

**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

October 10, 2018  
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

**NOTES**

Present: A. Krueger, C. Sherman, J. Krukones, M. Moroney, A. Kugler, W. Simmons, R. Drenovsky

The meeting notes from September 26<sup>th</sup> were approved.

C. Sherman welcomed committee members and reviewed the agenda. She provided a brief overview of UCEP's responses to CAP feedback around the incomplete grade and midterm grade proposals. R. Drenovsky was pleased with the additional language added to the incomplete grade policy; she felt it emphasized not only the seriousness of the contract, but at the same time also reinforced that it should only be utilized in extenuating circumstances. R. Drenovsky also expressed concern that some faculty misunderstand when to counsel students on appealing for an incomplete grade versus simply withdrawing from the course. A Krueger assured that there could be a layer of approval built into the petition process, if necessary, that could be used as a means of monitoring usage.

The majority of language in the mid-term grade policy proposal did not change. Minor edits were made in the Rationale section, clarifying Banner 9 functionality and grading options. J. Krukones wondered if the phrase "purpose statement" (located in the Rationale and Discussion section) was an intentional choice, which C. Sherman confirmed.

A. Krueger elaborated on changes that were made to the student classification policy based on feedback and questions from the last UCEP meeting. Language was added to outline the effect the new policy would have on registration and time tickets. In essence, the policy will help to reinforce the gap between where students think they are in terms of class standing and completed credit hours versus where they actually are. Committee members were satisfied with the changes and approved posting both the student classification and revision to student petition policies for public comment.

Discussion then turned to the auditing policy proposal. As C. Sherman explained, the revision streamlines the auditing process and provides a rationale that the previous policy lacked. Committee members were satisfied with the policy proposal and due to its operational nature, approved to send for public comment. Born of this conversation was one centered on "Gold Streaks", or alumni graduated from the university 50+ years. Current established practice is that this audience is the only one allowed to take courses at John Carroll at a reduced/free rate, however there is no formal policy stating such. A. Krueger commented that the Registrar's Office periodically fields call from community members and alumni graduated less than 50 years

inquiring what options may be available to them. J. Krukones stated that this may be a topic worth revisiting, in conjunction with Graduate Studies and Alumni Relations.

Finally, the newly created policy on awarding posthumous and honorary degrees was reviewed. This will ultimately fall under the purview of the Provost. While there was consensus around the posthumous degree as worded, the honorary degree gave the committee pause. R. Drenovsky questioned the purpose of awarding the degree, as well as the name of it, since the University already distributes a different type of honorary degree during commencement. A. Krueger was able to provide some context, explaining that individuals who never completed their coursework occasionally contact the University to see what they would need to do in order to earn their diploma; an honorary degree of the type outlined in the policy would be one way to pacify them. W. Simmons said that while he sympathized with these individuals, he felt that awarding a degree – even honorary – was not the appropriate remedy. R. Drenovsky also felt that the policy would be in direct opposition to the one passed last year limiting degree completion to 10 years. C. Sherman polled the committee to see if they were comfortable with removing all language about honorary degrees from the policy altogether. The committee agreed and the paragraph will be removed. The Committee approved posting the Posthumous Degree policy proposal for public comment.

A brief conversation about honorary degrees currently awarded at commencement ensued. A. Krueger asked if there were any parameters or criteria in place for the selection process. According to J. Krukones, there used to be a committee tasked with determining recipients, but he wasn't sure there was one anymore. The comment was made that the conferral of honorary degrees felt more closely tied to advancement.

C. Sherman thanked the committee for their work and the meeting concluded at 9:44am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne