

MINUTES
College Senate Meeting
Friday, February 6, 2009

Attendees: Ed Kingston, Colleen Bishop, Aimee Dumaresq, Jennie Patteson, David Thompson, Yvonne Carey, Marie Melton, Bill Hurd, Anita Showers, Brian Wisniewski, Amy Gillespie, Kris Swanson, Andrew Smith, Rebecca Ward, Terry Clore, Pamela Frank, Bruce Glassco, Crystal Newell

The January minutes were approved with edits.

Introductions

Andrew Smith was introduced as the alternate for Laurie Thurneck.

Sex Offender Policy

Currently, PVCC has a set of working guidelines in place for when a sex offender applies. Our policy is that a student will be dropped from his/her classes but that an appeal can be made. We are now attempting to write a policy similar to Germanna's where a hold is placed at the time of the student's application. The student would then be required to meet with the Dean of Student Services, the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services, and the Safety and Security Officer. This group will then decide whether or not to allow the student to attend. If the student is denied admission, he/she can appeal, in which case the appeal will be heard by a committee.

During the past few weeks, the various Senate members edited the working draft written by Bruce Glassco via Google Docs. As a group, the Senate discussed people's individual questions and further edited the document. Sample questions included: 1.) Must we post a list of convicted sex offenders who attend PVCC on our web site? Yes, according to both state and federal law, we must have a page on our web site that lists all currently enrolled students who are convicted sex offenders. It would probably be linked off of the security page. We currently do not meet this requirement. 2.) What about online-only students; should we distinguish between on-campus and online students in the policy? No. These students have the potential to harass others (via e-mail, etc.) as well. 3.) Does the policy differentiate between credit and non-credit students, i.e. shouldn't all students be made to talk to Mary Lee Walsh? Yes. So therefore, the following sentence was added: "This policy applies to all applicants, whether taking credit or non-credit classes." 4.) Section 3.8, the wording "only be imposed" seemed very strong. Do we want to give the dean more latitude in the decision-making process? It was suggested to change 3.8 to "Denial of admission *should be imposed* if there..." 5.) It also was suggested that the definitions from section 4 be moved under section 1. 6.) Section 3.8, change "themselves" to "himself" and "herself" respectively.

If a student wishes to appeal an admission decision at Germanna, it is funneled through a committee. The same model is proposed here. The question is: should it be the Sexual Misconduct Committee or another newly made committee? If an Admissions Review Committee is formed, then it must be trained properly and have proper procedures in place. The consensus was that the Admissions Review Committee is more appropriate because that's what they are actually determining. Also, they can handle other issues.

Ed Kingston stressed that we as a College must provide due process to the students; we cannot over exert our authority and deny education to a student without proper evidence. This policy will ensure that students are treated fairly.

It was motioned that the draft be finalized and taken to the various constituencies, i.e. FPA, PASS, and SGA. These groups can then make suggestions. The Senate will make the final edits and present the policy to the administration.

College Council

The main purpose of the proposed College Council is to avoid having the standing committees send policies/minutes through the Senate. These items would be sent directly to the president. The College Council would only focus on college-wide issues. Proposals and issues brought up by the newly formed Faculty Senate, PASS, and SGA would be funneled through the College Council for consideration. The major concern right now with the Senate is that it seems redundant. Why rehash policies when a committee of "experts" already has discussed the issue.

Some on the Senate agree; the Senate is, in fact, redundant. It also can make the approval process much longer than necessary. Others felt that as a group of diverse representatives, everyone's voice is heard and other perspectives are brought to the table. Often times, good things come out of the revision process. With the current Senate, every constituency/group gets a chance to see a policy before it is approved. The Senate is a cross-cut of the College. One may argue that a committee could have an agenda; the Senate ensures that each group is taken into consideration. Also, sometimes students are not adequately represented on standing committees. With the Senate, we have a number of student representatives from SGA; we are ensuring that the student voice is heard.

Bruce Glassco commented on the fact that if the College Council only acts on policies brought forth by FPA, PASS, and SGA, then it may not meet often. The College Council may become obsolete.

Questions put forth before the Senate members included: Is the entire governance structure broken? Will participation increase with the new proposed structure?

More information will be forthcoming once the Executive Committee meets to discuss the topic further.

Adjournment. Meeting adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

The next meeting will be held at 2:00 p.m. on Friday, March 6, 2009.

Submitted by,
Crystal Newell