

JOHN CARROLL UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICIES

Angela Krueger, Catherine Sherman, Todd Bruce, John Ambrose, Rebecca Drenovsky,
Margaret Farrar, Rick Greci, Jim Krukones, Kathleen Manning, Al Miciak, Michelle Millet,
Maryclaire Moroney, Anne Kugler, Walter Simmons

August 29, 2018
9:00am, Faculty Lounge

NOTES

Present: C. Sherman, A. Krueger, R. Drenovsky, M. Farrar, J. Krukones, W. Simmons, M. Moroney, K. Manning, R. Greci, M. Millet

C. Sherman welcomed the UCEP committee back to the start of fall semester and extended greetings to new Staff Council member J. Ambrose and W. Simmons; a student representative is still to be determined. She also stated that the UCEP sub-committee was hard at work over the summer developing six new proposals for fall business, including course definitions, types, and levels. C. Sherman also informed the group that the bulletin supplement is now posted on the Provost's Office webpage. In addition, information on the transcript notation policy can now be found on the Registrar's Office webpage and study abroad criteria is now housed on the Global Education site. C. Sherman then noted that the meeting would focus on two policy proposals: mid-term grades and a refined petition process.

The reporting of mid-term grades will be affected by the implementation of Banner 9. After John Carroll completes its transition from Banner 8, mid-term grades will no longer be available for subgroups, meaning either all students receive mid-term grades or none do. A discussion about the positive pedagogical impact of providing mid-term grades to all students ensued. According to A. Krueger, the mid-term grade report would still be pushed out on its current timeline. M. Farrar commented that this type of information would be beneficial for retention research. M. Moroney remarked that given the shape and size of the incoming freshmen class, this would be good data to track. R. Drenovsky asked that the committee evaluate the deadlines for mid-term grades and the date for full-term course withdrawal at some point, as they are too far apart. She would also like warning reports to be generated for each discipline – this would be beneficial to our students who are “flying under the radar,” i.e. their overall GPA does not give cause for concern, but their major GPA might. C. Sherman reminded the committee that this policy would need to be presented to CAP quickly and asked that what the faculty response to a policy supporting mid-term grades for all students might be. R. Greci imagined that some faculty might say they haven't done enough grading by that point in the semester to be able to provide one. M. Millet stressed that the university already provides faculty access to Canvas as a tool to make things easier. M. Farrar stated it would be bad pedagogy to not have grades by week 12 and they might be a good tool to tie into retention. C. Sherman remarked that mid-term grades would serve as a benchmark for both students in trouble and those that are thriving. R. Drenovsky imagined mid-term grades would make academic advising conversations more meaningful. R. Greci stated that implementation of the policy may be messy and wondered how much hand-holding or babysitting of our students is necessary. W. Simmons remarked that that is a sociological trend and that this is what our students have come to expect. M. Moroney commented that ultimately, it's up to our students to respond to feedback. M. Farrar wondered,

if by adopting mid-term grades for all, would the early warning evaluation reporting system still be necessary? She then likened it to a checked box with very little return. R. Drenovsky agreed, stating that as an advisor, she doesn't find it helpful. A. Krueger then suggested coupling the removal of the early warning system with the implementation of the mid-term grade policy. This suggestion was endorsed by the committee and will be sent to CAP for approval. Follow-up with the Retention Committee and Todd Bruce will also be necessary.

R. Greci wondered who makes recommendations about first-years, readmits, and transfers and if John Carroll has any policy in place around them. A. Krueger commented that there are policies and criteria for transfer students, but there is inconsistency in application. M. Farrar stated that summer personnel churn also complicated things, however the current organizational structure in admissions does not make sense. M. Moroney also expressed frustration over the lack of a concrete application deadline; our rolling admissions practice makes things difficult. M. Farrar pointed out that this topic is directly related to retention and following up with Todd Bruce and the Retention Committee. M. Millet also suggested extending an invite to the new Vice President for Enrollment Management, Stephanie Levenson, to attend a future UCEP meeting. C. Sherman said she would follow up with Levenson.

Discussion then moved onto the second topic on the agenda: revision to the petition process, specifically around transfer credit. A. Krueger reminded the committee of the transfer course equivalency table maintained on the Registrar's website. As it is, this table currently renders some petitions unnecessary. A. Krueger explained that under the new policy, students would only need to petition if the course is not on the equivalency table or if they would like the course to transfer in as something else. Courses are re-evaluated every four years, so the data can remain current. IT is also currently working on developing an interactive database. As the Committee was in favor of the proposal, it was approved to be posted for public comment.

M. Farrar asked about the status of the major declaration process and where it was housed. A. Krueger reviewed the current process, which is housed in the Registrar's office. K. Manning mentioned that she likes the new process. The only change she suggested would be to eliminate the need for the student to print out an email and walk it over to the appropriate department – it would be easier if it was transferred electronically. A. Krueger said that the Registrar's Office is working on that.

R. Greci asked for a status update on the incomplete grade policy currently with CAP. According to C. Sherman, revisions were made and it is one of the top priorities on CAP's agenda this year, along with mid-term grades, due to its time sensitive nature.

After no further discussion, the meeting concluded at 10:02am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne