

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

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

September 27, 2017
9:00 a.m.; Faculty Lounge

NOTES

Present: Martha Mondello-Hendren, Emmanuel Brown, Todd Bruce, Eddie Carreon, Rebecca Drenovsky, Rick Greci, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet, Maryclaire Moroney, Al Nagy, Catherine Sherman.

The notes of the September 13 meeting were approved with no additional comment.

The committee discussed which proposals for policy change identified and reviewed by the Current Educational Policies subgroup should be sent to Faculty Council for judgement/action, which proposals should be reviewed by UCEP, and which proposals may need to be reviewed by both groups. Seven (7) policies were discussed and the committee determined which needed review by Faculty Council, UCEP, or both. The determination for each policy and the rationale are included below:

1) Grading System – removal of FA, WF, C, HP, and P grades. F grade requires a last date of attendance.

Determination: **SEND TO FACULTY COUNCIL**

Rationale/Discussion: The committee discussed how proposals should be sent to Faculty Council, and who has the ultimate authority to approve policy changes. R. Greci noted that some faculty will want the opportunity to commit, while others won't. T. Bruce agreed that faculty should be able to comment, though perhaps not be responsible for making the changes. M. Hendren said that some of these grades are driven by the administration (e.g. WF is for Financial Aid reasons) and that other administrative bodies may need to see and comment on it. It was determined that UCEP would recommend the policy and the reasons for its review to Faculty Council to vote on.

2) Grade Changes Time Limit

Determination: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Rationale/Discussion: M. Moroney noted that there were different types of grade changes to consider, including incompletes and faculty errors/miscalculations. R. Greci said that if we're changing how and when grades are changed, then it needs to go to the faculty as you're changing grading policy. T. Bruce noted that faculty don't set when grades are due or when grades convert. C. Sherman observed that this wasn't an unreasonable change and could be benchmarked against other schools. A. Nagy agreed, noting that we're setting the rules of the game. M. Hendren said that changes made years later start to call the integrity of the academic record into question, and that we need a set policy. It was agreed by all that exceptions could always be made later. M. Hendren also noted that the policy could always be reviewed in a year and adjusted as necessary.

3) Degree Completion Time Limit

Determination: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Rationale/Discussion: All agreed that this was an administrative issue, and faculty were only involved on a case-by-case basis. E. Carreon pointed out that the inclusion of "normally" in the policy was problematic. R. Drenovsky agreed that this invited exceptions. M. Hendren explained that cases exist where students come back after 25 years wanting to complete their degree and it was difficult to meet their needs and keep the integrity of the degree as programs and degrees have changed, or no longer exist. R. Greci pointed out that the degree would now say "2018" even if the majority of coursework was completed much earlier. E. Carreon asked if language could be added to allow exceptions. M. Moroney said it was better to say that students must finish in 10 years. E. Brown said that this made sense from the standpoint of a student. "Normally" was deleted from the text.

4) Summer Graduates Participating in the Spring Commencement Ceremony

Determination: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Rationale/Discussion: T. Bruce voiced M. Farrar's point that the issue should be split in two: the timing was an administrative issue and that the grade point average baseline was a faculty issue. M. Moroney observed that the faculty had determined the 2.0 baseline GPA and that the policy change was enforcing that decision. R. Greci agreed that this wouldn't be changing faculty policy. T. Bruce noted that this would do away with having to calculate the 3 pt. quality point deficit and students will know well ahead of time if they can walk or not. R. Greci asked if exceptions would still be allowed. M. Hendren said that that was ultimately up to the Deans and the Provost. M. Moroney and M. Hendren also observed that it should be reconsidered what to do if students don't have a 2.0 GPA and are allowed to take their last classes elsewhere (which don't affect the GPA).

5) Excused Absences

Determination: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Rationale/Discussion: M. Hendren explained that J. Krukones in the Provost's Office had tweaked the language in the bulletin to include religious holidays under excused absences. C. Sherman noted that this was current practice. M. Moroney said that the change helps clarify expectations for which situations need documentation sent to the Dean, and which situations were up to the faculty. All agreed that this was fine. It was observed that this was a procedural change and not a policy change.

6) Student Responsibility

Determination: **BOTH**

Rationale/Discussion: Addressing issues of consistency across campus publications and resources. All agreed that when confusion arises, the Bulletin was the final authority. E. Brown suggested that the statement should be added to all course syllabi so that students would see it repeatedly.

7) Bulletin of Entry

Determination: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Rationale/Discussion: M. Hendren said that in the past we have erred on whatever was best for the student, but that too many changes were being made. We need to revisit this and faculty need to understand the repercussions of bulletin changes. R. Greci observed that if students were being locked into a 4-year curriculum the department chairs and faculty needed to be forewarned. A. Miciak said that this was more than a chair issue. R. Drenovsky agreed and said that the chairs need to bring this to their department faculty.

8) Transcript Notation and Conduct Letter Policy

Determination: **ADMINISTRATIVE**

Finally, M. Hendren brought back the discussion from over the summer regarding proposed changes to transcript notations for dismissals and expulsions. She provided context for the proposed changes, noting that some states were legislating these types of changes. She raised the question of whether the notations belong on an academic record, but that ultimately the institution needed to do something to

alert other institutions. She said that it was important for campus-leadership to weigh in before the changes go campus-wide. E. Carreon noted that conduct letters were usually vague and that the onus was on the receiving institution to dig further. He expressed support for the proposed changes. R. Drenovsky asked why a notation and a letter. M. Hendren explained that the letter would explain why the notation was there. R. Greci raised questions about the terminology of “suspension” and “expulsion”. M. Hendren explained that the policy defines all of the terms for probation, suspension, and expulsion. A. Nagy said that we should follow the guidance of legal counsel, and M. Hendren said that the policy had been drafted with our legal counsel. M. Hendren asked if the committee agreed that it was fine not to put the violated policy on the notation. The committee agreed.