

Minutes*

**Senate Consultative Committee
Thursday, , 1995
12:30 - 3:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall**

Present: John Adams (chair), Carl Adams, Joel Bergstrom, Rachel Brand, Thomas Burk, Sheila Corcoran-Perry, Lester Drewes, Sara Evans, Virginia Gray, James Gremmels, Kenneth Heller, Robert Jones, Geoffrey Maruyama, Harvey Peterson, Michael Steffes, Rabun Taylor, Barbara Thompson

Regrets: Roberta Humphreys

Absent: Brandon Lujan, Jason Mork, Donald Ness, Chad Reichwald, Tim Stanislawski

Guests: Shirley Nordstrom, John Stearn

Others:

[In these minutes:

1. Committee on Committees

Professor Adams convened the meeting at 12:45 and informed the Committee that it annually has the responsibility of identifying individuals who can serve as a nominating committee for members of the Committee on Committees. In response to the puzzled look on the faces of Committee members, he explained that the process sounds contorted, but the one committee the Committee on Committees does not appoint is itself, so a special nominating committee is required. It was agreed that the names of faculty members who would serve on the nominating committee would be identified at the next meeting. (Student appointments are made by a different process.)

2. U Card

Professor Adams then welcomed Shirley Nordstrom and John Stearnes to the meeting to discuss the U card. Ms. Nordstrom began by explaining the background of the project, and noted that it is intended to support U2000 by increasing user-friendliness and making life easier for faculty, staff, and students. The card, to be issued to everyone, will eventually be usable for a number of functions: library use, duplicating, food services, parking, building access, Recreational Sports, credit balance checks, financial aid, etc., and (at the option of the card-holder), banking and long distance telephone calling. They passed around two samples of what the U card will look like. There will be a pilot group issued cards in the near future, including members of the steering committee that they have relied on for help;

*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represent the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

full distribution is planned for Fall Quarter, 1995. They noted that implementation for all services may take place over time; it would, for example, be extremely expensive to place card readers on all the vending machines.

Committee members posed several questions about the cards.

- Why is there a "role code" (e.g., faculty, staff, student, and so on)? That was recommended, Ms. Nordstrom said, because departments extend courtesies and offer services in different ways to different groups (e.g., faculty may keep books out of the library longer than undergraduate students). There are seven different "role" codes, and more subdivisions within them (including such categories as "guest," "affiliate," and "regent"). The one on the card for any individual will always be the "highest" one.
- The front of the card will be the same for all campuses; the back will be different for each campus. Some access to services will be system-wide (e.g., the libraries); others will be limited to the campus of origin.
- The two vendors chosen to support the card--Twin City Federal and AT&T--went through a "request for proposals" process. They are the ones who offered the best services and were most enthusiastic about it. They will supply revenue, and the card-holders will have the option to use their services, at a cost they would not otherwise be able to obtain.
- There will be no expiration date, but there will be an issue date. Individual departments or units will make their own decisions on whether or not a card will be honored after a certain length of time. For students, for example, a library system would check to see if a student was registered before permitting books to be removed.
- There was discussion of the magnetic stripes on the card and the data that will be contained on them. One of them will contain cash value; one will be able to put money into a machine and have credit on the card. The card will then be usable for small purchases on campus and carry a declining balance. (The amount will be limited, because if the card is lost, it will be like losing cash.)
- The information on the card about banking and telephone services, should a cardholder opt to use them, would not be known to the University.
- There will be sites, on all campuses, which one may contact if, for example, one were to lose a card on Friday night (or at any other non-business hour). The card itself will be free; one would have to pay a replacement fee were it lost.
- There is a lot of information on the card about the person, including a picture; would that not be valuable to someone with evil intent? They have tried to minimize the amount of information, but some of the numbers, such as student ID, are what admit the cardholder to University systems and services.
- If revenue is generated by the card, what will it be used for? To support the card office; after that, it could be used to increase applications of the card so it could be used by everyone in more ways, or however else the administration might decide the funds could help the University community. The appearance of corporate logos on the card, moreover, is not "selling out"; they are partners with the University in offering the card, and what they are offering to cardholders will be better

than what anyone could get elsewhere.

- The information on the card is encoded according to international standards; anyone with the right machine could read it. But this also means that all vendors can adapt to this card.

One Committee member recalled having such a card while on leave at another institution; "with the parade of horrors" going on, it was said, the card nonetheless made life much easier and its value far outweighs all its potential drawbacks.

Professor Adams thanked Ms. Nordstrom and Mr. Stearnes for their presentation.

3. Various Items of Committee Business

Professor Adams then took up several items of business.

- The Transition Advisory Committee report will be distributed to Committee members.
- The Board of Regents is now not scheduled to take up the Academic Freedom Policy until June and July, giving the governance system and the administration sufficient time to review it thoughtfully. A small administrative group has been examining the existing policies, and it and most other people appear to agree that slight revisions to the 1938 statement may be most appropriate; that group will prepare a draft for review by the Committees and by the Senate in February, and probably action by the Senate in April or May.
- He asked Professor Heller that the Committee on Educational Policy take up the question of how the University deals with transfer students, especially into IT and CLA. The University spends a lot of time addressing issues relating to new freshmen, but a major stream of students at the University is transfers--and it knows less about those students. This is a subject that Senior Vice President Infante and Associate Vice President Kvavik think very important. Is there a better way to identify, recruit, admit, and serve the needs of transfer students, and a way to encourage them to attend full-time? Professor Heller accepted the assignment for SCEP.

He clarified that he did not mean to imply that fewer transfer students attend full time than other students; the point, he said, is that instead of DISCOURAGING people from going full time, as is now the case, it should encourage them to shift to full time.

Committee members discussed the standards for admission of transfer students--decided by the colleges--the lack of planfulness with respect to transfer students, and the failure of the University, until recently, to keep track of students who came and left--leaving it without needed information. The last point was also linked to the low participation of alumni in University affairs and fund-raising.

- Professor Adams then inquired if Committee members wished to say anything more about the proposed Regents' policy on tuition. Professor Gray reported that the Finance and Planning Committee would be sending a letter to the President expressing concern about the possible excessive use of academic fees and the need to keep control of them; the Committee did not, however, oppose them.

The students have a number of objections to the policy, it was said, and are preparing a position paper on it. The major concerns are: (1) the language is vague and confusing--Regents' policies

should articulate principles, it was agreed, but the principles should be understandable; (2) the use of academic fees; (3) tuition remissions and waivers reported as student aid (because the money is in part coming from the students themselves)

- There will be a report from the chair and vice chair of the Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics at the February 2 meeting to talk about its role in monitoring the academic performance of student-athletes.
- Everyone is familiar with the hassles that surround copyrights and duplicating; is this an issue the Committee wishes to take up? Faculty are becoming increasingly agitated, and there is a body of case law building up that is creating more obstacles.

The situation is getting worse, said one Committee member, and the University should begin to negotiate agreements with publishers of books and journals that the University will not buy them or use them unless they sign access agreements. Universities are consumers and producers, and should not give control of this issue to the courts.

The most recent decision, in the Texaco case, applied to for-profit organizations, and it is not clear that it applies to universities. The Copyright Permissions Committee is wrestling with the issues, but if universities must accept the current line of court decisions, they will need to restrict access.

It was agreed that there is enough activity on this subject that the Committee need not become involved.

With no other agenda items proposed or before him, Professor Adams adjourned the meeting at 2:30.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota