

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

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

September 12, 2018  
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

**NOTES**

Present: C. Sherman, A. Krueger, J. Ambrose, J. Krukones, R. Drenovsky, T. Bruce, M. Moroney, K. Manning, W. Simmons, O. Shackleton, A. Kugler, R. Greci

C. Sherman called the meeting to order and welcomed A. Kugler and new student representative O. Shackleton. She then provided policy updates. The mid-term grading policy is with CAP – language was added indicating that this policy will broadly serve retention efforts and that the early alert system may be suspended with its implementation. The revised incomplete grade policy from last spring is with CAP as well.

The meeting notes from May 9<sup>th</sup> and August 29<sup>th</sup> were approved.

C. Sherman provided background and context on this summer's UCEP course scheduling work group. Discussion then transitioned to work group outcomes. After reviewing policies of fellow institutions and EAB benchmarks, the work group evaluated scheduling holistically and developed a Course Scheduling Master Document that includes: recommendations on workflow, guidelines for deans and chairs, a glossary of terms, approved time slots, and 11 course type definitions (condensed from 24).

The review and subsequent discussion of course type definitions was the primary focus of this meeting. A. Krueger provided background and stated that through data analysis, it was discovered that 60% of courses at John Carroll are currently classified as "lecture." R. Drenovsky commented that chairs will likely need direction on how they are to implement these changes going forward. She also raised the point that different pedagogy could be used across different sections. R. Greci wondered how course type definitions affect scheduling; T. Bruce outlined how the two work in tandem, and also explained how course type definitions could also be leveraged to effectively implement maximum course caps. A. Krueger reminded the committee that with the size of the current freshman class, it is imperative that space is used as efficiently as possible. If we can get a sense of the pedagogy used for particular courses, we can better allocate facilities and future renovations budgets accordingly. T. Bruce then illustrated how course type definitions ultimately are an advantage for our students – they know what to expect of a course before they sign up. O. Shackleton echoed that students would look at this information when registering for classes.

Delving deeper into the individual course type definitions, there was little conversation around "lecture," "discussion," and "lab." R. Drenovsky liked how each one provided examples. Care was taken to differentiate between the sciences and arts when defining "seminar." R. Greci commented that in Boler, most special topics courses are automatically designated "seminar,"

and wondered how that might be impacted going forward. C. Sherman suggested that some recalibration may occur within departments. R. Greci questioned if it wouldn't be more beneficial to have extra columns on the scheduling spreadsheet, rather than course type definitions, as it seems most of the conversation is actually centered on class size.

After further dialogue, it was suggested that "seminar" could be collapsed into "discussion." A. Kugler argued that as a discipline, the Humanities exists in seminar format; A. Krueger also said that most graduate level courses are considered "seminars." K. Manning and R. Greci cautioned to expect confusion from chairs on how to differentiate between the two definitions; however, the inclusion of different size options to "discussion" might help alleviate this. A. Krueger reminded the Committee that they would be soliciting feedback from department chairs and faculty before moving forward so that additional discussion would be forthcoming.

R. Greci wondered if the typical student would even differentiate between the different types of courses, thinking they might only consider those defined as "hybrid," "online," or "in-person." O. Shackleton stated that in her personal experience, she does select classes based on her learning style preferences. Continuing the "hybrid"/ "online" discussion, T. Bruce explained that for ease of reporting, those definitions were written to mirror those provided by the Online Learning Consortium. It was then confirmed that co-requisite courses can have different course type definitions. Additionally, the "study abroad" course type has been eliminated from the list as it is reserved for registration and billing purposes for students participating in a semester or year-long study abroad program. Courses that include a week-long study abroad component will have a "travel" attribute so students can search for them and the university can better track them. To conclude the discussion, T. Bruce asked committee members to consider if there are any classes they offer that don't fit somewhere in the 11 different types. A. Kugler mentioned synchronous and asynchronous e-learning courses, however in the interest of time, C. Sherman asked that conversation be continued at the next meeting.

C. Sherman then outlined the next steps the final item on the agenda, the Course Scheduling Survey. It will be sent out to deans, who will then disseminate it to department chairs. Questions will cover course levels, numbering, and course type definitions. Once collected, feedback will be presented to university leadership and UCEP. Revisions to the Course Scheduling Master Document will be made accordingly if better language is suggested.

The meeting concluded at 10:01am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne