

## ILLINOIS TECH UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

---

Meeting Minutes  
Tuesday March 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), Saran Ghatak substituting for Erin Hazard (HASS), James Mann (INTM), Erdal Oruklu (ECE), Nicole Legate (PSYC), John Twombly (SSB), Jeremy Hajek (ITM), Kindon Mills (ARCH), Matthew Bauer (CS), Andy Howard (BIOL), Stephen Kleps (CAEE)

Note: There were substitutions for voting members who could not stay when meeting extended past 1:45pm:

Solomon Kang for John Twombly, Edoarda Corradi for Stephen Kleps, Pam Houser for James Mann, and Arlen Moller for Nicole Legate.

**Chairing Meeting:** Kathir Krishnamurthy

**Also Attending:** Taylor Rojas (UGAA), Nicole Beebe (Dean COC), Solomon Kang (SSB), Zipporah Robinson (Academic Success), Daniel Bliss (HASS), Cynthia Torres (Acad Affairs), Nicole Novak (Libraries), Jeff Wereszczynski (VP Acad Affairs), Joe Gorzkowski (UGAA), Gabrielle Smith (UGAA), Michael Arnaudo (Armour Acad Advisor), Kevin Cassel (VP Acad Transformation), Keith Green (HASS), Kelly Roark (CLI), Ayesha Qamer (Registrar), Carly Kocurek (LCS), Edoarda Corradi (CAEE), Katie Spink (Pre-Med), Ankit Srivastava (UFC), Carrie Hall (Armour), Kiah Ong (AMAT), Rich Klein (SSB), Katherine Quiroa (UGAA), Jennifer deWinter (Dean LCS), Yasmin Rodriguez-Escutia (Armour Acad Advisor), Jonathan Harmon (GSC/GAA), Melanie Jones (Armour Acad Advisor), Arlen Moller (PSYC), Keith Alexander (UGAA), Pam Houser (INTM), Brian Casario (ELS), Diane Fifles (Univ Accred)

A quorum was reached and the meeting started at 12:48 pm.

1. Approval of the proposed meeting agenda. Kathir Krishnamurthy shared the [proposed agenda](#) which had been previously distributed. John Twombly moved to accept the agenda and Matt Bauer seconded the motion. 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 [March 10, 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 to indicate the results of the electronic voting on major proposals that were introduced at the March 10 UGSC meeting. The voting deadline was 1pm on March 17. At that time there had been 13 replies to the email for casting votes. All the proposals were approved, the specific results are as follows:
  - a. Revision of program: Bachelor of Science in Biomedical engineering **13-0 approve**
  - b. New program: Bachelor of Science in Cybersecurity and AI **13-0 approve**
  - c. New program: Bachelor of Science in Business Administration with Artificial Intelligence **13-0 approve**
  - d. Program elimination: BS (Bioinformatics) **13-0 approve**
  - e. Program elimination: BS (Molecular Biochemistry and Biophysics) **13-0 approve**
  - f. Program elimination: BS in Molecular Biochemistry and Biophysics / MS in Molecular Biochemistry and Biophysics **13-0 approve**
  - g. Revision of Program: BS (Food Science and Nutrition) **13-0 approve**
  - h. New program: Bachelor of Science in Game Design and Experiential Media with Specialization in Technical Game Development **12-0 approve, 1 abstain**

Kathir mentioned that after this vote, he approved all of these proposals in his CIM queue and these have now been voted on (by electronic vote) at UFC and all have been approved at UFC. The next step in the process, since these are major proposals, is that they will be communicated to all faculty for the 10-day notice.

Kathir also reviewed the timeline for the proposals being classified as minor changes that will be voted on later in today's meeting. He indicated that April 3 is the final deadline for all approvals to be made in CIM in order for items to make it into the next bulletin. He mentioned that he can't approve items at the UGSC level until they make it into his queue. For any items that are approved today that aren't already at the UGSC queue in CIM, he is encouraging those who made the proposals to try to ensure that the proposals get to the UGSC queue as soon as possible.

4. The next item on the agenda was discussion and voting on 27 proposals classified as minor changes. These were broken up in the agenda into four categories: (a) new incubator proposals of programs with artificial intelligence, (b) revision of existing programs, (c) new minors or certificate programs, and (d) revision of existing minors. All of these are listed individually below. In each case, the proposal was described to the committee by the person indicated in parentheses, opportunities for questions and discussions were given, a motion for accepting the proposal was made and seconded (by members as indicated below) and a vote was taken. Below are the details.
  - a. New incubator programs with Artificial intelligence

Before any votes were taken, Jeff Werezczynski made a comment regarding a question that came up at a previous UGSC meeting regarding programs that include the phrase "with Artificial Intelligence" and which require students to

complete the AI certificate programs. The question was whether students would be awarded the certificates in addition to having the phrase “with Artificial Intelligence” as part of their degree program. After consideration of the question, the answer from UGAA is that the certificates will not be granted in this situation. Only the “with Artificial Intelligence” will appear on the transcript and diploma for students in programs with those titles. The reasoning behind the decision is that you can’t have the requirements of the degree program count for both the degree program and for the certificates.

- i. [BS-GDAI: Bachelor of Science in Game Design and Experiential Media with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Carly Kocurek**)
    - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: John Twombly
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - ii. [BS-PHAI: Bachelor of Science in Physics with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Emily Leiner**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard seconded by: John Twombly
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - iii. [BS-APAI: Bachelor of Science in Astrophysics with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Emily Leiner**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: John Twombly
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - iv. [Bachelor of Science in Biochemistry with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Andy Howard**)
    - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Victor Perez-Luna
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - v. [BA-ASAI: BA Architectural Studies with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Kindon Mills**)
    - moved by: John Twombly, seconded by: Saran Ghatak
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - vi. [BS-PPAI: Bachelor of Science in Public Policy with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Saran Ghatak**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: Victor Perez-Luna
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - vii. [BS-CMAI: Communication and Emergent Media with Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Saran Ghatak**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: John Twombly
    - approved without objection or abstention
- b. Revision of existing programs
- i. [BS-PHYS-3: Bachelor of Science in Physics](#) ([summary doc](#)) (**Emily Leiner**)
    - moved by: Matt Bauer, seconded by: Jeremy Hajek
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - ii. [BS-BIOL-3: Bachelor of Science in Biology](#) (**Andy Howard**)
    - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Victor Perez-Luna

- approved without objection or abstention
  - iii. [BS-PSYS-1: Bachelor of Science Psychology \(summary doc\)](#) (**Nikki Legate**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: Kindon Mills
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - iv. [BS-CS-2: Bachelor of Science in Computer Science](#) (**Matt Bauer**)
    - moved by: John Twombly, seconded by: Victor Perez-Luna
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - v. [BS-CCSE: Bachelor of Science in Computer and Cybersecurity Engineering \(summary doc\)](#) (**Erdal Oruklu**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: Matt Bauer
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - vi. [BS-CPE Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering](#) (**Erdal Oruklu**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: Matt Bauer
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - vii. [BS-ASPY-1: Bachelor of Science in Astrophysics \(summary doc\)](#) (**Emily Leiner**)
    - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Fred Weening
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - viii. [BS-EPHY: Bachelor of Science in Engineering Physics](#) (**Emily Leiner**)
    - moved by: Jeremy Hajek, seconded by: Matt Bauer
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - ix. [BS-CIS-2: Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems](#) (**Matt Bauer**)
    - moved by: John Twombly, seconded by: Kindon Mills
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - x. [BS-DS: Bachelor of Science in Data Science \(summary doc\)](#) (**Fred Weening**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: Matt Bauer
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - xi. [BAC-INTM-3: Bachelor of Industrial Technology and Management \(summary doc\)](#) (**James Mann**)
    - moved by: Andy Howard, seconded by: Victor Perez-Luna
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - xii. [BS-AI: Bachelor of Science in Artificial Intelligence](#) (**Matt Bauer**)
    - moved by: Fred Weening, seconded by: Jeremy Hajek
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - xiii. [BS-GDEM: Bachelor of Science in Game Design and Experiential Media](#)
    - moved by: Fred Weening, seconded by: Jeremy Hajek
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - xiv. [Update on Bioengineering specialization](#) (**Victor Perez-Luna**)
    - Since this proposal is not yet in CIM the item was requested to be removed for consideration at this meeting
- c. New minors or certificate programs

- i. [MHUM: Medical Humanities \(summary doc\)](#) (**Saran Ghatak**)
  - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Fred Weening
  - approved without objection or abstention
- ii. [CER-AP Certificate in Applied Philosophy](#) (**Saran Ghatak**)
  - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Fred Weening
  - approved without objection or abstention
- iii. [CER-PE: Certificate in Professional Ethics](#) (**Saran Ghatak**)
  - moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Fred Weening
  - approved without objection or abstention
- d. Revision of existing minors
  - i. [ASPY: Minor in Astrophysics](#) (**Emily Leiner**)
    - moved by: Fred Weening, seconded by: Victor Perez-Luna
    - approved without objection or abstention
  - ii. [SUST Minor in Sustainability](#) (**Stephen Kleps**)

Stephen noted that there is one error in what is listed in the CIM document. The intention of the proposal is to add two courses: BIOL 200 and CHE 541 to the list of choices students have to fulfill requirements of the minor. BIOL 200 is listed correctly in the CIM document, but while it is indicated that CHE 541 should be added to the list of choices, the course isn't listed in the correct location in the CIM document. He expressed the hope that we could vote on that intention now and make the changes to the CIM document later without having to resubmit everything.

It was the understanding that this revision including adding the CHE 541 class was what we are voting on today. If it is impossible to make the change at this point, the document will be resubmitted in the Fall.

- moved by: Kindon Mills, seconded by: Andy Howard
- approved without objection or abstention
- iii. [BIOL: Minor in Biology](#) (**Andy Howard**)
  - moved by: Fred Weening, seconded by: Matt Bauer
  - approved without objection or abstention
- iv. [GDEM: Minor in Game Design and Experiential Media](#) (**Carly Kocurek**)
  - moved by: Fred Weening, seconded by: Jeremy Hajek
  - approved without objection or abstention

5. The next agenda item was a discussion of the most recent draft of the [course numbering policy proposal](#). The presentation was made by Daniel Bliss.

Daniel indicated that the policy in the proposal had been approved recently by GSC and had been reviewed over spring break by the Deans. It is the same proposal that was shown at UGSC prior to spring break with a few modifications in the description of 400-

and 500-level courses to accommodate professional programs. Jeff Werezczynski added that, based on the feedback from the last UGSC meeting, one of the other changes to the previous draft is that there is no longer any mention of the typical prerequisites for a given hundred-level course.

Matt Bauer asked a question relating to the appropriate level for courses that would be offered to graduate students who need to fill in a deficiency in their undergraduate preparation for their graduate program. He indicated that currently CS would offer these as 400 level courses that don't count toward the graduate degree program and was wondering if these could be now numbered as zero-hundred courses or if that would cause other issues. Jeff asked Matt to explain the situation in more detail and to continue the discussion through email.

Andy Howard had a question concerning how this policy would be implemented: who would be responsible for checking whether existing course numbers in a particular academic department were in alignment with the policy? Jeff indicated that this would primarily be a responsibility of the individual departments with oversight from the Deans. Andy explained that his concern was that if everyone thinks that someone else is responsible to check, then we'd have a problem. Jeff understood his concern and expressed his view that each academic unit should have a standing curriculum committee and those committees should ensure that their current courses are in alignment with the policy and make the necessary changes if they are not in alignment.

Jeremy Hajek asked if there is a timeline by which departments must review their course numberings and make any necessary changes. Jeff responded that there is no expectation that this is done in the remaining weeks of this semester, but course numberings should be reviewed carefully and necessary changes should be made in the Fall 2026 semester.

Murat Vural had a specific example on which he wanted to get clarification. The course MMAE 350 is offered by his department and in some programs it is taken in a student's fifth semester (so third year) while in other programs its taken in student's fourth semester (so second year), is that going to create a problem with whether the course should be numbered at the 200 or 300 level? Jeff responded that no, he doesn't see any problem with this; the current numbering is fine. There are bound to be some overlapping situations like this and that is not an issue. He mentioned that where there is a problem, for example, is situations in which students are being told that they should be taking 300 level courses during their freshman year.

Murat moved that the course numbering policy proposal be accepted and the motion was seconded by Matt Bauer. The motion passed without objection or abstention.

Jeff indicated that, with the passage of this proposed policy, he has a follow-up that he'd like to present. He displayed a [proposed revision](#) to the course numberings of courses

which are integral to the Core curriculum; specifically in part B. (Humanities 200 level course) and part C. (Human Sciences Module).

The proposed revision would renumber the 200 level HUM courses listed in part B of the core curriculum to be the corresponding 100 level courses (i.e. just replacing the leading 2 with a 1) and renumber the 300 level courses labelled with the (H) or (S) designation in the Core with the corresponding 200 level numbering. He explained that these renumberings would realign these courses with the course numbering policy that was just passed and also better align with course numberings in the Illinois Articulation Initiative.

This proposal is planned to be voted on in the HASS department this Friday. Jeff said he normally wouldn't have brought this proposal up for UGSC consideration until after HASS had voted on the proposal, but due to the time constraints for getting changes into the next bulletin he is asking if HASS approves these changes on Friday, that then UGSC takes an electronic vote on this proposal prior to its next scheduled meeting. Given that there are no changes being made to the actual courses, just to their course numberings, he expressed his view that this is a minor change.

Katie Spink commented that, according to the handbook, changes to the Core curriculum are supposed to go to town hall meetings. Jeff responded that his view is that the proposal isn't to actually change the Core curriculum, the exact same courses are being offered. The courses are just being renumbered to align with the course numbering policy. The same courses will be used to meet the same requirements just with different numbers.

Edoarda Corradi asked if this would have any impact on the IPRO part of the Core. Jeff responded that no, it only affects the Humanities and the Human Science Module of the Core.

Jennifer deWinter wanted to clarify that it is Psychology as well as HASS courses that are being renumbered in this proposal. She also mentioned that she has run this proposal by Nick Menhart and the Provost and they are in agreement that this does not constitute a change to the Core curriculum; this does not need to go to a town hall meeting.

Murat Vural asked if this will enable students who transfer into Illinois Tech to have more of their transfer credits count to meeting Core curriculum requirements and thereby enable them to have more free electives. Jennifer responded that yes, this is absolutely the case.

There was no further discussion. Kathir indicated that if this proposal gets departmental approval this Friday, then UGSC shall have an electronic vote on the proposal.

6. The next item was an update on implementing the change from the current co-terminal programs into the new “plus-one pathway” which had been discussed at previous UGSC meetings. Jeff Werezczynski made the presentation.

He displayed [a document](#) which, among other details, gave the rationale for the need to make the change in structure while emphasizing that the core academic value: students obtaining a Bachelor’s and Master’s degree in an accelerated time frame will be retained. One of the most significant drawbacks to the current structure is that since students obtain the Bachelor’s degree at the same time as their Master’s degree, Illinois Tech’s four year graduation rate is very much lower than peer universities. Other difficulties in the current implementation include a high administrative cost and financial aid compliance issues.

The basic structure of the new plus-one pathway is as follows (see the document for more specific details): students will receive their Bachelor’s degree in the normal timeframe and then transition to graduate status. While they are an undergraduate student they will be able to take up to 15 credits of courses (depending on the program) that count towards their Master’s degree and that can also be double counted toward meeting requirements for their undergraduate degree. These courses taken while an undergraduate will be charged at the undergraduate tuition rate. If they have obtained 15 credits of graduate level classes as an undergraduate, then they will need an additional 15 credits of graduate level classes as a graduate student to obtain their Master’s degree. This can be obtained within one additional year of study. Students will be paying tuition at the graduate rate after they obtain their Bachelor’s degree. This financial drawback to students is partially offset by the fact that they can obtain 15 double-counted credits at the undergraduate rate in the plus-one structure while only 9 double-counted credits were allowed in the co-terminal structure.

The last page of the document and the final part of Jeff’s presentation was on the transition for students currently at Illinois Tech to the new plus-one pathway. The transition is dependent on how far along a current student is in the co-terminal program. Jeff indicated that there are approximately 280 students currently enrolled in the co-terminal program. Of those students, if they have obtained 9 or more credits towards their master’s degree by the end of this term, then they can stay in the co-terminal program. The remaining students will be transitioned to the plus-one pathway. The document spells out all the details and has clauses under which students can make appeals for exceptional cases. For students who are enrolled in the co-terminal program as of May 16, 2026, the document states that institutional financial aid packages will be made so that the financial responsibilities of the student in the plus-one pathway are at least comparable to those under the co-terminal structure.

Murat Vural asked for some clarification of what the criteria of when a student will be allowed to finish out in the co-terminal program: Do they need to have taken 9 credits of

500 level courses or would 9 credits of 400 level courses that could be counted to their master's program be sufficient? Jeff responded that if a student had only taken 9 credits of 400 level courses that were eligible for double-counting to the master's program, then they would be transitioned to the one-plus pathway. However, he said that students in this situation could appeal to not transition and UGAA would consider such appeals on a case-by-case basis.

Solomon Kang had a few questions. One question was that since the four year graduation rate is important, is it possible to break students into separate categories (co-terminal vs non-co-terminal) and report the four-year graduation rate separately in order to get a more realistic account of the situation. His other question concerned the fact that a lot of co-terminal students in SSB are transfer students. These students really like the co-terminal program as it gives more flexibility because sometimes due to transfer credit issues the students may need to take some lower level classes in their fourth or even fifth year. Jeff responded: (1) The rules for how four-year graduation rates are calculated are set by outside standards, it is not something that we have control over. (2) The case of transfer students is a good example of where a student who is told they must transition to the plus-one pathway may have a good case for making an appeal. They may be in a situation where it is just not feasible for them to graduate with a Bachelor's degree by the end of their fourth year status. Academic Affairs deals with appeals to rules of all sorts and they will consider appeals in this situation as well.

Katie Spink asked about what should be done with all of the defined co-terminal programs that are listed in the bulletin. Jeff responded that this was something that he needed to discuss with Nick Menhart from an accreditation standpoint. We aren't really changing what programs can be combined into an accelerated Bachelor's and Master's, we're just changing the structure of the way that students can obtain the accelerated degrees and we are changing how many credits can be shared.

Kindon Mills shared some considerations that may be specific to Architecture students, and that this change from co-terminal to one-plus pathway is really going to affect their students significantly. One example she gave is that the Architecture department offers the only Tall Buildings Master's program in the world and that the students in this program are almost exclusively co-terminal students. This program is really going to take a hit under the new one-plus pathway as there may be many students who will not be able to afford to do the program under the new structure. Jeff responded that he understood her concern, but there are limits to what the university can do from a financial standpoint.

Gabe Smith indicated that she is currently doing graduation check-outs for all co-terminal students, and that most of these students are doing some undergraduate level coursework during their last semester. So there is definitely going to have to be a change to how students are advised given the new structure in the one-plus pathway. Jeff

responded that this is a very good point, and something that he is planning on discussing in the upcoming meetings he will be having with advisors.

Jeff indicated that he is happy to have continued discussions with people with concerns on an individual basis. He said he knows that there will be some bumps on the road during this transition period, but it's something that we have to do.

Kathir thanked Jeff and indicated that this was an informational item. It is not something that we will be voting on.

Kindon asked why this is considered only an informational item for UGSC as it affects undergraduates, perhaps more so than graduate students. Jeff responded that the university is not changing degree programs with this change. We are changing financial structure and how students are classified in systems. Kindon indicated she understood that the students affected aren't yet graduate students, but it still affects them. Jeff indicated that this is also not an item that is going to be voted on at GSC.

7. Kathir asked if anyone had any other business for discussion. There was none.

Kathir thanked everyone for staying well past the normal ending time of the meeting.

Jeremy Hajek moved to adjourn the meeting. This was seconded by Kindon Mills. There was no objection or abstention.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:36pm.