

Academic Assembly
June 1, 2015
2:05 – 3:35pm, STCN 130

MINUTES

Present: David Arnesen, Sarah Bee, Patricia Buchsel, Terri Clark, Brooke Coleman, Lynn Deeken, Bill Ehmann, Meg Green, Mike Huggins, Chuck Lawrence, Margit McGuire, 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 institute leave of absence or hardship withdrawal
 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 (made this year) allow students to identify a preferred provider for mental health assessment – university can veto decision if there is a pre-existing 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 behavior (does this include participating in protest?)
 - b. Why include disruptive behavior instead of just threat to self or others (not included in policy of other institutions)?

- 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 oppositions or abstentions
 - C. Far right column NWCCU authorizations – does not need vote but should have an in depth conversation next year about issues this raises for SU
- IV. Discussion of Items for the AcA End of Year Report**
- A. Divestment
 - B. Ombuds charter
 - C. Financial transparency
 - D. Handbook approval and work done by committee
 - E. AcA participation on Board of Trustee subcommittees
 - F. Program reviews
 - 1. Numerical counting of new programs and reviews
 - 2. Time spent on process discussion
 - 3. Working on relationship between program review and financial analysis
 - G. Increased membership by two part time faculty
 - H. Ongoing governance reform
- V. Discussion of Agenda Items for Next Year**
- A. Ongoing spreadsheet with items
 - B. Other suggestions can go to Rob
 - C. Offer schedule to President for meetings
 - D. Send AcA reps to Cabinet, as invited
 - E. Stress resumption of governance reform process
 - F. New finals policy proposal at next meeting
 - G. AcA representative on GEC at next meeting
- VI. Executive Session**