

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

February 5, 2020
9:00am, Murphy Room

NOTES

Present: A. Krueger, C. Stehlik, R. Drenovsky, W. Simmons, E. Mish, M. Moroney, J. Krukones, L. Brown Cornelius, K. Manning, T. Bruce, C. Sheil. Guests: T. Galvin-Green, S. Levenson, S. Tcheurekdjian, S. Love, A. Kaskey, E. Hahnenberg, A. Canda

The meeting minutes from December 11, 2019 were approved.

A. Krueger opened the meeting with introductions of all guest attendees.

The proposal for Priority and Preferential Registration was shared and background context provided. A. Krueger defined the difference between “priority” and “preferential” registration. She stated that there had previously been no guidelines or criteria to determine which groups received preferential registration. The policy was created to provide greater equity in registration. A. Canda expressed concern for the policy, believing it a potential “bait and switch” for current students, as priority registration is often advertised as a benefit of participating in the Honors program. She observed that this practice is not unique to John Carroll University, as many institutions across the nation use it as a recruiting tool. A. Canda believed that asking the Honors program to apply for preferential registration every year could negatively affect a population she has worked hard to grow. She also stated that she was not aware of any courses, besides linked, that are completely shut out after Honors program registration concludes. R. Drenovsky shared that when she was department chair, she would often encounter equally good students being shut out of courses. Moreover, R. Drenovsky was also concerned about the number of honors students who would share that they were only in the program for the preferential registration benefit. A. Canda responded that the current curriculum now eliminates that possibility. S. Levenson wondered how registration last semester changed. A. Krueger responded that registration is now based on earned credit hours. It is also spread over a longer period to enable better advising. S. Levenson stated that JCU’s top five area competitors all provide preferential registration to Honors students. She also believed that the policy “mixed and matched” words to our institution’s detriment; in her opinion, priority registration does not mean anything to our students. She questioned how the university would be able to recruit students if programs are not able to guarantee that they will be able to provide registration benefits from one year to the next. S. Levenson also stated that priority registration is a free benefit that costs the university nothing. She asked that the committee consider how this policy would affect recruitment and enrollment. She felt that as long as students are able to register before their peer-group, they would consider that preferential. Consensus among the Committee and representatives of the affected populations was that it is not fair that freshmen register before seniors, but believes it would be okay if students with priority registered before

their peer groups. E. Hahnenberg, speaking on behalf of Borromeo seminarians, noted that the Borromeo students live off-campus at the seminary in Wickliffe, and they are only able to attend courses on campus Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. As a result, the students sometimes have trouble finding courses to fit within their time constraints. He stated the relationship with the Catholic diocese was beneficial to JCU. He also wondered what could be defined as “activity” as it was not clear from the language in the current policy draft. S. Tcheurekdjian suggested including language in the policy referencing the mission. She shared that the Arrupe program has approximately 112 students and courses are typically offered only once per year, which makes registration a challenge. She shared that she worked with the Registrar, and identified a nice compromise – preferential registration is now given to juniors and seniors in the program. She stated that this worked out well. S. Love spoke as an advocate for student veterans, many of whom were previously or are currently on active duty, receiving GI benefits, have families, or are older. Therefore, these students have different needs and deserve preferential treatment. C. Stehlik wondered how many students would not fall under Group 2, given the right argument. A. Kaskey asked under which group the SAS students would be classified. A. Krueger responded Group 1. E. Mish suggested that to avoid confusion, the policy language change from “priority” and “preferential” to “registration” and “priority.” It was agreed that the criteria for Group 2 need to be revised, potentially referencing the university’s mission and embedding language indicating any groups that are legally mandated to have priority registration. The Committee agreed that the term “activities” was problematic as most students on campus could qualify. E. Mish thought that if the policy is only looked at as a recruitment tool, it could be interpreted in such a way that athletes, commuters, students who work outside jobs, transfer students, etc., could all have priority. L. Brown Cornelius said that athletes often struggle to find courses that fit into their schedule. She suggested that Michelle Morgan, the Athletic Director, be part of the conversation as well, since registration directly affects student athletes. A. Krueger observed that this discussion brought up issues outside of the policy that need to be considered, such as when the university offers courses; most are only offered between 9:00am-2:00pm. M. Moroney shared that the real issue at hand is not actually registration, but is instead “bigger picture” of the availability of courses and facilities. W. Simmons agreed. A. Krueger then stated that it sounded like there was consensus from the committee that priority registration before peer groups was acceptable. Additionally, it was recommended that group approvals be reviewed every 4-5 years rather than every year. A. Krueger will take the committee’s suggestions back to the subgroup and revise the policy. As chair of the subcommittee, any additional feedback or further questions can be sent to her.

The next item on the agenda was the revised major declaration policy. A. Krueger outlined the structure and details of the revisions. Based on feedback, a check-in at the 45 credit hour mark was included in the policy, as were departmental requirements for continuing in a major. C. Sheil asked if every department used the same declaration form. A. Krueger responded that they do. He then expressed concern regarding conditional acceptance, as the Biology department utilizes conditional acceptances as a means to monitor student progress. M. Moroney clarified that anyone who declares a biology major entering the university would still be considered conditionally accepted until they met the benchmarks set by the department. T. Bruce stated the changes would keep students from chasing majors they want but will not be successful in. A. Krueger suggested placing major restrictions on courses; R. Drenovsky believed that chair permissions should be used more often than instructor permissions going forward. A. Krueger observed that developing better reporting for department chairs would be necessary to effectively monitor student progress. C. Sheil stated that while he can help

students develop plans to success, students end up doing something different. In those situations, A. Krueger suggested the possible use of registration holds. For the sake of time, final discussion regarding this policy will resume next meeting.

On a final note, W. Simmons mentioned that it seemed not enough instructors seem aware of the incomplete grade policy. A. Krueger stated that additional information could be shared at department chair or general faculty meetings as needed.

The meeting concluded at 9:58 am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne