

university

# SENATE

October 18, 2006  
WS 218

Meeting convened at 3:30 p.m.

**Members present (alphabetical):**

Emilio Colcar, Jr. representing Rick Bassett, Jamie Begian, Cindy Chuang, Sara DeLoughy, Abe Echevarria, Robert Eisenson, Gancho Ganchev, Carol Hawkes, Karen Koza, Tara Kuther, Sam Lightwood, Susan Maskel, Allen Morton, Duane Moser, James Munz, John Murphy, Vijay Nair, Elizabeth Popiel, Jeffrey Schlicht, Cigdem Usekes, Lori Wagner, Robert Whitemore,

**Guests present:**

Provost Linda Rinker, Mary Beth Amyot, Neil McLaughlin

---

**I. ANNOUNCEMENTS:**

None

**II. MINUTES**

Minutes October 2006 have not yet been distributed

**III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Faculty on Committees**

Pres. Kuther: This item is a placeholder; we will return to it when we discuss the revision of the Nominations and Elections bylaws.

**B. University Policy and Procedure: Instructional Departments:**

Pres. Kuther: Dr. Munz notified me that they're not yet ready to discuss this item, so it will come up for the November meeting.

**C. Graduate Council Late-Registration fee**

Pres. Kuther: If you recall at the last meeting the discussion of the Graduate Council Annual Report centered on the late registration fee and its origins. I just distributed an email from Chris Shankle to myself regarding this and as you can see it says a motion to implement a late registration fee of \$50 was proposed and passed at the November 17, 2003 Graduate Council meeting. From there the proposal was submitted to the VP of Academic Affairs, (now the Provost), then to the VP of Finance (at that time Rich Sullivan) and then to the Board of Trustees for approval. Because of these steps needed for approval the late registration fee wasn't enacted until the Spring, 2006 semester. The rationale was the Grad Council felt that by imposing a late registration fee it would encourage students to register in a more timely manner and prevent

unneded course cancellation(s) as well as progress students through their programs without interruptions. So that would be the rationale. Any comments?

**Sen. Maskel** - I just wanted to say, it looks like it's too late because it's already passed all these places that it had to pass, but the Biology Dept. did talk about it and we were unanimously against this. Our graduate students are some of the culprits who register late and we don't think it's going to stop them from registering late and we don't think it's going to serve the purpose. What we think would be better, probably, is if the graduate students knew that they didn't have to pay exactly when they registered, that seems to be their hang up. They think that when they register they have to pay and they don't want to pay yet and therefore they don't register. So if somebody concentrated on that we think it would be better.

**Sen. Nair** – This was brought to the Senate in May, 2004 and the Senate was informed that a late registration fee would be charged and at that time the Committees' report suggested, more than suggested it said the thing would be in effect in the fall, 2004 semester. That committee was unaware, at that time, that it had to go through all these channels and then the Board of Trustees. So, the point is I did check the minutes of the Senate meeting from May, 2004 when this proposal was brought to us and there were no comments, so nobody said anything, so it is too late now.

**Pres. Kuther** – Yes it does appear in the Grad Council Annual report 2003-2004, so it has come here. It just takes a very long time to pass through the channels. Any additional comments?

**Sen. Hawkes** – Well even though it has been passed, and I know there was good reason for it would it be possible for those that have better ideas to propose new changes and going through all the procedures? It's not necessarily frozen, I assume.

**Pres. Kuther** – No, it isn't. If there are additional suggestions then I would suggest that you go to the Grad Council for modifications.

**Sen. Whittemore** – I have a question. If this is set as policy, would there be a way for the rest of the University to look at this as a possible way of inviting students to come into class registration early enough that we know what classes would go before 24 hours, 48 hours, three days before classes begin?

**Pres. Kuther** – You mean at the undergraduate level?

**Sen. Whittemore** – Yea, I don't know if this is the place for that discussion but I would be looking for what people think about this as an idea. So many of our classes end up being cancelled across the college for lack of a sort of platform of 12 students. It's particularly hard on upper division classes which are majors and essential for graduations and preparation in the field. It seems that we're trying to systemize it but we seem to be continually returning to kind of a struggle between department needs and administrative priorities and the physical realities and perhaps this would be one strategy across the board that students would understand as a way of getting them to commit before they leave for the summer or before their winter break to what courses they would like to take. It would also cut down on people who are just over subscribing

for classes so that they could shop when they get here and then decide whether they would or would not take the class. So, those are some of the issues.

**Pres. Kuther** – Those sound similar to reasons mentioned by Chris Shankle in his email.

**Sen. Begian** – Regarding the Music Department, that would be very difficult for us to implement, having a late registration fee, our audition process doesn't begin until the students are being housed and we've had a chance to hear them. It takes as many as 7-10 days, class days, to figure out where we're going to place students in an ensembles, things like that. We just have that built we need to be able to plug kids into a different class and sometimes in order to make an ensemble, we have to say you need to drop this section of Psych because we need to put you in this combo now because that's the only time that that group can meet. It would be very difficult for us.

**Sen. Nair** – One more comment, I am looking at this email you just distributed, the 2003-2004 report of the Graduate Council said that a late registration fee would be charged after August 15<sup>th</sup> for the fall semester and January 19<sup>th</sup> for the spring semester. So, I'm assuming that (inaudible)

**Pres. Kuther** – Yea, I don't know about the deadlines. One thing I do notice is that, in reading the Graduate Council Annual report where the dates are listed it is noted, "except for the English Department graduate students who register as a group." So, potentially, we could use this for a model for undergraduates.

**Sen. Nair** – Well, I think it's a good idea because it says the motion passed at the Nov. 17<sup>th</sup> grad council meeting (inaudible)

**Sen. Ganchev** – I think that this is a good idea to give the students incentive to register early but I believe that it should be a positive incentive rather than a fee to give them give them (inaudible).

**Sen. Maskel** – If there were a fee imposed on undergraduate students, where would the money go once it was collected, the extra money?

**Mary Beth Amyot** – Just to respond to that question, any of the student fees that are collected that are a late fee variety they go into the General fund for general allocation.

**Pres. Kuther** – if we were to pursue a late registration fee further for undergraduate students, how would you suggest we go about it?

**Mary Beth Amyot** – On the undergraduate level?

**Pres. Kuther** – Yes

**Mary Beth Amyot** – I'm not sure of all the steps, but the point where I would get involved would be within the university process verifying if it would be a fee that would make sense for

the university and then I would on behalf of the university take it to the Board of Trustees. The preliminary steps to get the university endorsement is probably more academic affairs.

**Provost Rinker** – I think what we probably need to do is decide here today if this is the direction you want to go and make a recommendation and then it would come to me and I would set up the committee and start to move the approvals at the undergraduate level.

**Sen. Munz** – It seems to me as parallel to the Graduate Council it should first go to CUCAS as a proposal.

**Sen. Whittemore**– I couldn't hear you Jim, as a proposal? But it would go as a proposal after consideration with the Provosts' ad hoc committee?

**Sen. Munz** – No, I don't know if we need an ad hoc committee. I mean the current fee originated at the Graduate Council.

**Pres. Kuther** – You're assuming that CUCAS serves the same as the Graduate Council?

**Sen. Whittemore** – is it the sense of the body that it would make sense first to take the idea out to our various departments to discuss it at department meetings, bring back the consensus before somebody makes a proposal to CUCAS? As opposed to one department making the proposal? I mean I'm wondering if that's the better route.

**Pres. Kuther** – I'm still thinking about which committee would work. I guess it makes sense it's CUCAS. But it seems that before we even make a proposal to CUCAS we need to have more of a discussion. Here's a question to all of you, do you think this merits further discussion or should we put this on our November agenda as an item?

**Sen. Hawkes** – Yea, it seems we need more knowledge before we come to a conclusion the purpose of this, as I understand it, is not as a fund raiser, but it is to try to make more courses available so that the courses don't have to be cancelled and therefore be unavailable to students who really need them but who delay until the last minute and it seems to me that we should go to national studies that have been made of such a thing, I'm sure that the Association of Registrars for example, would have some data on what has been effective on other campuses in trying to get students to register earlier and there may be other associations that have made such studies. We might also put together a focus group of our own students, what would persuade them to register earlier. It may not be a fee, there may be other incentives that would be effective.

**Pres. Kuther** – It seems to me we would ask CUCAS or which ever committee that we would deem appropriate to study the issue.

**Sen. Nair** – It seems to me that we don't know the extent of this problem at the undergraduate level. It would make sense to ask the Registrar.

**Pres. Kuther** – How about if we place this on the November agenda and we ask Senators to go to their departments and get input and I'll ask the Registrar for input.

**Provost Rinker** – Being a bit new, so I do apologize for this, I think there are two issues in discussion, late registration fee and then the whole notion of courses being available to students and I don't know if they're married together. I like your idea of certainly having the registrar giving you some data and also bring some issues like these back to your departments. I think that would be very worthwhile.

**Sen. Ganchev** – A related issue and if we're going to bring this to our departments maybe this is one as well, there was a policy some time ago that new courses have a lower requirement for students, maybe this is worth discussing as well. Not twelve but I don't remember the number, maybe six it was, new courses.

**Sen. Munz** – Another problem would be the Student developed studies which are often established after the start of the semester.

**Pres. Kuther** – So what we'll do is I'll ask Senators to bring this to their departments and seek input in the discussion of a late registration fee for undergraduates and we will discuss this in November. I will also ask the Registrar to attend and ask for data on late registration fees. Moving on, Parking. Beth Amyot is here to son behalf of the Parking Committee

**Beth Amyot** – Tara asked me to speak on this issue and there are two main issues which I plan to address because that seemed to be the focus of the interest and those were the first the new garage on 5<sup>th</sup> and Osborne and its designation for student parking and then secondly information on the process that lead to the current parking policy, so I will share information on those two topics and I also want to hear from you with any suggestions, comments or other issues that you have so that I can take them back to the parking committee which will be meeting in early November. First, just a bit of contextual information and I know a lot of you have a much longer prospective than I do here, my prospective is only about 18 months but I think we've made some really good progress in that 18 month period, one thing I do know about parking is that people have really strong feelings about it and we spend a lot of time talking about it. On the midtown campus with the opening of the new garage, there has not been one day that both garages were full, so we have a week and a half of experience and so far there's been adequate parking due to the number of spaces for everybody. There are still issues that some have, that I'm aware of, that's where parking is available, but the fact is there is parking and that is something new. It's really good so we've made great progress in that regard. About the new garage I think the easier issue to address is why is that designated for students only? I think that's a question that you all have. Whenever there is a capital project at the university, there's really three ways to finance it and depending on which way the university goes we have more or less flexibility in how we use the facility and our first choice is always to get a general obligation bond from the State because then the State is actually funding it, that's generally how our academic facilities get funded that's why we're waiting for the funding for the new Arts Building. Secondly there's what's called a CHEFA process which is funded from students' fees and that's how our new student center is being funded from the student fees but not exclusively from Westconn, all the CSU students who pay student fees pay for these kind of facilities. And then the third way is a specific obligation bond where revenue generates from a specific source at the university and that's the way we're getting the new parking garage on the midtown campus. In order to package that, to get the bonding for it, we had to specify that western students would pay parking fees that will pay for

the garage and the garage would be there. That's really the factual basis for why that parking garage is limited to students' use. That's how the whole facility was designed from day one in terms of the financing. It may not have been communicated well in the past, but that is the reality of the situation. If you have any questions of if you need more information to be helpful with that I'd be happy to provide more.

**Sen. Nair** – One comment, when this matter was first brought to the Senate that was in 2003, VP Rich Sullivan spoke to the issue and he told us that we were going to build a 600 car parking garage on the corner of fifth and Osborne right where the student parking was. Everyone was lead to believe that the parking garage would be just on the student parking lot. It was never communicated that it would extend into the faculty parking lot. The issue is not that faculty and staff don't get to park in the garage, the issue is that the parking that is available to faculty and staff was taken away and we were, I think, misinformed.

**VP Amyot** – I understand

**Sen. Schlicht** – Is there a legal reason why the students of Westconn could not say we are willing to share the parking garage with anybody who works here?

**VP Amyot** – I would want to check with bond council on that. I would check into that. The way everything is written, the whole, it went through all the governmental authorities it was referred to as a student financed parking garage for students to park there. I don't know that ever anyone has ever had a basis to come and say the students were willing to forego the parking and let others park there. I could ask the question, if there's a realistic possibility that that's going to transpire.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Let me extend the reason I asked that question. It's my understanding the white Street garage is not being filled. A couple of floors are empty and students are being turned away repeatedly. So there's apparently a faculty staff garage and a student garage and I understand the dichotomy, perhaps we could set up an arrangement where we're exchanging spaces so that people can use both. So if that's not strictly a legal issue, that we cannot use the students' piece of property, then I think we should be able to facilitate something like that that would make it more pleasant for everybody.

**VP Amyot** – I'm willing to ask the question but I think what transpired before was that until we knew that we could adequately serve the faculty and staff in the White St garage, we were really only letting faculty and staff park there. Now that we have some experience, we are letting students park there, too, for the overflow. There's nothing that limits our use of the White St. garage, White St can be used for faculty staff and students. The students wouldn't be obligated to make the swap, they could say let us use our garage and we'll propose a general purpose garage, so I'm not sure that the students would be willing to do that. We believe that we need all the fifth avenue garage for commuter students and it has been filling up for commuter students and initially we had the overflow going to the Patriot Garage but now we're going to let them go to the White St. garage. We did think about if there was still excess spaces in the white street after commuter students were parked there how would we offer up those extra spaces, who should be invited to those extra spaces. We don't want to consistently have spaces unused.

There are a lot of Westside resident students who believe they should be able to park on Midtown because they have a job to go to after school and so on. And we just said you can't do that at this time, we don't really know if we have room to do that. One of the things that the parking committee needs to look at is if we do have extra capacity on midtown campus now how should that get allocated out? I will ask the question of bond council whether we can allow faculty and or staff to park in the student garage. The students have no incentive to allow that to happen.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I understand that.

**VP Amyot** – I can't really respond to what was communicated before

**Sen. Nair** – I know, but it is a problem. Nobody knew the faculty and staff were going to lose those spaces.

**Neil McLaughlin** – Just to add to that a little bit we only took 15 faculty spaces that's all that was allocated for faculty in the old days. The one by the Haas library was mixed faculty/staff/student lot.

**Sen. Nair** – No it wasn't.

**Neill McLaughlin** – Yea it was

**Sen. Nair** – There was a divider between the faculty/staff and the student parking.

**Neill McLaughlin** – yea, I know but what that meant was that 50 faculty spaces were actually lost.

**Sen. Nair** – it was a lot more than 50. I parked there for years, there was a lot more than 50.

**Neill McLaughlin** – All I've got to go by is the maps and the count and it says 50 faculty in that section and the rest of it was supposed to be dedicated for student parking. It's been that way for 5 years that I was here.

**Sen. Nair** – I'll look at the map myself.

**VP Amyot** – Be that as it may, I should apologize for the lack of communication that preceded me but right now we have a garage on that site and there is student parking there and that's kind of where we are at this time. I do think that all the parking problems need to be an evolving process and we'll try to respond to best meet the needs of the university community that's what parking is about. So, anything, any ideas or changes we need to look at it and research it and see what needs to be done. One of the issues that

**Sen. Begian** – The issue of concerts at night, is there an insurance issue why parents of students can't park there to go and see a concert in White Hall?

**VP Amyot** – one of the issues that we have looked into was the question is when the garage is not needed by the students can it be used for other purposes? From a legal point of view the answer to that is yes. So, we know, legally in the evenings there's no reason why that garage cannot be opened up for use by others in the university and so I think I responded back to the music department on that. I'm planning to bring it to the parking committee to see that they are in agreement that that would be a wise decision for the university to do that way folks going to the library in the evening, or going to concerts or whatever or going to the Berkshire gym that they could park over there.

**Sen. Whittemore** – I notice you said in the University, does that mean an outside person coming to a concert could not use that facility?

**VP Amyot** – No, an outside person coming to a university concert could use that facility. But if we had, it still needs to be used for university purposes. The garage still needs to be used for purposes associated with the university. In terms of the process that lead to the current parking policy when we realized we were going to take that 300 space parking lot off line to build the new garage it was clear that the parking crunch that existed at that time was going to be exaggerated so we better do some planning to come up with the best solution we could and so an ad hoc group was formed on request of the President to study the issue and I was on that committee that grew and at that time we had to do a lot of research to make sure we knew how many parking spaces we had everywhere. How many students do we have on campus at different times of day? How many f/t employees. To try and really get a handle from a quantitative point of view there are parking gaps and that kind of thing. We went all through that and I think we did come up with some steps that were progressive and that we came to the decision that student, if they were resident students, they need to have one parking space on their home campus and they couldn't commute back and forth. That's freed up a lot of parking spaces, especially on the midtown campus. A lot of students don't like that, that they have to take the shuttle around instead of driving their cars, but we just really don't have any space for them to park. We also created a visitors parking lot beside Old Main which was sorely need and I think we need more visitors' space than that. And then we designated certain areas that previously had been open parking for categorized employees and I think that that made the parking more efficient. We cut down on circling cars going around various lots looking for a space. I think those were all positives. I've gotten quite a bit of feedback from folks about the reserved parking issue and I know that that's something that's on everybody's mind and I welcome anybody who has any specific thoughts on that to bring them forward today so that when the parking committee meets in early November then they can be addressed. When the group convened to talk about reserved parking, I will say there was a lot of different views on the committee I think it goes down to value systems and why you think there should be reserved parking, why you might not think there should be reserved parking, while in the end we came up with a recommendation it took a lot of discussion to get there and there are many different views on that matter. I know it will be reconsidered when we meet again. But one of the things that did happen that probably nobody in this room knows and I think will surprise you is that is at the result of the work of the (inaudible) that there are actually fewer reserved spaces than there were before. There are about 75 spaces now which is a reduction of 28%. And when it became clear through the deliberations of the committee that some positions were going to have reserved parking there was a feeling that reserved parking should not be solely for administrative positions but academic positions should

also have some reserved parking and that's when it was introduced that the academic chairs should have reserved parking. That's a bit of the dialog that occurred in the parking committee, so if anyone wants to add to that, I know there are a few committee members here, does anybody want to add to that? So, that as a result of the deliberations of that committee a recommendation was made to the President who accepted them and they were implemented with the thinking that ok, we're gonna start out the fall semester this way, we're gonna see what happens when we get the new parking garage open how that opens up parking on the midtown campus, we're going to reduce the number of reserved spaces by 28% we're going to include in the reserved parking spaces academic chairs and we're going to reconvene in November.

**Sen. Echevarria** – Regarding that reserve space, on one side it says reserved are marked, on the other side there are numbered spaces, are those reserved also with the numbers on the ground?

**VP Amyot** – Which area are you referring to?

**Sen. Echevarria** – Adjacent to White Hall between the dorm and White Hall. There's one side that has reserved marking, and on the other side it has numbered spaces. Are both sides reserved?

**Mr. Neil McLaughlin** – No, just the side that has the yellow lines that says reserved.

**Sen. Echevarria** – So anytime you see those lines that say reserved, those are actually reserved? Anything else that just has a number it is not reserved? It's open, ok. The only other issue I have with this is when those reserved spots, people leave them for the day, they just open up, and then nobody can use them anymore for the rest of that day. I would suggest and it was not my idea, this is somebody who came up with this idea, if somebody really wants a reserved spot close to the building they work in, maybe they should be given the opportunity to buy it, for that semester \$50 - \$100 bucks whatever it might be, they own it for that semester. And that money could go to good things like financial aid or whatever.

**Sen. Nair** – You said earlier if anybody else on the committee had comments to make to please make them, so I'll make them. I was on the committee, just a bit of background. Parking has always been an issue since I've been here. In 2002 the Senate approved a committee that included Paul Hines, Peter Lyons, Luigi Marconi, and Jamie Gravius, who was the SGA President and Ron Shaw who was the Chief of Police. The charge for the committee was looking at the problem and make some recommendations and the committee did some work and made recommendations to the Senate in November, 2002 and the Senate debated and forwarded it to Dr. Whittemore, made a motion to forward these recommendations to the President and requested a response from the President. April, 2003, Rich Sullivan, VP came to the senate at the direction of President Roach and addressed the issue and I just read you one sentence from that meeting. To combattal the two documents in my opinion that VP Sullivan (inaudible) at those recommendations made by the committee but rather just talked about two pages worth about parking. Having said that, just a background, and then this committee, I was a member of the committee that was directed by VP Amyot, the value system, it's based on the value system. It took a lot of time to get people to say what it is that these reserved parking spaces were based

on. It took a long time, finally the word came out. It's a "perk", that is the word, it's a perk based on status. I'll stop there.

**Sen. Ganchev** – I think that it is best to limit the number of assigned spaces as much as possible. It is a question of values, it is also a question of functionality. I'll start with the functionality first. If we have enough space then the assigned spaces do not add anything. If we do not have enough space, they just add additional problems because they stay empty and the other parking is used. Currently here we still do not have enough space at the West Side there are 44 non-assigned spaces, 11 assigned numbered spaces, 7 spaces for handicap and 3 spaces for police. Well 11 to 44 I believe is quite a high ratio and this is one of the reasons that we don't have enough space. Regarding the value aspect of that, I'm not happy with the decision to include the department chair among the people who have this perk because in many departments are actually by definition democratic teams and they work best as democratic teams and there is some ranking inside but it is academic ranking not this kind of ranking of perks. However, having assigned to somebody a space in parking is simple and it is read by everybody and many people actually read it as an additional ranking. So although in our production unit this may correspond to the needs of the unit because the production units are (inaudible) by nature, I believe that it does not correspond to the needs of the academic departments.

**Sen. Whittemore** – Having heard the comments and also having been the one who initially made a motion that the committees' recommendations be forwarded to the President for possible action as the prodigal son I return to the motion, so if I can read the motion I rest on the shoulders of good friends who helped me with this, I would like to suggest it, if it's appropriate shall I read it?

**Pres. Kuther** – Yes, thanks

**Sen. Whittemore** – "Whereas the present system of designated parking is not based on any demonstrable need. Whereas these designated spaces remove parking spaces available to the vast majority of faculty and staff, even when the spaces are left vacant. Whereas these designated spaces impose unnecessary hardship on those who do not have such spaces and whereas continuing to provide such designated spaces to some and not to others serves to promote discontent, The University Senate recommends to Pres. Schmotter that the practice of providing designated parking spaces on the campuses of Western Connecticut State University be immediately discontinued"

**Pres. Kuther** – Do I have a second? Sen. Ganchev Discussion?

**Sen. Schlicht** – I want to just talk to the third paragraph about imposing unnecessary hardship, I think that's taking it a little far and I would be happy to have that paragraph struck. I don't know that anybody is suffering seriously unnecessary hardship because they're not able to park in a spot closest to a building and I may suggest also that it may be beneficial in some ways not to park right next to the building. I'll leave it at that, so I think that paragraph is unnecessary.

**Sen. Echevarria** – It becomes a hardship in the winter time when you have to walk a long distance to your classroom and if you're carrying something bulky. Maybe frostbite will set in.

**Sen. Nair** – I just want to mention as a matter of interest that in November, 2002 senator Schlicht had said exactly the same thing the health benefits of walking long distances, the problem Jeff is that I am not interested in health.

**Sen. Moser** – The idea of no reserved parking is taking it a bit much. If you look at it as a status symbol kind of thing perhaps I could see the argument. But we do have certain members, typically the Deans, presidents who are on and off campus as part of what they do every day. They're not just here, they're on and off for meetings, meetings in the public, meeting for fundraiser kind of things, that's what they do as the nature of the job it's not really due to their status they need that reserved spot.

**Pres. Kuther** – would you like to make an amendment?

**Sen. Moser** – I'm just making comment, I'm not amending anything.

**Sen. Whittemore** – Can I speak? I think my sense of this and the reason why I was willing to present it even though the words are not my own, but certainly my sentiments are the same, is that the slippery slope begins when you decide well who is or isn't in a position of needing a spot. The president banned the use of designated spots in the white st lot for purposes of generally recognizing having a fenced off section for administrative personnel was, perhaps, an unreasonable reservation when many of those spots were not used when other people were looking for spots. I think there was a recognition that there was some commitment to a community ideal in removing the fencing from the white st. lot. I also think that the issue is not that there might not be a good argument for particular individuals, the issue is once we start making individual arguments where does it end and I fear it will end no where. It will continue on, we'll have this discussion forever and ever and I don't think we need to, I think if there are sufficient numbers of spots at this point there seems to be, we need not worry about people not being able to find a place to park when they come back. I myself have gone and come back and find always there's a spot in the upper floor of the white st. lot at the very least. Which by the way the place we were talking about as designating administrative parking so they would always have a place to park, we were talking about solving this problem with the committee two years ago. (flip over tape)

**Sen. Nair** – A long time ago when we talked about places where folks park it's generally the people who work there, the President, the Vice President what have you, there are enough parking spaces there anyway, I don't think that we have to worry about the President driving around for hours looking for parking. We have enough parking for everybody so it's not a problem.

**Sen. Lightwood** – So the question of reservation and the quality of parking. It seems as though the spots that are reserved are actually nice spots, I mean if I were to look for a spot first, besides next to white hall which is where I always look, if I wanted to park someplace all the time, it seems all the nice spots are reserved, is there anyway of disassociating that, making the spots reserved as many as anybody wants that aren't so convenient so that we don't feel so offended

when we're trying to take the lottery into our hand and find a nice spot and have it reserved. Is that something that came up in your discussion?

**Sen. Nair** – yea the position was if you're going to have a reserved space it's got to be as close to your office as possible unless it's not a perk.

**Unidentified** – There was not debate about that?

**Sen. Nair** - Yes of course there was debate about that, I was quite involved in that debate.

**VP Amyot** – I think that is an issue that could be revisited by the committee, if there were going to be reserved spaces, where should they go?

**Sen. Moser** – If you don't make those spaces convenient for the person who has the reserved spot, you're actually taking up two spaces, one for the car and one for the sign where they're not parking.

**Sen. Lightwood** – I also heard rumors, this might happen in the winter time anyway, because while the reserved spots now are nice in the winter time you have to take the snow off your car, which brings up another complexity.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I just wanted to comment first on the idea that if there is enough parking reserved spots don't matter but (inaudible). I also wanted to put on the record that I did ask all our adjuncts and faculty to comment on this and none of them had comments so that my only assumption from that is they're happy with the way things are, so I don't know what other people have to report from their departments, I don't know how much of a problem this is for the entire university, but for our department its not an issue.

**VP Amyot** – I invited University comment to faculty, staff community by email and I received 8 comments, five from faculty, one from staff and two students.

**Pres. Kuther** – So the motion on the table is to recommend to President Schmotter that the practice of providing designated parking spaces on the campuses of Western Connecticut State University be immediately discontinued. Further discussion?

**Sen. Whittemore** – one final comment from my corner. When a decision is made it affects the lives of anybody in this community. It seems to be important that the people who represent those lives are present at the discussion and it's my understanding that on this committee there was one faculty member who, as I understand it, did not attend. It is a concern to me whenever one body makes decisions for the welfare of another and another element to this is that the discussion should by any ad hoc committee be attempting to receive the word (inaudible) background those whose lives are going to be affected by this. I think that where I disagree with my colleague, Sen. Schlicht, on this is that it does have to do with values when you come on and find that there are designated slots not occupied at a time when you're looking for one and in a sense there's an interesting message here which is that somebody has decided that there's merit in a status to get a perk that others don't have. I don't know that that's a slope that we want to be on in an

institution that senator Ganchev was saying at least at the level of departments does operate on the principal as a collegial democratic sense of our positions not by the actual ranking.

**VP Amyot** – Two comments, one is since I've been named Chair of the parking committee we would be totally open to having more faculty representation on the committee and I feel like maybe I need to, without imposing my personal comments, I feel like I need to impart a little bit more about the committee discussion because I think what happened was there was a sentiment that the president chose the positions by virtue of their work that really needed the parking, that's where it started and then the question was where to draw the line. It took a lot of time and lot of discussion and it became difficult to decide when does it go from being functional to more of a status or a value decision and that was very difficult for the committee and that did happen. Once it started it get below the Deans' level there was a feeling that if there was going to be other professional staff there then we also need to have academic chairs, so what you described to happen actually did happen with the committee. The comment about it being a perk was made and some people thought that was fine and some people thought it was terrible but the original discussion was functionally who really needs the parking space because they're going on and off campus for meetings all the time at a time when parking was at a premium.

**Pres. Kuther** – What was the composition of the committee?

**VP Amyot** – I have it here this was an ad hoc committee formed by the President it had the four Vice Presidents on it, Dean of Students, Chief of Police, Deanna Schaab who heads up the Westconnect, the Dean of Human Resources, Vijay Nair, Rebecca Woodward and George Kain. We would be open to having more faculty representation.

**Sen. Schlicht** – One more general comment, it seems like an appropriate time to talk about it, talking with a former senator about the role of senate and one of the things that came up was how we seem sometimes duplicate work that we've assigned to subcommittees. I'm sure that the people that are on this committee talking about parking have spent a lot of time thinking about what makes sense at the university and it's not sort of a whimsical decision to have some designated parking spots. I'd be reluctant to sit here in fifteen minutes and counter act that work by simply saying let's approve a resolution that says take away all designated spots, I think that something more should be done to recognize the work that they've done.

**VP Amyot** – I was hoping to get some feedback to bring back to the committee when we met November 7<sup>th</sup>, that's really what I was hoping to get from the faculty Senate.

**Sen. Nair** – it seems to me this resolution on the table would be feedback.

**Sen. Lightwood** – There are some points of the proposal that seem like a strong statement. Is there any room for negotiation on the conclusion other than abolishing, would you be willing to make a statement from Senate asking if this could be revisited?

**Pres. Kuther** – Are you proposing to amend the wording?

**Sen. Whittemore** – If you're interested I am not interested in bottom-lining this proposal. If there's another motion that comes to the floor after this is voted down, that's fine. This proposal stands.

**Sen. Nair** – Just one point, you don't need Sen. Whittemores' permission to make an amendment to the motion if you choose to propose an amendment, I think the Senate would entertain it.

**Sen. Lightwood** – Well, I just thought that the vote might simply go down because it's too strong a statement and then we could propose an amendment, either way.

**Pres. Kuther** – One alternative if you don't have an amendment to read we could let that happen.

**Sen. Echevarria** – Can I just make a general comment? All this came down and it is the way it is but I just feel like when it began nobody realized the work of the faculty because you have a lot of faculty coming on that's scrambling for a space that the students are scrambling for and getting late to their classes especially during the winter time and I feel the faculty is an important body on this campus and if I were leading the ship I would make sure that my faculty had some kind of priority first and foremost and I think that would encourage some good things to happen.

**Sen. Moser** – Do I understand your proposal would this eliminate faculty parking as well as student parking and make it a totally open campus?

**Sen. Whittemore** – This is speaking to, obviously there are certain conditions that some lots have that we have to face.

**Sen. Moser** – Ok, so we're talking about the White St. Garage could be open to absolutely everybody? I'm not talking about the handicapped?

**Sen. Whittemore** – No, I'm referring here specifically to designated individual spots? Reserved spaces.

**Sen. Moser** – Well the proposal put forth by our President of the Senate suggested (inaudible) about ten spots, but they're never all full at the same time. (inaudible) I'm not sure that designated parking has been sufficient.

**Sen. Nair** – May I attempt to define it? I remember clearly there was a confusion about the two words, reserved vs. designated. Ron Shaw came to the Senate at one point and said "Reserved" means this lot is for faculty and staff, this lot is for students. Designated means the space is designated for an individual person or an office. That's the definition. I'm not arguing the point, I'm trying to explain it, if you don't like it provide another definition. It's somewhere in the minutes.

**Sen. Moser** – As a resolution things must be defined somewhere, Ron Shaw may not be the authority.

**Sen. Nair** – Ok, so the definition is that designated refers to spaces designated to individual people, reserved means the space is for categories of people.

**Sen. Ganchev**- I think that the last suggestion does not address the problem with the value system. This problem still stays there.

**Pres. Kuther** – Well, two things are happening here, I think we're providing suggestions for Beth to take back to the parking committee and then secondly we're also looking at this motion to suggest or to recommend to the president that we discontinue the practice of providing designated spaces. Additional comments discussion regarding the motion?

**Sen. DeLoughy** – I have a question, did the committee consider having people apply for a certain number of parking spaces that might be reserved, apply based on need? That is where we've kind of gotten into a discussion about the varying levels of need to be close to a building. Was that even brought up that there might be some sort of number of spots for which people might apply?

**VP Amyot** – There was discussion about reserving groups of spaces for individuals based on various criteria, one of which would be functionally their job required them to come and go and it would be more productive if there was a space for them, it wasn't in terms of having an application per se based on need.

**Chief McLaughlin** – I'd just like to mention one thing that since the garage has been here, even when it's only partially open in the beginning of the semester, we have had the new rules and regulations, i.e. that the students have to park in the student areas, and the staff and faculty park in staff and faculty areas, we've been able to control those staff and faculty areas a lot better than we ever have been in the past. I think the idea of putting students in the new garage, etc. was a good idea. There is ample space at the Midtown campus for all staff and faculty and the garage right now on White St. sits every day with 2-300 open spaces. I think we've kind of licked the crunch for staff and faculty. I'm not so sure we've licked the whole commuter parking process yet, we still are closing down those student commuter parking garage at 10:30 quarter to 11 every day until the class changes over or whatever so that it's out of business for about an hour because all the spaces are taken but we can put people either in the Patriot garage, Patriot garage is scheduled for some maintenance, I believe, and we're going to lose some spaces for about a month, we've been putting them in the White Street garage but there should still be adequate parking on Midtown campus.

**Pres. Kuther** – Further discussion?

**Dr. Montague** – I'm Rich Montague, Chair of the Business School, at the last business school Chairs meeting the Chairs of the business school volunteered to give up their reserved spaces. If you remember three years ago we had reserved parking out here and the chairs of this building agreed to give it all back because we saw the problem. Here I agree with the President of the Senate, there's not enough spaces for that to happen. The reserved spaces take up 25% of the total parking spaces, that doesn't make any sense for the business school chairs. We haven't figured out how to do that, the Dean was going to check into how we could do that, if we just

give them up like one of them did, and then he has two spaces that somebody described before. So although I'm not a Senate member I would think the business school chairs have no problem here, there are like two other chairs and a Computer Science chair and the Education chair and I think one of the computer directors have a reserved space. How it ends up with those spaces, but I can tell you that an hours worth of discussion on how to give this up and what can we do? We volunteered to give them back at our meeting but everyone says well we can't do that till we know that somebody else can use all those spaces and I think we should give them all back and then everybody here in this building would be here. As you saw today when you came there aren't enough spaces and from now till 5:30 all the people that are coming to try to teach here are not going to be able to park in this lot. They're going to have to illegally park or try to go park where the student's park and that comes with all kinds of problems with the students.

**Sen. Ganchev** – I just want to mention that the Chair of the Computer Science department has expressed discomfort with the decision.

**Dean Morton** – Can I raise one more point about what we talked about and what he said was very true but there's another problem and the Westside is dramatically than the midtown campus and we have a situation that occurs here normally around 4:30-5:00 and a lot of the education students that come to take classes at night do not park in the student parking, they park in the faculty parking lot so there's one more factor taking away faculty parking so we have extra pressures here and I just want to bring out and emphasize how different the two campuses are.

**Motion: The University Senate recommends to President Schmotter that the practice of providing designated parking spaces on the campuses of Western Connecticut State University be immediately discontinued. (defeated: 7 in favor, 9 opposed, 2 abstentions)**

**VP Amyot** – I just want to thank everybody for, I do have to say this is my first time coming in front of the Senate and unfortunately it had to do with parking and it's not ideal for me but I am always very receptive and appreciative of any input that you care to give and I will take it seriously will be sure it will be properly considered by the committee as well.

**Pres. Kuther** – So, regarding parking

**Sen. Lightwood** – It is somewhat impromptu, I'm not sure if it's necessary at this point to make a formal statement, but I'm going to make it anyway. I would like to propose the same set of rationales just as a statement from the Senate that includes the parking committee to reexamine this and take into account our concerns just as a statement of our interest. We would like for them to reexamine

**Pres. Kuther** – So the recommendation is for them to reexamine the issue of parking spaces on each of the two campuses of WCSU. So let me read you the motion.

**Motion: “Whereas the present system of designated parking is not based on any demonstrable need. Whereas these designated spaces remove parking spaces available to the vast majority of faculty and staff, even when the spaces are left vacant. Whereas these designated spaces impose unnecessary hardship on those who do not have such spaces and**

**whereas continuing to provide such designated spaces to some and not to others serves to promote discontent, The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee reexamine the issue of providing designated parking spaces on the campuses of Western Connecticut State University” (Lightwood/Nair) Discussion?**

**Sen. Hawkes** – It seems to me that the motion assumes that everybody in the Senate shares the concerns that were expressed and I don’t think that everybody in the Senate does share those concerns because the motion was defeated.

**Pres. Kuther** – However, parliamentary procedure allows for the motion to come forth.

**Sen. Hawkes** – Oh, surely it does.

**Sen. Koza** – Also in light of what was said here too about Westside being a little bit unique sometimes those designated spots protect the parking from the students coming in. That’s the only thing that stops them in that portion of the faculty lot so that the faculty that’s coming in, they know that the Chair or what not are not parking there. It’s a deterrent from those that are not supposed to be parking in the faculty that do it’s a deterrent at least for that amount of spaces. I don’t know how you would address that. It’s a kind of unique problem here for this campus.

**Sen. Schlicht** – An extension of that idea seems to be that every faculty member should have a designated spot.

**Sen. Koza** – You know you’d have to understand this school, it’s crazy at night and students are desperate to park in the faculty lot and they over fill, and remember we lost parking because of the student building coming up. We haven’t gained that back yet they have all the trailers still there so,

**Pres. Kuther** – Are you proposing an amendment?

**Sen. Koza** – I just want to consideration because if you take that away in essence what you’re trying to help you is really hurting.

**Pres. Kuther** – The motion isn’t taking anything away, the motion is about the University Senate recommending to the Parking Committee that they re-examine the issue of designated parking spaces

**Sen. Koza** – It’s a consideration, but is it a blind consideration. It’s without knowledge of what’s happening.

**Sen. Hawkes** – It seems to me that if the motion were simply that the Senate recommends that this be reconsidered, that’s one thing I’m sure that everybody on the Senate would agree, the motion as you read it incorporates most of the previous motion, which was defeated.

**Pres. Kuther** – So is there a recommendation to amend the motion, to remove “the”?

**Sen. Hawkes** – I would propose simply having the motion to request the Parking Committee to reconsider ...

**Sen. Nair** – May I make a comment. The Parking Committee is reconsidering, so what would be the point in the Senate requesting the committee to do something that they do something they're going to do anyway?

**Sen. Begian** – Should there be something in there to the language of distinguishing between the Westside and Midtown campus? Is it part of their reexamination of the, is a global point of view for all parking, everywhere?

**Pres. Kuther** – It seems like that may be the consideration. Is there a proposal to modify the motion?

**Sen. Whittemore** – The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee re-examine the issue of designated parking spaces at Western Connecticut State University in light of the differences expressed on the floor of the Senate and the possible differences between the Westside and Central campuses of WCSU.

**Sen. Nair** – May I suggest instead of all those words if you were to simply on each of the two campuses of Western CT State University would probably cover it.

**Pres. Kuther** – So, that's a proposed amendment. Sen. Lightwood are you ok with it?

**Sen. Lightwood** – Yes.

**Pres. Kuther** – So, the new resolution continues with the Whereas portions and then adds:  
**“The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee reexamine the issue of designated parking spaces at Western Connecticut State University in light of the differences expressed on the floor of the Senate and with regard to each of the two campuses on WCSU.”**

Full motion: **“Whereas the present system of designated parking is not based on any demonstrable need. Whereas these designated spaces remove parking spaces available to the vast majority of faculty and staff, even when the spaces are left vacant. Whereas these designated spaces impose unnecessary hardship on those who do not have such spaces and whereas continuing to provide such designated spaces to some and not to others serves to promote discontent, The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee reexamine the issue of designated parking spaces at Western Connecticut State University in light of the differences expressed on the floor of the Senate and with regard to each of the two campuses on WCSU.”**

**Sen. Nair** – My suggestion was just get rid of the in light [of] and all that stuff and just say “each of the two campuses”. My suggestion was the resolution to stay as it was and simply insert the two words each “of the two” three words.

**Sen. Whittemore** – So, if I'm hearing you we recommend they reexamine the issue of designated parking spaces at Western Connecticut State University on each of the two campuses.

**Pres. Kuther** – Please forward that to me. So it's a proposed amendment, Sen. Lightwood are you ok with that?

**Sen. Lightwood** – I'm fine with that.

**Sen. Maskel** – I think I'm missing something. I thought Beth just stood there and said that she wanted our opinions because she wanted to take them back to the Parking Committee to reexamine it so I think she's doing it anyway, so what good is this motion, what further good is this?

**Pres. Kuther** – As I understand it the purpose of this motion is to have a formal statement in the record

**Sen. Whittemore** – I would say the reason why the whereas' are in from my point of view is it speaks to the issue of values on campus and that is the core idea behind this. I also think that the Senate is in the habit and I'm guilty of it, too, of forwarding on their discussion for somebody else to review without formally stating the grounds upon which the Senate feels the discussion should go forward.

**Sen. Moser** – I'm not sure I agree with all the whereas'. If Sen. Lightwood would agree to remove the whereas', I might vote for it.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I propose an amendment to abolish the whereas'.

**Pres. Kuther** – Ok, we have a proposed change in the amendment. Sen. Lightwood?

**Sen. Lightwood** – At this point I kept the whereas' in there because it is important to be able to convey some intent and they do that. Originally, when I was looking at the whereas' my reaction was well, ok, if that's pretentious for me, but I thought about phrasing it at all. If in fact that the body decides that is still too much then we'll live with it.

**Sen. Hawkes** – Does the amendment now contain the "whereas"?

**Pres. Kuther** – At the moment the motion contains the "whereas" and it ends with requesting that the Parking Committee reexamine the issue of designated parking spaces on both campuses on WCSU and Sen. Schlicht has just asked to propose an amendment for the "Whereas" to be stricken and Sen. Lightwood has said no. I believe we need a second for the proposed amendment. Ok seconded by Moser. Discussion on the amendment to strike the whereas.

**Proposed amendment: strike sections beginning with Whereas**

**Sen. Nair** – I make a comment on the motion if you delete the Whereas' then the motion is superfluous in that it is asking the Parking Committee to do something that VP Amyot just told

us it was going to do, so I don't know why the Senate would exert itself to pass that kind of a motion.

**Sen. Schlicht** – I agree, I thought that the intent of the motion was simply to put on record that we're whatever about parking, not that we were going to express a specific opinion about which way it should go.

**Pres. Kuther** – At present the motion doesn't read any specific opinion, as I read the motion it says whereas the present system of designated parking is not based on any demonstrable need.

**Sen. Schlicht** – Stopping with that paragraph, I think there's a disagreement about that in the sense that some people.

**Pres. Kuther** – further discussion on this amendment?

**Sen. Moser** – The whereas' does not contain the only motivation for this. In the remaining part it does say we request a reexamination of the issue of designated parking, so the whereas' are not the issue.

**Sen. Nair** –Do you disagree with them?

**Pres. Kuther** – Sen. Whittemore can you read the last portion of the motion?

**Sen. Whittemore** - The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee reexamine the issue of designated parking spaces on each of the two campuses on WCSU.

**Sen. Hawkes** – Is that the whole motion?

**Pres. Kuther** – no that is the last part of the motion

**Sen. Hawkes** – So it does have all the whereas'?

**Pres. Kuther** – Yes, and at the moment we're discussing Dr. Schlicht's suggestion or post amendment that will remove the whereas'. Further discussion of the amendment: whether to remove the whereas? Hearing none, **all in favor of removing the whereas' to this amendment: 5; Opposed, 8; So the motion stay as is.**

The current resolution includes the whereas' and ask. Discussion?

**Motion: Whereas the present system of designated parking is not based on any demonstrable need. Whereas these designated spaces remove parking spaces available to the vast majority of faculty and staff, even when the spaces are left vacant. Whereas these designated spaces impose unnecessary hardship on those who do not have such spaces and whereas continuing to provide such designated spaces to some and not to others serves to promote discontent, The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee that**

**the Parking Committee re-examine the issue of designated parking on both campuses of WCSU (R-06-10-01; passed 11-2 with 2 abstentions)**

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. National Student Engagement Survey (NSSE)**

Pres. Kuther: This is regarding the administration of a survey to freshman's and seniors, however Drs. Rinker and Bernstein have asked that we postpone this item until the November meeting.

**B. EAP Annual Report 2005-2006**

This was enclosed in your packet. Discussion? Hearing none, we'll move on.

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

None

Motion to adjourn Munz/Eisenson  
Meeting adjourned 5:00 PM

Respectfully submitted by  
Linda D'Aurio-Recording Secretary  
Elizabeth Popiel – Senate Secretary

SENATE RESOLUTIONS  
October 18, 2006

**R-06-10-01**

*Whereas the present system of designated parking is not based on any demonstrable need.  
Whereas these designated spaces remove parking spaces available to the vast majority of  
faculty and staff, even when the spaces are left vacant.*

*Whereas these designated spaces impose unnecessary hardship on those who do not have such  
spaces and whereas continuing to provide such designated spaces to some and not to others  
serves to promote discontent,*

*The University Senate recommends that the Parking Committee that the Parking Committee  
re-examine the issue of designated parking on both campuses of WCSU (passed 11-2 with 2  
abstentions)*