

**COMMITTEE:** Admission & Retention Policies

**MEETING DATE:** Feb 6, 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, Lisa Ellison

Meeting called to order at 4:00pm.

**ACTIONS OF MEETING:**

*Discussion Item #1: ENG1100 for transfers/military students*

Hvastkovs: Lisa Ellison from the WAC committee to discuss removing ENG1100 for transfers.

Ellison: Explained that the Chair of the Faculty Senate tasked the WAC committee to identify some solutions for transfer students, especially military students, to have ENG1100 or an equivalent for a requirement. After discussing various entities on campus, the WAC committee recommends removing ENG1100 from the transfer requirements. There is no reason for students to take ENG1100, a basic writing foundations course, once they are here.

Hvastkovs: Amy Franks is in favor of this change as she deals with transfer students with military backgrounds a lot.

Asby: The academic advisors across the campus would support it.

Ellison: ENG1100 is the basic writing foundations course so students have to take the class once they transfer over to ECU, they still have to take it. There is no reason for them to take it once they are here.

Anderson: The Admissions office is in favor of this requirement being removed as this will help us become more transfer-friendly. No other institutions in UNC System require this.

Anderson made a motion to approve the removal of ENG1100 from our transfer admissions requirements.

M. Baker seconded.

All in favor.

## Discussion Item #2: AIV policy updates

Powell: Discussed the work group's process. Each member of the work group was tasked to look at the AIV policies of the sister universities in the UNC System and discussed the findings, such as where it was held and how it was compared to ECU. It turned out our AIV policy is not bad compared to our sister universities in the system. They were told to consider the process where the accused is required to do some type of continuing education related to plagiarism. For example, App State University has a program where students who violate the policy pay \$100 to go through modules. If they violate the policy again, they are now in the "should have known better" stage because they already went through the modules.

Hvastkovs: After looking at other schools, ECU's AIV policy seems good; we might need to edit a little bit but that is it.

Powell: Mentioned that we, as faculty, don't want to lose our right to have a support person/witness in the meeting. The work group's assignment to research other institutions within the system confirms that it is reasonable and it should be on the policy. App State, for example, allows both to have up to two support people.

R Baker: spoke to Anne Ticknor because she knew this item was on the agenda in ARP meeting but she wasn't able to attend. She wanted to ask when the final version from the work group would be available because it should be presented to this committee then to the faculty senate for reapproval. In addition, the idea of a compromise where the initial part stays in the faculty manual and the next part is for OSRR and what happens being in PRR – was it pursued?

Hvastkovs: They seem like they have issues with the timeline, for example, 7 weekdays.

R. Baker: If they feel like their hands are tied on adjusting the timelines as they can't meet them but they feel more free do make adjustments on PRR (vs. Faculty Manual). If this is in PRR, the timeline issues can be more easily fixable than the faculty manual.

The chair of the faculty and the officers decide whether any changes are significant enough to require a committee review and then the committee would review the change and decide whether the proposed change is problematic or not.

Hvastkovs: Felt that many problems were perceived problems but they don't seem bad. They complained that it is difficult to find, but it can be easily located by just searching in the search engine. There is a group of people who believe that this is not good, but it is not that bad except for the chair approval part, which we took it off of the policy. So it is basically the same policy from a couple of years ago.

R. Baker: Generally, once it is passed through Faculty Senate, the senators from each college/unit, hopefully, go back and update the faculty. However, when it gets to the Chancellor's step, it is not what is happening. We can discuss a new way of publicizing the policies when they are approved/passed; currently, we don't see it and are not sure if OSRR is going to send out a newsletter about the updates.

Bae: voiced if faculty would read the email from OSRR. This conversation of AIV policy started 2018 or even earlier and it is still being discussed in 2023. The changes in the administration affect the policies, but this was already passed well before the new administration came in and has been sitting in the office too long without any updates or approval after it was approved in Faculty Senate.

Hvastkovs: The work group still has meetings and will update the committee.

### *Discussion Item #3: Excused Absences*

Hvastkovs: discussed the excused absences policy, which was passed through Faculty Senate, but it needs to be approved for the catalog changes. He had a conversation with the Dean of Students. After going through this committee, it goes through Faculty Senate and passes. We were sent the updates – some are okay but some are kind of bad but we got this after it went through the faculty senate already; so we cannot just make changes to it.

DOS wants no decision-making power on what activities are deemed to warrant excused absences. They want clear cut therefore, some verbiage was added (non-emergency military training, etc.). DOS also argued that the “extreme personal emergency or serious medical condition” is vague because what constitutes as an extreme personal emergency might be different depending on individual perceptions. So we deleted it and replaced it with “hospitalization”.

In addition, the currently passed version includes that the faculty has a right not to accept the UEA if the student didn’t communicate with the faculty within the proper lead time. He added verbiage explaining that the instructor, however, can still accept UEA if he/she/they feel that the student made a good faith effort.

M. Baker: Faculty always has a choice to excuse students’ absences, but this began because some faculty doesn’t want to excuse absences that the student thinks it should be excused. If it is helpful, we can leave it but he suggested taking the last sentence out.

Hvastkovs: They didn’t understand why there were two sections so he had to explain what it was. In addition, they weren’t satisfied with the court-related/subpoena.

Wagoner moved a motion to approve the changes to the policy and to have it matched with the university catalog.

M. Baker seconded. Passed unanimously.

### *Discussion Item #4: Military Holistic Review*

Hvastkovs: In the undergraduate catalog, it is mentioned that a student can request a holistic review, but the military and veteran students are not included in that. It doesn't lay out that if you are a military student/veteran student, you can request a holistic review. We were requested to consider adding the holistic review part to the military and veteran students.

Murphy: It is stated in the paragraph below that students who feel special circumstances should be considered during this review may request a holistic review. We can add that sentence to the veterans and military section. It is not clear if that sentence includes military/veteran students or if it needs to be explicitly under the corresponding section.

Anderson: Clarified that any applicants who don't meet the standard admissions requirements can request a holistic review. This happens a lot with our veterans. If we add the sentence there that there will be no question as to whether it is applicable to our military/veteran population.

All in favor.

M. Baker moved a motion to adjourn.

Powell seconded.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:50pm.