

**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

February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2019  
9:00am, CAS Conference Room

**NOTES**

Present: J. Ambrose, C. Sheil, A. Krueger, C. Sherman, R. Drenovsky, K. Manning, W. Simmons, A. Kugler, R. Greci

The minutes from February 6<sup>th</sup> were approved.

C. Sherman welcomed the committee and reviewed general announcements. She introduced the feedback that was collected during the community comment period for the Incomplete and Mid-term Grade policy. The Incomplete Grade policy will next be sent to the faculty for a vote, while the Mid-term Grade policy was approved by both Faculty Council and UCEP. It will go into effect beginning this spring 2019 semester. C. Sheil was curious as to how this policy change will be communicated to all parties involved. C. Sherman responded that she will reach out to Maryclaire Moroney and the Office of Advising to help draft messaging. It is the hope that this policy will lead to the eventual sunset of the current early warning system.

C. Sherman then extended a formal invitation to C. Sheil, the chair of CAP, to join UCEP. R. Drenovsky felt this would be a beneficial addition. There were no other objections. C. Sheil said he would double-check with the Faculty Council Chair to make sure this fell under the CAP Chair purview.

Conversation then transitioned to the Experiential Education Registration and Grading Policy. Based on feedback provided by CAP, revisions in language were made to the policy. A. Krueger suggested that perhaps the policy didn't need to prescribe a way to proceed, but that it could instead suggest who an instructor should contact for consultation in creating an experiential course – i.e. the Registrar's Office, Financial Aid, etc. This would potentially provide the faculty with more options for course creation. R. Drenovsky observed that no matter the resultant policy, it would still present a significant change for faculty. She then pondered the best way to ensure longstanding courses are brought into the new compliance guidelines. A. Krueger commented that although there was no easy way to ensure compliance, disobedience could jeopardize John Carroll University's federal financial aid. C. Sheil recommended being more upfront about the university-wide consequences in the policy messaging. A. Krueger asked if it would be beneficial to have UCEP representatives attend chair and faculty council meetings to help explain the policy. The committee felt that would be helpful. In preparation, C. Sherman and A. Krueger will construct a procedural document, with a more detailed compliance piece, to illustrate to faculty that there are multiple options for experiential course creation. They will present this document to the committee at an upcoming UCEP meeting. C. Sherman also stressed that when grades are not assigned in a timely manner, it can have a wide-spread impact on students, such as on graduation clearance, academic standing, etc.

Discussion transitioned next to the NSO Advising and Registration survey. Since the last committee meeting, input was solicited and revisions were made based on the feedback. With UCEP's approval, it will be launched to the faculty and staff involved in registration. R. Drenovsky felt the survey still didn't address the amount of orientations and when they are scheduled. As chair, she is finding it increasingly difficult to find faculty to staff them. She would like to see some examples used at other schools outlined in the survey to illustrate various models. C. Sheil observed that the current process is beneficial for providing consistent messaging to larger groups, however he feels it affords him very little personal time with students. R. Drenovsky questioned if registration actually needed to occur during orientation. Instead, if it were to happen during Streak Week, for example, the faculty would be under contract and therefore need to participate. A. Kugler questioned if anyone had talked to Stephanie Levenson to find out her feelings about the orientation structure and how it may or may not affect melt. In addition, she commented that if students did not register until August, departments wouldn't know what courses to cancel until too late. C. Sherman noted that Advising would be meeting with Admissions and Orientation. She also asked if faculty would want to participate in Orientation in different ways. K. Manning stated she liked the current process, and while it may need improvement in some areas, in general, she found it functional. R. Drenovsky felt orientation created equity issues. Lower income families often chose to attend the last orientation session to reduce the amount of travel, and associated costs, to campus. Students are then forced to create their schedule based on a limited amount of available courses, whereas students who attend earlier in the summer have better course selection. J. Ambrose spoke to his orientation experience and supported the adoption of a variety of models in an effort to target different populations, i.e. commuters. K. Manning recommended including a question about the intent of orientation. C. Sherman stated she and A. Krueger would edit the advising and orientation survey to include a question about manageability and examples of other models. After these changes are made, the survey will then be sent out to faculty and staff to solicit feedback.

Due to Spring Break, the next UCEP meeting is scheduled for March 13<sup>th</sup>, 2019. The meeting concluded at 9:55am.

Notes recorded by S. Payne