

**COMMITTEE:** Admission & Retention Policies

**MEETING DATE:** Jan 9, 2023

**PERSON PRESIDING:** Eli Hvastkovs

**REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Michael Baker, Lynn Murphy, Jennifer Matthews, Cynthia Wagoner, Stephanie Bae

**REGULAR MEMBERS ABSENT:** Amy Frank

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Angela Anderson, Steven Asby, Shannon Baker Powell, Chukwudi Ubah

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Rachel Baker

Meeting called to order at 4:00pm.

**ACTIONS OF MEETING:**

*Discussion Item 1: AIV Policy*

Hvastkovs: Introduced Anne Ticknor (Chair of the Faculty), who attended the meeting to discuss the Academic Integrity Violation (AIV) policy with the committee.

Ticknor: Mentioned that there are a few things going on that the committee is aware of but expressed the desire to share a bit of insight from the Chair of the Faculty's perspective and the next steps. First of all, the AIV policy was passed in Faculty Senate some time ago. When she took over the chair position, she talked with Virginia Hardy (Former VC). It was found during the conversation that there was some confusion partly because the substantial changes had been made in the last few years and it is not in effect yet; the other part was about making it accessible for students. For example, what does being accused of an academic integrity violation mean for a student? Currently, it is in the Faculty Manual because the academic integrity violation starts in a classroom and it is the faculty's responsibility to investigate and report.

Ticknor: Was notified that the AIV policy would come back with comments but the details weren't shared. When it was delivered back, it came with many edits and lots of lines out which were not expected.

Four points standing out from the edited version were: 1) Instructor's rights have been deleted from the document. This is concerning because it is the faculty member's class and he/she/they should have some rights in the process. 2) Graduate students being included in the process; one graduate student looking at another graduate student. Kathy Cox, interim dean of Graduate School assured that it wouldn't be an issue. 3) Faculty members having someone present when

he/she/they have a conversation with the accused because it could be a precarious situation especially when there is a dispute and/or a disagreement. 4) If new evidence is found after it goes to OSRR, the instructor has varying limits on what can be done and what he/she/they can do.

In addition, the memo indicated that there would be a workgroup set up to look at the policy with the goal of getting it to PRR. The Chair of Faculty's stance is that the faculty should have control over the AIV policy. Hvastkovs and Powell are part of the workgroup (3 faculty members, 2 from this committee), one staff from Student Affairs, and one university attorney.

Hvastkovs: Shared that the working group will meet on Wednesday, but the administration would like to make it into PRR (it is for policies – this applies to all employees, not just faculty).

Ticknor: Explained that PRR is about policies. It is focused on matters that apply to every employee, regardless of what their position is. Several UNC institutions don't have a faculty manual, just PRR. One of the major points is that the Faculty Manual is governed by faculty, overseen, written, and voted on by faculty. PRR does go through its process, but it is not faculty focused. It is across the university. There are different voices and eyes on it and it doesn't go through the same process as Faculty Manual. PRR could change a lot quicker than Faculty Manual. For PRR, the Chair of Faculty and faculty officers review an item and decide if there should be faculty advice on it or not. Moving an item from Faculty Manual to PRR takes away the faculty-shared governance because it takes away the faculty oversight for specific policies affecting faculty.

Murphy: Asked what the next steps are after the workgroup does the work and makes a recommendation – specifically if this policy needs to go through the Faculty Senate or not.

Ticknor: Clarified that the workgroup is separate from the meeting that Hvastkovs, Ticknor, Provost, and one of the university attorneys where they are discussing the blue-colored version because the university is currently operating in the old version, not the blue version (updated). After the meeting, if the meeting goes well, it will come back to ARP to present it to Faculty Senate. The faculty senate needs to vote again. They might vote not to approve even though they voted to approve before the changes.

The workgroup is for thinking forward. However, a policy cannot be moved from the Faculty Manual to PRR without a vote from the Faculty Senate.

Powell: Commented that there seemed to be a big discrepancy between Faculty Senate/Admission and Retention Policies committee and the administration – the work this committee has done for AIV policy was voted by Faculty Senate, but then it sat with the administration since April 2022, not moving forward.

Hvastkovs: Mentioned that the administration acknowledged that this committee had worked on the policy, but it was mentioned that there are a lot more things to do to make it better, which was never communicated before.

Ticknor: If the policy gets divided, the faculty still need to govern the faculty side of the policy.

Murphy: Wanted to clarify if this committee is on hold for the AIV policy.

Ticknor: Mentioned that four items are currently discussed in the Chancellor's office – she reminds the Provost and Chancellor about these items during her one-on-one, but the recent administration change definitely impacts this.

Discussion Item #2: University Excused Absence

Hvastkovs: Updated the committee that the university excused absence was passed by the Faculty Senate; it is now in the Chancellor's office.

M. Baker: Reminded of a policy that got changed and the committee needs to decide if it is minor or substantial. It was originally for the medical withdrawal, talk to the Dean of Students office, but it was changed to talk to the Dean of Students office for incompletes and other options.

R. Baker: Commented that the changes this committee makes have counterparts in the university catalog. The changes should also be pushed to the university catalog as well because they both need to have the same information. For example, we changed the language for the grade appeal on the faculty manual, but it was not changed on the catalog, so the policy was not aligned with the catalog. The catalog doesn't get updated unless there are specifically told to do so; it is updated in July every year. It is possible to have two different policies in effect at the same time.

It is usually, once the Chancellor approves it, it is the policy in effect. However, the catalog would not change at the same time; even if we put through a change to the catalog, it won't be updated until July.

Hvastkovs: Excused absence policy is approved pending the administration's approval. Do we want to delay it?

R. Baker: Recommended that the committee needs to figure out if this is a substantial item or not.

Hvastkovs: Commented that they added one line. Asked if this would be considered substantial.

M. Baker: Made a motion to deem the changes to be non-substantial.

Wagoner seconded.

All in favor.

Asby: Go Pirates

Powell made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by M. Baker. All in favor.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:35pm.