

**COMMITTEE:** Admission & Retention Policies

**MEETING DATE:** April 4, 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

**EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT:** Shannon Baker Powell, Chukwudi Ubah

**OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Rachel Baker, Anne Ticknor

Meeting called to order at 4:00pm.

**ACTIONS OF MEETING:**

*Discussion Item #1: AIV policy updates*

Ticknor: She shared that she has been following the AIV policy and this committee's work because this follows a different process than what we typically do in terms of a policy being sent back to a committee. She has met with the Provost Coger several times and will meet with VC Frye tomorrow after a brief chat with him.

Hvastkovs: He refreshed everyone about the process we went through so far; we passed all revisions to the AIV policy through Faculty Senate, but it came back with some edits that we didn't agree on, so we suggested to the administration for changes. It is currently with Provost/AA, while the work group with 3 faculty (Hvastkovs, Powell, Woodward), Leila Faranesh from OSRR, and CJ Click-Kimber, a university attorney. They gave a list of things they did not like, such as the extra chair step where the chair needed to meet with the accused, which we got rid of. He reviewed and rewrote all others (e.g., timeline) to match with the other UNC institutions. It turned out that ECU's AIV policy is very similar to other institutions, except that we have the AIV policy in the Faculty Manual, whereas some others may have it in PRR. He presented this to the work group, and Leila and the attorney didn't agree with the faculty group with the updates.

He asked them to review and provide the written out process of how OSRR would like it to be handled so they could move on, but the next meeting they came back and told the faculty in the work group that it doesn't matter what we were going to do as faculty and that they will basically

take everything we worked on and take it out of the faculty manual to put it in the PRR because it is controlled by them.

The University of North Carolina Policy 700.4.1 discusses student conduct and due process; the attorney keeps referring to 700.4.1 whenever he would like to present their agenda by stating that we are not following 700.4.1, which is not true. This is the very policy that got us to add the extra chair step in the first place. He told them that 700.4.1 doesn't have anything to do with what they are trying to do (putting this into PRR vs. leaving it in Faculty Manual). However, CJ Click-Kimber informed them that it is the way it is going to be, no matter what the faculty want. He asked who would write the part on PRR, and they said they would, but then they canceled the meeting last week because they didn't write anything.

Matthews: She commented that she was assuming that there is an authority that gives the university authority to pull this policy out of the Faculty Manual and make it a PRR.

Hvastkovs: He indicated that the university attorney told the faculty in the work group that the Provost gave them the authority.

Ticknor: Typically, the recommendation is provided by a committee, and it goes to the Senate. If the committee is not in favor, the committee would provide information so Faculty Senate can weigh in on vote/not vote on the item. At least it is a point of information, so there was awareness of the process and what was happening. Technically, they could do that but that would be in an undesirable form, for a lot of reasons because it was against the faculty will and that was part of why it would be prevented at Faculty Senate so we could find out how faculty felt about it.

Hvastkovs: He added that he also made a comment to the university attorney and others that this is not the normal process.

Bae: She asked why they are fixated on the AIV policy. This was all proposed, voted on by the committee, and voted on by the Faculty Senate prior to the current administration. Wondered if this is the start of the rest of the changes.

Hvastkovs: They mentioned the process gets moved through this way because it is tied to the University of North Carolina Policy 700.4.1, which discusses student conduct, and that is why the attorneys need to get involved. However, the University of North Carolina Policy 700.4.1.1 states that academic matters are not student conduct matters and, therefore, the attorneys cannot get involved. However, the attorneys argued that this leaves us open to being sued.

Ticknor: She found that during the program review of OSRR, a comment about the location of the policy came up. The question was whether can it be in both locations or was the recommendation it should be one place over the other; Dr. Hardy, back in April 2022, said that she didn't know and that she'd get back to Dr. Ticknor – she still hasn't seen the program review nor she got the answer to that question.

One point of contention is the location of the policy: Who can find it and who can access it easily? The argument is that the students are unable to find it, which is argumentative. They

could easily put on the OSRR's website, which they have a link to. They could keep the graphic chart that they have and use plain language in some ways as well, in addition to the link to the policy.

The other question was about when did this happen? During the meeting she and Dr. Hvastkovs had with Provost Cogger and GC Zigas, she found that all the edits were made before Provost Cogger joined ECU so it happened between April 2022 and July 11. It is unclear who made the comments because she was never told exactly who, but the Provost didn't make the comments.

Hvastkovs: He asked if there is anything else the administration would like to change in addition to this.

Ticknor: No, but added that we are in a holding pattern. There were four items that went through Faculty Senate back in April 2022 that have been held up for various reasons. The AIV policy is the most tension-filled one because it is not following the process.

Matthews: She asked if it is still worth gathering more faculty input.

Ticknor: She asked to bring it to the floor. Talk to the college senators about writing a statement if that's how you all operate. If the senators or the ARP committee could gather faculty opinions and statements, share them with the speaker, the more, the better.

Hvastkovs: He was meeting with the group on Wednesday; do we add a non-negotiable list that they wanted and let them write it, or do we not participate?

It is challenging because he had met with her multiple times to fix the last version, but then now it is like it never happened. He would refer back to the multiple meetings by stating this is what we had to address; you said this; we addressed it here.

They never came out to say that they want to make this a PRR; rather, they state that let's try to work together on a policy. When Dr. Hvastkovs pointed out that the ARP committee had already been working on the policy and it needed a minor revision, it is never realized that we worked on this before.

Bae: She asked if Dr. Ticknor would like to hear from individual faculty or from unit senators

Ticknor: She answered that either way works, as it is helpful when she meets with the senior administration.

Ticknor left the meeting

Wagoner: She suggests the ARP committee issue a statement, and she could share it with her unit senators because this is frustrating.

Murphy: She expressed her concerns; the ARP committee's recommendations and the work the committee has done have been overlooked for some reasons. She supports issuing a statement as a committee.

Hvastkovs: He offered that he could send an update on Wednesday about what the work group had discussed and then he would draft the statement to share.

Hvastkovs: He shared that they dwell on the University of North Carolina Policy 700.4.1, which discusses student conduct; however, the University of North Carolina Policy 700.4.1.1 states that academic integrity violation issues are not a student conduct matter.

*Discussion Item #2: transfer student requirements based on incoming credits*

Hvastkovs: He shared that UNCG has a policy with different foreign language requirements for students transferring 60/90 hours. For example, if a student brings 90+ credit hours, the requirement is waived. He asked if any programs at ECU had any policies similar to this.

Asby: In general, transfer students and transfer credits are big deals, so they would be able to find cases if they would like.

Hvastkovs: He pointed out that his intention was not to upset the foreign language department; rather, he would like to know if this is possible in anywhere.

Anderson: Writing intensive requirements is complicated because there is another committee that has oversight of the requirement, and they have recently revised a lot of requirements in the last few years.

She is hesitant to have a different degree requirement for a transfer student than those who spend four years with ECU. ECU has made a name by saying that online degrees are the same as in-classroom degrees. She shared that her office regularly gets petitions for waiving requirements and others, but it is outside of the norm.

Hvastkovs: He mentioned that he wanted to share this because UNCG is one of our competitors. He asked if there was anything that would facilitate more people coming to ECU and if we lose the competition to UNCG because of this.

Anderson: She answered that she didn't know that ECU loses to UNCG right now as much as ECU does to some of the other competitors in the system. She shared that UNCG's enrollment is down just as ECU so UNCG is trying different strategies to address that.

She mentioned that ECU being able to bring more than 18% out-of-state will be a bigger thing to help us. ECU is struggling with App State and WCU, the promise schools that \$500 tuition is good, however, their fees are higher than ECU.

Asby: He shared that it has become apparent that it is a competition point across the nation where transfer students are trying to be educated but they are trying to see how many credit hours are accepted when they do. ECU allows transfer students, if they are interested in certain academic programs, to come and have a lot of their credit used. However, there is a big difference between credit accepted and credit applied. UNCG might be going to get into the same situation where they are taking all the credits but it is unclear whether the transferred hours are actually being used as applied credit for completion or not.

Hvastkovs: He mentioned that the ARP committee worked on some policies, such as English credit. He asked if there was anything that the committee could take a look.

Anderson: This would involve another committee, and the general education requirements has been revised in the last 10 years. However, ECU still have more Gen Ed requirements than other schools in the system.

Hvastkovs: He stated that other schools in the system require 30-35 whereas ECU requires 40 credit hours for Gen Ed.

Anderson: There are two classes that our accreditors don't require that are required Gen Ed classes for every single student. In conclusion, ECU requires more Gen Ed classes than other sister schools.

Hvastkovs: He shared that they are Kinesiology class and Health 1000. He initially thought it was one 3-credit hour class, so ECU requires a random elective – is it needed?

Anderson: For SACS requirements, it is not required.

Hvastkovs: He asked if ECU states that Gen Ed is 37 credit hours (if the elective gets deleted) instead of 40, it would be better.

Asby: There are academic programs that truly do not give electives, and it is tough. He believes forcing it into certain categories is less attractive than a general elective. A general elective would allow a student to take something they really are interested in versus a set of categories that they may not be.

Wagoner: She stated that her program has a one-hour free elective; all ensembles are one hour so students end up just taking another ensemble because it is the only one-hour class they could find. She doesn't think it is good for them; she wishes music students had more space than the curriculum to breathe.

Hvastkovs: He mentioned that he was trying to think of ways to make it more palatable for students to want to come to ECU.

Meeting Adjourned at 4:47pm.