<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John S. Mackinnon</td>
<td>Leslie Craig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. S. Cane</td>
<td>Stephen Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Belcourt</td>
<td>Made Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Baun</td>
<td>Y. K. Yip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William McCombs</td>
<td>WME ACED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L. Seagle</td>
<td>Paul Tescano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boett Lang</td>
<td>E. Reilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Anderson</td>
<td>Stephanie Bace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Hamilton</td>
<td>Jan Bayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. V. St. INI</td>
<td>John Shumaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Wagner</td>
<td>Glenna Spaite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. G. Khan</td>
<td>John Hayes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Miller</td>
<td>William Reinbolt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. H. Babor</td>
<td>Alvin Magid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Berman</td>
<td>E. S. A. M. Jensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roz Annix</td>
<td>Thomas G. Loscano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. M. Whittaker</td>
<td>Fred Beharwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. W. C. Smith</td>
<td>M. Shittigari Sattinuk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyd E. Anderson</td>
<td>Desfosses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. O. Davis</td>
<td>O. C. Orfeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. M. Tyler</td>
<td>Steven Seidman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. J. A. Kondal</td>
<td>J. W. C. Enfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. F. H. Anderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. O. Davis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. A. Cooper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. M. S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn M. H. K.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lauren Konaei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald L. Simonti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovina Bryant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Fanthom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinblum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIVERSITY SENATE
Monday, March 16, 1987
Campus Center Assembly Hall – 3:30 P.M.

AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of February 9, 1987
2. President’s Report
3. SUNY Senators’ Report
4. Chair’s Report
5. Council Reports
6. New Business
   6.1 Bill No. 8687-05: Proposed Statement on Principles
   6.2 Bill No. 8687-06: A Certificate Program in Public Sector Management
   6.3 Bill No. 8687-07: Proposed Model for the Committee on Student Conduct
   6.4 Bill No. 8687-08: Proposed Revisions to the Student Guidelines Concerning Academic Dishonesty
   6.5 Bill No. 8687-09: Proposed Revision to the Residence Requirement
The meeting was called to order in the Campus Center Assembly Hall at 3:43 P.M. by Chair Birn.

1. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of February 9, 1987 were approved as written.

2. President's Report

The President reported that in deference to an anticipated lengthy meeting this afternoon, he would make his report brief.

Budget - The President stated that since the Governor has funded $10 million of the $16 million to be distributed to the University Centers and some statutory colleges, and that State appropriation was $1.4 million, the Research Foundation tithe was brought back to $8.4 million.

Salary Savings - Mr. O'Leary reported that salary savings for the coming fiscal year imposed on the University were set at 1.9% by the Governor's Office.

Senate Bill No. 8485-14 - The President reported that prior to 1965 students not completing enough credits per semester were placed on academic probation (quantitative standards). We had no qualitative standards. On May 6, 1985 Senate Bill 8485-14 was approved, stating that a student not achieving enough academic credits per semester would receive
an "academic warning." Academic probation was then taken to mean a GPA below 2.0. It was subsequently learned that about 400 entering freshmen had a GPA below 2.0. Mr. O'Leary suspended the subject bill and turned it over to the Undergraduate Academic Council. The Council ruled that "all inappropriate sanctions to the word 'probation' fall" and returned the bill to the President. When it was approved by the Senate, it was assumed and noted in the bill, that it would not affect financial aid. Mr. O'Leary reported that he learned very recently that the federal government will not allow an exemption of sanctions for financial aid. Once a student is declared not in good academic standing, he/she loses financial aid. Mr. O'Leary asked for concurrence of the Executive Committee in his suspension of Senate Bill No. 8485-14. Concurrence was given unanimously.

3. SUNY Senators' Report

K. Scatton reported that the next statewide meeting will take place in Buffalo in April.

4. Chair's Report

Chair Birn reported that the annual Senate election for Chair-Elect and Secretary will take place this year on Monday, April 20 in the Assembly Hall. He also announced that the Wednesday, May 6 Faculty Meeting has been changed to Friday, May 8.

The Chair moved approval of H. Adams to the Student Affairs Council and P. McCormick to the Research Council. The motion was seconded, approved, and unanimously carried.

5. Council Reports

EPC - The Council met on February 23. The Resource Advisory Committee is involved in Budget Panel matters and the Long Range Planning Committee is involved in Graduate Initiative proposals dealing with international programs.

UAC - The Council meets regularly and will have a definition of grading, and elimination of quantitative retention standards for the May 4 Senate meeting.

GAC - The Council met two weeks ago and today. Chair Berman reported that it is looking at a policy statement that requires all contract courses as well as campus courses to be counted toward the degree program.

SAC - The Council will meet with EPC regarding notation of extracurricular activities on student transcripts.

Research - The Council has nominated B. Lang, C. Baglioni and E. Blanchard as the three outstanding scholars for the Faculty Scholar Exchange Program and has forwarded their names to SUNY Central.
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UCC - Chair Anderson reported that the Council is looking at parking and bus service, with particular emphasis on the Wellington run.

CAFE - No report.

CPCA - No report.

Library - No report.

6. New Business

6.1 Bill No. 8687-09: Proposed Revision to the Residence Requirement - J. Levato moved the subject bill be approved. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

6.2 Bill No. 8687-05: Statement of Principles of Accreditation - R. Ward moved the subject bill and reported that there is no policy on campus regarding appropriate review of programs by outside accrediting bodies. Council members believed that to be consistent with the goals of the University such a program must be in place. The motion was seconded. A friendly amendment was made to change the title to "Statement of Principles of Accreditation." The amendment was accepted by R. Ward. The motion for approval was unanimously carried.

6.3 Bill No. 8687-06: A Certificate Program in Public Sector Management - J. Berman moved adoption of the bill. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

6.4 Bill No. 8687-07: Proposed Model for the Committee on Student Conduct - H. Cannon moved approval. The motion was seconded. J. Berman made the friendly amendment to change "amendment" to "amendment" in two places. The motion was accepted by H. Cannon. H. Hamilton made the friendly amendment that page 1, part I, read "That the attached recommendation of the Committee on Student Conduct be accepted." The amendment was accepted by H. Cannon.

J. Berman made the friendly amendment to change on page 2, paragraph 1, second sentence, "That Office will also notify the Dean of the appropriate college and the Chair of the appropriate department of the details of the case that has been initiated." The motion was seconded. H. Hamilton made the friendly amendment to change the same sentence to read, "... appropriate department of the name of the student, the name of the faculty member and the general nature of the case that has been initiated." H. Cannon moved the previous question. The motion was seconded. A vote resulted in a tie of 22 ayes, 22 nays and 1 abstention by J. Bernstein. Chair Birn cast the deciding vote to defeat the motion. A motion was made that the sentence be deleted. The motion was seconded and defeated with 17 ayes and 23 nays.
A. Magid moved that the same sentence be changed to read, "That Office will also notify the Chair of the department, or the dean where there is no chair, of the name of the student against whom charges are being made, the faculty member laying charges and the nature of the charge."

K. Birr moved the previous question. Motion seconded and carried with 19 ayes and 17 nays. The motion to approve the subject bill as amended was carried.

6.5 Bill No. 8637-08: Proposed Revisions to the Student Guidelines Concerning Academic Dishonesty - H. Cannon moved adoption of the bill. The motion was seconded. H. Cannon gave a brief history of the bill. R. Gibson, Parliamentarian, informed Chair Birn that it was very near the 5:00 P.M. mandatory meeting closing time and informed him of the alternatives available. The Chair reported to the Senate and a motion was made that the bill be referred for study to UAC. The motion was seconded. A friendly amendment was made that it also be referred to GAC. The motion was carried with one nay by H. Cannon and 1 abstention.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Beverly Roth

Beverly Roth
Senate Recorder
The last meeting of the academic year of the statewide Faculty Senate was held in Buffalo on April 10-11. At this meeting Karen Markoe of Maritime College was elected President of the Senate for the 1987-89 term with Nancy Bunch of Empire State College (New York City) was named Vice President/Secretary to fulfill the one-year term vacated by Professor Markoe.

The Faculty Senate passed four bills to be forwarded to the Acting Chancellor for his consideration:

1. The Senate requested SUNY Administration to do whatever is within its power to mitigate the negative financial impact of the Tax Reform Act of 1986 on graduate assistants and teaching assistants in SUNY.

2. The Senate has urged the Chancellor to direct each Chief Administrative Officer to create an Affirmative Action Review Board to review and assess the program and action of the Office of Affirmative Action every three years. The proposed action suggests the Board be appointed jointly by the CAO and the Presiding Officer of the campus Governance Body and should include faculty, staff, and administrators, at least one-half of whom are women and/or minorities with the majority of the membership holding continuing appointment.

3. The Senate endorsed the position that when considering the status of faculty for promotion, reappointment, continuing appointment, and/or discretionary salary increases, records of research, teaching and university and community service in the disciplines of minority or women's studies should be judged on a par with all the traditionally recognized fields of study.

4. The Senate has requested the Chancellor to direct all CAO's to appoint future Affirmative Action Officers to a "home base" line-item faculty or staff position which they may occupy or to which they may return should they leave that office by reason of resignation or dismissal. This would be accomplished consistent with normal consultative procedures.
I am forwarding to you the Inter-Fraternity Council and the Pan-Hellenic Council proposed constitutions.

After some editing and review by the Student Affairs Council, and its Sub-Committee on Student Government and Organizations, they both passed unanimously among the members present at the Student Affairs Council meeting on Friday, December 12th, 1986.

They are now ready for action, concerning their Provisional Charters - procedure B of the 3-step process: Temporary Recognition, Provisional Charter, and then Permanent Status. The recommendation of the Student Affairs Council to you is that these adjusted documents should be granted their Provisional Charters.

Within the next two years, we the Student Affairs Council, are looking forward to assisting you again in the pending adoption of the Inter-Fraternity Council and the Pan-Hellenic Council into permanent stature. We are aware that this will be in conjunction with the Greek Life Advisory Committee’s amendments to the permanent charter recognition procedures.

On behalf of the Student Affairs Council, I am pleased that the Greek Life at the State University of New York at Albany is finally becoming an official entity. The Student Affairs Council strongly feels the need for the Greek organizations to conform to University actions, all the while the University must establish a special relationship with these Greek organizations, so that they can further the educational mission, and therefore, the Greeks can contribute to the quality of University life.

cc: Student Affairs Council
    Donald Birn
    Beverly Roth
    Laura Brezosky
    Francisco Duarte
    James Doellefeld
    Jessica Casey
    Helen Adams
    Leon Calhoun and the Greek Life Advisory Committee
    Robert Berke
    Jessica Horowitz
    All Fraternity and Sorority Presidents
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Statement of Principles

SUBMITTED BY: Council on Educational Policy
January 26, 1987

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That the University Senate endorse the statement of principles on accreditation adopted by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and that the University at Albany seek accreditation only from organizations that accept those principles. (See Appendix)

II. That the University Senate endorse the proposal that the University at Albany seek accreditation only from organizations affiliated with the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation or which plan to seek affiliation with COPA, except that the President may make exceptions to the policy on recommendation of the faculty of a program if in their judgment accreditation by a non-affiliated organization is essential for the future employment prospects of its students.
RATIONAL

In the past two years there has been increasing national concern among educators about the process of accreditation, particularly specialized accreditation of academic programs. To assure that reviews of academic programs remain a useful and valuable means of protecting and enhancing quality in higher education, the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) adopted a statement of Principles on Accreditation in 1985. The CIC is a consortium of eleven mid-western universities (the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Indiana University, the University of Iowa, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the University of Minnesota, Northwestern University, the Ohio State University, Purdue University and the University of Wisconsin). The statement, prepared by the CIC chief academic officers, describes the standards that must be met if accreditation is to serve the universities, their faculty and students and the public.

In November 1986, the Senate of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) officially adopted the CIC guidelines for use by its member institutions. These guidelines are presented in the Appendix to the bill.

Several years ago the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation was formed to provide formal recognition of accrediting bodies, using a set of guidelines that are consistent with the principles recently endorsed by NASULGC. A self-study Advisory Panel chaired by Dr. C. Peter Magrath, President of the University of Missouri, issued a report on the objectives, priorities, governance and financing of COPA on October 2, 1986. This Report contained a reaffirmation of the following principles:

-- A fundamental purpose of accreditation should be recognized to be this: to focus on the educational values of the institution or program in order to elevate its standards and quality without being trapped into a narrow counting of minimal standards measured by mundane statistics.

-- The processes of accreditation should deemphasize narrow technical standards, whether in a specific program or an entire college or university, and instead emphasize the pursuit of educational standards and outcomes of the highest possible quality appropriate to the extraordinarily competitive world that the United States now faces.

-- The accreditators should view themselves first and foremost as educators, significant partners in the process of teaching and learning dedicated to improving standards relevant to the mission of the college, university, and programs which they assess.

As a doctoral-granting institution, the University at Albany undergoes a review for institutional accreditation on a ten-year cycle by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.
In addition to its institutional accreditation, the University at Albany has nine programs which receive specialized accreditation:

Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology  American Psychological Association
Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology American Psychological Association
M.S. in Rehabilitation Counseling Council on Rehabilitation Education
B.S. & M.S.W. in Social Work Council on Social Work Education
M.L.S. in Library Science American Library Association
B.S. and M.B.A. in Business American Assembly of Collegiate School of Business
M.P.A. in Public Administration National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration

All of these organizations are recognized by COPA.

The Computer Science Department has recently requested accreditation for its B.S. program from the Computer Science Accreditation Board, which is not yet COPA affiliated. The Department of Chemistry is recognized by the American Chemical Society, which is also not COPA affiliated.
APPENDIX

1. Evaluation must place its emphasis on the outcome of the educational process. Criticisms by accrediting teams directed at procedural or organizational details must be based on reasonable evidence that those details affect the performance of graduates or the quality of education provided to them. Where quantitative standards are cited or advice is offered on the organization of the instructional unit, structure of the curriculum, sequencing of courses, teaching loads, methods of instruction, graduation requirements, and designation of the degree or other credentials conferred, the university has a right to expect evidence of a reasonably direct relationship between what is being recommended and the ability of the program to achieve its goals.

2. The standards applied in the accreditation process must not discourage experimentation, innovation or modernization, either in teaching methods or in the curriculum itself. An accrediting body can legitimately point out deficiencies it believes will result from a particular innovation. It can ask for assurance that the institution will provide the resources that the innovation will require, and it can insist on some plan of evaluation. What it must not do is impose standards that place obstacles in the way of originality, creativity, or innovation on the part of the faculty or the institution.

3. Recommendations should be diagnostic, not prescriptive. For example, an accrediting agency could properly question whether there is enough effort to evaluate teaching performance, or whether student input on such evaluation is adequate, but it should not try to prescribe a particular form of or approach to evaluation.

4. The accreditation report must explicitly recognize institutional diversity. Every university has its own unique resources, methodologies, special mission, and educational philosophy. In particular, the interplay among graduate education, undergraduate education, research and public service will differ greatly among programs and from one university to another. Each university can expect that accrediting teams will familiarize themselves with its special circumstances and resources and will take them into account in relation to the programs being reviewed.
5. Accreditation should not encourage the isolation or self-containment of an academic program. In larger universities with substantial program depth, even the most specialized professional school can benefit by drawing upon the library holdings, courses being taught, research in progress, and faculty interests in other schools and colleges. A university can expect an accrediting team to file a report that shows awareness of these supporting resources and actively encourages their shared use.

6. The burden of accreditation must be kept as light as possible, both for the institution being accredited and for the accreditation team. Size of team and duration of the accreditation visit should be limited to the minimum necessary for a productive review. Data requirements and other advance preparation should also be kept to a minimum, recognizing, however, that encouragement for self-study may be one of the best products of an accreditation review. Finally, there must be a reasonable, fair, and expeditious procedure for questioning conclusions of the accrediting body without elaborate interim or supplementary reviews or reports.

7. The institution being accredited should be consulted as to the composition of the accrediting team, and has a right to expect that a majority of team members will be drawn from peer institutions and comparable programs. A useful evaluation requires substantial input from persons who are directly familiar with the nature of the institution and program being accredited. Without experience at comparable universities or in similar programs, not even the most careful observer can acquire such familiarity in the course of a brief team visit or by reading documents, however carefully prepared.

8. In the case of professional schools, although there must be significant input from the profession itself, the ultimate authority over educational policies must remain firmly in the hands of the academic community. If a realistic program of training for a profession is to be offered, the contributions of practitioners must be solicited and welcomed. We do our students no favor if we fail to equip them to practice according to standards enunciated by the profession and by society in general. At the same time, universities cannot escape the ultimate responsibility for what they teach, how it is taught, by whom, and to whom. They cannot meet this obligation if final authority over standards and sanctions for academic programs rests largely in non-academic hands. Forging an effective partnership between the professions and the professional schools in this regard will continue to offer a major challenge and opportunity for both groups.
9. The greatest help an accrediting agency can offer to a program is to demand that its educational goals be clearly stated and that the program be reasonably calculated to achieve those goals. An accrediting body can offer useful advice - but only advice - as to whether, in its opinion, the resources are adequate to meet program goals. The primary question must be whether these goals are being achieved, however, rather than whether square footage or salary levels or teacher-student ratios or telephone accessibility meet some arbitrary measure. The essential purpose of accreditation is to assure the prospective student and the public that necessary standards of quality are being satisfied. However meritorious it may be to advance the salaries, perquisites, or working conditions of the faculty or administration of the unit being evaluated, the accrediting process is not the proper vehicle to use for this purpose. An educational program is validated first and foremost by how well it accomplishes the goals set for it. This, in turn, rests ultimately on how well its students and graduates are able to perform - no matter how difficult that is to appraise or predict.

from: Accreditation: A Statement of Principles, NASULGC
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A CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT

PROPOSED BY: Graduate Academic Council
March 2, 1987

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That the certificate program in Public Sector Management with the attached requirements be approved by the State Education Department.

II. That this bill become effective September 1988.

III. That this bill be referred to the President for approval.
A. Program Identity
1. Proposed Title: Public Sector Management
2. Proposed Award: Certificate
3. Proposed Starting Date: September 1988
4. HEGIS Code: 2102
5. Sponsor: Department of Public Administration

B. Program Background and Description
1. Overview

This proposal describes a new program leading to a certificate in public sector management. The program is designed to serve the needs of relatively inexperienced or untrained managers in New York State service. The certificate program will offer these professionals the opportunity to gain management skills and earn credentials in public management.

The Public Administration Department of the Graduate School of Public Affairs recognizes a group of professional public sector employees that are not served by current programs in the school or region. These professionals are often field specialists, with only bachelor degrees, who hold or seek administrative positions, and have no formal training in management. Our experience reveals that this group is interested in specialized graduate training in public management. The objectives in establishing a certificate in public sector management are twofold: to provide an introductory program in management that does not require the commitment of time required for the discipline's traditional degree, the MPA; and to build a bridge for the non-degree, non-traditional student to the academic degree programs of the school.

Through the Department's experience with management development programs in the state, it has become clear that there are many professionals holding administrative positions without a background in training in management. Due to the nature of their specializations, degrees in the substantive field or on the job experience, rather than administrative skills, are the currency for promotion. Options available to administrators or supervisors deficient in management skills have been quite limited. Choices include in-service training courses, an array of unaffiliated courses offered through evening programs at a number of campuses, and full degree programs in public administration or public affairs. Ad hoc training often fails to be comprehensive, to provide credentials, or to link the specialty to its administrative environment. Degree programs are, in general, an unattractive option to this population because of the substantial commitment of time and resources necessary to complete a degree program at this period in their careers. A graduate certificate program in management offers a shortened, but specialized, alternative to a master's program in public administration while providing the professional with a recognized credential.
2. Within the proposed certificate, students can combine courses in general management principles and skills with courses related to an area of specialization. The benefit to graduates of the certificate program includes enhanced skills and employability within the management hierarchy of their agencies. The program will be useful also to professionals who seek promotion into supervision or administration.

2. Program Description

The Certificate in Public Sector Management requires a minimum of 20 graduate credits taken in at least five graduate courses. Most of the courses supporting this program will be offered by the Department of Public Administration. However, depending on the discrete specializations chosen by students, supporting courses can be drawn from such schools and departments as Criminal Justice, Social Welfare, Information Science and Policy, Education, Political Science, Public Affairs and Policy, and Computer Science.

Within the five-course program, two courses deal with general management principles, one course links a student's specialty to its administrative environment, and two courses deal with special topics in the field. This design allows for flexible curriculum planning to insure the greatest relevance to a student's field of specialization. Available specializations include: Human Resources Management; Court Systems; Information Management; Public Policy; Financial Management; and Planning and Control.

There will be no new courses developed specifically for certificate specializations. All courses will be drawn from existing concentrations within degree programs or from courses created through new program endeavors (e.g., health systems management).

Each student will be assigned an advisor whose expertise lies within the student's desired specialization. Students and advisors will establish jointly certificate curriculum plans taking into consideration the student's previous education, experiences, and goals.

C. Facilities

Rockefeller College is an appropriate site for this program activity. The College has a proven record in attracting public sector professionals to its degree programs, a commitment to serving the needs of government, and the support facilities in its libraries and computer user laboratories to provide a quality program.

The campus of Rockefeller College is in an ideal location to serve the needs of public sector managers: strategically located between the two centers of state government in Albany, the campus is accessible to most agencies.

D. Relationship to Campus

The proposed certificate program falls within the campus' public policy mission and commitment to community service. The program will serve the needs of public sector professionals seeking administrative training to improve performance or achieve promotion in management roles. In the absence of such a certificate program, this group of professionals is denied a feasible, short term, quality training program in public management.
This certificate is expected to have a complementary relationship to other university programs. No other campus unit offers an introductory certificate program in public sector management training. This certificate is designed to be a pre-master's level program in management, although individuals with master's degrees in other fields may well be attracted to the program.

It is conceivable that there will be direct benefits to existing programs. The certificate is expected to attract many professionals who sporadically engage in management training courses as an alternative to degree programs. Some of these students may eventually transfer their certificate credits to degree programs at Albany. Hence, the certificate can be an effective bridge between traditional and non-traditional programs. At the completion of the Certificate program students will be near the halfway point of regular degree programs in public administration; this may be a critical level of accomplishment which induces students to matriculate into degree programs.

Rockefeller College has participated in the Public Service Training Program which has brought more than 600 students to our classrooms in administrative and supervisory courses. A percentage of these students may be interested in transferring some of their accrued credits to this certificate program and thereby earn a credential for their efforts. Further, a percentage of certificate holders may then be attracted to a master's program upon reaching this intermediate goal.

E. Enrollments

Student demand for this Certificate program is estimated to result in an initial enrollment of 15 students, then attaining a level of 35 students in the fifth year of operation.

1. Estimate headcount enrollments in the proposed program for the first five years of operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This program will have a modest impact on future campus enrollment composition and totals as its enrollees will be part-time students taking at most one or two courses each semester. Total graduate student headcount will be affected by a factor of less than 1%.

rmc049
It is hereby proposed:

I. That the attached report of the Committee on Student Conduct be accepted in fulfillment of the requirements of Bill Nos. 8384-02 and 8485-17.

II. That this bill be referred to the President for approval.

Background:

Bill 8384-02 (Sept. 19, 1983) specified the composition and operation of the Committee on Student Conduct, including a requirement of Senate review in the Spring of 1985. Bill 8485-17 (May 6, 1985) responded to that mandate; it also recommended certain amendments to Bill 8384-02 and those amendments were approved.

This bill should be regarded as a synthesis of the prior two bills. There are two substantive changes: 1. It removes the requirement of biennial review by the Senate, and 2. It removes the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Student Affairs as ex officio members of the Committee. Approval of these changes are recommended by the Committee on Student Conduct as no longer being necessary requirements.

Membership

Membership of the Committee on Student Conduct will consist of twelve members of the teaching faculty, four professionals and ten students. The appointments to the Committee on Student Conduct will be made jointly by the Chair of the University Senate Executive Committee, the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Vice President for Student Affairs. Two members of the teaching faculty will be named Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee on Student Conduct.

Appointments to the Committee on Student Conduct will be made in the Spring of each year with the understanding that members would normally serve for two years. Staggered terms would be arranged to accomplish an approximately equal number of turnovers each year.
Disciplinary Hearing

In each case of alleged academic dishonesty, the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs will draw from the membership of the Committee on Student Conduct a panel of five members of the faculty, of whom at least four will be teaching faculty, and two students. That Office will also notify the Dean of the appropriate college and the Chair of the appropriate department that a case has been initiated. Each panel will be assigned responsibility for hearing each case of academic dishonesty. The panel will be chaired by either the Chair or Vice Chair (previously named) of the Committee on Student Conduct.

In dealing with cases which do not involve allegations of academic dishonesty, the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs will in each case designate a hearing panel drawn from the membership of the Committee on Student Conduct consisting of three teaching faculty, one professional, and four students. The Chair or Vice Chair will serve as convenor and chair.

It should be noted that recommendations of the Committee on Student Conduct are implemented by the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Therefore, all recommendations stemming from allegations of academic dishonesty will be forwarded to that office with a copy to the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs who may respond, if he or she so elects, to the Vice President for Student Affairs prior to implementation.

Appeals

Appeals arising from cases of academic dishonesty will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Student Conduct not involved in the original hearing. The subcommittee will consist of three teaching faculty, one professional, and one student. The chair of the subcommittee will be the Chair or the Vice Chair of the Committee on Student Conduct or, when necessary, another member of the teaching faculty.

Appeals stemming from cases which do not involve allegations of academic dishonesty will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Student Conduct not involved in the original hearing. The subcommittee will consist of three teaching faculty, one professional, and four students. The Chair or Vice Chair will serve as convenor and chair. When necessary, another member of the teaching faculty may serve as chair of the subcommittee.

Administration

The Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs will administer the student conduct system which deals with the judicial/disciplinary process on the campus. This includes reviewing allegations, developing 'logging' and follow-up systems, establishing dates and times for hearings, assigning cases to appropriate hearing bodies or officers, notifying those involved of hearings, training those who serve as chairs and/or members of judicial bodies, receiving recommendations following hearings, notifying those involved of outcomes, developing periodic reports, dealing with appeals, advising and consulting with faculty and staff, and providing for periodic system review and revision.
The Office of Vice President for Student Affairs shall prepare periodic reports for the Executive Committee of the University Senate and the Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs. The Chair of the Committee on Student Conduct may submit an independent report to those named above and, in addition, may provide a periodic report on student conduct to the University faculty. The Vice President for Student Affairs is charged with the responsibility for providing the technical and budgetary support to implement this provision.
It is hereby proposed:

I. That in cases of academic dishonesty where the student involved is given probation, suspension, or dismissal, that the student's transcript show such action. The entry on the transcript would read:

Sanction - Effective Dates - "Academic Dishonesty"

II. That this bill be referred to the President for review by the University Council.

Rational:

It is the strong belief of the committee that placing such a notice on the student's transcript would serve the following purposes:

- Act as a strong deterrent to the constant and growing problem of academic dishonesty.

- Underscore the seriousness of this violation of the Student Guidelines, and show the sincerity of the University community concerning the manner in which it is dealing with it.

- Affirm that academic dishonesty is a reflection of academic performance, and that the transcript should show and will show such performance in its entirety.

- Indicate, directly on the transcript, a distinction between probations, suspensions and dismissals which are a result of academic dishonesty, and those that are a result of other disciplinary problems.
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UNIVERSITY SENATE

Proposed Revision to the Residency Requirement

Proposed By: The Undergraduate Academic Council

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

Degree candidates must earn, while in matriculated status, 30 of their last 36 credits in courses for which they registered at the Albany Campus of the University.

RATIONALE:

The basic provision of the current residence policy was adopted by University Senate in 1979 (copy attached). A significant number of our students take one or two Summer Session courses at another institution the summer before or the summer after their senior year (students doing the latter then graduate in August). These students do not have their "last 30" credits earned on this campus. They then petition the CAS to have the rule waived, which is routinely done for students missing six or less UA credits of their final 30. The current regulation is proving to be too rigid, so flexibility is accomplished through "automatic" waiver. This would appear to be an inefficient and inappropriate mode of operation. It is proposed that the policy be changed to allow up to six of the last 36 credits for graduation to be taken at another institution.
UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

Revision of Residence Requirement

INTRODUCED BY: Undergraduate Academic Council
December 3, 1979

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT THE FOLLOWING BE ADOPTED:

I. That for the B.A. and B.S. degrees, the current residence requirement be amended by addition of the following requirement for all students graduating in May 1984 and thereafter:

"A minimum of 30 graduation credits must be completed in courses on the Albany campus."

Approval of the amendment would result in the following residence requirements:

1. Complete a minimum of 30 graduation credits in courses on the Albany campus.

2. Earn the last 30 credits in courses for which they are registered on this campus.

II. That this resolution be referred to the President for approval.

RATIONALE

It is strongly felt that at least 30 graduation credits should be under the direct supervision of a faculty member at SUNY-Albany. The Undergraduate Academic Council received from its Curriculum Committee the original proposal which was that 45 graduation credits should be earned in courses on the Albany campus. After consultation, including the Admissions Office, it was agreed that 30 graduation credits was a more realistic figure and would cause minimal difficulty in admissions.

The proposal maintains the current requirement that the last 30 credits applicable toward the baccalaureate degree must be in courses for which the student registered on the Albany campus. Coursework pursued through cross-registration or SUNY study-abroad programs would continue to satisfy that requirement. Students in both these programs register for a specific SUNY-Albany course which appears on the transcript.
RATIONALE--contd.

Under the current regulations, it is possible for a student to receive a degree from Albany without ever taking a course on our campus. For example, a transfer with 90 credits who studies abroad during the senior year could satisfy all existing requirements. The Council felt that a minimum number of credits must be completed on this campus under the supervision of a SUNY-Albany faculty member if we are to certify the student has a degree from Albany. The equivalent of two semesters work did not seem unreasonable. These credits need not be taken as the final 30 degree credits but will, for example, be met within the first year by most freshmen admitted to Albany.

Approval of the proposal should not affect transfer admissions, since students will still be able to transfer up to 90 credits.