

**COMMITTEE:** Admission & Retention Policies

**MEETING DATE:** February 7, 2022

**PERSON PRESIDING:** Eli Hvastkovs

**REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Lynne Murphy, Jennifer Matthews, Stephanie Bae, Michael Baker, Joshua Gardner

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Cynthia Wagoner, Stan Eakins, Angela Anderson, Steven Asby, Elizabeth Fleischer

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Purification Martinez, Rachel Baker

Meeting called to order at 4:01pm.

**ACTIONS OF MEETING:**

Agenda Item 1: Conduct Policy

Discussion: Subcommittee posted report of minor changes/feedback to submit from whole committee.

Hvastkovs asked for motion of approved feedback

Motion: Wagoner

Second: Matthews

All AYE, motions passed

Agenda Item 2: AIV Policy

Discussion: Hvastkovs discussed how Chair of the Faculty Martinez had a meeting with the University Attorney (UA). Hvastkovs discussed previous UA discussing concerns over faculty concerns “dolling out punishment” over cheating allegations, which prompted the initial rewriting of the AIV Policy. Paul Zigas, current UA, reviewed the rewriting suggested by previous UA and determined there is no need to include the previous suggestions in current policy language. Upon this determination, Hvastkovs revised the policy, especially the language regarding the addition of meeting with a department chair, which has now been eliminated. Current proposed policy now reflects what was similar to the previous policy (prior to former UA recommendations).

Chair Martinez spoke and agreed that Hvastkovs summarized correctly. Martinez recalled that over the summer she and Hvastkovs received a mixed amount of feedback across faculty, chairs, and other offices across campuses inquiring why more feedback was not asked for from these parties. Martinez referenced an early fall meeting with Zigas over these concerns and that he looked over current policies and previous suggestions by previous UA and determined if those suggestions were necessary going forward. Zigas said he did not have a problem with ECU's policy mirroring NC State's policy, which reflects ECU's previous policy of not including the step between initial meeting and referral to OSSR. In other words, Zigas said there is no need for a department/chair meeting.

Hvastkovs: does "complainant" / "defendant" language need to be changed?

Martinez: no, it does not have to be changed.

Hvastkovs shared screen to review policy/current track changes. Hvastkovs removed any language that would require the formal department meeting.

Hvastkovs posited the following questions to the committee:

- 1.) Does committee approve language?
- 2.) Do we want to change terminology of "initial meeting"?
- 3.) How do we define "cheating ring"?

Gardner: spoke to keeping terminology of "initial meeting" for simplicity/general understanding.

Murphy: "complainant" / "defendant" language is difficult? Maybe just say "faculty member" / "student."

[Vast support of agreement from committee members on Murphy's suggestion]

Martinez: compared NC State's policy to ECU's policy and spoke to simplicity of NC State's policy and how stiff ECU's policy is.

Hvastkovs: OSSR asked if we could include visual image to help explain.

Martinez: OSSR actually created one.

Hvastkovs: removing chair part will make it much simpler.

Hvastkovs: asked committee to look over track changes for next meeting to give feedback/make any additional questions.

Hvastkovs: how do we want to define a "cheating ring"? OSSR says it needs to be defined.

Hvastkovs: perhaps "three people working together in a non-course sanctioned manner that improperly..."

Anderson: what if it is two students?

Murphy: does it make a difference in procedure in number of people involved?

Matthews: if it is three or more people, then OSSR handles it, right?

Matthews: it also seems like it would matter the number of students involved

Murphy: agreed on it mattering the number of students involved and if the students are all in the same course?

Martinez: committee could say that if the volume of the students in the course is too high, then the faculty will consult with OSSR

R. Baker: encouraged reaching out to OSSR for history on matter

Matthews: any reason for use of terminology of “cheating ring” // seems archaic? maybe just eliminate term altogether?

Hvastkovs will follow up with OSSR over concerns/questions

Hvastkovs: once the faculty member has submitted to OSSR, student can appeal and go before AI Board. Discussed current makeup of board and need of grad student reps. OSSR suggested undergrads serve on grad board. Hvastkovs suggested no and asked for committee feedback. Gardner, Murphy, and Wagoner further spoke against undergrads serving on the AI Board for a grad student appeal. Hvastkovs will follow up with OSSR.

Issue raised of a student withdrawal from a course. Question asked if committee could add clause that says the registrar should email faculty member if a student withdraws?

Anderson: there is an automatic notification in place now where it is sent to the faculty member if a student withdraws. Committee could add to say that faculty needs to notify registrar’s office if email is received and student is involved in AIV. Hvastkovs will add comment.

Matthews: can faculty be proactive and send email to registrar to place hold if student is involved in AIV?

Anderson: registrar doesn’t place hold; OSSR does

Martinez: noted NC State’s policy which states that students cannot withdrawal from class.

Linked resource in chat: <https://studentconduct.dasa.ncsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/39/2018/08/RAIV-Updated-2018.pdf>

Committee will add comments, suggestions prior to next committee meeting before voting on revised policy.

Agenda Item 3: UEA Policy

Discussion: Hvastkovs: verbiage passed for UEA Policy. However, in the meantime...

R. Baker: the item was on agenda for faculty senate, but suggestions sent afterwards were beyond editorial, so item removed.

Hvastkovs: Dean of Students had edits//concern over language over excused medical absence and there was 1 faculty concern.

Now, Hvastkovs has included new suggestions based on Dean of Students and faculty concern. New proposed UEA Policy sent to committee. Dean of Students wanted to clarify language around short term illnesses and how students need to contact Student Health Services to work with faculty member. Reviewed types of absences.

Hvastkovs: Any feedback on edits?

Matthews: so just to be clear, university doesn't give excused absence?

Hvastkovs: sometimes; if it is long term, but question/concern is over short term

Bae: further concern over short term and use of plagiarized medical absence documentation

Hvastkovs: is there a way to phrase this to say "instructors should work with students who have short term illness?"

Murphy: that doesn't seem to carry much weight, so it's hard to make a blanket statement --- maybe say it's to the instructor's discretion (based on syllabus language and departmental policy)?

Hvastkovs asked committee to look at AIV Policy and UEA Policy to add comments/feedback for discussion at next meeting.

Hvastkovs asked for motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn: Bae

Second: Wagoner

All AYE; motion passed

Meeting adjourned at 5:10pm