

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

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

February 14, 2018  
9:00 a.m.; OC 47

**NOTES**

Present: C. Sherman, A. Krueger, R. Drenovsky, M. Farrar, J. Krukones, K. Manning, A. Miciak, M. Moroney, A. Nagy

The notes from the meeting of January 31, 2018, were approved.

C. Sherman announced that seven committee proposals had been posted to the UCEP webpage, five of which would remain available for comment until February 26. The proposals on course attempt and grade exclusion would be open for comment until March 1. Meanwhile, the proposal on excused absences is awaiting N. Santilli's decision on the memo to UCSLE. C. Sherman also said that she, A. Krueger, and N. Santilli had visited the Faculty Council last week to discuss collaborating with that body. A. Krueger noted that the visit let them know that the faculty voice is represented on UCEP. C. Sherman also informed members that the next meeting will feature Stacey Love on the subject of transfer-friendly policies. Pamela Mason will appear at a later meeting to discuss proposed policies for Global Education.

The committee then turned to the next steps to be taken regarding the proposal on the Bulletin of Entry. Faculty members on UCEP reached out to department chairs and received a generally positive reaction to the proposal. C. Sherman asked whether the committee could agree to move it forward, or was more feedback necessary. A. Nagy said that he was against the proposal, believing that it locks us in too much. K. Manning noted that the most important thing was achieving clarity on the applicable Bulletin for first-year students. C. Sherman said that a review of other institutions had revealed a variety of policies re: the Bulletin of entry. M. Farrar observed that one concern has been transcribing, and making sure that course titles on transcripts reflected course content needed for licensure. A. Miciak said that he favored a single Bulletin to cover a student's entire undergraduate career but was unsure that a single policy could handle exceptions. K. Manning pointed out that it was a matter of working with the registrar. A. Krueger added that the registrar's office often was made aware of matters only at the last minute. M. Farrar stressed the need to deal with the governance issues underlying the Bulletin; switching to a yearly Bulletin before doing so could actually make things worse. A. Krueger suggested that we might benefit from a form for curricular changes that department chairs could fill out. C. Sherman said that she and A. Krueger would connect with the Registrar's Office to discuss possible protocols to accompany the policy proposal. Also, she looked forward to the time when students would no longer have to deal with multiple Bulletins. A. Miciak noted the need of language that would help clarify the situation. R. Drenovsky said that we need a plan that satisfies the large majority of departments, not necessarily every one of

them. C. Sherman suggested that the Bulletin proposal could benefit from additional disclaimer language.

C. Sherman next introduced the policy review guidelines document, which describes how proposed policies will be vetted. The document includes a template for proposing policies as well as a routing form. C. Sherman invited members to start thinking about effective dates and next steps for current proposals after the conclusion of the thirty-day comment period and UCEP's final review. M. Farrar noted that the review of academic policies hasn't occurred for a long time. M. Moroney added that we have many other policies that aren't written down anywhere. C. Sherman wondered whether we might need a Bulletin supplement to capture and communicate coherently policy revisions before the next Bulletin is released. R. Drenovsky suggested that perhaps the Bulletin should not include policy material. C. Sherman proposed collecting everything that had been passed this year. R. Drenovsky asked whether the repository for this material should be the registrar's office, as opposed to the provost's office. A. Krueger agreed, noting that the registrar is where this material often "lives." C. Sherman suggested that N. Santilli decide the matter. K. Manning urged that the registrar's webpage be made known to students, who otherwise were unaware of its existence. M. Farrar added that this also affects the training of academic advisors. C. Sherman suggested that the University's professional development day might represent another opportunity for UCEP to inform faculty and staff of policy and procedural updates. In the end, it was decided to post the policy review guidelines.

The last item of business concerned the policy on Major Declaration and Internal Transfer. C. Sherman discussed the subgroup's most recent work on the proposal, noting changes and updates, such as the establishment of parallel internal transfer deadline dates for both CAS and Boler. A discussion of the proposal ensued. M. Farrar thought that the proposal could be clarified in parts. R. Drenovsky was concerned that students could simply call themselves a major in a department of their choice; to her, it sounded as though additional benchmarks had to be met for a genuine declaration of major to take place, as a result of which the "acceptance" into the major as found in the proposal was actually conditional. A. Krueger thought, for that reason, that "acceptance" be replaced by "continuation." K. Manning predicted that "full acceptance" would be confusing to students as well. M. Farrar noted the differences in advising structures between CAS and BSOB. R. Drenovsky expressed admiration for parallel practices but said that we need to make it work for CAS. A. Miciak noted that nowhere in the Bulletin does it say that a student needs 45 hours to declare a major. M. Farrar thought that we should keep the Bulletin vague in that respect. C. Sherman concluded that a consensus had formed about the need for greater clarity. M. Moroney pointed out that we cannot move on the matter until the vote is held on the current advising model, and further conversations on alternative advising approaches, such as using professional staff advisors, which A. Nagy suggested be called professional "schedulers" instead. In the end, it was agreed to table the policy discussion until appropriate staffing was in place for CAS to make the proposed changes.

The meeting concluded at 10:00 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones