# ILLINOIS TECH UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES COMMITTEE

---

Meeting Minutes
Tuesday August 26, 2025
12:45pm
Online via Zoom
(pdf version available here)

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

**Chairing Meeting:** Kathir Krishnamurthy (FDSN)

**Also Attending:** Carrie Hall (Armour), Mary Haynes (UGAA), Zipporah Robinson (Academic Success), Melisa Lopez (Student Success and Retention), Nichole Novak (Libraries), Yasmin Rodriguez-Escutia (Armour Acad Advisor), Abby McGrath (Enrollment Services), Pam Houser (INTM), Joe Gorzkowski (UGAA), Keigo Kawaji (Armour), Michael Arnaudo (Armour Acad Advisor), Katherine Quiroa (UGAA), Mary Jorgenson Sullivan (ELS), Keith Alexander (UGAA), Ayesha Qamer (Registrar), Katie Spink (Pre-Med), Taylor Rojas (UGAA), Gabrielle Smith (UGAA), Kyle Hawkins (AMP), Rich Klein (SSB), Kathy Nagle (ARCH)

Quorum was reached and the meeting was started at 12:49pm

1. Approval of the proposed meeting agenda. Kathir Krishnamurthy asked for a motion to approve the proposed agenda. Kindon Mills made the motion and it was seconded by Andy Howard. The motion passed without objection.

2. Approval of Meeting minutes. Kathir Krishnamurthy indicated that the minutes for the UGSC meeting on April 22, 2025 were distributed electronically. John Twombly moved to approve the minutes, this was seconded by Victor Perez-Luna. The motion passed without opposition. Andy Howard abstained from the vote as he was not a UGSC committee member when the meeting took place.

3. Kathir welcomed the new members of UGSC and reviewed the role and responsibilities of the UGSC committee as put forth in the faculty handbook:

   1. The UGSC shall review and recommend to the UFC and the university faculty new programs and the financial support needed to implement them.
   2. The UGSC shall formulate policy and recommend to the UFC and the university faculty general education and graduation requirements, as well as admission standards.

3. The UGSC shall review, approve, and inform the UFC of course and program modifications, including ancillary, university-wide academic policies related to undergraduate programs, such as testing, placement, proficiency, and grading.
4. The UGSC shall review, as needed, existing degree programs, particularly those not subject to external degree accreditation review, and report its findings to the UFC.

Andy Howard pointed out that this year the administration has made some changes to the academic calendar and wondered if the UGSC was consulted or played a role in these changes. Katie Spink indicated that in the past there has been a subcommittee of UGSC, which included a student, that has looked at the academic calendar, but to her knowledge the administration did not consult with UGSC regarding the changes made to the calendar this Fall. She mentioned that some of these changes were meant to address accreditation issues. Andy indicated that he felt UGSC should have input into proposed changes to the academic calendar and Katie responded that in the past UGSC has been consulted, but that this time UGSC was left out of the loop. Kathir said he would look into what administrative group is in charge of the academic calendar and see if they are receptive to including UGSC's input in the future.

4. The next agenda item concerned a [draft document on the Standard Operating Procedures of the UGSC](). Fred Weening made the presentation. He displayed the draft document and summarized the document while scrolling through the details. The different areas that the document gave policies and procedures for were:

   1. Meeting Policies (substitution for absences of voting members, modality of the meeting, quorum requirements, recording of meetings)
   2. Approval of changes to curriculum (classification criteria of significant versus insignificant changes, procedures for significant vs insignificant changes, necessity of having proposals entered into CIM)
   3. Core Curriculum subject area subcommittees (procedures for requesting that a course be given a core area designation)
   4. Periodic review of degree programs (form for reporting summary of changes, policy to ensure reporting in a timely fashion)
   5. Making changes to the standard operating procedures
   6. Formation of ad-hoc committees
   7. Record keeping (online repository of minutes and related documents)

Katie Spink indicated that she felt the document was a very good starting point. She suggested that there needs to be two additional areas where policies and procedures should be given:
   1. Minors (it is important that minors come before UGSC even if they are viewed as insignificant changes, so that faculty are aware of the curriculum in the minors)

2. Approval of academic policies (for instance the policies we have been discussing on how many minors a student can have, double-counting of courses, etc,)

Kathir asked that all UGSC members take the document back to their departments for discussion and further input. We shall continue discussion at the next few UGSC meetings. He indicated that we should make the policies and procedures of UGSC as transparent as possible, and that he'd rather spend extra time now before the document gets approved rather than revising the document after approval.

5. The next item was an update on the HLC accreditation assurance argument drafting and Core Curriculum assessment process review from Mary Jorgenson-Sullivan.

Mary indicated that the last full-cycle accreditation from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) took place in 2016; we are now in our next full-cycle accreditation. The accreditation consists of an assurance document and a site visit. The accreditation criteria that HLC used in 2016 have been revised, now there are 4 criteria:
   1. Mission
   2. Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct
   3. Teaching and Learning for Student Success
   4. Sustainability: Institutional Effectiveness, Resources, and Planning

She explained that this year, we are going to be working on our assurance argument, which is a document that indicates to HLC that we meet the four criteria for accreditation. The site visit will take place in October of 2026.

She displayed a [powerpoint](#) which summarized the process for creating the assurance argument. For each of the 4 criteria listed, there is a team for drafting the assurance argument in the given criteria. The powerpoint gave the team leaders and members, as well as a timeline for the process.

She asked that UGSC representatives make their units aware of what is happening and to help as much as possible:

○ Ensure that faculty are including course, program and (if applicable) core learning objectives in their syllabi.

○ If a faculty member has an online course (especially Coursera or Risepoint), ensure that they have reasonable, substantive interaction with students.

○ Be forthcoming with documents when requested by teams working on the assurance argument.

○ During the site visit, participate in the faculty meetings and open topic meetings.

As meeting time was running short, Mary indicated that she would give her update on the Core Curriculum Assessment at the next UGSC meeting.

6. The agenda item on curricular changes from the Stuart school of Business was postponed until the next UGSC meeting due to time constraints.

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

   The meeting adjourned at 1:46 pm.