

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, Charles Stehlik, and Olivia Shackleton

December 11, 2019
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

NOTES

Present: A. Krueger, J. Krukones, O. Shackleton, R. Drenovsky, L. Brown Cornelius, W. Simmons, Z. Saritoprak, M. Moroney, T. Bruce. Guests: S. Crahen, J. Krevh

A. Krueger opened the meeting with general announcements. She will send out meeting dates for next year closer to the start of the spring semester. Next, she welcomed guests Jan Krevh, Director of the Student Health and Wellness Center, and Sheri Crahen, Dean of Students, to discuss the newly proposed immunization policy.

The meeting minutes from November 13, 2019 were approved.

Discussion then transitioned to the immunization policy. Due to disease re-emergence across the United States and college campuses, the Student Health Center and the Dean of Students are proposing a new immunization policy that would require vaccinations for undergraduate and graduate students against certain diseases. The Student Health and Wellness Center would track compliance with the policy using current processes and systems. S. Crahen stated there is language included in the draft that allows for certain exemptions. J. Krevh acknowledged that John Carroll is behind most universities and this policy would bring the university up to standards. W. Simmons wondered if this would be mandatory, and if students would not be admitted without proof of immunizations. S. Crahen clarified that the university would admit them, but holds would be placed on their account in subsequent semesters until proof of immunization paperwork is provided. R. Drenovsky observed that part of why the United States is where it is at in terms of outbreaks relates directly to choices made regarding exemptions. She spoke to benefit of herd immunity. R. Drenovsky then wondered if S. Crahen or J. Krevh had an idea of what percentage of students might be inclined to request an exemption. J. Krevh stated that the Student Health and Wellness Center currently captures about 50% of student immunization records; of that population, she estimated there are only 2-3 exemptions. S. Crahen further explained that if an outbreak occurred, any non-vaccinated students would be asked to leave campus. She also stated that if the immunization policy was implemented, it would likely need to be revisited in upcoming years pending ongoing legislative issues. W. Simmons questioned how the immunization policy would affect enrollment. Z. Saritoprak asked if John Carroll could offer immunizations on campus. J. Krevh stated the Cuyahoga County health department is willing to come to campus to provide immunizations; the university also has an outstanding order with the Cleveland Clinic. A. Krueger asked if the immunization policy could define criteria as to what qualifies as exemption. She also wondered who would be evaluating the exemptions for approval and suggested consulting with Legal for advice. M. Moroney questioned if a student were required to vacate campus for the stipulated twenty-one days, how the university would accommodate them during that time - would they have access to information online? She was not sure that process needed to be included in the policy, but it should be a process worth considering. A. Krueger observed that the committee seemed to be

in support of policy, but would like further clarification about defining and clarifying exemptions. The committee recommended the development of a plan for students who are required to vacate campus in the event of an outbreak. S. Crahen will consult with Legal and follow-up up with the committee. W. Simmons questioned if this proposed policy was just for students or for faculty and staff, as well. S. Crahen responded that it is for students; any policy for faculty and staff would come from Human Resources. A. Krueger said the committee would follow up with Human Resources.

The next item on the agenda was the withdrawal deadline. Faculty members were not in support of the new withdrawal deadline as suggested in the proposed policy. A. Krueger shared that feedback indicated an “if it isn’t broken, don’t fix it” approach. Additionally, the majority of faculty felt that if a student were paying for the class and wished to remain enrolled, the instructor should not prevent them from doing so. Z. Saritoprak shared that the policy had very vocal opposition. C. Sheil also revealed that the newly implemented midterm grade policy was part of the discussion, as well. A. Krueger clarified that the policy was sent to Faculty Council solely for feedback, not for approval. It was still in the committee’s purview to move the policy forward for public comment. Since the policy revolved around pedagogy, she wondered if it should not be shared with deans, as well. R. Drenovsky supported sending the policy to deans, to review with department chairs, in an attempt to educate on the reasons for the policy recommendation. She also acknowledged that it could be a difficult conversation for instructors to have with students to get them to realize when it in their best interest to withdraw from a course. C. Sheil recommended sharing any supporting graphs and documentation with deans and chairs. A. Krueger will follow-up with deans and department chairs to gain support for the policy, as the committee feels there are too many repercussions to let it die.

The committee next reviewed the guidelines for backdated registration for internships. Policy stipulates that backdated registration for internships is no longer permissible, but paperwork isn’t always completed in time for students to register during add/drop week. Instead of backdating registration, departments will be asked to create additional sections of second 7-week courses for students who have to register late for their internship. This will ensure that the university remains in compliance and that students register for the course in the same semester work is to be completed.

A. Krueger shared that graduate policy updates could be viewed online in the upcoming weeks. These policies are an attempt to bring alignment between graduate and undergraduate student policies. These policies will be disseminated via emailed for voting. She observed that in some cases, there was practice in place, but no actual policy. A. Krueger then highlighted several of the graduate policy updates. The first was incomplete grades. She stated the new incomplete grade online petition is a contract between instructors and students. The Office of Graduate Studies would like to implement this at the graduate level as well. She then wondered if the petition should include language requesting that any supporting documentation be sent to the Office of Graduate Studies. The committee agreed. The next policy regarded in progress grades. A. Krueger clarified that a PR grade should only be used for theses and essays which are in progress, not as an incomplete grade for a semester course. W. Simmons wondered about internships. R. Drenovsky stated that she and N. Gehlert had previously discussed this and counseling with shift away from using PR grades. Additionally, this will place the onus students to register themselves for the course and add motivation to complete the program. Students will also register for a zero credit course for tracking purposes to confirm students intend to continue. Finally, the time limit for degree completion was changed from five years to six years. The committee agreed with this.

The meeting concluded at 10:00 am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne