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

November 13, 2019
9:00 am, CAS Conference Room

NOTES

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

A. Krueger reminded the committee that the last meeting of the semester would occur on
December 11, 2019. Additionally, she stated she is in the process of getting policies posted
online for public comment.

The meeting minutes from October 30, 2019, were approved.

Conversation regarding data governance issues resumed from the previous meeting. The first
topic discussed was regarding degree substitutions. Currently there is no guidance around this
and the number of degree substitutions is getting worrisome in relation to degree integrity. M.
Moroney commented that in the absence of a curriculum committee, she recommended having
a conversation with department chairs. R. Drenovsky observed that contracting faculty might be
partially to blame for this increase, as departments are having difficulty finding enough people to
teach necessary courses. She also wondered what the tracking mechanism would be if a policy
was put in place limiting the amount of degree substitutions. A. Krueger stated that while the
amount of substitutions is staggering, there is no real way to track them except manually. R.
Drenovsky stated that it is sometimes difficult to be cognizant of how many substitutions
students already have when approvers are only able to see petitions one by one. She
suggested creating some sort of reminder in the petition template that must be acknowledged
by the approver after reviewing a student's degree evaluation. W. Simmons observed that the
International Business with Language and Culture (IBLC) major has an abundance of
substitutions due to not having any designated IBLC faculty. S. Herbert asked for clarification
about the issue. A. Krueger replied that 90% of students have some sort of substitution on their
degree evaluation. Since department chairs and program directors already review all petitions,
S. Herbert did not see a problem with the amount of substitutions processed. He also believed
that a policy enacted around substitutions would significantly limit transfer students. A. Krueger
explained that the substitutions in question are not necessarily related to transfer credit, but
rather to degree requirements and not delivering on our published majors. M. Moroney
suggested compiling data and then conferring with department chairs to have a bigger
discussion. T. Bruce also observed that this might require a culture shift, as he believes there
has long been a sense that students can petition anything and that they will always be
approved. S. Herbert stated that the potential bigger problem would be individuals approving
petitions outside of their purview. A. Krueger explained that petition decisions are sent primarily
to department chairs and occasionally assistant deans. She wondered if an improved training

process might be necessary for advisors and chairs, especially when chairs transition. Ultimately, S. Herbert felt comfortable putting decisions regarding substitutions in the hands of department chairs. A. Krueger summarized the conversation, determining that UCEP would not be formulating policy regarding substitutions; this issue will instead be addressed through more consistent education regarding petitions.

The next topic for discussion related to the university's 3-2 programs. These programs have traditionally experienced tracking challenges. R. Drenovsky stated she has participated on several ad hoc committees regarding this issue; additionally, CAP has previously attempted to address this matter. She observed that people want 3-2 programs to be more nimble and quick, but that CAP makes the process longer and harder. A. Krueger believed that this issue does not rise to the level of policy; rather, it is more an issue of streamlining practice and procedure. She also observed that since no one owns the process, it is mostly self-reported by students, which has proven to be problematic. Additionally, she also stated that university is often unaware of changes to curriculums at other schools, which can present trouble when transferring credits back. S. Herbert observed that a curriculum committee should be managing the process, but in the absence of one, CAP should manage it. He then proposed following questions: what is the approval process for 3-2 program (and if there is not one it needs to be created) and how do we track 3-2 students? He suggested consulting with CAP on the approval process and the creation of a working group to examine the issue further. UCEP will send this recommendation to the Data Governance committee.

A conversation relating to CPA students occurred next. In order for individuals to qualify to sit for the CPA exam, they need to have completed 150 credit hours. According to Financial Aid, since students are only required to complete 120 hours for their undergraduate degree, any extra credits completed above those should not be eligible for financial aid. There was confusion regarding this interpretation, possibly due to the tightening of regulations from the Department of Education. A. Krueger will reach out to Claudia Wenzel for further clarification.

The next topic centered on the declaration of major. Some students do not declare their major until the spring semester of their senior year. However, the check-ins that were built into the declaration of major policy discussed at the last UCEP meeting should help alleviate this going forward.

A. Krueger introduced the subject of direct admit to the Boler College of Business. W. Simmons stated that the practice was implemented to compete with bigger institutions that direct admit, as an extra year of waiting to declare a major can make a difference to students; it also permits students to be advised accordingly immediately. T. Bruce observed that there is a common misconception around the university that all students are considered CAS students until they declare a major. A. Krueger recommended sending this topic back to the Data Governance committee for further clarification.

The next item for discussion was science lab credit hours. T. Bruce stated this category could be expanded to include field experience, practicums, and internships as well. He observed that there does not always appear to be consistency between the types in relation to the amount of work completed both inside and outside the classroom. S. Herbert commented that he has seen this issue treated in different ways, but typically not at the same institution. A. Krueger opined that UCEP does not need to address the issue; however, she believes it does need review. T.

Bruce suggested compiling a list of all things a curriculum committee should address, as it would strengthen any eventual proposal.

The Data Governance committee recommended looking further into teaching assistants. R. Drenovsky observed that it seems no one on campus accepts ownership of the process; any time she asks the Human Resource Department questions regarding teaching assistants, they send her elsewhere. L. Brown Cornelius stated that any completed work-study needs be for credit or paid. She recommended a review be conducted to ensure that John Carroll University conforms to this policy. The Committee determined that all practices should be reviewed in consultation with the Office of Legal Affairs to ensure compliance.

Viewing past courses in Canvas was discussed next. Students are not currently able to view previous courses in Canvas in an attempt to prevent students from reusing previously submitted assignments. The committee decided this practice should be reviewed by UCEP.

Another issue raised by the Data Governance committee is having an accurate instructor of record on courses. There is currently a host of courses with chairs listed as the instructor of record. S. Herbert observed that this practice should not be occurring; instead, instructors should be listed as "TBD" and updated as necessary. The Registrar's Office will monitor this issue.

The final topic of discussion was regarding PR progress grades. These grades should only be used for those students in the process of completing their Master's thesis. A. Krueger observed that some instructors utilize the PR grade rather than an incomplete grade. It was decided that access to the PR grade option should be restricted, and coupled with the new incomplete grade policy, this issue should be resolved.

The meeting concluded at 10:00 am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne