Academic Assembly

June 1, 2015   David Neel, Erik Olsen, Katherine
Raichle, Roshanak Roshandel, Rob Rutherford, Heath Spencer, John Strait, Dan Washburn
Minutes taken by Rosa Hughes

I.   Review of 5-18-15 Minutes
    A.   Edits
        1.   VIII.A.2. remove "based on GPA"
        2.   VIII.C.1. replace "deans" with "colleges/schools"
        3.   VIII.C.5. replace "treated" with "funded"
        4.   VIII.C. 6. Remove "Division 1"
    B.   Approved with one abstention

II.   Discussion of Involuntary Leave Policy (Michele Murray, Mary Peterson)
    A.   AcA wished to discuss informational with Student Development
    B.   Overview
        1.   Context
            a.   Policy is over 10 years old
            b.   Part of larger support system for students of concern
            c.   Updated in conjunction with the DoE Office of Civil Rights earlier this year
        2.   System of Student Support
            a.   Starfish reporting software that loops in academic advisors
            b.   Students of Concern Committee (SOCC) – tracks students with behavioral concerns
            c.   Threat Assessment Team – when student poses acute threat to institution
        3.   Intervention for Medical Crises
            a.   Students experiencing serious health crisis (pose immediate threat to own health, have intention and means to harm self or others)
            b.   Dean of Students in consultation with SOCC, associate dean, student, and family will
        4.   Involuntary Leave Policy
            a.   Avenue of last resort
            b.   Enacted in rare instance when student poses immediate threat but student and family deny mental health crisis
            c.   Amendment (assess this year) allows university to identify a preexisting mental health (mass this year) allows student to identify a preferred provider to relationship (e.g., parent acting as psychologist)
    C.   Discussion
        1.   Concern with faculty involvement in policy
            a.   In I.A., faculty member is required to report disruptive be

      c.   Why not include more faculty involvement in process (Cornell and Columbia include faculty advisors in the decision-making)?

2. Background – SU had a case involving this policy open for several years, after which the Department of Education recommended SU make clarifying changes to the policy and distribute the updated policy to the campus at large
3. Process does say other individuals as may be appropriate – there may be situations where the concern about the student came forward because of a faculty member, who would then be included in the discussion
4. Not designed to speak to political protest, etc., addresses behavioral health issue that disrupts the classroom environment
5. Do not intend this policy to become a substitute for policies that deal with behavior issues that are not mental or physical health related
6. Request to include language that explicitly mentions faculty member involvement in process
7. Schools with professional programs have professional codes of conduct that allow faculty to adjudicate classroom/professional disruptive and behavioral issues but this policy speaks to much more serious and timely threats

III. Chart of Authorizations
    A. Addition of line items 16 and 18 – suspension of programs recommendatory by AcA
    B. Motion to approve chart with proposed added lines
       1. Approved with no oppositionthc 0 fo 3.3(t)-5.9h Tc 0)-4.3(i)7.6()-9f(n)-03C /LBody 3.3(t)- 10.043 0 Td(8.28