University of Idaho  
2007-2008  
FACULTY COUNCIL AGENDA  

Meeting #18  
Tuesday, February 12, 2008, 3:30 p.m.  
Brink Hall Faculty Lounge  

Order of Business  

I. Call to Order.  

II. Minutes.  

III.  
- Minutes of the 2007-08 Faculty Council Meeting #17, February 5, 2008  

IV. Chair’s Report.  

V. Provost’s Report.  

V. Other Announcements and Communications.  
- Parking and Transportation Proposed Changes 2008-09 (Carl Root)  
- Resolution in Favor of the Right to Bargain Collectively (Don Crowley)  

VI. Committee Reports.  

VII. Special Orders.  

VIII. Unfinished Business and General Orders.  

IX. New Business.  

X. Adjournment.  

Professor Don Crowley, Chair 2007-2008, Faculty Council  

Attachments:  
- Minutes of 2007-2008 FC Meeting #17, February 5, 2008  
- Parking Presentation & Campus Map
Present: Adams (w/o vote), Baker, Crowley (chair), Fritz, Griff, Hubbard, Machlis, McCaffrey, McCollough, McDaniel, Mihelich, Miller, Murphy, Oman, Rowland, Rush, Schmeckpepper, Sullivan, Watts (for Ripplinger w/o vote), Ch. Williams, Wilson. Liaisons: Newcombe (Coeur d’Alene), Stauffer (Boise) Absent: Guilfoyle, Ripplinger, Schmiege, Ci. Williams; Crepeau (Idaho Falls) Observers: 1

A quorum being present, the chair called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m. in the Brink Hall Faculty Lounge.

Minutes: It was moved and seconded (Miller, McCaffrey) to accept the minutes of the January 29th meeting as distributed (noting only that McDaniel was not present). The motion carried unanimously.

Chair’s Report: The chair asked the council what, if anything, it wanted to do vis-à-vis the Yardley report. The ensuing discussion (see also provost’s report) did not suggest there was great urgency on the part of council to take an official stand. Rather, council would like to see further discussion in all parts of the university community. The chair noted that he had distributed a possible resolution of collective bargaining to the members of council and that it would be on the agenda for discussion at next week’s meeting. He also noted that there was continued interest among the faculty councils/senates of the four state colleges and universities for a collective resolution on domestic partnerships. It was good that there was dialog among the faculty leaders on topics of common interest.

Provost’s Report: The provost’s report, temporally intermingled in the chair’s report, was exclusively devoted to the Yardley report. The provost noted that we wanted to be more nationally competitive. The strategic plan lays the groundwork for decisions which might take us toward that goal. We cannot look to the state for more money and it will be a while before increasing enrollments provide substantial additional resources. Administrative discussion about possible models for change has begun. He assured the council, in tones that suggested both admiration and chagrin, that there were no “shrinking violets” among the deans. Thus council could be assured that all concerns would be heard. He further suggested that growth in graduate enrollments might come in the form of increased enrollments in the centers and the institutes. In response to a question, he agreed that any changes must consider a unit’s service to other departments and potential “ripple effects” changes in one unit might have in others.

FC-08-028, FSH 1620: University-Level Committees; FC-08-030: FSH 1640, Committee Directory; FS-08-032: UCC Committee Structure: In the absence owing to a dental emergency of Professor Guilfoyle, the secretary provided background on a set of seconded motions from the Committee on Committees. The general thrust of the proposals was almost exclusively editorial and consolidatory. The consolidation would put the information for all of Faculty Council’s university-level committees in a single place. Probably the most substantive change being proposed would allow faculty holding administrative rank (i.e., department chairs) to be appointed chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The former Fine Arts Committee now “rebranded” the Arts Committee, slated a few years back for dissolution due to inactivity, revised its function and structure. The newly reconstituted committee would advise the university administration on the management of the university arts, as well as promote and advocate the arts. The committee’s work in reviewing its purpose was recognized by both Sally Machlis and the Faculty Secretary. The motion carried unanimously.

