distributed. Matt Bauer moved to accept the agenda and Andy Howard seconded the motion. Kathir asked if anyone wanted to propose additions or changes to the agenda; none were proposed. The motion to accept the agenda as presented passed without objection or abstention.

2. Approval of Meeting minutes. The minutes for the UGSC meeting on February 17, 2026 had previously been made available on the UGSC website. Kindon Mills moved to accept the minutes and this was seconded by Matt Bauer. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

3. The next item was a proposal to have a special meeting of UGSC on Tuesday March 3. Kathir explained that there were still a lot of proposals that had been submitted to UGSC

with the hopes of being approved in time for inclusion in the next catalog. He asked members who had such proposals or who were still planning on submitting such proposals to indicate these to the committee.

There were quite a few proposals mentioned, and there was some discussion regarding using the incubator policy to propose some new programs of the variety BS in X plus AI. Nick Menhart pointed out the incubator policy could be used, but that these are still new programs and need to have new CIM entries including assessment plans. Kiah Ong asked how one indicates in CIM that a proposal is to be submitted under the incubator policy. Aeyesha Qamer answered that this must be made clear in writing within the proposal itself, there is no special CIM attribute signifying an incubator proposal.

Kindon Mills moved to accept the proposal of a special UGSC meeting on March 3 and this motion was seconded by Fred Weening. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

4. The next item was to vote on a number of proposals that had been introduced at previous meetings.

   a. New program: [Bachelor of Arts in Architectural Studies](). Kindon Mills gave a brief re-cap of the proposal. Kathir asked if there were questions/comments. There were none. Jeremy Hajek moved to accept the proposal and this motion was seconded by John Twombly. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

   b. New program: [Bachelor of Science in Construction Management and Architectural Technology](). Brent Stephens reminded the committee of the details of the proposal. Kathir asked if there were questions/comments. There were none. Murat Vural moved to accept the proposal and this was seconded by Stephen Kleps. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

   c. New program: [Bachelor of Science in Communication and Emergent Media](). Bo Rodda gave the review of the proposal. Kathir asked if there were questions or comments. There were none. Erin Hazard moved to accept the proposal and this motion was seconded by Andy Howard. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

   d. Name change to program: [Change Bachelor of Science in Psychological Science to Bachelor of Science in Psychology](). Nikki Legate reminded the committee of the rationale for the proposal, and that there are no changes to the program other than the name change. There were no questions or discussion. John Twombly moved to accept the proposal and Kindon Mills seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

e. Name change to program: [Change Bachelor of Science in Applied Cybersecurity and Information Technology to Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity](). Jeremy Hajek explained the rationale and that there were no other changes besides the name change being proposed. There were no questions or discussion. Matt Bauer moved to accept the proposal and John Twombly seconded the motion. The motion passed with no objections, but there was one abstention from Erdal Oruklu.

f. Putting a program in hiatus status: [Bachelor of Science in Behavioral Science and Wellness](). Nikki Legate gave the review of the proposal and the reasoning behind it. Andy Howard asked if there were any students currently in the program and Nikki responded that there are currently five students in the program, and that the department will work with these students to make sure that they can complete the program if desired. The proposal for hiatus status is so that no other students can enroll, the plan is to eliminate the program when there are no longer students in the program. Andy suggested that the plan to allow the students in the program to finish should be called a teach out plan. Nick Menhart commented that the point of the hiatus status is to avoid the need for a formal teach out plan. There were no further questions or discussion. Fred Weening moved to accept the proposal and Andy Howard seconded the motion. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

g. Recommended catalog changes for AY 2026 regarding

   i. dual and joint degrees. ([proposal document]() / [CIM entry]())
   ii. coterminal / amp / plus 1 program ([revised proposal document]() / [CIM entry]())

   Kathir reminded the committee that these had originally been proposed two UGSC meetings ago, and that he had asked for a vote at the last meeting but there were some questions that arose and it was decided to delay voting until this meeting. Nicole Beebe who originally made the proposal was not at the last UGSC meeting, but is here now. The two catalog changes were made as separate proposals.

   (i) Nicole reviewed the proposal concerning dual and joint degrees noting that from the undergraduate standpoint the main change in policy that the catalog changes describe is that the requirement that a student's final 45 credit hours be obtained at Illinois Tech would be changed to be that at least 45 credit hours will be from Illinois Tech courses.

   Kindon Mills asked whether there would be one degree which has the name of the two universities or if there would be two degrees (one from each university) awarded. Nicole indicated that it would be two degrees. There was a bit of

discussion on when this would fall under the category of a joint degree or a dual degree (dependent on the names of the degrees offered by each university), but in either case each university would be awarding a degree. The details of how many credits each university is accepting from the other university would be described in a memo of understanding agreement between the universities. This is not part of the details of the proposed changes to the catalog.

Nick Menhart asked if we could get clarification of whether the proposed change of the 45 credit hours policy (final vs at least) applies to just these dual / joint degrees, or whether this is a proposed change that applies broadly to all undergraduate programs at Illinois Tech. There was a bit of discussion of this point between Kevin Cassel, Nick, Jeff Wereczszynski, and Nicole. Ultimately the consensus was that this catalog change was limited specifically to dual and joint degrees where there are memos of understanding agreements which will spell out the details of what credits will be allowed to transfer between Illinois Tech and the other university involved.

Murat Vural asked how this catalog change would affect any currently existing dual or joint degree program; for example the agreement currently with Wheaton College, among others. Nicole indicated that this catalog change would just apply to new joint/dual degree programs, but that in future catalogs there would likely be some clean up in terminology being used in past agreements so that there is consistency with the new policy.

Murat also asked if there is a way to track which students are in joint programs. He indicated that currently he can only be sure by asking students directly if they are in a joint degree program. Sometimes he said he can find this information in for instance degreeworks, but other times not. Kevin Cassel responded that there is a way to record this information now, but it is not being uniformly implemented. Everyone was in agreement that moving forward it is important to make sure that attributes need to be consistently set in student records so that students in these programs can be tracked.

There was no further discussion on this catalog change proposal. Fred Weening moved to approve the proposal and this was seconded by Jeremy Hajek. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

(ii) Nicole Beebe next reviewed the proposed catalog changes regarding eliminating the co-terminal program and making some changes to the wording of the Accelerated Master's Programs (to fix some consistency issues) which will be marketed as the "plus-one" program. She indicated that she understood there were some questions as to how the elimination of the co-terminal program will be implemented and that the [revised proposal document](#) addresses some of those

questions. She indicated that Kevin Cassel and Jeff Wereczszynski can also address questions in this regard.

Kevin asked Kathir to scroll to the last bullet point in this document where it indicated that current students eligible for the 2026 admissions cycle of the co-terminal program have until August 1, 2026 to apply to the program. After that the co-terminal program will no longer accept applicants. To be eligible to apply, students need to have at least 60 credits and at least a 3.0 GPA.

Matt Bauer commented that he thinks students that are currently at Illinois Tech shouldn't have that August 1, 2026 deadline. They might not be anywhere near the 60 credit requirement by August 1, 2026 but we've been advising these students about the co-terminal program already.

Jeff Wereczszynski indicated that the students Matt is referring to are primarily Freshman as most sophomores who would be interested in the co-terminal program would have the required 60 credits. Kevin added that they are replacing the co-terminal program with an alternative path for students to get a Master's in an accelerated time period.

Matt responded by saying that it's not the same deal; we advertised and advised students about the co-terminal program and now we're pulling it away from them. Murat Vural agreed with Matt's position, pointing out that some of these students that would be denied the opportunity most likely specifically came to Illinois Tech because of the co-terminal program. His understanding is that the cost structure will change significantly for these students.

Kindon Mills indicated that it would be helpful to know some specific numbers of how many students we are talking about and what the changes in the cost structure would be. She indicated she is not per se against the proposal but in order to make a decision she wanted more information.

Stephen Kleps said that he absolutely agrees with Matt's and Murat's position here. He indicated that to him it seems like a breach of contract situation since students were admitted with the co-terminal program being advertised. Kian Ong agreed, stating that he has a student who came to Illinois Tech this semester specifically because of the co-terminal program.

Nick Menhart mentioned that one of the changes that is described in the revised proposal document is that students can now share 15 credit hours between undergraduate and master's programs (instead of a prior limit of 9 credit hours). This benefit should offset some of the changes to the cost structure that students will be faced with. Kindon mentioned that this is another indication that we need

more specific data to weigh in the decision process concerning making a vote on this proposal.

To give some indication of the change in cost structure, Jeff mentioned that the average discount rate that students get at the undergraduate level is 55%, while at the graduate level it is only 10%. Nick Menhart shared his screen to show some more specific numbers. The numbers he showed were based on average amounts charged to students, not for any specific student. Under the current co-terminal program during the last three semesters the amount a typical student would spend is on the order of 34 thousand dollars. While in the new situation to get a Bachelor's and then a Master's degree the typical student would spend on the order of 49 thousand dollars during the same time period (this accounts for the benefit of increased allowed sharing of credits). So we're talking about a difference on the order of 15 thousand dollars.

Katie Spink asked for some clarification of the sharing of up to 15 credits (instead of 9 credits). The clarification was that as an undergraduate, a student can take 15 credits of master's level courses and those 15 credits can be used to satisfy their undergraduate program requirements (say as technical or free electives) and then also be used as 15 credits toward their master's degree. If a student were to do this, they would be paying for these 15 graduate level credits as an undergraduate (i.e., at the cost structure of an undergraduate). Students could actually take more than 15 credits of graduate level courses as an undergraduate, but only 15 credits can be dual counted.

There was some further discussion regarding the issues related to taking graduate level courses as an undergraduates.

Kathir asked for a show of hands to see if quorum was still present; it was. Murat Vural made a motion to accept the proposed catalog changes. Andy Howard seconded the motion. Since there had been discussion both in support and against the proposal, Kathir asked for a vote by show of hands. The results of the vote were 4 in favor, 5 against, and 1 abstaining. The proposal did not pass.

h. Program revision: Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry. David Minh, who had made the previous presentation of the proposal, asked if this item could be tabled until the next UGSC meeting since the Biology department has not yet voted on the proposal.

Given that it was already past the scheduled meeting time, Kathir asked for a motion to move the remaining agenda items to the March 3 meeting. Kindon Mills made the motion which was seconded by Andy Howard. There was no objection or abstention to the motion.

Matt Bauer made a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded by Fred Weening. There was no objection or abstention.

The meeting adjourned at 2:03pm