

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

Angela Krueger, Steve Herbert, Todd Bruce, Ed Mish, Rebecca Drenovsky, Chris Sheil, Rick Greci, Jim Krukones, Kathleen Manning, Michelle Millet, Maryclaire Moroney, Lisa Brown Cornelius, Zeki Saritoprak, Walter Simmons, and Olivia Shackleton

October 2nd, 2019
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

NOTES

Present: C. Sheil, O. Shackleton, A. Krueger, L. Brown Cornelius, M. Millet, J. Krukones, S. Herbert, E. Mish, R. Drenovsky, W. Simmons, K. Manning, Z. Saritoprak, R. Greci

A. Krueger opened the meeting with introductions of committee members. She then proceeded with general announcements. She shared that John Carroll published its first online bulletin this past summer, which will also be transitioning to an annual cycle going forward. Additionally, the course numbering subgroup met over the summer. The subgroup will be working with the different academic departments on campus to dive deeper into their rationale behind course numbering. The subgroup will then work to create a template for departments to transition from the current numbering system to a 4-digit system. The transition is slated for after the strategic planning effort is completed. A. Krueger also provided an update on the experiential education policy. More discussion on the policy will be needed as additional stakeholders needed to be consulted to address CAP's concern that the new policy was not prescriptive enough.

Conversation next turned to the minor in residency policy proposal. The policy states that at least 30% of a student's minor needs to be completed in residence at John Carroll. The policy was approved by CAP and received no comments during the University's open comment period. J. Krukones asked if the policy was to be strictly interpreted. A. Krueger confirmed that yes, the policy means that a student could not round from 29.99% to 30%. S. Herbert wondered if language could also be added to the policy to state "30% or a minimum of two courses." A. Krueger explained that such language could not be included, as there is currently no standardized way of defining majors, minors, and concentrations; each department has their own interpretation. This lack of standardization was noted briefly as a potential topic for future policy work. R. Drenovsky moved to approve the policy. C. Sheil seconded.

The next item on the agenda revolved around the possibility of creating policy geared towards graduate students. Since the scope of UCEP includes both undergraduate and graduate students, A. Krueger wondered if it would be beneficial to go back and clarify to which student populations the policies passed last year apply. W. Simmons stated his belief that, for consistency, there should be one university policy, with the expectation that there would be exceptions. R. Drenovsky mentioned she has identified policy gaps at the graduate level because that population of students has traditionally not been included in conversations in the past. R. Greci commented that he does not recall seeing a copy of the graduate studies bulletin in several years. A. Krueger confirmed that the bulletin is posted online and that next year both the undergraduate and graduate bulletins will be combined into one document. R. Drenovsky posed the idea of adding a graduate student representative to the committee, which received enthusiastic support. M. Millet wondered if it would be appropriate to assume that all policies passed last year would apply to graduate students. A. Krueger stated that should be a

conversation with the deans. R. Drenovsky also suggested editing the policy draft template to include an area to specify which population the policy would be targeting.

Discussion then moved to the previously awarded degree policy. CAP believed the policy, as written, was too presumptive and restrictive; it was then redrafted to state that any student wishing to pursue a second baccalaureate degree would be considered a transfer student, and as such, would need to complete the transfer student core. W. Simmons questioned the difference between a second degree and a second major. S. Herbert noted the difference between degree types and majors. R. Greci clarified that CAP thought the policy as previously written penalized students who may have already earned a degree and rewarded students who transfer in sixty credit hours. Z. Saritoprak also explained that students sometimes are unable to find a job with their first degree and may appreciate the opportunity to earn a second to increase their marketability. In both instances, CAP did not feel as though the policy should be used to tell students what is in their best interest. W. Simmons wondered what evidence there was for not letting a student pursue a second degree. A. Krueger responded that most schools she reached out to felt that it would not be financially advantageous for students and that there may be more expedient options available to them. C. Sheil stated one of John Carroll's biggest challenges is its lack of certificate and graduate programs. He also felt that although there may be less financial aid available to students, we should not prevent those willing to take on the financial cost themselves. A. Krueger also mentioned that Enrollment is looking for clarification, especially as it relates to international students and their ability to pursue equivalent degrees. E. Mish observed that with the upcoming anticipated college demographic shift, the University would likely see an increase in non-traditional students. Offering second baccalaureate degrees would be a good tool to attract students. M. Millet observed that it would be beneficial to have an Enrollment counselor dedicated to non-traditional students. S. Herbert commented that once a concrete policy is in place, exceptions to the policy can always be made. C. Sheil stated that by bringing in students under the transfer core policy, John Carroll would maintain the Jesuit Heritage component and thus uphold degree integrity. A. Krueger reminded the committee that John Carroll students looking to pursue a second degree should be counseled that the GPAs for both degrees would combine. S. Herbert wondered if you could prevent combining by assigning students new Banner identification numbers. He also observed that with the current policy language, John Carroll could potentially open itself up to offering accelerated degrees and expanded continuing education programs in the future. After no further comments, the policy will be sent back to CAP for final review and a recommendation will then be sent to Faculty Council.

The final policy for discussion was the revision to the withdrawal deadline. John Carroll's withdrawal deadline is considered by many to be too late. Moving the deadline earlier in the semester would align the policy with the mid-term and incomplete grade policies, both passed last year. A. Krueger stated this would be in the best interest of students and C. Sheil observed that the policy would allow students to be more proactive in their education. S. Herbert recommended the removal of specific dates from the policy, as they can be communicated when academic calendars are published. After no additional changes or suggestions, A. Krueger stated the policy would be sent to faculty council for review.

W. Simmons inquired about international students completing internships. As it is currently, international students can only take advantage of internship opportunities if an internship is required of their program. He wondered if this policy could be reviewed in the future. A. Krueger suggested that this might be a topic for specific departments first.

The meeting concluded at 9:54am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne