

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

Nick Santilli, Todd Bruce, Eddie Carreon, Rebecca Drenovsky,
Margaret Farrar, Rick Greci, Angela Krueger, Jim Krukones, Kathleen Manning, Al Miciak,
Michelle Millet, Maryclaire Moroney, Al Nagy, Catherine Sherman

January 31, 2018
9:00 a.m.; Faculty Lounge

NOTES

Present: N. Santilli, E. Carreon, R. Drenovsky, M. Farrar, R. Greci, A. Krueger, J. Krukones, K. Manning, M. Moroney, A. Nagy, C. Sherman

The notes from the meeting of January 17, 2018, were approved.

C. Sherman said that the meeting would focus on three specific proposals: Major Declaration/Internal Transfer, Grade Exclusion, and Course Attempt, and discussion of a proposed policy review routing process and template. C. Sherman introduced routing process guidelines and invited UCEP feedback. With regard to the proposed routing process, R. Greci wondered whether putting the proposals into the hands of the Faculty Council might be risky. C. Sherman suggested, in that case, we route only relevant proposals to Faculty Council and post others directly to the UCEP page for campus comments. N. Santilli agreed, pointing out that we would have already consulted with the Faculty Council. R. Greci added that the Faculty Council appreciated the outreach, too. E. Carreon asked whether UCEP had decided how its proposals will go to the Faculty Council. C. Sherman suggested that it occur on a policy-by-policy basis. She added that the routing form includes other "destination" options. N. Santilli said that UCEP can act as a consultant for individuals who have developed policy proposals. On another topic, C. Sherman noted that she and A. Krueger are meeting with Stacey Love to ask whether she could pay a visit to the committee. N. Santilli said that UCEP should get into the habit of doing its work through subcommittees, which could then bring the issue back to the main group.

The first of the policy proposals dealt with declaration of major and internal transfer between colleges. C. Sherman explained that she and the UCEP subcommittee had incorporated several policies into a single one, as well as added a section on internal transfer. The overall significance of the proposal, according to R. Drenovsky, is that we are not putting up roadblocks to students who are ready to declare a major. C. Sherman added that there are guidelines regarding major progress. M. Farrar expressed agreement with A. Krueger's comments on the draft of the proposal but wondered why students couldn't simply declare a major earlier. She was not sure that the revision addressed this issue. R. Drenovsky said that the ability of students to succeed in a particular discipline was a separate conversation. R. Greci noted that, in the Boler School, students still have to go through a declaration process even after their acceptance into the college. M. Farrar said she understands, but does not necessarily agree with the view of some faculty that students should not declare their major early, that they first need a broad sampling of the liberal arts. R. Drenovsky asked whether we should first have acceptance into a college and then a separate declaration of a specific major. There was concern about the advising load

for large majors. A. Nagy cautioned against creating too many guidelines “up front” and suggested simply that students be required to declare a major by a certain point; he was much less concerned with the incoming “funnel.” In response to a question from R. Greci, R. Drenovsky affirmed that it is difficult to remove a student from a major. M. Moroney added that it should be a more defined process, not something left up to the academic advisor. M. Farrar asked what other schools do, which prompted a brief discussion about the policies of other schools, including Dayton, Loyola Chicago, Santa Clara, and LeMoyne. N. Santilli asked how we could move the policy to the point where the proposal could be posted. R. Greci predicted that the strong feelings of many faculty on the subject could result in a tug-of-war. To counter that, R. Drenovsky suggested contextualizing the proposal within the larger framework of student retention and success, in the hope that would bring as many faculty as possible on board. M. Farrar wondered whether we could isolate the more problematic elements and deal effectively with those. R. Drenovsky thought that particularly controversial issues included, first, the timing of a student’s declaration of major and, second, making the department chair responsible for excluding students from a major. E. Carreon asked whether there were any implications for a double major. In the end, the committee agreed that the proposal should go back to the subgroup.

C. Sherman addressed the Grade Exclusion proposal. This policy replaces the term “freshman privilege” with “grade exclusion” and is aimed to be more transfer-student friendly. The Grade Exclusion proposal elicited a positive reaction and will be advanced to the “posting” stage. In addition, the subgroup will collaborate with the registrar’s office on the necessary coding of the process on transcripts.

C. Sherman next introduced the “Course Attempt” proposal. This policy replaces the term “course repeat” with “course attempt.” C. Sherman explained that we want students to petition only when necessary. In addition, Committee members discussed the nuances of the policy and how it ultimately focuses on student success. UCEP will post the policy to the UCEP page for comments.

N. Santilli suggested that it might be useful for members of the University Committee on the Student Learning Experience to visit UCEP for a discussion of student persistence. He also thanked the subgroup for its work on all of the proposals. C. Sherman will return the Major Declaration/Internal Transfer proposal to the subgroup for further work. C. Sherman said that she will collect comments made in reaction to the five policy proposals posted thus far.

The meeting concluded at 9:55 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones