COMMITTEE: Admission & Retention Policies

MEETING DATE: Nov 7, 2022

PERSON PRESIDING: Eli Hvastkovs

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Michael Baker, Stephanie Bae

REGULAR MEMBERS ABSENT: Lynn Murphy, Amy Frank, Cynthia Wagoner, Jennifer Matthews

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chukwudi Ubah

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Rachel Baker

Meeting called to order at 4:02pm.

ACTIONS OF MEETING:

ARP committee didn't have enough regular members to meet a quorum. R. Baker advised that the committee could start discussing an issue, but we cannot enact anything without meeting a quorum. The members in attendance could be sub-committee and work on the items that we can vote on during the next meeting. This time, the attended members decided to work as a sub-committee to work on the office hour policy so we could vote via email.

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Discussed the office hour policy and how the presentation at the faculty senate meeting went. The main issue with the faculty senate last year was about how long it should take for faculty to send a reply to a student's email. The ARP committee changed it from 24 to 48 hours and put an automatic reply for long absences. An amendment with that language was passed via the faculty senate, but the overall section then got tabled back to the ARP committee to make appropriate changes.

<u>M. Baker</u>: Asked if there were any specific changes or additional changes we should discuss or make on the office hour policy.

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Explained that the main issue with the faculty senate was how long it should take a faculty member to respond to a student's email. The ARP committee discussed that those office hours should be conducive to student engagement and reflect the nature of the course delivery.

<u>R. Baker</u>: Added that the faculty senate had issues with the verbiage of "schedule office hours that reflect the availability of students"

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Shared the suggested changes on the faculty manual document. Currently, the changes the ARP committee has made read, "Instructors should choose office hours that reflect the availability of both the students and the instructor to participate in the office hour interaction". The ARP committee's main point for the office hours is to not have the office hours at midnight nor only between 8-5.

<u>M. Baker</u>: Read Part 8.1.2A (faculty members teaching one or more courses must maintain 5 hours of office hours during the work week... office hours must mirror the delivery mode of the course)

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Discussed different faculty teaches different time/day and they can choose what works for them and for the student. For instance, a faculty member teaching a night class could do office hours the hours before the class.

<u>M. Baker:</u> Suggested that we make the verbiage a little more tentative; for example, faculty should attempt to choose office hours that reflect the availability.

<u>Bae:</u> Expressed the concern about why faculty members can't just work with students. If a student can't make it during office hours because he/she has a course, they can communicate and find time and day that work for both of them.

<u>R. Baker:</u> Clarified that the concern of the faculty senate was asking the practicality of it – for instance, the office hours must be posted on the syllabus but then how would faculty know the student availability before the semester starts or should the office hours be changed after the semester has started. They were concerned that this meant extra work to try to find time/day. However, what ARP committee intended was focused more on finding a time that works for both faculty and students and scheduling office hours that makes sense.

<u>Hvastkovs:</u> Made changes on the verbiage to "should attempt to schedule office hours that reflect the availability". We also got "must maintain 5 hours". We can send that out to ARP committee and get their comments.

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Shared that AIV policy, which passed the faculty senate, is likely to be coming back to the committee. It has been sitting in the Provost's office. It is being held out in the administration because we have new leadership and they would like to review it. The Chair of the faculty was told by Dr. Hardy that the upper administration wasn't sure about the policy as

ARP committee didn't work with OSRR, which is a misunderstanding. ARP committee has worked closely with OSRR with AIV policy.

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Introduced an issue with ENG1100. He was informed that the veterans and military who come in with credits don't necessarily want to take ENG1100. This precludes us from getting transfer students to ECU.

R. Baker: WAC committee is reviewing the issue. ARP approved a policy that allows accepting students who didn't meet some of the admission requirements. It is a 'holistic review' of students and it was meant to allow students who didn't meet the requirement to come to ECU. However, this ENG1100 issue apparently couldn't be considered under that, possibly due to the undergraduate catalog language that specifies that military vets and their children or descendants or relatives have to meet the admission requirements - Even if they could be considered under that holistic review and ECU accepts them, they may be barred from doing that because of the sentence. WAC is currently reviewing the ENGL1100 issue but WAC may not be ready to let go of the transfer requirements.

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Clarified that the holistic review can possibly work but then this is holding them back.

<u>R. Baker:</u> Explained that it might be due to rules about veterans. UNC system doesn't waive out-of-state fees for the military so the units that would like to recruit military face challenges. There are many other states that would waive it and students might be more likely to go to an institution that waives the out-of-state fees for the military.

<u>Hvastkovs</u>: Suggested that we would continue to discuss this further. Also he commented that he would discuss this with WAC chair and Will Banks (Director of University Writing Center).

Chair Hvastkovs requested motion for meeting to adjourn.

Motion: M. Baker Second: All

Meeting adjourned at 4:32pm