In the context of this discussion, the issue of recruiting a new faculty secretary came up. There are still no applicants for the job. In response to a question, the current faculty secretary noted that the job was always very educational and often rewarding but did not constitute a waystation on any obvious career path. It did not preclude research and teaching but it did take time away from them. Various councilors suggested that position, as currently advertised, was not marketable.
FC-08-028: NOI: College of Science, Academic Certificate in Reproductive Biology: Professor James Irish provided background on this seconded motion from UCC. He noted that it would be an offering of the UI-WSU cooperative program, the Center for Reproductive Biology and was targeted both to our own graduate students (WSU already has a certificate program of this sort for its students) and returning professionals. The discussion quickly blossomed into a discussion of academic certificates more broadly and how they fit within the university’s overall structure and how many of the increasingly numerous certificate offerings were actually successful in attracting and graduating students, either internally or externally. In the absence of any hard data, such a discussion was inconclusive. The chair wondered if data on the number of various kinds of certificates could be reported. [It turns out that the Registrar’s Office, since time immemorial, codes certificates as “attributes” rather than as “degrees/minors.” Doing so does not allow a report to be run showing numbers of students completing a certificate. The Registrar’s Office is already in the midst of reprogramming so as to allow more complete tracking of certificates. In the mean time, with the current information, a report is being developed that would show the number of participants in the various certificate programs.] Returning to the specific proposal at hand, the motion carried unanimously.

FC-08-031: NOI: College of Education, Academic Certificate in Technical Workforce Training: Dean Rowland noted that this proposal, a seconded motion from UCC, had originally been requested by the state’s Department of Education. It was designed to attract corporate trainers and would be offered both in Moscow and Boise. He anticipated some five to ten people a year would take advantage of the offering. The motion carried unanimously.

FC-08-033: NOI: College of Education, Adult Basic Education (GED) Instructor Training: Dean Rowland gave some background information on this seconded motion from UCC, noting that it too had been requested by the state’s Department of Education, would require no additional classes, and would provide recognition for those involved in this type of adult education. The motion carried unanimously.

FC-08-034: NOI: College of Education, Discontinuance of Character Education Certificate; FC-08-035: College of Education, Discontinuance of Dance Performance Minor; FC-08-036, College of Education, Discontinuance of Online Instruction Certificate; FC-08-037, Discontinuance of Recreation Minor; FC-08-038, College of Education, Discontinuance of Social Dance Minor; FC-08-039, College of Education, Discontinuance of Sports Ethics Minor: Council took up this set of seconded motions from UCC, all for discontinuance of some minor or certificate, as a single item. Dean Rowland provided some background, noting that the certificates target for discontinuance had suffered from chronic low or zero enrollments. The discontinuations of the minors were more of a consolidation of minors: there would be a single dance minor and two recreation minors remaining. In answer to a council member’s statement that, given today’s climate of unethical behavior in sports it seemed odd to be discontinuing a Sports Ethics minor, Dean Rowland agreed. However, he noted that the low enrollment in this minor did not justify tying up the valuable time of a nationally recognized professor in this area who taught this course, Professor Stoll. The motion carried unanimously.

FC-08-025 (Rev): Academic Certificate in Bioregional Planning and Community Design: A final seconded motion from UCC was explicated briefly by Professor Wilson. He noted that the council had already approved the program but, for lack of time, had not completed the approval of the accompanying certificate. This certificate was designed to attract professionals in the field back for further schooling and certification. The motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment: Surprised, but pleased, at the early hour, it was moved and seconded (Miller, Murphy) to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Douglas Q. Adams,
Faculty Secretary and Secretary to Faculty Council
Outline for Presentation to Faculty Council on 2008 Proposed Changes

Background

The mission of Parking and Transportation Services is to provide safe, convenient and cost effective services for the University of Idaho. We are a self-supporting organization committed to supporting the teaching, research, operational and public service goals of the University of Idaho. We manage the University’s parking and transportation resources to meet current and projected needs of the campus community while providing outstanding customer service.

As a unit within Auxiliary Services, Parking and Transportation Services is expected to be self-sustaining and actively work towards improving financial stability. Currently, Parking and Transportation Services is operating in a revenue neutral capacity and generating revenues that are roughly equal to expenses. The current operational mode does not allow funds to be placed into a protected reserve for future capital or campus development projects. As an example, deferred maintenance, required improvements to the University’s parking lots and the funding of any capital projects are necessary and, currently, have no funding available.

