

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 24, 2018
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

NOTES

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

The meeting notes from October 10th were approved.

C. Sherman opened the meeting by asking the committee to remind colleagues of the four policies currently posted for public comment. She then summarized the morning's agenda, giving a brief overview of the topics for discussion, including: the Experiential Education and Academic Sanctions policy proposals and a list of potential policies to focus on for the spring.

The Experiential Education policy proposal was developed by the UCEP subcommittee and the Registrar and Financial Aid offices. As C. Sherman stated, the purpose of the policy is to provide guidance on registration and grading procedures for standard and non-standard term experiential education course offerings while complying with federal financial aid regulations. W. Simmons asked for clarification around the Boler London/Brussels program and wondered if, according to the new policy recommendations, they would need to look at changing how grades are assigned (they currently issue "I" grades). A. Krueger confirmed, saying that since "I's" automatically roll to "F's" after a certain period of time, it would be more beneficial to report a progress grade of "PR." C. Sherman also noted the purpose and context of an Incomplete. R. Greci wondered if there was any way to adjust the end date of courses in Banner, as that might be an easier fix than adjusting other aspects of already well-established experiential courses. Both A. Krueger and J. Ambrose believed this could be done, however they weren't sure how much latitude there was regarding the standard term. C. Sherman added that the University would need to conform to institutionally established credit and contact hour guidelines. K. Manning suggested the possibility of creating two sections of a course for registration and billing purposes; the section in which the experiential component occurred could be zero credit hours, and the other could be for when the student was actually completing the work associated with it. This would also allow for an accurate transcription of coursework for students. W. Simmons also brought up the point that not all students who sign up for experiential courses actually go on the trip. A. Krueger reminded the committee of the purpose of the policy proposal, which is to make sure the institution remains in compliance with federal aid and that students are registered for the appropriate course for when they are actually completing their coursework. After further discussion about the availability of assigning "PR" grades for in-progress work, the committee decided more investigation would be necessary before the policy could be advanced.

Work on the Academic Sanctions policy was done by a subgroup over the summer. Although still in draft form, C. Sherman drew attention to the clear and precise language used to justify academic sanctioning and what it means to be in good academic standing. The definition of Academic Warning was also strengthened and a two semester limit was implemented for Academic Warning and Academic Probation. C. Sherman continued to summarize other policy updates, including the inclusion of an appeals process, procedural clarification regarding communications, and parallel sanctions language with Student Life (Suspension and Dismissal). Further input was requested regarding whether to use a 2.0 or graduated scale, as is outlined in the bulletin, for the Academic Probation threshold. W. Simmons mentioned that Boler students need to meet three criteria to be considered in good standing: with Boler, the university, and with their major. It's not unheard of for Boler students to be making good progress towards their degree completion elsewhere in their studies, but not well enough to be considered in good standing in the business college. R. Drenovsky observed that students are only currently being flagged for their overall GPA; she feels as though that doesn't capture enough students who may not be making progress towards their major. R. Greci suggested that restrictions could be placed to prevent undeclared students from registering for upper level courses. A. Krueger agreed, saying not only could class standing constraints be used, but major level ones could as well. K. Manning expressed reservation with placing students on Academic Probation after only one semester. While she agreed that in some situations it may be appropriate for a student to re-evaluate their strengths and switch majors, she didn't feel comfortable limiting their involvement in extracurricular activities. R. Drenovsky asked if there was any way red flags could be raised without deeming students "ineligible." She concurred about not wanting to penalize students, but also recognized that such sanctions are also important moments to reach out to students and potentially initiate tough conversations. Speaking from an academic advising perspective, M. Moroney mentioned that they have had minimal success in any way that's been gentler than what is being proposed in the policy. R. Drenovsky shared that a student hearing the same message from multiple people may be most beneficial as she has found success when she as a chair meets with struggling students, reinforcing the message coming from their advisor. M. Moroney stated that sometimes no matter the amount of resources available to help those that are struggling, there are sometimes outside pressures (i.e. parents, financial support) that advisors are unable to overcome. R. Greci questioned if maybe a third option apart from Academic Probation and Academic Warning could be added to the policy. M. Moroney reiterated that the policy is not trying to be punitive, but rather to be used as a motivator. R. Drenovsky was curious about what type of student populations would be most affected by the policy: athletes, men, women, commuters, transfers, PELL eligible, etc.? A. Krueger responded that the data hadn't been disaggregated to that level. With regards to athletes, though, preliminary data suggested that in the last year, of the 700+ student-athletes at John Carroll, only three would have been impacted by a 2.0 academic probation/warning participation threshold. For the sake of time, C. Sherman suggested revisiting this conversation at the next meeting.

C. Sherman asked members to consider seven potential policies for the committee to undertake in the spring. The group agreed to focus on three: percentage of coursework which must be done at John Carroll to earn a minor/concentration, using previously conferred undergraduate degree work to apply to a John Carroll degree, and formalizing course type definitions and any related matters. The Subgroup will review the three. Additional clarification was also requested for the UCAdP suggestions on the list.

Before the group adjourned, J. Krukones asked if there was a policy already in place for those students who've already earned an undergraduate degree but are interested in another. A. Krueger responded that while there was no official policy, the established practice has been that the student would only be allowed to pursue a degree in another area (i.e. if they already have a B.A., they could only be able to earn a B.S. at John Carroll).

The meeting officially concluded at 10:04am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne