

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

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

January 22, 2020
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

NOTES

Present: A. Krueger, T. Bruce, E. Mish, C. Stehlik, J. Krukones, O. Shackleton, C. Sheil, R. Drenovsky, L. Brown Cornelius, M. Moroney, K. Manning, W. Simmons. Guest: S. Love

A. Krueger welcomed everyone back for the spring semester and introduced guest Stacey Love, AVP for Enrollment Outreach.

The meeting minutes from December 11, 2019 were approved.

The first item on the agenda was revisiting the immunization policy. A. Krueger shared that she heard back from the Office of Legal Affairs about the committee's concerns regarding exemptions. The Office of Legal Affairs felt John Carroll University would be in a tenuous position if it attempted to determine the genuineness of religious exemptions; the policy as currently written is considered best practice. C. Stehlik observed that many students participate in a variety of service opportunities, which could occur with immunocompromised people. A. Krueger stated that the Student Health and Wellness Center will begin to track student immunizations and wondered if this information could somehow be shared, while remaining in compliance with the HIPAA privacy rule. L. Brown Cornelius believed that for service learning courses, certain partner agencies require immunizations, which will provide a layer of protection. C. Sheil suggested including language requesting to revisit the policy in three years. The committee then moved the policy to recommendation.

The committee next discussed the proposed readmission policy and accompanying procedures. A. Krueger initially clarified the difference between the old policy wording and the new proposed policy. S. Love observed that readmitted students are special cases and should be supported in the best way possible. She explained that when she started at John Carroll University, there were no policies or guidelines in place for readmitted students, which made evaluating students difficult. A. Krueger explained that the policy now outlines criteria for evaluating student applications; it also gives the university grounds to say "no." The proposed policy will streamline the application process for transfer and readmitted students. S. Love then clarified that suspended students must take courses elsewhere and would reapply to the university as a transfer student. She also highlighted that readmission does not guarantee federal financial aid. Students must also have a zero balance before being permitted to register for courses. C. Sheil wondered about the timeline for the process. A. Krueger stated that the policy did not include hard dates since they are typically not followed. R. Drenovsky agreed that including actual dates could sometimes be problematic, however she supported including language along the lines of "deadline to reapply is 30 days prior to the beginning of the semester." S. Love responded that

her office does not need that long to process applications. L. Brown Cornelius suggested “10 business days.” W. Simmons remarked that department chairs are also often included in the readmission conversation, which should be considered when developing a timeline. S. Love also observed that the new policy treats suspended students and students on probation equally. R. Drenovsky wondered how students suspended for disciplinary reasons would navigate this system. S. Love replied that the process is different for them, as it comes directly from the Dean of Students. T. Bruce remarked that leaves of absence give students an option to “stop-out” without any obstacles to their return, as they must be financially, academically, and disciplinarily in good-standing with university at the time of their leave. Following no further discussion, the policy was approved to post for public comment. Since the policy is administrative in scope, it was decided it did not need to be reviewed by CAP.

The final topic was the transient student application and registration process. C. Sheil observed the ease in which transient students can potentially register for courses in which they do not meet the prerequisites. He stated that if a student is only required to check a box on a form indicating they have met the prerequisites, they could be circumventing policy and procedure that department chairs have implemented for a reason. As such, visiting students might not have the background necessary for them to succeed in a course. S. Love replied that guest students are just that, a guest. The onus is therefore on them to make sure they are prepared. She stated it would logistically be difficult to restrict guest students from taking our courses. S. Love then reiterated that the form only states that credits will transfer back if a student passes the course - if they do not pass, it will set them back. It is therefore advantageous for the student to do well. C. Sheil theorized that as department chair, he could implement chair-specific restrictions on certain courses. However, he did not believe it would be out of line to request transcripts from transient students to demonstrate they have completed course prerequisites. A. Krueger replied that some local institutions, such as Lakeland and Cuyahoga Community College, require transcripts from their visiting students. She wondered which department or office would be responsible for reviewing the transcripts for transient students attending John Carroll. R. Drenovsky wondered how widespread this issue actually is. Additionally, students have the entirety of add/drop week to determine if a course might be too advanced for them. A. Krueger also stated that beginning this year, the transient student registration window opened earlier, thus giving department chairs more time to review potential registration issues outside the first week of the semester. She also supported utilizing the chair-permission course restriction. T. Bruce asked if these changes would affect CCP registration. A. Krueger replied that CCP would need its own revision, as the process is much different from the transient student process. S. Love suggested it might be beneficial to review data and look at which courses transient students have registered for in the past, which prerequisites were overrode, and how well the student did in the course. A. Krueger stated the data would be examined and presented to UCEP in a future meeting.

The meeting concluded at 9:52 am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne