

MINUTES
College Senate Meeting
Friday, December 5, 2008

Attendees: Anita Showers, Laurie Thurneck, David Thompson, Bruce Glassco, Ed Kingston, Brian Wisniewski, Freycinef Azo, Andrew Williams, Aimee Dumaresq, Amy Gillespie, Kris Swanson, Jennie Patteson, Crystal Newell

The November minutes were approved unanimously.

Senate Bylaws

As of the beginning of the Senate meeting, 12 senators had responded to the below proposal to change the bylaws (of the responding, all 12 had voted yes). Since a two-thirds majority of all senators is needed to pass a resolution, additional senators voted during the meeting. To expedite the vote, Anita Showers, Brian Wisniewski, Freycinef Azo, and Andrew Williams all voted. The proposal passed with a two-thirds majority (16 of 20 Senators). The next steps will be to notify Scott and to have the Web site changed.

A motion was made to change the bylaws to the following:

Meetings of the Senate are ordinarily open to members and invited guests. All other inquiries should be directed to the Office of Marketing and Media Relations.

C&I Policy

The Developmental Education Program policy will replace the current At Risk Student Policy and Procedure. The only addition to the current policy is number nine. The C&I committee discussed number eight and decided that adding “the consent of the both the instructor and the at-risk advisor” was advisable instead of not allowing at-risk students to enroll at all. This policy also made the procedures more clear.

The Senate suggested various edits, including: under Guidelines, #6, changing the SVD to SDV; #9, remove the quotation marks. Under Procedure, pg. 1 #1 add a hyphen to at-risk; #1, pt. f, there needs to be an ending parentheses; pg. 3 #6 change follow on to follow-up AND the following sentence to “Report on Assessment and Plan (e.g., Student Agreement for Academic Coaching) is sent to Counselor and becomes part of the Student Action Plan.”; pg. 3 #8, sentence should read: “Counselor discusses learning strategies inventory, the student’s progress, addresses concerns, offers encouragement.”

The Senate suggests that a decision be made between the terms “at-risk advisor” and “counselor”. Consistency throughout the document also should be a priority. As for preferences, the Senate suggests “counselor”.

The Senate approves the policy with suggested edits and with the assumption that the clarification and changes will be made by the committee.

Sex Offender Policy

The Executive Committee met with the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services to discuss the writing of the Sex Offender Policy. The Senate is tasked with writing this new policy for the entire school. Currently, there are working guidelines in place that resemble several other VCCS college policies; however, the only mandate the college must follow is the *Code of Virginia*. The VCCS also does not have a system wide policy; there is no uniformity across the colleges. For instance, some schools allow sex offenders to attend while being monitored, others denied sex offenders acceptance. Under PVCC's current policies/guidelines, sex offenders take classes.

The Sex Offender Policy must be written this academic year. So, Ed Kingston, chair, asked the Senate members, how do we proceed? Bruce Glassco suggested getting feedback from other organizations, e.g. FPA, PASS, and SGA. Others suggested having a subcommittee begin the process, or an individual, or the having the Senate work on it as a team. Again, however, time is an issue.

Questions arose as to the extent of the Senate's responsibility. Is the Senate responsible for the policy and the procedures? The Executive Committee felt the administration wanted the Senate to write both portions of the policy but would check with Kathy Hudson.

The Sex Offender Policy deals with possible students attending on-campus classes. The concern is that we have dual-enrollment students as young as 12 on campus.

The following ideas were considered for inclusion in the policy: notifying the faculty? Dropping the student and allowing them to appeal? Outlining guidelines for the Sexual Misconduct Committee? Evaluating each student on a case-by-case basis? Limiting sex offenders to online classes or more suitable programs?

A big question arose as to whose responsibility it will be? That is, does the responsibility lay with the student to appeal? Or, do we initiate a counseling session before they register for classes? It was suggested that when a student's application is flagged, we put a hold on his/her record preventing him/her from registering. It is preferable to use blocked instead of dropped. It is synonymous with our other procedures and less intimidating to the student. The only question may be how soon are we notified by the state after the student applies? Is it soon enough to block him/her from registering?

In an effort to move forward, a subcommittee volunteered to prepare options or general descriptions of a policy. The subcommittee consists of Bruce Glassco, Andrew Williams, and Aimee Dumaresq. It was suggested that a counselor be asked to join the subcommittee due to the nature of the policy.

The next meeting will be held at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, January 17, 2009.

Submitted by,
Crystal Newell