Parking and Transportation Services - 2008 Goals

- Disability accommodation
- Financial stability
- Fee structure where all users of the parking system contribute
- Deferred maintenance
- Identifying capital projects
- Transportation Plan update
- Effective information dissemination
- Customer service
- Improve visitor experience

Main Issues to Cover

- Process and schedule
- 1-year plan fee proposal
- Transportation Plan update
- Impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and downtown – commuter lots (Blue)
- Financial Issues - Proforma
- Proposed changes
- Visitor and Disability permit fees approved last year but will implement in 08/09
Proposal 1: Increase in Parking Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Proposed Price</th>
<th>07-08 Price</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold</td>
<td>$280 - $288</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>8 - 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>$144</td>
<td>$131</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td>$59</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Purple, Silver, Green)

| Blue       | $59            | $59         | none     |

| Meter Rate | $1.00/hr       | $0.75/hr    | $0.25/hr |

- 1 year fee proposal
- Looking to determine appropriate range and value of rates such as: $400, $300, $200, $100 – compression issue
- May require Red to increase faster than Gold
- Create new “Platinum” permit at highest level for lot 40 at Administration Building
- Keeping commuter lots (blue) “affordable” and relatively unchanged over time to help mitigate impacts in surrounding neighborhoods and COM/downtown
- Reach a level of funding sustainability and then level off to increases of inflationary rate of 3-6%

Proposal 2: Convert three Blue lots to Red lots: Lot 1, 45 and 54B

Issues

- Supports Parking and Transportation Services goal of establishing lot 57 & 60 as the major affordable blue commuter lots
- High demand lots – full early in morning, stay full all day
- Follows proposed fee schedule and increases revenues
- North campus needs additional Red parking, 64B is heavily utilized daily
- Overflow parking for employees with gold or red permits is necessary in the vicinity of the Administration building, currently lot 45 is providing convenient overnight parking for residents and not meeting needs of commuters

Impacts

- May influence permit sales, possible increase in sale of red permits and decrease in sale of blue permits or vice versa
- Will force blue permit holders to park in lots 57 or 60 and become pedestrians
- Will decrease unnecessary vehicular circulation from blue permit holders in these areas – blue permit holders will have destination lots and this will eliminate driving and searching for available parking spaces

Proposal 3: Convert Administration lot 40 to Platinum

Issues

- High demand lot where many administrators park
- High levels of unnecessary vehicular circulation on Campus Drive – permit holders searching for a space, students parking in meters or timed areas, drop offs and pickups in the back of lot 40 create too much congestion in the lot
- Unrealistic expectation - increase the assurance of parking availability for permit holders
- Ensure that the essential business of Admin Bldg is met
- Want to reduce/discourage but not restrict use of Departmental Permits
- Designated spaces need to be available for VIP guests
- Disability parking accommodation must be met in this area
Impacts
- Will reduce the number of gold permit holders who will have parking at the Administration building as an option
- Platinum permit holders will have much higher assurance of having a parking space, however the price of the permit will be greater
- Students and other short term users of this lot will no longer be able to access the back of the lot
- Reduce unnecessary vehicle circulation on campus drive

Recommendations
- Convert lot to platinum and issue a permit specific to lot 40 that will be able to park down to gold, red and blue
- Release very limited number of platinum permits relative to number of spaces available at a price of $400 for the 08-09 academic year
- Attempt to completely restrict back of lot to permit holders only – post as reserved Mon-Fri 6am-5pm, Platinum permits required, remove meters and timed spaces, possibly add additional disability spaces and designate an area for VIP guest parking only
- Use front area of lot 40 for short term and drop offs

Proposal 4: Convert all Magenta areas to Purple (lot 85 & 103)
Issues
- Proposal was requested by ASUI in the November parking memo of proposals
- Currently magenta/purple system causes confusion with both permits being valid in both colored areas
- Magenta area only consists of Nez Perce Drive and Blake Street – simple to convert to purple
Impacts
- Confusion from purple/magenta permit holders would be eliminated

Proposal 5: Convert 85R (Upper Nez Perce Drive) to Purple
Issues
- With the conversion of lot 45 to Red this will leave no overflow parking for Greek residents living on Nez Perce Drive
- Proposal is in consideration of the possibility of expansion of parking through the band field south of Greek houses
- Current red permitted street is underutilized
Impacts
- Would increase number of vehicles parking on upper Nez Perce Drive – but in areas where impact is less than Greek houses
- Would displace the few red permit holders who currently park in this area, it is suggested that these permit holders park on the west end of Nez Perce Drive or the newly converted lot 45
Proposal 6: Implement Fee of $10 for Daycare Permits

Issues
- Currently daycare permits are issued free of charge to those who have children that attend West Park Elementary School, Early Childhood Center and the daycare facility near the Niccolls building
- Permit allows 15 minute parking in any lot in any regular permit space to pick up or drop off a child
- Currently the administrative costs and cost of the product are not being covered

Impacts
- In fall 2007, 54 daycare permits were issued, this number of individuals will be affected by this change

Proposal 7: Implement Fee of $37 for FH Visitor Permits

Issues
- FH visitor permits are currently at no charge
- Abuse of FH visitor permits is substantial, residents of family housing attempt to use visitor permit for daily parking
- Currently FH visitor permits are issued along with the FH green permits for no extra charge
- The administrative costs and product costs are not being covered

Impacts
- In fall of 2007, 108 FH visitor permits were issued, approximately this number of individuals will be affected financially with this proposal
- May impact the number of FH visitor permits sold and this may reduce the amount of abuse by those who are really not in need of an FH visitor permit
- FH residents will have the option of purchasing the FH visitor permit for the year or a daily visitor permit when they have guests

Proposal 8: Implement Fee for Departmental Permits

Issues
- Currently the first departmental permit issued to a department is free and the second must be purchased for a price equal to a gold permit ($288 for 08-09)
- Administrative costs and time and materials issuing permits are not being covered
- Permits allow parking for 2.5 hours in all colored lots, meters and timed spaces; enforcement of departmental permits is difficult and time consuming
- Abuse of the permits is substantial campus wide, departmental permit holders park daily free of charge

Impacts
- Departments will need to budget for the purchase of a departmental permit – stated last year that this was coming
- May impact the number of departmental permits issued

Recommendation
- Implement fee of $150 for each departmental permit with no limit on the number purchased by a department
Proposal 9: Implement fee for Visitor Permits

Issues
- Administrative costs and time and material costs are not currently being covered
- Charging for visitor parking is standard on college campuses and with our peer institutions
- Currently visitors to campus are not contributing to the parking system

Impacts
- Departments who request several visitor permits for events will now have to bear the cost and budget for visitor permits
- SUB information desk will also distribute and collect fees for visitor permits
- Will allow Parking and Transportation Services to increase revenue
- Charging for disability permits directly coincides with charging for visitors
- Information will need to be clearly disseminated to the community

Recommendation
- Implement a fee of $1.00/day for visitor permits
- Charge same fee of $1.00/day for visitor permits issued to departments

Proposal 10: Creation of UI Disability Permit

Issues
- Currently disability permit holders are not contributing to the parking system
- Free permits provides financial motivation for fraud
- Needs to be implemented at time that visitor permit fee is implemented to be able to charge all visitors for parking

Impacts
- Will impact all disability permit holders who are accustomed to parking free of charge
- Will require disabled visitors to purchase a visitor permit
- Reduce financial motivation for fraud
- Will not change accessibility or restrict parking for disabled individuals in any way, Parking and Transportation Services’ main goal is to ensure the accommodation of persons with disabilities
- Requiring purchase of a University disability permit is a standard policy on college campuses and our peer institutions

Recommendation
- Require all state/temp disability permit holders to purchase a UI disability permit for $74.00, to match the rate of residential permits for the 08-09 academic year
- Require all visitors who display state/temp disability permits to purchase a visitor permit for daily rate of $1
- UI disability permits will be required when a state/temp disability permit holder is parked in a meter, however payment in the meter will not be required
- UI disability permits will be required when a state/temp disability permit holder is parked in a timed space, however no time limit will apply
- UI disability permits will be required when a state/temp disability permit holder is parked in a regular permitted space or a regular disability parking space
- Proof of state/temp disability permit registration will be required upon purchase of a UI disability permit
- Temporary disability permits will be issued by DSS with doctors consent for a daily rate of $1