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 Grenci, Jim Krukones, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet,
Maryclaire Moroney, Al Nagy, Catherine Sherman

October 25, 2017
9:00 a.m.; CAS Dean's Conference Room

NOTES

Present: M. Hendren, N. Santilli, T. Bruce, R. Drenovsky, M. Farrar, R. Grenci, J. Krukones, M. Moroney, A. Nagy, C. Sherman; Guests: E. Brown, E. Carreon, K. Manning, C. Rose

The notes of the October 11 meeting were approved.

The meeting continued with the final vetting of policy revisions that had been suggested by the "Current Educational Policies" subgroup. The policy changes and the committee's decisions regarding them are as follows.

1) Bulletin of Entry. The recommendation is that there be a single Undergraduate Bulletin for a student's Core Curriculum as well as major.
   Discussion: Up till now, there has been constant confusion as to which Bulletin a student falls under; the transition from the distributive to the integrative Core Curriculum has only exacerbated the situation. This situation, added R. Drenovsky, raises other problems—e.g., issuing a Bulletin only every two years—that need to be addressed. M. Farrar suggested that the real problem is the practice of departments introducing changes into their programs without having to go through governance. A. Nagy said that we need a dynamic, changing curriculum. R. Drenovsky wondered whether there could be a time limit to changes that can be made by a department. M. Hendren suggested that we can do some things in the meanwhile for the sake of achieving consistency across the University.
   Decision: Post the policy on the UCEP website for comment.

2) Transcript Notation. The question is whether conduct issues belong on an academic transcript. The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers recently said that it was up to the individual institution to decide the matter.
   Decision: Post the policy on the UCEP website for comment.

3) "I" (Incomplete) Grades. As explained by C. Sherman, the Incomplete Grade proposal expands the *Bulletin's* brief Grading System description to articulate the purpose, timing, and processes involved with issuing Incompletes. As a result, students will understand what work is due in order to complete a course and by when that work must be submitted; in this way, any "I" situation will be brought to a definitive conclusion.
   Discussion: M. Farrar asked how this policy would go out for comment. M. Hendren replied that we would use "Inside JCU" and the UCEP website. N. Santilli suggested that an even more public announcement might be desirable. T. Bruce proposed a joint

announcement with the University Committee on Administrative Policies and Programs. C. Sherman asked if we could impose a time limit for comment. The consensus was that the comment period should be limited to 30 days. M. Hendren also asked how we might communicate with students about this policy. E. Carreon said that we need a uniform, coordinated communication policy. M. Hendren suggested issuing the policy as soon as possible and explaining in the announcement that it would be further elaborated later. Suggestions were also made about bringing it to a general faculty meeting and/or department chairs' meetings. E. Brown cautioned against sending it to students at this time, thinking it might cause confusion during course registration for spring semester. N. Santilli proposed addressing a meeting of the student government. It was also asked whether it might be possible to summarize all of these policies. For now, only two of them are going to the Faculty Council, namely, those involving the grading system and the grade-change time limit.
Decision: The committee endorsed the policy and is sending it to the faculty.

4) Major Declaration and Internal Transfer. This proposal expands on current University policies as well. C. Sherman highlighted important revisions to current policy, including the timing of declaration, outcomes of unsuccessful majors, and relevant procedures. Of note, the University would have guidelines for the internal transfer between CAS and Boler.
Discussion: In discussing the reasons behind the "direct admit" of Boler students, N. Santilli explained that it started as a "coding" issue, that is, identifying students correctly so that they be given adequate academic advising. It was pointed out that non-Boler students are coded according to "area of interest." Boler students are not tagged with an area of interest due to direct admit. R. Drenovsky pointed out that there is still faculty angst about direct admit; M. Hendren urged that we not become involved with that controversy. The committee will finalize its review of this proposal at a future meeting.

As a separate issue, it was asked how, or whether, information about the admission of students to different programs was communicated to the necessary parties, e.g., program directors.

The meeting concluded at 10:10 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones