The regular meeting of University Senate was called to order by Chair Harrison at 3:05 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9, 2006 in the Tamarack Room of Davies Center.

I. Minutes of April 25, 2006 University Senate meeting approved as distributed
   Minutes of April 24, 2006 University Academic Staff meeting approved as distributed
   Minutes of April 24, 2006 University Faculty meeting approved as distributed

II. Chancellor’s Remarks – Chancellor Larson
   • Highlights from Board of Regents meeting last week – details on website
   • Held lengthy discussion linking Plan 2008 to Growth Agenda – President Reilly has three goals
     1) Produce more state citizens with four year college degrees
     2) Use university resources to attract baccalaureate degree holders to Wisconsin from other states
     3) Grow number of jobs that can keep Wisconsin competitive in 21st Century
   • Patti See, UW-Eau Claire Senior Student Services Coordinator for Academic Skills Center, received Regents Academic Staff Excellence Award
     • Gave fabulous acceptance speech
     • Stop and congratulate her
   • Number of budget initiatives discussed
     • Growth agenda
     • Workforce development
     • Chippewa Valley NanoSTEM
       • Regional collaborative effort between UW-Eau Claire, UW-Stout and Chippewa Valley Technical College
       • In area of sciences, technology, engineering and math
       • See more as workforce development, but is also growth agenda item
     • Nursing shortage
     • Teacher education in sciences
     • Wisconsin Covenant
     • Veterans tuition remission
   • Audit of student segregated fees determined all schools in compliance
• Is debate on how students should vote on increasing segregated fees – whether should be elected body or full student body voting
• Chancellor car allowances eliminated; will provide leased vehicles for each chancellor
• Collectively system gave up over 200 administrative positions in last biennium; UW-Eau Claire met request by reducing 10 FTE
• Education Committee
  • Now bachelor of liberal arts for teachers at UW-Parkside
  • UW-Milwaukee to have PhD in social work; Milwaukee will probably continue to come forth with another dozen or so PhD requests
• Governor came and talked about Wisconsin Covenant
  • Encourages students starting in eighth grade to keep college as part of agenda for future
  • Sign covenants that if they take college preparatory courses, stay out of trouble, earn a B average and graduate, state will supply appropriate finances to pursue college education
• Has been pleasure and honor to serve as interim chancellor – don’t ever forget this is remarkable university
• Work done here by faculty and staff daily exemplifies our motto of excellence
• Has been energizing, rewarding and enlightening 15 months; have loved being here
• Thank each and every one of you and wonderful administrative team for collectively keeping momentum going; hopefully nothing dropped between cracks
• Have chosen great new chancellor to lead you into future
• Know you will meet new challenges and maintain marks of excellence
• Caveat to you is not to become complacent because of excellence; encourage you to increase nimbleness and flexibility
• Will deeply miss people here and great university, but not the job

THANKS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE presented to Interim Chancellor Larson in sincere appreciation for her valuable contributions to UW-Eau Claire during this important transition period.

III. Chair’s Report – Chair Harrison
• Chancellor signed off on modifications to senate-recommended 2006-2007 Comprehensive Salary Plan
• Chancellor considered our resolution and one from student ad hoc subcommittee regarding smoking
  • Determined changes in smoking regulations should be implemented not later than June 1, 2006
  • Changes include
    • Courtyard connecting Davies, Mc Intyre Library, Schofield, and Old Library designated nonsmoking area
    • New designated smoking entrances will be identified for Schofield Hall and Library
    • All entrances to Davies considered nonsmoking with exception of veranda at east end upper level near Council Fire Room, south entrance to Marketplace on lower level, and loading dock
  • Appropriate signage, such as smoke free zones, will be developed
  • Enforcement will depend upon cooperation of smokers and nonsmokers
• Please return Senator Interest Surveys – information helpful to Nominating Committee in early fall
• Senate Committee chairs please submit copies of minutes of all meetings held this year to Senate Office
• Greatly appreciated opportunity to work this semester in Office of Student Development and Diversity as Acting Associate Dean of Student Development
  • Learned and experienced much while serving as campus judicial officer and heading up projects
  • Observed extensive hours invested by support services to enable students to be physically and emotionally ready to attend our classes
    • By Students with Disabilities Office, Academic Skills Center, University Police, Housing and Residence Life, Advising, and especially Counseling Services
  • While many of our students would make it on their own, many would not without this extended support
  • Amount of support offered our students at UW-Eau Claire to help them become successful is incredible
• Express sincere gratitude to Vice Chair Gapko for making arrangements to serve as acting chair
• Thank senators with terms expiring for their services – some may be reelected
  • Mitchell Freymiller – Biology
  • Daniel Stevenson – Computer Science
  • Alex Smith – Mathematics
  • Barbara Lozar – Psychology
Nola Schmitt – Family Health Nursing  
Leslie Foster – Library Services  
Margaret Devine – Accounting and Finance  
Debra Jansen – Adult Health Nursing  
Michael Wick – Computer Science  
Ann Hoffman – University Advancement  
Kristen Sandager – Health Services  
Daniel Drumm – Learning and Technology Services  
Bill Jacobsen – Career Services  
Sharon Westphal – Psychology  
Connie Russell – Records and Registration

IV. Faculty Representative’s Report – Senator Wick

- UW-System Compensation Advisory Committee met about pay plan issues
  - Passed out data; focused on faculty although data also available for academic staff
    - Of 32 institutions in peer group
      - UW-Eau Claire professors ranked 31st; $8000 below median
      - Associate professors ranked 29th; $5700 below median
      - Assistant professors ranked 25th; $3200 below median
    - Gets worse if look at AAUP or CUPA data
  - Salary plan strategy now to include multi-biennia plans, even though legislature cannot commit beyond current biennium
    - Plan is to reach median of peer group in three biennia – assumes we will receive 5.1% pay plan every year while peers receive 3.1% increase
  - Basic argument is need to be at median to compete in market for professors
    - Supported largely by anecdotal tales of people leaving for higher offers
    - Own data does not support claim as turnover in 2000 was 8.68% and in 2004 it was 7.37%
  - Pay plan policies likely to continue, although still under discussion, include: one-third rule; combined faculty, academic staff, and institution proposals; and chancellors’ ten percent discretionary fund
  - I voiced concerns on our behalf
    - Below median argument ineffective
      - Making that argument since 1991 hasn’t gotten us anywhere
      - Counterargument is someone has to be below median
    - Mass exodus argument not valid – less of us leaving now than six years ago
    - Growth agenda seems counter-intuitive given we can’t pay our current people or afford programs currently in place
    - Possible argument might be to tie pay plan to measures of performance negotiated with legislature
    - Comments and suggestions met with complete silence; appears will continue with median argument so would not count on 5.1% quite yet

- Board of Regents Meeting
  - Patti See did an outstanding job – blown away by her credentials and acceptance speech
  - Was also resolution of appreciation for our chancellor; she did fine job representing us to board
  - Was progress report on Plan 2008
    - Board had charged President Reilly with four things
      1) Adopting system-wide diversity accountability report card
      2) Instituting system-wide diversity award
      3) Holding chancellors accountable during salary and performance evaluations
      4) Accountability including both incentives and penalties for not reaching goals of Plan 2008
    - Board not pleased that partial progress on only one goal – we have developed an equity scorecard
    - Would expect to see more action in coming months
    - Considerable momentum to encourage DIN initiatives that tie into Plan 2008
  - UW growth agenda for Oshkosh presented – for total cost of $11.3 million, plan from 2007 to 2013 to increase
    - Student FTE by 12%
    - Degrees conferred by 10%
• Students of color by 75%
• Nontraditional students by 50%
• Approximately 50 FTE positions
• Chancellor car allowance dropped in favor of fleet rental – seems only making political statement as savings estimates anywhere from negative to $200/month because not clear on maintenance costs
• Distribution of delayed 2005-2006 pay plan for academic leadership approved so those funds finally released
• Remarks by Governor Doyle on Wisconsin Covenant with education as key to economic success of Wisconsin
  • When governor pushed about specifics of plan, response was highly educated people always turn simple things into complex things, just need to do it
• Responses to questions and comments from floor
  • Did discuss how many potential hires turn down positions at UW-System because of salary issue
    • Again anecdotal stories brought to table
    • Legislators, however, don’t care about quality argument and whether or not we get our first picks as long as someone fills positions
  • Was also discussion that people leaving are ones with most flexibility, that is fresh hires and that hiring process is expensive
    • Was no data supporting this one way or another although was some strong anecdotal evidence
  • Growth itself generates some of funding for growth agenda – increasing number of students increases tuition revenue
    • Oshkosh also appealing to system for additional GPR dollars
  • Number of universities are coming forward at front edge of growth agenda
    • Is concern that in end may be no dollars, but will still be told to grow
    • Legislators still saying there is no money to give
    • All initiatives together add up to about $85 million; with cost to continue of $80 to $90 million, don’t know where money for UW-System would come from when Wisconsin hovering around $1.6 billion deficit
  • Faculty at Oshkosh concerned about future and workload demands of initiative because already have course availability problems, growing classes and budget cuts
• Report on System Advisory Committee on Compensation – Vice Chair Gapko
  • Is much less information available about how academic staff faring
  • Have asked for more information for fall meeting before we make recommendations about pay plan for next biennium
  • New data show academic staff slightly more than 23% behind peers across nation
  • Staying coupled with faculty because think that is best way to be funded – would be worse off if decoupled
  • Now 13% more behind than when title structure first established in 1989 – keep trying to address shortfall, but don’t seem to have way to do that
• Responses to comments and questions from floor
  • Analysis for salaries vs. cost of living in western Wisconsin has been done
    • Percentages vary from 9% behind with cost of living adjustment to 11% behind without

V. Academic Staff Representative’s Report – No Report

VI. Announcements
• Reception for chancellor will be on May 10, 2006
• First meeting of fall semester will be on September 12, 2006

VII. Unfinished Business
A. Second Reading – Motion from Academic Staff Subcommittee of Executive Committee
  Modified Academic Staff Review of Performance Senate Action
Continued Debate
• None

Vote on Motion 42-AH-01: Motion PASSED by University Academic Staff senators.

B. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
  Promotion Criteria Approval
Continued Debate

- My department against motion
  - Various reasons best summed up by DPC ought to be able to come up with consensus document everyone could agree on so shouldn’t have minority so opposed to document that necessary to forward minority report
  - Adding extra bureaucracy since people now can go and have private conversations about document

Vote on Motion 42-FP-03: Motion DEFEATED by vote of 9 for, 20 against by University Faculty senators.

C. Second Reading – Motion from Budget Committee

Budget Committee Functions

Continued Debate

- Report from Senate Executive Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
  - Motion referred to Executive Committee at first reading
  - By consensus, committee recommended changing order of first sentence to read:
    The Budget Committee serves as a liaison to Faculty and Academic Staff to disseminate budget related information, investigates any matters of concern related to the University budget, and serves as an advisory group to the Vice Chancellor for Business and Student Services.
  - Without objection, revised wording accepted

- Speak against motion – original wording talks about investigating and initiating budget proposals, recommending priorities for existing and new programs, review of current budget allocations and existing budget policies
  - Worried new language codifies current practice of committee
  - Have been on committee, know how it works – largely as rubber stamp and mostly setting planning reserve
  - In decades past, committee more aggressive at policy formation and allocation
    - Faculty development funds available on campus initiated by Budget Committee
    - Would rather keep option open to regain interest and enthusiasm in future
  - By going to this wording, Budget Committee would be able to investigate when necessary, which reflects what committee doing right now, instead of “continuously investigating”
  - Part of intent of reworking committee function was to let people who are elected to committee know they are not actually going to make decisions on how money is spent
  - Being honest about committee functions
  - Series of clauses at end of functions paragraph allows for expanding role of committee if occasion should arise
  - Like list of other responsibilities that may be included at end of paragraph
    - Also would like to see us retain Budget Committee as strong senate committee
    - Sister institutions are across the board from campuses where Budget Committee is very active and makes recommendations on budget changes and allocations to other campuses where doesn’t seem to be budget committee at all
    - Maybe should just incorporate phrases at end into current functions rather than writing new one that says we aren’t doing much
  - Even if pass motion today, as constitutional change would have to be ratified by University Faculty and University Academic Staff

MOTION by Senator Gapko to refer the motion back to the newly formed Budget Committee in fall to consider again seconded.

Debate

- Budget Committee spent lot of time discussing whole issue
  - Really not much we can do
  - If money were to become available, function is set up with language to deal with that
  - Will vote against this

Motion DEFEATED.

Continued Debate on Main Motion

- Current way committee operates does not limit way committee can operate
Perhaps 30 years ago, this was very dynamic committee that made initiatives and proposals
Never will be in position of making decisions, nor should it be, but committee could be much more proactive
Would like to leave door open for us to become more proactive with proposals

Vote on Motion 42-BC-01: Motion PASSED by vote of 26 for, 13 against as amended. It will be taken before entire University Faculty and Academic Staff for ratification.

D. Second Reading – Motion from Technology Committee
Single Standard for Clickers

Continued Debate
• None

Vote on Motion 42-TC-01: Motion PASSED by vote of 29 for, 12 against.

E. Second Reading – Motion from Faculty Personnel Committee
Chairs as Tie-Breakers

Amendment 42-FP-04-a1:
Amendment proposed by Faculty Personnel Committee by a vote of 6 for, 0 against to insert additional language in the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook, Chapter 5, page 10 as follows:

To be considered a positive recommendation (e.g., supportive of reappointment, tenure, or promotion), a simple majority of the voting members must vote for the action (more votes “for” than votes “against”). Subject to the qualification immediately below, any personnel action that does not have a simple majority of the voting members voting for the action (either a tie or more votes “against” than votes “for”) is considered a negative recommendation (e.g., against reappointment, tenure, or promotion). However, when a vote on a tenure-related action results in a tie vote and the department chair recommends tenure, the department’s recommendation is positive, as per UWEC 3.08, Granting Tenure (FASH 5.25).

• Not amending language of motion, amending motion to make changes to a second paragraph in handbook
• Without objection, changes to second paragraph brought into debate

Continued Debate of Amended Motion
• Coming from professions, hate to see anybody get fired, but in looking at politics of situation, would like to point out three things
  1) Motion would set up department where half of tenured faculty don’t want this person; will be in situation for years to come
     • Not sure you are doing person a favor
  2) With decision going to chair, half of faculty will be thoroughly convinced own chair made wrong decision
     • Not good place to be as chair
  3) Then decision goes to dean
     • Under present circumstances if positive decision comes forward from department, dean’s role is to decide whether departmental evaluation plan (DEP) adequately and appropriately followed
     • In situation where DPC is split and chair tips balance, can dean reasonably make decision that DEP followed, but half of people on DPC didn’t agree with following DEP
     • Poses problems up line
• Provost opposes motion – granting tenure one of most important decisions faculty ever make as results in lifetime employment
• Believe tie should be considered negative vote – tie vote casts too many doubts for lifetime appointment
• Ability to break tie vote gives chair more power than individual faculty members on DPC
  • State law clear that department casts first vote for tenure
  • This university defined department as DPC and made choice that chair not a member of DPC; most UW campuses include chair as member believing chair should have equal vote in all personnel decisions
  • Could think about making chair a DPC member in future; could still have tie votes, which should be treated as non-tenure votes – don’t think you want dean to break tie votes
• Do not see purpose for this motion – appears to be a solution in search of a problem
• Reviewed records for past 11 years; in 168 tenure decisions made at university, none resulted in tie vote
• Believe members of DPC fully aware of importance of tenure and purposely work hard not to put department in situation of tie vote
• Motion may give DPC incentive to avoid making difficult decisions; do not think DPC should abdicate responsibility

Appreciate comments on complicated issue
• Keep in mind motion not causing rift in department, but trying to resolve rift should it occur
• Issue was brought to committee
• No on tenure cases means done deal, except for appeals
  • Dean does not make decision now, nor under proposal
  • Is chancellor’s call, not dean, not provost
• Every member of DPC counts as one vote; chair, normally tenured member of department, would vote if not currently chair
  • Proposal just lets them use vote to benefit candidate – can’t force, can only break, ties
  • Chair would not have more power than DPC members
• Don’t know if would cause more tie votes; don’t think people who cannot come to agreement are likely to feel comfortable leaving it up to somebody whose opinion they do not know
• Committee would argue if vote is that close on such an important decision, should open up for larger input than just DPC
• DPC is most important personnel unit at university
  • In that department, may be living with tenured people for many decades
  • Believe with tie vote, dangerous to grant tenure
  • Still think tie vote should be negative as control for worst case scenario
  • Can either make a mistake and tenure somebody who doesn’t deserve to be tenured, or somebody who should have gotten tenure is turned away
  • First case has longest and worst implications for institution
• Deferring decision and gathering greater input as case moves up line toward chancellor means input is farther away from department where it belongs; oppose motion
• Department opposed motion because if someone can only garner a tie, they shouldn’t be brought forward
• That chair would normally be on DPC not always case; occasionally deans appoint outside chairs for limited periods of time
  • In that case, putting tie-breaking vote in hands of someone not in field; could create conflict
• Could also conceivably have nontenured chair making tenure decision which flies in face of whole tenure process; at least would need to amend motion for those situations
• Favor motion
  • Understand and appreciate that chair from outside discipline may lack discipline-specific knowledge to make decision; in case like that is good idea to get more information
• Already have situation of small departments with no DPC where functional equivalent makes decisions
  • Seems unfair that in some departments chair acts as functional equivalent of DPC and in others completely blocked off from decision
• Important to get more information in close cases and this is one way to go about that
• Favor motion – keep in mind this is just an option for chair
  • Tie vote in DPC does not necessarily mean half of tenured members in department don’t support tenure; chair could be tenured and then majority of tenured faculty could approve candidates but it will not matter since chair has no voice
  • Proposal allows to move this along and have more information – don’t see any dangers
• If tie vote in department was based on something ideological or illegal prejudicial reasoning, chair would be able to advocate for person and go forward despite DPC tie vote
• If DPC votes for tenure, law allows chancellor and Board of Regents to say no
  • Is state ruling that if DPC says no, chancellor or Board of Regents cannot give positive vote except under extraordinary circumstances, which has not happened since law enacted
  • Are cases where persons denied tenure appealed and were awarded tenure through due process
• Issue brought to Faculty Personnel Committee by Chair Harrison as result of questions brought to Senate Office
• Committee then determined to bring item forward to senate
• Seems probationary faculty member has job of making case to DPC
  • If there is a tie vote, that case has not been made
  • If want to put chair on DPC, go ahead, but tie vote, which means not receiving a majority vote should be a negative tenure decision
• Argument that allowing chair this option would risk foisting an unfavorable candidate on department can be made for any due process appeals cases where persons denied tenure by department are granted it on appeal
• When have a tie vote on DPC, to say majority don’t support candidate not true in many cases where chair of department is tenured and supports tenure for candidate
  • Many arguments put forth that do not make logical sense
  • Believed on committee that when vote is tied, we ought to error on side of allowing chancellor to weigh in
  • Hearing from number of senators that when vote of DPC tied, benefit of doubt should not be given to candidate
  • That is philosophical difference
• Support motion because in case of tie, throwing out one person’s input who is probably a viable member of department doesn’t seem right
• Rationale as to why chair is not on DPC in first place might clarify some of current discussion
• Chairs are appointed and serve at discretion of deans; although we continue to see our chairs as part of faculty, truth is they have moved into administration
  • Can be question as to where allegiance lies and where best interests served
  • Easiest to charge DPC with making basic decisions in department with chair having right and duty to contribute opinion as action goes forward up chain of administration
• If it goes forward
  • From my department’s perspective, next year will make tenure decision and have outside chair
    • Possibly could have one, one and one vote so this is not theoretical; this could happen next year
  • To have chair in on decision as part of deliberation is fine, but to have chair make decisions outside deliberations in isolation of office is not
    • Will vote against because if can’t get simple majority in own department for tenure, don’t deserve to get tenure
• Anyone can abstain, but typically not recorded in minutes, person abstaining choosing not to participate in voting process
• Handbook is clear that tenured faculty member cannot refuse to serve on DPC
• If you are on sabbatical, you can still vote
• If your significant other is in same department, you can choose not to vote due to conflict of interest
• Chair as tie-breaker would happen subsequent to vote being taken by DPC
• Committee did look at possibility of chair being in DPC meeting
  • Intention was that since chair conducts independent review anyway, chair would not break ties by casting a vote, but would weigh in after vote and possibly send action forward

Vote on 42-FP-04: Motion DEFEATED by University Faculty vote.

VIII. Reports of Committees
❖ Executive Committee – Chair Harrison
  • At May 2, 2006 meeting, consultation on proposed name change from University Centers and Programs to University Centers held with Vice Chancellor Soll
    • No objections to change noted
  • After discussing Budget Committee functions, committee also provided comments to Jan Morse concerning proposed criminal conviction check policy
  • Next meeting will be September 5, 2006, when will discuss procedures for University Senate and University Senate Executive Committee
❖ Faculty Personnel Committee – Senator McAleer
  • Met May 8, 2006 and worked out amendment to motion just soundly defeated
  • Finalized recommendation to Interim Provost Tallant on advising as stand-alone category for evaluation
  • Discussed proposed policy on criminal conviction checks
  • No more meetings scheduled this year
❖ Academic Staff Personnel Committee – Senator Brockpahler
  • Met on April 27, 2006 to talk about UW-System Guidelines for Criminal Conviction Check Practices
Criminal conviction checks is new term used in criminal justice field for background checks
Passed two motions addressing practices
  • If practice of conducting checks adopted for positions not specifically addressed in policy, rationale should be carefully documented and methods to be used to assess whether an applicant’s criminal conviction substantially relates to duties and responsibilities of position clearly articulated
  • Timelines should be set at local level
    • When UW-Eau Claire creates local implementation guidelines, need timeline for applicants to dispute information discovered during criminal conviction check
    • Must provide sufficient time for potential employees to review report, collect supporting materials and respond to report before further action can be taken

♦ Academic Policies Committee – Senator McIntyre
  • Completed business for academic year today with reviews of Public Health Professions and Special Education Departments

♦ Physical Plant Planning Committee – Senator Russell
  • Met May 1, 2006 and drafted motion to be presented later this meeting
  • Ends business for year

♦ Budget Committee – Senator Gallaher
  • Last meeting of year on May 1, 2006; Dave Gessner reported on state of university budget
    • Left committee confident budget being well managed in time of shrinking funding

♦ Compensation Committee – Vice Chair Gapko
  • Meeting coming up next week
  • Academic Staff Subcommittee has report ready for committee to look at

♦ Nominating Committee – Senator Lo
  • No meetings scheduled at this time
  • Please complete survey so Nominating Committee will have something to work from when gathering nominations for senate elections in fall

♦ Technology Committee – Senator Duckworth-Lawton
  • Met on May 5, 2006 for last time this year
  • LTS Director Mey updated committee on GE wireless coverage and sound system
  • NET will take over instructional technology training as well as continuing pedagogy and academic training currently doing
    • Will facilitate linking pedagogy to instructional technology deployment in scholarship of teaching and learning
    • Also meant to improve classroom teaching and effective use of instructional technology
  • LTS will put meeting minutes on website for faculty and committee to look at
  • Number of Spectator reporters asking about clickers and other student media

IX. Special Reports – Update from Campus Civility Team – Chair Harrison
• Campus Civility Team received charge in February and worked hard during semester to accomplish goals
  • Campus civility website - http://www.uwec.edu/civility with some helpful links for instructors concerning
    • Email etiquette
    • Plagiarism – examples of what is and is not plagiarism
    • Respect for others
    • Sample syllabus information to help launch ideas about what you expect to happen in your classroom
      • By end of summer, site will have all information faculty and instructors asked to put on syllabi – including such things as diversity statements and handicapped information
      • By August, site will contain summaries of campus survey data
    • Please look for fun events coming this fall helping us share respect for one another

X. Miscellaneous Business
First Reading – Motion from Physical Plant Planning Committee
• Motion is result of presentations made to senate earlier – one involved concept of turning Putnam parking lot at base of hill into green space entrance to Putnam Park and possible outdoor classroom
  • This is committee proposal to address concern about loss of parking spaces if lot converted
Motion 42-PP-02

MOVED and seconded by Physical Plant Planning Committee (7 for, 0 against) that a plan for the establishment of a park entrance to Putnam Park in the present location of the Putnam Parking Lot be endorsed and advanced to the chancellor. To accommodate 42 lost parking spaces in the Putnam Lot, 56 of the 80 GF spaces in the Phillips lot should be reallocated to the metered spaces adjacent to Phillips Hall. Of the 56 ‘freed’ spaces, 42 will be assigned to Katharine Thomas and Putnam hall residents and the remaining allocated to handicap, faculty and students.

Debate

• Since this is last meeting of this session, motion can be referred to committee to keep it alive over summer, or be voted upon today by suspending rules
• Speak in opposition to motion on basis of action by United Hall Council, representative body of 4,000 students living on campus, unanimously against conversion of Putnam parking lot
  • Some concerns brought forward on April 4, 2006 addressed in improved motion here today; are several others that remain unaddressed
    • Move in and move out for 388 families of residents living there – fairly significant increase in distance from current parking to proposed parking
    • Eliminates all short-term parking in front of those buildings for pick-up and drop-off
    • Proposal does not adequately address lighting and safety concerns for walking in this area

MOTION by Senator Duckworth-Lawton that we suspend the rules to vote on this today seconded and PASSED by two-thirds vote.

Continued Debate on Motion

• Thought moving metered spaces would also reduce traffic backup in Phillips lot
• Are three components of comprehensive plan for this area
  1) Garfield Redevelopment
  2) Entrance to Putnam Park
  3) Parking
  • Committee bringing forward this part of plan to develop parking lot as park
    • Motion creates space for park and then allows Facilities Management to plan details – lighting, benches, tables, etc.
  • Motion mostly addresses parking to accommodate 42 spots eliminated by loss of Putnam parking lot
    • Committee looked at priority parking on campus
      • Handicapped parking would be top priority
      • Then guaranteed faculty and staff, followed by regular faculty and staff parking
      • Then students in dorms, then off-campus students
      • Finally short-term meters for dropping things off and lowest priority would be two-hour meters for people who don’t want to walk or don’t want to pay price for parking permits
    • Currently giving lowest priority prime parking spots; so reallocated parking to put guaranteed parking in prime spot, put students from residence halls in former GF spots, then moved excess students into new meters in Water Street parking lot
      • Water Street is lot everyone in community sees; because spots always available there, community does not see parking problem on campus
    • Lighting is same lighting students have to go through now to get to library, so any problem with lighting should be addressed
    • In regard to move-in day, could close down street to use for that, even if street is pedestrian mall
  • To clarify, will be drop-off and pick-up just like there is now; perhaps even more so if it is part of pedestrian mall
    • Revised plan not available April 4th when United Hall Council vote taken – this proposal took many of those concerns into account
    • Committee thought were being proactive in moving spots to Phillips lot – distance to residence halls not much different than distance from residence hall parking on upper campus
    • Would still have 20-minute drop-off area right outside Davies and also turnaround as approach footbridge on Garfield Avenue would remain available
    • Utilization of Water Street parking lot is great idea for long-term meters for students coming to campus for a few hours
Would reduce flow of traffic in Phillips lot due to back-up of cars with people trying to get to parking meters

Ayres proposals dealt purely with Garfield Redevelopment; this suggests further development to meet needs and have input from those who live and work on campus everyday

Sensitive to issues brought up by students; understand modification addresses some of those issues

Worried about rushing this through; plan to vote against because don’t see need to rush

Worried about trumpping students with valid concerns – parking at further distance, safety issues, lighting

Is also problem on other side of Phillips with sharp corner on road leading to parking lot – getting into and out of lot can also be nightmare – will be bigger problem when isn’t main road going up hill

Is no opportunity to widen street at that point; about only option would be looking at safety concerns and eliminating any standing or parking at corner

Are several things I like about this plan

Like leaving green space closer to Schofield Hall

Like idea of ramp coming straight off footbridge, but meeting ADA requirements for grade would put it awfully far into Schofield lawn

Also have concern that don’t have sidewalk directly in and out of Old Library – would like committee to look at that

Handicapped parking behind Putnam Hall is long ways from Katharine Thomas Hall, especially in winter – would like to see parking in front of two residence halls left there

Good ideas, but go beyond what proposing here

Looking at very important parcel of land that could be attractive entrance to park being used as parking

Making change would be improvement to campus

So changed priority for parking, reduced amount of coming and going through Phillips lot, move students a bit further away from dorms and put two-hour parking across river

People with GF permits do not leave cars there all day – reason to have GF permit is to allow leaving and returning to campus during day

Would still cause good amount of traffic in Phillips lot

Not sure unless campus commits to towing that $20 ticket will prevent students from using those spots

Not all people using paid parking here doing so to avoid buying permits (i.e. cheap, lazy, morally inferior)

Also used by those who have to leave campus, arrive after 7:30 a.m., or have short-term mobility problems

Have huge parking problem on campus related to assumption that people come in morning and leave at night when most of us really can’t do it that way

Students haven’t had enough time to get feel for this proposal which addresses some but not all of their concerns

Think we are transferring problem of meters; need to know who does use those metered spots

Have GF spot because supervise student teachers off campus – if get rid of two rows of meters in Phillips lot, would make huge difference in traffic flow in that lot

Many times prevented from getting out of or into GF spot because of long queue for metered spots

Overwhelmingly support proposal for doing two wonderful things

- Creates more green space in area where sciences can use campus
- Addresses major concern of parking in Phillips lot

MOVED by Senator Whitfield that the motion be referred to Physical Plant Planning Committee over the summer to be discussed and brought back next fall seconded and PASSED.

Without objection, meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Submitted by,

Wanda Schulner
Secretary to the University Senate