

**JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY**  
**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS**

Martha Mondello Hendren, Nick Santilli, Todd Bruce, Barbara D'Ambrosia,  
Rebecca Drenovsky, Margaret Farrar, Rick Greci, Jim Krukones, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet,  
Maryclaire Moroney, Al Nagy, Catherine Sherman

August 30, 2017  
9:00 a.m.; Faculty Lounge

**NOTES**

Present: N. Santilli, T. Bruce, R. Drenovsky, M. Farrar, R. Greci, J. Krukones, A. Miciak, M. Millet, M. Moroney, A. Nagy, C. Sherman

N. Santilli announced that M. Hendren would be unable to attend today's meeting due to the birth of her grandchild.

The Department of Education and School Psychology has developed a proposal for a single-cost tuition rate for the online Early Childhood Generalist-4/5 Endorsement Program. Dr. Pamela Mason forwarded the proposal to UCEP to secure its approval. It was quickly decided that this proposal should not have come to UCEP. N. Santilli said that he would discuss the matter with Dennis Hareza instead. More broadly, it was noted that the committee needs to identify a pathway for individuals interested in bringing items to the attention of UCEP.

The committee next began to discuss several policies that had been reviewed by a group chaired by C. Sherman. C. Sherman presented the policies along with relevant background information. She first discussed proposed revisions to the grading system, including the consolidation of Failure grades; elimination of HP, P, and X grades; and a revised description of the B grade. M. Farrar asked why UCEP should act on these changes rather than the faculty. C. Sherman explained that her group was charged with reviewing a number of policies, and that they were simply bringing their findings forward for the committee's (and others') consideration. R. Drenovsky commented that the proposal would be a help to the Committee on Academic Policies (CAP) and would jump-start CAP's efforts. N. Santilli asked whether UCEP should send one recommendation at a time to CAP or several. C. Sherman suggested grouping policies for further review. M. Farrar said that our priority should be clarifying the student experience. In the end, N. Santilli said we will forward the proposal to the Faculty Council.

The next policy concerns a time limit for grade changes. R. Drenovsky said that this policy would protect us against students coming back after two or three years and requesting grade changes. M. Farrar asked whether this policy ought to go to CAP as well or whether it could be handled by an administrative decree; moreover, if it were the latter, then where should it be publicized? N. Santilli thought that the answer to M. Farrar's first question would depend on

what the Faculty Council had to say; in other words, forwarding the proposal to that body would give them the right of refusal.

The third policy under review deals with a time limit for degree completion. While this policy is already on the books, it was decided to remove the line about exceptions being approved by the dean.

The fourth policy has to do with the circumstances under which summer graduates might be permitted to participate in the spring commencement ceremony. This matter already had been discussed, and in that discussion it was decided to reaffirm that, to receive such permission, undergraduates must have no more than 9 remaining credit hours in their degree program. However, summer graduates now must have a 2.0 (truncated, not rounded) grade point average in all categories in which a 2.0 grade point is required for degree completion. In addition, the policy states that students participating in the May ceremony who have not completed all degree requirements will have their honors listed in the commencement program according to their overall grade point average at the end of spring semester. It was decided at this (August 30) meeting that language should be added to the statement to clarify that the “honors” in question refer not to the Honors Program but rather to “Graduation Honors” (the designations *cum laude*, *magna cum laude*, and *summa cum laude*).

The fifth policy deals with excused absences. The statement on excused absences has already been changed—based on a discussion at the August 2 UCEP meeting—so that, in the *2017-19 Undergraduate Bulletin*, provision is made for “the observance of a religious holiday” as one of the grounds on which a student might request an excused absence. Now, in addition, language will be added clarifying the appropriate offices to contact for submitting documentation to request an excused absence (or disability-related notification of accommodation). M. Moroney noted that the documentation process always has been the practice; with the added language, it has been made explicit.

The sixth policy deals with the issue of student responsibility for “knowing and abiding by John Carroll University policies, procedures, and requirements as articulated in the *Bulletin*.” C. Sherman recommended the responsibility statement be highlighted and moved to the front of the *Bulletin*, accompanying the other statements of notice. M. Farrar asked whether provision was made for bad or misguided academic advising. For example, should we add language to this statement about mistaken advice from an academic advisor that can be documented by a student, perhaps in the form of relevant emails? M. Farrar also wondered whether we need an additional statement holding students responsible for the emails they receive from the University. It was suggested that students be required to sign off on a statement regarding their responsibility at every registration session.

The seventh and last policy concerns the bulletin of entry, that is, the undergraduate bulletin to whose degree and curricular requirements students are held. It was decided that this matter needs more discussion.

C. Sherman's group will continue reviewing other policies and bring the results to the committee for discussion.

The meeting concluded at 10:10 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones