

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, Emmanuel Brown, Eddie Carreon

September 13, 2017
9:00 a.m.; CAS conference Room

NOTES

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

The notes of the August 30 meeting were approved.

M. Hendren introduced Eddie Carreon, the associate director of Residence Life; he will be attending as a representative of Staff Council. In addition, Emmanuel Brown will be attending as a representative of the Student Union.

The committee continued discussing the issue of the (undergraduate) bulletin of entry. It was suggested that students be subject to a single Bulletin, as this would help to center them throughout their undergraduate years. At the same time, M. Farrar noted that the shortcomings of the Bulletin reflect a governance problem, resulting in the ease with which things are changed. R. Greci pointed out that things change a lot in four years, e.g., even the names of academic programs. R. Drenovsky urged that the onus should be on departments and faculty to explain these changes. M. Farrar said that someone has to try correcting this situation by working with the Faculty Council and that she would be willing to undertake that task. R. Greci asked whether this would mean a change in what now appears in the Bulletin, to which C.Sherman answered yes. According to N. Santilli, two things are at stake: first, a clarification of the process, and, second, operational matters that need to be cleaned up. In the end, the committee encouraged M. Farrar to work with Faculty Council as she had proposed.

The discussion turned to the relationship between UCEP and the Committee on Academic Policies (CAP). A. Miciak said that the role of CAP was not clear to him; M. Farrar agreed. R. Greci suggested that CAP is a process body that shepherds proposals into being; it does not try to stop programs, although the faculty could choose to do that. N. Santilli said that CAP has been doing a good job with the Core but not necessarily with academic departments, an idea with which other members were in general agreement. It seemed as though CAP was effective only in helping new programs receive approval (causing R. Drenovsky to observe that new programs always receive approval at John Carroll). M. Farrar thought that the issue of bulletin of entry falls into the general category of degree completion, which is a faculty purview; thus,

UCEP should develop a specific proposal and take it to the faculty. The proposal should spell out best practices and describe probable effects on students, academic advisors, and others. C. Sherman urged that the proposal be accompanied by a timeline. N. Santilli saw a connection with the Board of Directors' intention to review all governance documents, including all JCU handbooks. Clarifying the issue of the bulletin of entry, then, would facilitate that process.

A. Miciak addressed the attempt to separate academic from administrative policies, saying that it could create a divide that has not existed until now. M. Farrar suggested that the divide is not invented. R. Greci proposed that UCEP and CAP have shared responsibility; M. Farrar agreed, seeing the relationship as a form of shared governance. M. Hendren said that gray areas should be jointly reviewed and decided by both UCEP and CAP. N. Santilli suggested that the committee examine past practice. What could UCEP do as a committee to make things move more efficiently through the committee system? A continuing problem is the lack of a program prioritization or resource allocation process. How do we create a framework for the review of governance documents? Also, we need to recognize that the governance process is new and will require patience and flexibility.

The question was raised as to whether we must send all of the policy revisions being discussed by UCEP in recent weeks to the Faculty Council. M. Farrar stressed that we need to be explicit and clear about responsibility for all of these policies.

M. Hendren turned to the draft document "Policy Writing Framework," which had been circulated prior to the meeting. R. Drenovsky said that any policy proposal should include what currently exists as well as what needs to be changed. It was also suggested that every policy proposal should indicate whether the matter is urgent, simply needs review, or represents some kind of notification. In the end, M. Hendren said that she will circulate the subgroup's document among committee members.

The meeting ended at 10:00 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones