

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

March 28, 2018
9:00 a.m.; OC 47

NOTES

Present: C. Sherman, R. Drenovsky, M. Farrar, R. Greci, J. Krukones, A. Miciak, M. Moroney, A. Nagy; guest: Michelle Reynard

The notes from the meeting of March 14, 2018, were approved.

C. Sherman reported on the status of four committee proposals—on the grading system, Incomplete grades, excused absences, and bulletin of entry. Most of the ensuing discussion focused on the bulletin-of-entry proposal, which calls for students to follow a single undergraduate bulletin from matriculation through graduation. C. Sherman noted that about a half-dozen department chairs were consulted about the proposal. A. Nagy expressed concern that being held to a single bulletin so far in advance would create difficulty. C. Sherman asked whether some measure of curricular flexibility would suffice to deal with the problem, for example, a range of possible courses or special topics course for fulfilling requirements; A. Nagy countered that it was necessary to keep those requirements as specific as possible. R. Drenovsky wondered whether we could develop a policy that takes account of such situations; she thought that, for most majors, the proposal as presently written would work. R. Greci asked whether it might be possible to issue an addendum to the Undergraduate Bulletin. M. Farrar expressed concern as to how that process would be controlled. A. Miciak inquired about bulletin requirements in force at the time of major acceptance. R. Drenovsky pointed out that there is a difference between the intention to major in a particular subject and the actual acceptance into that major. M. Reynard said that students tend to cherry-pick from different bulletins depending on what they want or what serves their particular interests. A. Miciak asked whether we could circumvent problems by the use of academic petitions. M. Farrar expressed her preference for a single bulletin of entry. She advocated that every department needs to have a teach-out plan for handling the impact of that change, and that the Subgroup will work on caveat language for the bulletin of entry proposal to address curricular responsiveness and flexibility. In the end, C. Sherman said that all four proposals will be posted.

M. Reynard was present at the meeting to explain the issue of student ranking. Currently the Registrar's Office runs the ranking process three times a year. In accord with a memorandum that had been made available to committee members prior to the meeting, M. Reynard suggested that we get rid of ranking, as it no longer serves a useful purpose. Committee members expressed unanimous agreement with that suggestion. R. Greci wondered whether some students might actually be concerned about the discontinuance of the policy. It was suggested that the elimination of ranking could be communicated to the University community in advance of the change.

Finally, C. Sherman reported on the work of a subgroup that had reviewed the bulletin software of three companies. The subgroup concluded that the package offered by SmartCatalog was superior in terms of its functionality and pricing. J. Krukones, another member of the subgroup, agreed that SmartCatalog best promised to meet our current needs for upgrading the bulletin. A. Miciak asked, in the end, who specifically would be responsible for overseeing the revised process of producing the bulletin. The answer was the associate academic vice president.

The meeting concluded at 9:55 a.m.

Notes recorded by J. Krukones