

**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

October 30, 2019  
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

**NOTES**

Present: A. Krueger, E. Mish, C. Stehlik, L. Brown Cornelius, C. Sheil, J. Krukones, M. Moroney, R. Drenovsky, T. Bruce, O. Shackleton, Z. Saritoprak, W. Simmons, R. Grenci

A. Krueger began the meeting by welcoming new graduate student representative C. Stehlik to the committee. The meeting minutes from October 16, 2019 were then approved.

Discussion transitioned to the major declaration and internal transfer policy. This policy was first explored in 2018, but after lengthy discussion, the committee agreed to postpone any action due to limitations; it is now being revisited. A. Krueger stated that current data supports students wanting to enter the university with a declared major. She shared that S. Herbert is also in support of this policy, as he believes it aligns with student success efforts. A. Krueger then observed that there is inequity in the current policy. A revised version would allow for students to enter as a declared major at the point of matriculation. C. Sheil observed that what he likes about the current declaration process is that it allows him to view Banner Student Profiles. He requested under the new policy department chairs be granted access to those students intending certain majors, in order to evaluate their program progress and success. A. Krueger agreed that request should be part of the policy implementation process. R. Drenovsky stated that there are certain departments that currently require students to meet certain benchmarks before they are accepted to a major; if all students were able to enter John Carroll University with a declared major, she wondered what the formal removal process would look like if it was discovered that students were not meeting those requirements. R. Drenovsky said that while she understands why entering college as a declared major is appealing, she remained a proponent of either a conditional acceptance option or a means to limit the number of courses a student can take in order to ensure success. C. Sheil wondered how conditional acceptances would be enforced under the new policy and if chairs would be able to remove students from courses. A. Krueger responded that conditional acceptances would be processed manually, and that removals need to be student-initiated; however, she did recognize the need to develop a way to restrict student registration beyond a certain point. She then pointed to the Boler ten-course limit student attribute and shared it was manually tracked by Mrs. Atkins. T. Bruce assured the committee that this struggle was not unique to John Carroll University. C. Stehlik questioned if students were being told about declaration process guidelines during orientation. A. Krueger stated they were, but observed that not every department has the capacity to manually track students if CAS were to implement a system similar to the one Boler uses. The only way to empower them would be to hire more advisors. R. Drenovsky reiterated that without a mechanism in place to monitor student progress, a new direct admit policy would undo any

positive work previously achieved by departments. M. Moroney agreed with the need for an enforcement mechanism, and thought instituting a checkpoint with students would be beneficial.

A. Krueger then added language to the policy requiring a check-in sophomore year. C. Sheil asked what the benefit is for students to declare their major upon entry into the university. A. Krueger replied that data supports that the earlier students are able to declare their major, the more successful they are, as they are able to find their “academic home.” W. Simmons commented that even though Boler allows for direct admit, it does not necessarily mean that all students are successful – it just means Boler has to manage them better. T. Bruce reminded the committee that “undeclared” would remain an option for students and that sometimes more robust support is available to those that enter undeclared. R. Greci reiterated that while direct admit is beneficial, it does require follow-up. R. Drenovsky also recommended implementing another tracking mechanism besides overall GPA. Specifically, she inquired about tracking major GPAs. W. Simmons agreed, as you cannot graduate with one and not the other. A. Krueger observed that this also leads to a conversation about what actually counts as a major. A. Krueger then asked the committee if they felt the new policy was inclusive of all students. R. Drenovsky stated that as long as a sophomore check-in mechanism is written into the policy to ensure success, she feels it is reasonable. E. Mish summarized the discussion and stated that while there seemed to be consensus on the policy language; however, the policy cannot fix advising issues. A. Krueger will research the possibility of developing an attribute for students that will prevent registration, similar to the one used in Boler. She then asked if the committee should hold off on approving the policy and only move forward when there are mechanisms in place to support it. This seemed to have universal support, so the policy will be revisited later. Once approved, it will go to Faculty Council.

The next conversation related to issues identified by the university’s Data Governance committee. T. Bruce was present to answer any questions. The first topic related to rules defining majors, minors, concentrations, and certificates. UCEP determined that it would like the opportunity to draft policy addressing this. R. Drenovsky asked that this conversation consider both undergraduates and graduates. The next discussion focused on offering certificates. UCEP determined it would like to write policy around this but recognized that it must include financial aid in the process. W. Simmons observed that offering certificates would be a beneficial revenue generator for the university. R. Greci wondered if certificate programs would be evaluated and assessed by the HLC as well; T. Bruce responded that they would. Cross-listed courses were considered next. Oftentimes cross-listed courses have different course numbers. A. Krueger questioned if this was policy-related or if it might be something that Coursedog could manage. It was determined that this topic was more process-related. It would only pertain to policy if the committee were to define different expectations for 200/500-level cross-listed courses. The next topic of conversation was course fees. Data Governance questioned who is setting the amount and what fees are used for. L. Brown Cornelius stated that there is no current system in place to regulate fees associated with certain courses. She felt this is a larger conversation than UCEP. A. Krueger suggested that UCEP draft a recommendation to present to S. Herbert, proposing the creation of a subcommittee. Substitutions of courses was the final discussion. A. Krueger observed that the number of substitutions students request brings into question the alignment of degrees with the published curriculum and degree integrity. W. Simmons claimed that, as things become more integrated, this could potentially be an issue. A. Krueger also stated this relates to advising: with the reduction of faculty, there are fewer courses available that students need as required by their degrees. T. Bruce also commented on

the general culture of petitions; students are advised to petition everything. Due to time constraints, the conversation was curtailed and will resume at the next meeting.

The meeting concluded at 9:59am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne