

ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
September 15, 2021
Zoom Meeting from 2-3 p.m.

Members Present: Keith Goyne (Chair), Cassandra Garcia, Kimberly Smith,
Susan Sumner

Members Absent: Robin Panneton (on research leave), Keith Thompson

Recorder: Arlice Banks, Executive Administrative Assistant, College of Natural Resources
and Environment

Keith Goyne, Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

I. Review and Vote Upon

- A. Before the meeting, the committee received a copy of Draft 9, containing comments received from Rachel Holloway and Steve Capaldo. There were no items to vote upon.

II. Review and Approve Agenda

- A. The agenda was approved without modification.

III. Notifications

- A. Arlice will work with Sheila Collins to determine the availability of Rachel Holloway and Rick Sparks to attend a meeting in the near future.
- B. Due to delays in receiving comments on Draft 9 from University Legal Counsel, the committee has not scheduled a second meeting with campus partners across the university. Campus partners will be invited to attend a committee meeting this semester to ensure that everyone has an opportunity to provide input into this process by reviewing a draft document a second time. Individuals who cannot attend the meeting will be asked to provide written feedback.

IV. New Business

- A. Page 1, Comment from Steve Capaldo: Steve is concerned about sharing confidential, particularly mental health, information among the committee members.
 - 1. The comment was made that people need to see the process in action to understand how confidential information is protected.
 - 2. Members felt that the last paragraph from Section 3.1—Relief Request Form and Submission of Request should have addressed Steve’s concern, “Importantly, the process shall limit the sharing of medical, disability, and other private information to only the campus entity selected by the student to review their compassionate relief request.”

3. Since Steve's uneasiness regarding sharing confidential information was noted, perhaps it would be advantageous to incorporate the wording from Section 3.1 into Section 1.0—Purpose so that confidentiality is mentioned sooner rather than later in the policy.
 4. In Section 3.2.5, it was suggested to change “and associated materials” to providing a definitive list of materials that would or would not be reviewed.
- B. Page 1, Comment from Steve Capaldo: Steve believes that the committee has an arbitrary vote to allow a student to return after receiving relief, which he believes should not be in the committee's purview, but up to the student and one or more of the campus entities.
1. The committee believes that Section 3.2—Comment, Review and Approval Process, Number 5, maybe the source of Steve's concern, “The Compassionate Relief Committee shall also determine the need to prohibit a student from enrolling in an upcoming semester and placement of an academic hold on the account of students granted relief.”
 2. It was suggested that the following language be added to Section 3.2—Comment, Review and Approval Process, Number 5, so that the last sentence reads, “The Compassionate Relief Committee shall also determine the need to prohibit a student from enrolling in an upcoming semester and placement of an academic hold on account of students granted relief with a strong weight on recommendations from support offices that have reviewed the case.”
- C. Page 1, Comment from Rachel Holloway: Rachel wonders about situations where a student fails to take required/recommended steps or accommodations as guided by a campus entity to address what might be an ongoing issue, or student does not seek/continue in recommended treatment.
1. It was suggested that we change the sentence to read, “...there shall be no limitation on the number of times a student can apply for compassionate relief; however, consideration of subsequent requests for academic relief after the first request will take account of the student's responses to required or recommended stipulations of prior academic relief.”
- D. Page 2, Comment from Rachel Holloway: Rachel asked that the committee consider rewording paragraph six, Section 2.0—Policy, to include the stipulation that a student must work with the campus entity and use its accommodations in the subsequent semester.
1. Rachel suggested using the following wording, “...a student's relief request may establish expectations related to the academic relief request, including prohibiting students from enrolling in the next academic semester if, in their professional judgment, it is determined that the student would be best served by time away from their academic studies.”

2. The committee agreed that it is appropriate for the supporting unit to place expectations on student that enhance student success and address root causes associated with the student's challenges . Rachel's suggestion was made.
- E. Page 3, Comment from Rachel Holloway: Rachel wants to clarify when the student provides additional information or documentation to the campus entity
1. In Section 3.2—Comment, Review, and Approval Process, Number 4, Rachel thought it might be confusing when the student provides additional information or documentation if requested by the campus entity.
 2. If the process is built correctly, there is no reason why a student shouldn't submit all information at the start of the process. Steps can be built in to protect the flow of confidential information. However, students often do not include all information required at the beginning of the process, so follow-up by the campus entity is always possible.
 3. The committee agreed that the existing wording is concise as written, and no modifications were made. The campus entity is responsible for contacting the student to request additional information or documentation as needed.
- V. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 2:42 p.m.