

COMMITTEE: Admission & Retention Policies

MEETING DATE: March 14, 2022

PERSON PRESIDING: Eli Hvastkovs

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Jennifer Matthews, Michael Baker, Joshua Gardner, Stephanie Jung-in Bae

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Stan Eakins, Angela Anderson

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Rachel Baker

Meeting called to order at 4:04pm.

ACTIONS OF MEETING:

Agenda Item 1: AIV Policy

Discussion: Hvastkovs had meetings with OSSR and made suggestions based on conversation, which were incorporated into document and shared with the committee prior to the meeting. Hvastkovs asked for a motion of approval to submit proposed AIV Policy changes to Faculty Senate.

Motion: Gardner

Second: M. Baker

All AYE; motion passes

Agenda Item 2: UEA Policy

Discussion: Hvastkovs shared proposed policy changes prior to meeting for any additional feedback to proposed policy. No additional feedback given. Hvastkovs asked for a motion of approval to submit proposed UEA Policy.

Motion: Eakins

Second: M. Baker/Matthews

all AYE, motions passes

Agenda Item 3: Office Hours Policy

Discussion: Hvastkovs shared proposed policy changes prior to meeting to inquire about any additional feedback to proposed policy.

One comment on proposed policy changes indicated that office hours for face-to-face instructors allow for a percentage to be completed virtually and a percentage to be completed in the physical office.

Gardner: raised question about the need, as listed in the current draft, for the designation of a percentage of office hours to be completed face-to-face. Mandating all face-to-face instructors have a certain number/percentage of office hours in the physical office space doesn't account for all types of classes, in which built in face-to-face conferencing is already a standard pedagogical practice --- especially post/ongoing pandemic in which students have embraced virtual means of meeting. We should at least consider giving department chair/units flexibility with this requirement.

Eakin: raised question of addition of "student engagement" in the line of "office hours and student engagement" and if it is needed/if it is confusing for readers.

Matthews: suggested changing to "office hours *for* student engagement"? Has only taken it to mean office hours posted for students. Some faculty may take advantage of this. 20 percent does seem arbitrary, but faculty may interpret it as "If I am teaching all online, and all my office hours can be online, then why do I need to go to the office?"

Hvastkovs: this does re-center back to the initial reason for this discussion of instructors who do teach online and students not being able to get in touch with them --- some are communicating only by phone, not by email, which is why "email" was added to proposed policy.

Hvastkovs: maybe say "a portion of the office hours as approved by the unit administrator"?

General agreement among committee members that this language provides more flexibility for individual departments, faculty, and unit heads.

Hvastkovs asked for a motion of approval to submit proposed Office Hours Policy changes to Faculty Senate

Motion: Eakins

Second: M. Baker/Matthews

all AYE, motions passes

Hvastkovs: Chair Martinez has requested that committee look at DWF rates for gen ed classes and determine if rates are too high for online delivery.

M. Baker: is there concern that there are more D/W/Fs online than in person?

Hvastkovs: unsure, will clarify. Asked if Anderson if she had any additional follow-up.

Anderson: thinks what is being asked with this request is the potential need of more online program offerings. The reason that there have not been online offerings at the undergrad level is because of less availability. However, there have been more offerings after the pandemic. Thinks the concern/question is: are students as successful online as they were F2F? Listed various components to be considered and said it is hard to look just at base-line data without considering all other components. If this committee wants to look at specific courses, we can reach out to IPAR for that data.

Matthews: does this correlate to new state funding?

Anderson: discussed different components as related to funding.

Eakins: raised concern on the committee being equipped to deal with being tasked with this question given all of the control factors in order to make a reasonable judgement call? Suggested recommending to Chair Martinez to contact IPAR, as it seems like a much more significant research project for them. Hvastkovs will followup with Chair Martinez.

Hvastkovs asked for motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn: Eakins

Second: Bae

All AYE; motion passes

Meeting adjourned at 4:42pm.