Revised
COMMITTEE: Admission and Retention Policies Committee

MEETING DATE: Monday, February 2, 2015

PERSON PRESIDING: Jonathan Morris

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Allison Danell, Melinda Doty, Michael Duffy, Katie Flanagan, Amy Frank, Susanne Jones

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: John Fletcher, Jayne Geissler, Mia Leone, Derek Maher

__________________________________________________________

ACTIONS OF THE MEETING

Agenda Item: Review the Minutes for January 12, 2015.

Action Taken: Minutes were approved pending one correction as follows: “Maher presented the concern within the College of Arts and Sciences for accountability in grade changes, and independent study courses.”

Announcements:

Morris stated that no one from Student Affairs has yet agreed to come to our committee to talk about the PRR on student disciplinary probation.

Unfinished Business:

Agenda Item: Probation in PRR/Student Conduct

Discussion: Morris asked if there were any further concerns that should be addressed by the committee.

Action Taken: Hearing no specific questions about the existing regulation on disciplinary probation covered in PRR 3.3.2—3.3.2.3, Morris said that he will confer with Andrew Morehead to see if there are specific issues with this policy that our committee should consider.

Agenda Item: Syllabus Language to be revised for the ECU Faculty Manual

Discussion: Flanagan distributed two handouts: the first was called Syllabus Recommendations; the second was entitled Course Syllabus Examples including DE Suggestions. In the first handout, the essential sections of the syllabus were enumerated. These included 1) course name and contact information, 2) introduction (description and learning objectives), 3) required materials for the course, 4) grading system, 5)
organization/scheduling in the course, 6) course policies and mutual expectations, including academic integrity, students with special needs, and continuity of instruction. The second handout provided an outline for a syllabus that is face-to-face or distance education. The sections include: course description, contact information, required or recommended text, description and purpose, objectives, conduct of the course, attendance policy, grading policy, exams and assignments, short application/reflection papers, research paper and oral presentation, classroom community, late work policy, academic dishonesty, special assistance, emergency weather or other interference with course delivery, caveat, and course calendar. These points reflect some of the best practices in syllabus design.

Committee discussion focused on required and recommended items as well as distribution date and the responsibility of posting syllabus language. Committee members in administrative positions shared their experiences of requiring syllabi in their departments.

**Action Taken:** Morris will circulate with the committee revised syllabus language to be voted on through e-mail.

**Agenda Item:** Grade change oversight from the Unit Head

**Discussion:** Steps in this process should be identified at the university level. What do we have in terms of grade change oversight? Is there a reporting process? Maher suggested that the unit administrator be notified of grade changes. Angela Anderson could annually generate a report on grade changes that is broken down by college, department, prefix, and faculty member. This would be easy to do.

**Action Taken:** Morris inquired into the role of our committee and the possible action anticipated. This will be further explored.

**New Business:**


**Discussion:** Morris and Flanagan represented the Admission and Retention Policies Committee at the conference. A handout, *Ad Hoc Committee on Developing Non-Cognitive Skill Development*, was distributed to committee members. Other ad hoc committee members include Elizabeth Coghill of Student Advising and Support, Karen Thompson of Career Services, Kathy Hill of Student Affairs, and Dorothy Muller of the Office of Faculty Excellence. Flanagan reported on the Chapel Hill conference and the ad hoc committee activity. The purpose of the committee will be to develop non-cognitive skills in order to increase retention rates among at-risk first year students. The target population will be 1) summer enrollment students, 2) participants in the freshmen immersion program, and 3) freshmen on academic warning. The general plan will be to
1) administer a pre-test, 2) craft a personal action plan based on advisor/faculty feedback, 3) administer a post-test, and 4) compare participant retention with retention from 1 calendar year before. Reference was made to the recently published book, *Beyond the Big Test*. Learning is not episodic, and fear of discovering inadequacies is real. Three groups who have access to advisors to do the pre-test, intervention, and post-test, include 1) student athletes, 2) participants in freshmen immersion, and 3) co-ed 1000-level students already on academic warning. Gender and ethnicity impact us, as do athletes’ expectations. The Admission and Retention Policies Committee has to form an ad hoc committee and develop its charge since there is not a collective voice among faculty. ARP committee members recommended possible additions to the ad-hoc group. There is not timetable at present for the completion of the ad hoc committee’s work.

The committee adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

NEXT MEETING: Monday, March 2, 2015 at 4:00 PM in Rawl Annex 142.