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UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING
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AGENDA

1. Approval of Minutes of March 25, 1985
2. President's Report
3. SUNY Senators' Report
4. Chair's Report
5. Council Reports
6. Old Business
   6.1 Bill No. 8485-07, Proposed Combined Degree Program in Public Affairs and Policy
7. New Business
   7.1 Bill No. 8485-09, Proposed Minimum 2.00 GPA Graduate Requirement
   7.2 Bill No. 8485-10, Proposed Qualitative Retention Standards
   7.3 Bill No. 8485-12, Proposed Definition of Retention Credits
   7.4 Bill No. 8485-13, Proposed Changing of Current Probation to a Warning
   7.5 Bill No. 8485-14, Proposed Definition of Good Academic Standing
   7.6 Bill No. 8485-15, Proposed B.A. and B.S. in Computer Science
   7.7 Bill No. 8485-17, Proposed Revision of Academic Student Conduct Model Committee Composition and Operational Procedures
UNIVERSITY SENATE
MINUTES
May 6, 1985


The meeting was called to order by the Chair, Pat Rogers, at 3:40 P.M. in the Campus Center Assembly Hall.

1. Approval of Minutes

The Minutes of March 25, 1985 were approved as written.

2. President's Report

Mr. O'Leary said that he appreciated the work of the Senate, and particularly that of Chair Pat Rogers during the 1984-85 academic year.

Reorganization - Mr. O'Leary reviewed his remarks made at the May 1 Faculty Meeting concerning plans for reorganization. A search for a Vice President for Research and Educational Development has been conducted without fruition over two consecutive years. The College of Humanities and Fine Arts has not had a permanent dean for that same time. Mr. O'Leary stressed that focus and coherency are important to provide a consistent image and briefly outlined some of the changes that will take place, including opening searches for the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies and for a Dean for the College of Humanities and Fine Arts.

3. SUNY Senators' Report

H. Cannon said that his report was included in the meeting packet. He requested that any faculty member who serves on a statewide Senate committee, please let him know.

4. Chair's Report

The Chair thanked President O'Leary for his endorsement and thanked everyone else for their 1984-85 Senate work.
5. Council Reports

EPC - The Council received and accepted reports from three standing committees: Long Range Planning Committee, Resource Advisory Committee, Evaluation Policy Committee. The Council met on May 6 to discuss the future of the Business Education Program. Their recommendation was to discontinue all future activities of that Program.

UAC - Report in the meeting packet. C. LaSusa moved to bring Bill No. 8485-16 on the agenda as new business: the Proposed Revision of Dean's List Qualifications. The motion was seconded. The motion passed with three opposed and five abstentions. The Bill will be included on the agenda as Item 7.8.

GAC - Report included in the meeting packet.

SAC - The Council approved Student Guidelines for the 1985-86 year.

Research - Approved establishment of SUNYAA biomedical review board; and a center for the study of communication.

UCC - The Council Chair distributed copies of their bus-user satisfaction/needs survey and thanked the 400 students who provided input and comments.

CAFE - The Council will be working on a recommended Statement of Academic Ethics for Faculty.

CPCA - No report at this time.

Library - W. Hammond strongly recommends that, as a short-term response to library overcrowding, storage room on-campus be found. As a long-term measure the Council recommends construction of a new library building on this campus.

Chair Rogers expressed particular appreciation to those who have chaired Councils this year.

6. Old Business

6.1 Bill No. 8485-07, Proposed Combined BA/MA in Public Affairs and Policy.

C. LaSusa moved for the Bill's approval. D. Reeb seconded. The Bill was unanimously approved.
7. New Business

7.1 Bill No. 8485-09, Proposed Minimum 2.00 GPA Graduation Requirement

C. LaSusa moved for its approval. S. McGee Russell seconded. (C. LaSusa said that there were several people present at the meeting specifically to answer questions on Bills 8485-09 through 8485-14.) Bill 8485-09 was approved with one abstention.

7.2 Bill No. 8485-10, Proposed Qualitative Retention Standards

C. LaSusa moved for this Bill's approval. Seconded by W. Lanford. A short discussion followed. S. Landis moved to refer the bill back to committee. I. Weinstein seconded. A discussion followed.

H. Cannon moved that all matters pending before the Senate be brought to a conclusion. Seconded by S. McGee Russell. Dr. Cannon's motion was approved with 7 opposed and 6 abstentions.

The motion to refer back was defeated: 15-39-2. The motion to pass Bill No. 8485-10 was approved 40-14-0.


H. Cannon moved that all matters pending before the Senate be brought to a conclusion. The motion was seconded and approved with 4 opposed and no abstentions. The motion to reconsider was defeated with 9 in favor and no abstentions.

7.3 Bill No. 8485-12, Proposed Definition of Retention Credits

C. LaSusa moved for approval. D. Reeb seconded. The Bill was unanimously approved.

7.4 Bill No. 8485-13, Proposed Changing of Current Probation to a Warning

C. LaSusa moved for approval. D. Reeb seconded. K. Birr asked to know the consequences of being on academic probation. H. Hamilton said that the warning title is a signal to the student that he or she may not be progressing toward a degree at a reasonable pace. This is a distinction between the two criteria for retention. A lengthy discussion followed.

H. Cannon moved that all matters pending before the body be brought to a conclusion. The motion was seconded and passed with objections.

Bill No. 8485-13 was approved.
7.5 Bill No. 8485-14, Proposed Definition of Good Academic Standing

C. LaSusua moved for approval. It was seconded. The Bill was approved unanimously.

7.6 Bill No. 8485-15, Proposed B.A. and B.S. in Computer Science

C. LaSusua moved for approval. J. Levato seconded. The Bill was approved unanimously.

7.7 Bill No. 8485-17, Proposed Revision of Academic Student Conduct Model Committee Composition and Operational Procedures

H. Cannon moved for approval. J. Levato seconded. S. Auletta moved an amendment that item 4 of this bill be deleted. The motion was seconded and defeated with 5 abstentions. The Bill was approved with 7 opposed and 3 abstentions.

7.8 Bill No. 8585-16, Proposed Revision of Dean's List Qualifications

C. LaSusua moved for approval. W. Lanford seconded. S. McGee Russell provided a short explanation and history for this bill. W. Hammond suggested that S. McGee Russell add to his Bill that a student on academic probation not be placed on the Dean's List. The suggestion was not accepted. K. Birr moved an amendment to remove the words "or part time". R. Bosco seconded. A short discussion followed. With K. Birr's approval, R. Bosco withdrew K. Birr's motion to amend and moved that this Bill be referred back to committee. Motion was seconded. A lengthy discussion followed.

H. Cannon moved that all matters pending before the body be brought to a conclusion. Motion seconded and passed. On the motion to refer back to committee, 21 were in favor, 19 opposed and 1 abstention. The Bill was referred back to committee.

I. Weinstein moved to add a Resolution to allow the Senate as a whole to discuss termination of the Business Education program. The motion was seconded. A quorum was needed to do so, but not present. The Resolution was not added.

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Receiving same, the meeting was adjourned at 5:37 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Beverly Roth
Recorder
The most recent meeting of the SUNY Senate was held in Oneonta on April 12-13 with Senator Cannon and Alternate Senator Gibson representing Albany.

Senators were urged to encourage faculty attendance at the conference in Albany April 21-22 "Black Studies/Women's Studies: A Symposium Honoring James Baldwin."

The Committee on Student Life is planning a conference in Brockport on October 25, "Changing Strategies for Changing Student Populations." Again, attendance by faculty was urged.

The Senate endorsed proposed Guidelines for Degree Revocation currently before the Board of Trustees. It also asked the Chancellor to urge campus presidents to attempt to more clearly distinguish between "competence" and "excellence" when making recommendations for University-wide awards. In addition, it urged faculties to amend bylaws, where necessary, to allow statewide senators to serve on local governance bodies and executive committees.

The Senate also heard a presentation by Chancellor Wharton and members of his staff concerning the recently approved budget.

Since each of the Senate committees are annually appointed, any faculty at Albany willing to serve on a Senate committee are requested to discuss such service with Senator Cannon who serves on the Executive Committee of the statewide Senate until July 1. In addition, nominations for parliamentarian of the SUNY Senate are solicited.

Faculty interested in exchange programs with other SUNY units, other colleges and universities within the state or nation, colleges and universities outside the United States, or with industry, agencies, or non-collegiate institutions or agencies are asked to inform their statewide Senator in order to have such information available for preliminary work by one of the Senate committees.
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Methodology

Fifteen hundred questionnaires (copy attached) were mailed to three groups of currently registered students during the second week of March 1985. A follow-up mailing was not done. Using the SAMPLE procedure in SPSS, 500 students were randomly selected from the total population of Alumni Quad residents. Similarly, 400 uptown dormitory residents and 600 off-campus (non-commuter) residents were randomly selected from their respective populations.

Responses were received from 413 (27.5%) students. When respondents who indicated that they did not use the bus (55 or 13%) are excluded, usable responses numbered 358 (23.9%). By group, the breakdown is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses are representative within each group by class status but women are significantly over-represented (64% of the sample versus 52% in the population). However, a comparison of male and female respondents revealed no significant differences across all variables in the survey. Therefore, it was considered unnecessary to use any statistical weighting procedures since it would not effect substantive conclusions drawn from the survey data.
Caution is always advisable in generalizing from survey results to the larger population with a relatively small response rate. The problem of selection bias cannot be completely discounted. One may not want to ignore, however, the views of 358 users of the bus system, particularly in those areas where they express a fairly consistent view.

FINDINGS

Questions 6-9 were designed to identify the purposes and extent of use of the bus system. As one might expect, the primary purpose for the bus system for both Alumni Quad residents and off-campus students is transportation to and from classes. It is also no surprise to find that those living in the uptown dorms use the buses primarily to get to places off campus for non-University events and activities.

In terms of usage, 54% of uptown residents use the bus only one or two times a week - 91% ride the bus six or fewer times per week. Ninety-one percent of respondents living at Alumni Quad report riding the bus ten or more times a week compared to 68% of off-campus.

While 65% of Alumni Quad residents rely on the bus system as their sole means of transportation, only 34% of off-campus and uptown students have no other means of transportation.

Questions 10-13 can be seen as "perception" questions. They attempted to measure student awareness of bus schedules and ticket sales locations. Over
90% of the respondents knew that schedules were available though uptown residents were slightly less aware - only 81% knew about bus schedules. 26% of respondents without bus stickers were unaware of bus ticket vending machines.

The vast majority of students knew of only one or two of the three vending machines. Most students were aware of three of the ten sales locations which do not employ machines. It should be noted that the lack of knowledge of every available ticket outlet does not necessarily indicate a deficiency in the system. Students may find that one location is sufficient for their needs, and therefore only need to know of that location. Lack of awareness of vending locations is only a problem in "emergency" situations, such as running out of tickets late at night.

Questions 14-16 were designed to find which times students ride the bus, how far they walk to the bus and how long they wait during peak times. The responses to question 14 reflect the extent to which the bus line determines both student housing and student activities in Albany. The vast majority of downtown students walk three blocks or less to the bus and uptown students average two or three.

The two most frequent responses to the question concerning how long they had to wait on the average for a bus were 10 and 15 minutes.

Respondents were asked, in Question 16, to indicate the times (in specified time intervals) at which they usually rode the bus. Students'
concern about crowded conditions are more apparent when one learns that 73% of all off-campus respondents and 83% of all Alumni respondents report riding the bus between 8:00 and 10:00 a.m. From 46% to 64% of respondents in each group ride between 10:00 a.m. and noon. Eighty-five percent of uptown residents said they rode the bus at 9:00 p.m. and later.

Questions 17 and 18 attempted to measure the level of rider satisfaction for various aspects of the bus system. Responses did not appear to vary significantly with the frequency of use of the bus system. The Student Association survey indicated a pointedly increasing dissatisfaction with increased usage. This survey did not show the same result.

On the question of whether buses were usually on time, Alumni and uptown residents were divided in their opinions, with approximately equal percentages of each group expressing agreement and disagreement. Off-campus students, on the other hand, tended to agree that buses ran on time, with 52% expressing this opinion.

All three groups agreed that the buses are usually crowded. While 81% of Alumni and off-campus respondents agreed, only 70% of uptown residents responding agreed with this statement. Most respondents (70%) agreed that drivers were courteous.

Barely a majority (53%) of all respondents agreed that buses usually follow the schedule. Off-campus students agreed most with this statement (60%) while uptown (54%) and Alumni (47%) residents tended to agree less. As
a group, only Alumni Quad respondents were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the frequency of bus service - 58% were dissatisfied. This view is consistent with the fact that so many (83%) of Alumni residents report riding the bus at the same time - from 8:00 to 10:00 in the morning. Interestingly, off-campus respondents who also are heavy users of the bus system from 8:00 to 10:00 a.m. were divided in their opinions, as were uptown residents, with approximately equal percentages being satisfied and dissatisfied.

On the question of safety, 71% of all respondents were satisfied with bus safety, though as was noted below and will be cited again below, crowding was a major concern of respondents. Uptown students were more likely (59%) to be satisfied than Alumni and off-campus respondents who split about evenly in their satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

A majority, though barely, of uptown (51%) and off-campus (55%) respondents were satisfied with the cost of the bus system.

In summary, uptown residents tended to be less critical about crowded buses but more critical of cost, while Alumni respondents tended to be more critical about crowded buses, the schedule and the frequency of bus service.

On the question of grading the bus system, 50% assigned a "C", 33% assigned a "B", 13% assigned a "D", 3% assigned an "A", and 1% assigned an "E". By residence (Alumni, uptown and off-campus), this distribution varied little except for off-campus students who gave proportionately more "A's" and fewer "D's".
Many students provided comments which were extremely useful in understanding their views of the bus system and in highlighting problems the survey questions did not directly address. The most frequent of the comments regarded the crowded buses, and a common suggestion was to change bus schedules to vary with classes. Another frequent comment was a complaint regarding the frequency of weekend and late evening service. Following is a list of other of the more popular comments:

1. "Buses run in packs" -
   During peak time periods, the buses are sometimes scheduled to run at very short intervals in order to try and cope with the high demand. During non-peak times, the schedule and how well it is adhered to by drivers should be reviewed in order to avoid this phenomena.

2. Should sell tickets at Information Desk and Bookstore
   No place Downtown to buy stickers or tickets -
   Tickets are available at Draper, Alumni, the Bookstore, and in a machine by the Campus Center Information Desk.

3. Uncomfortable seats -
   These are school buses originally designed for elementary and secondary students. More comfortable, roomy buses would cost much more and increase the cost of operating the system. In replacing buses, this should, however, be taken into consideration.
4. **Public safety is a long and dangerous walk for late night tickets** -
   This comment reflects the need to make tickets available near the Quads at all hours.

5. **Can't purchase tickets off-campus** -
   This was a frequent complaint that has not been addressed. Perhaps stores and/or bars downtown would be willing to cooperate with the University in bus ticket sales.

6. **No machine at Alumni Quad** -
   This is true, although tickets are available at the Walden Cafeteria until 7:00 p.m. Our later suggestion to consider using UAS vending machines may provide a solution for this problem.

7. **Alumni riders crowd on downtown Wellington buses, forcing Wellington riders to wait another 45 minutes** -
   This problem can be solved by riding an Alumni bus to Draper and waiting there for a Wellington bus. In the cold months, this is an uncomfortable situation, so a Wellington Express - only stopping below Draper - may be a viable alternative at crowded times. While this could be considered a short-term problem if the Wellington is not available after Fall 1985, access to downtown Albany is seen as desirable by students.
8. Hawley Library should offer free round trip tickets if they don't have the book needed.

Given the majority of riders who originate from downtown, it was imperative that Hawley Library not be viewed as the point at which free tickets can be easily attained, especially because of the possible workload on library staff. For this reason, free tickets are not offered at this location.

9. Sticker replacement policy is unfair

Prorate sticker cost throughout the semester

Fee is too high

Fee is reasonable

Why do off-campus students bear the burden of supporting the bus system?

While these comments reflect a level of dissatisfaction with the bus fee, students tended to be more dissatisfied with the operation of the fee system, or felt they did not receive their money's worth. The sticker replacement policy was repeatedly criticized and should be reviewed.

CONCLUSION

By far the most prevalent problem with the bus system is its inability to satisfactorily handle the number of people attempting to use it. Although there are times when some buses run empty, there are also times when the crowds fill every bus and cause discomfort and safety problems.
Another problem which leads to dissatisfaction is rider misperceptions. Many people believe that there are extra buses that could be run during peak hours or that the number of buses on the road is not related to usage statistics. Many students are also unaware of important ticket sales locations such as the Bookstore, Public Safety, Traffic Safety, Kumquat Cafeteria and Walden Cafeteria.

SUGGESTIONS

The committee has three suggestions which it believes could help resolve some of the problems with the bus system. The first and most important of these is to purchase at least one new bus. A ninety-passenger bus with an estimated ten runs per day could help relieve some of the crowded conditions that now exist. At some times during the day (peak hours when all buses are in use), this would require an additional driver, at other times it would merely replace a broken or smaller bus. Although this is an obvious solution, it is not easily achieved. Nevertheless, it must be stated as the most important component of improving the bus service. It is not clear that even one bus would be enough. It is clear that this is the only solution that hedges against bus breakdown and the continuing deterioration of the existing fleet while also expanding the capability of the system.

A second suggestion is the improvement of rider awareness. To the extent that students are more aware of how and where to obtain tickets normally and in emergencies, the greater the likelihood they will experience fewer difficulties. Periodic advertisement of the locations of ticket sales
locations that students need in emergencies (late night, both uptown and downtown) could solve some of this problem.

A third suggestion is to undertake discussions with UAS on the use of one slot in selected UAS vending machines for the sale of bus tickets. The expense of purchasing and servicing several entire machines appears to have prevented the University from establishing more than three machine vending locations. Putting these tickets in selected UAS vending machines would make tickets more widely available at reasonable cost.

AREAS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Four areas exist which should be studied further. The first area that should be studied relates to the fact that 82% of survey respondents from Alumni Quad and 73% of all off-campus respondents reported that they ride the bus between 8:00 and 10:00 a.m. Many student concerns about frequency of service and crowded conditions are problems of peak-time use. Consideration should be given to ways of better coping with the heavy demand at this particular time.

The second is the frequency of late night and weekend buses. Enough comments pointed to this problem that further study is necessary to determine whether the problem is frequency of service or problems with the schedule and adhering to it.

A third area that must be studied further is the feasibility of adjusting the bus schedule to the fluctuating numbers of students enrolled in classes.
during the day (e.g., are there enough buses scheduled at times during the day/week when very large classes get over).

The fourth, and final, area that needs study relates to the questions of the bus fee. Should Hawley Library give free tickets for academic reasons? Should off-campus students bear the burden of the fee while Alumni Quad students ride free? The last bus fee question which must be resolved is the issue of replacement of lost or stolen stickers. Presently, when a sticker is lost, the full cost of the sticker must be paid even though the semester may be half over.
1. What is your class status:
   - Freshman \( \frac{7}{2} \) (1)
   - Sophomore \( \frac{10}{6} \) (2)
   - Junior \( \frac{8}{2} \) (3)
   - Senior \( \frac{7}{6} \) (4)
   - Undergraduate Non-Degree \( \frac{6}{9} \) (5)
   - Graduate \( \frac{6}{9} \) (6)

2. Sex: Male \( \frac{14}{7} \) (1) Female \( \frac{26}{6} \) (2) Unknown = 5

3. Do you live in:
   - Uptown Dorms \( \frac{10}{2} \) (1)
   - Alumni \( \frac{17}{9} \) (2)
   - Wellington (3) 13
   - Off-Campus (4)

4. If off-campus, what is your zip code: ______

5. Do you use the University Bus Service: Yes \( \frac{35}{8} \) (1) No \( \frac{55}{8} \) (2)
   If yes, please go to #6.
   If no, thank you for your help. Please fold so postage-paid panel is on outside, staple or tape survey closed and drop in mail. If you have any comments, please see #19.

6. What is your primary purpose for using the bus service? Getting to and from:
   - Classes \( \frac{36}{8} \) (1)
   - University activities/events \( \frac{10}{3} \) (3)
   - A University library \( \frac{18}{2} \) (2)
   - Places off-campus \( \frac{74}{4} \) (4)

7. On the average, how many times per week do you ride the bus:
   ______/Week times

8. Do you have other means of transportation to and from campus besides the bus system?
   - None of the time \( \frac{17}{7} \) (1)
   - Most of the time \( \frac{22}{2} \) (3)
   - Some of the time \( \frac{4}{2} \) (2)
   - All of the time \( \frac{15}{7} \) (4)

9. Do you have a bus sticker: Yes \( \frac{26}{8} \) (1) No \( \frac{55}{8} \) (2)
   If yes, go to Question #13.
   If no, please continue.

10. Are you aware that there are bus ticket vending machines? Yes \( \frac{60}{2} \) (1) No \( \frac{24}{1} \) (2)

11. If yes, how many bus vending machine locations are you aware of? ______

12. How many other bus ticket sales locations (excluding vending machines) are you aware of? ______

13. Are you aware of the availability of bus schedules? Yes \( \frac{33}{6} \) (1) No \( \frac{20}{2} \) (2)

14. How many blocks do you normally walk to get to a bus stop? ______

15. On the average, approximately how many minutes do you have to wait during peak times (8:00 to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 5:00 p.m.) for a bus? ______

16. At what hours do you usually ride the bus (check all that apply):
   - 8:00--10:00 a.m. \( \frac{23}{3} \) (1)
   - 10:00--NOON \( \frac{13}{8} \) (2)
   - NOON--3:00 p.m. \( \frac{17}{8} \) (3) 22
   - 3:00--5:00 p.m. \( \frac{19}{5} \) (4)
   - 5:00--9:00 p.m. \( \frac{21}{3} \) (5)
   - AFTER 9:00 p.m. \( \frac{17}{7} \) (6) 23-27
17. Please indicate the extent of agreement or disagreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buses are usually on time</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses are usually crowded</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus drivers are courteous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses usually do not follow the schedule</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Please rate the following aspects of the bus system. If dissatisfied, please explain in space below each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of the Bus System</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenience to Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of obtaining bus tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-STICKER HOLDERS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of obtaining bus stickers only</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STICKER HOLDERS ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Using the academic grading scale of A-E, what grade would you give the bus service?

\[
A = 3 \quad B = 33 \quad C = 50 \quad D = 13 \quad E = 19
\]

20. COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

PLEASE FOLD THE SURVEY SO THAT THE POSTAGE-PAID PANEL IS ON THE OUTSIDE, STAPLE OR TAPE IT CLOSED AND DROP IN THE MAIL.
Verbal report to the Senate 5/6/85

W. F. Hammond, Chair of Library Council

It has fallen to me this year to remind you ceaselessly of the fact that the library has a space problem. That was, in fact, the conclusion of last year's council which found the problem to be of "critical proportions."

This year's Council has passed the following resolution:

I. Because of the desperate space problems of the University Libraries, the Library Council strongly recommends, as a short-term response, that appropriate additional space be found on campus for the Libraries, and that funds be allocated for compact storage of library materials on campus.
II The Council recommends the construction of a new library building on this campus as the long range solution of the space problem.

The Library this year formed a task force headed by Dot Christiansen to study the question of how the Library would like to take care of its space problem. That report is due out in a month. It will discuss the Library's concept of what ought to be done with a new building. The review of that report will fall to next year's Council. Perhaps others will be interested in that report as well.
Moreover, though we are speaking of a new building we are opening up issues of campus priorities that lie beyond the domain of the Library Council.
PROPOSED COMBINED BA/MA IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND POLICY

PROPOSED BY: Undergraduate Affairs Council
Graduate Academic Council
May 6, 1985

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That the Combined BA/MA Program in Public Affairs and Policy with the attached requirements be approved and become effective immediately upon registration by the State Education Department.

II. That this bill be referred to the President for approval.
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

UNIVERSITY SENATE

PROPOSED COMBINED DEGREE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND POLICY

PROPOSED BY: Undergraduate Academic Council
May 6, 1985

1. Program Title and suggested HEGIS code number: Combined Major-Master's Program in Public Affairs and Policy: HEGIS code number: 2102

2. Titles and program code numbers of currently registered programs which are to be combined: B.A. in Public Affairs, 77786 and M.A. in Public Affairs and Policy, 03040.

3. General requirements for program completion:
   a. The combined bachelor's/master's degree program in Public Affairs and Policy requires a minimum of 148 credits, at least 40 of which must be graduate credits.
   b. Total minimum credits required for the combined undergraduate major and graduate program is 82 credits, 40 of which must be graduate credits.
   c. In qualifying for the B.A., students must meet all university and college requirements, including the minimum 90 credit liberal arts and sciences requirement, general education requirements, and residency requirements.
   d. In qualifying for the M.A., students must meet all university and college requirements as outlined in the Graduate Bulletin, including completion of a minimum of 40 graduate credits.

4. Specific program requirements:
   b. Approved substantive policy area: minimum of 18 credits. Examples are Public economic issues; Deindustrialization/Reindustrialization; Energy policy.
   c. A graduate course in public affairs and policy implementation: 3-4 credits.
   d. A graduate course in economics of the public and private sectors: 3-4 credits.

*Paf 502, 505, 521, and 522 fulfill undergraduate 4 course requirement for part 2 of B.A. in Public Affairs
5. Number of semesters of full-time study required for program completion:

Undergraduate, full-time study 7 semesters
Graduate, full-time study 3 semesters

6. Other program requirements:

University residency requirements (see page 27 of the Undergraduate Bulletin, 1984-85, SUNYA, and page 13 of the Graduate Bulletin, 1984-86 SUNYA).

Admission requirements:

Students may be admitted to a combined degree program at the beginning of their junior year, or after successful completion of 56 credits, but no later than the accumulation of 100 credits. A GPA of 3.2 or higher and three supportive letters of recommendation from faculty are required.
State University of New York at Albany
Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy

Combined BA/MA in Public Affairs
(with a concentration in public economic issues)
and Public Affairs and Policy

MODEL PROGRAM

First Year

Pos 101 M American Politics (3)
Paf 240 M Introduction to Public Policy (3)
Eco 100 M Principles of Economics I: Micro-economics (3)
Eco 101 M Principles of Economics II: Micro-economics (3)

Second Year

Paf 350 Comparative Public Policy (3)
*Eco 380 Contemporary Economic Issues (3)
*Eco 312 Development of the American Economy (3)

Third Year

Pos 416 Statistics for Political Scientists (3)
Pos 417 Empirical Data Analysis (3)
*Eco 530 Economics of the Public Sector (3)
Paf 498 Internship in Public Affairs (3)

Fourth Year

*Eco 531 Fiscal Economics (3)
*Eco 560 Monetary and Financial Institutions (3)
*Paf 522 Economics and Political Reasoning in Public Policy Analysis (4)
Paf 499 Senior Seminar in Public Affairs (3)
Paf 502 Philosophical Reasoning in Public Policy Analysis (4)
Paf 503 Public Policy in Theory and Practice (4)

Fifth Year

Paf 505 Quantitative and Algorithmic Reasoning in Public Policy Analysis (4)
Paf 521 Historical and Legal Reasoning in Public Policy Analysis (4)
Pad 505 Research and Computer Usage (4)
Pad 621 Quantitative Methods in Public Administration (4)
Paf 506 Implementation and Impact (4)
Paf 507,508  Current Topics and Research Colloquia (1)(1)
Paf 698  Master's Essay (3,3)

* Applies toward approved BA concentration
** Applies toward Substantive Policy Area for MA in Public Affairs and Policy
PROPOSED MINIMUM 2.00 GPA GRADUATION REQUIREMENT

PROPOSED BY: Undergraduate Academic Council
May 6, 1985

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That for students matriculated or readmitted to resume study in Fall 1986 and thereafter, the following graduation requirement shall apply:

That to be eligible for graduation from the University, matriculated students must have achieved a cumulative grade point average of at least 2.00 in all course grades earned at SUNY Albany.

II. That this be forwarded to the President for approval.

RATIONALE:

Because a 2.00 is currently required in all SUNYA coursework that can be applied toward graduation as well as toward students' majors, minors, and combined majors and minors, many students, faculty and others external to this institution believe Albany already has the proposed requirement. In fact, however, students may acquire any number of "E" and "unbalanced D" grades and graduate with well under a 2.00 average. Some have expressed consternation on learning this fact, and indeed it is troubling that a tiny number of students graduating with under a 2.00 can call into question the quality of the great majority of our students and the institution as a whole.

There appears to be no cogent argument why this peculiarity should not be eliminated. Only about a dozen or so students are now graduated with less than a 2.00, and virtually all of these students are only one or two "B" grades away from that goal. Provided only the requirement is phased in and students are notified in timely fashion whenever their overall GPA dips below a 2.00, there is no reason to expect most or all of the students who now fail to achieve a 2.00 at graduation will be unable to achieve this goal in the future.

It is certainly conceivable that an individual student, by virtue of some extreme extenuating circumstances and hardship, and despite the phasing in of the standard and the proposed new prohibition and dismissal standards which accompany it, will be granted an individual exception. The right of appeal remains, and this legislation merely establishes the minimum expectation.
Bill No. 8485-10

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

UNIVERSITY SENATE

PROPOSED QUALITATIVE RETENTION STANDARDS

PROPOSED BY: Undergraduate Academic Council
May 6, 1985

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That for students matriculating or readmitted to resume study in Fall 1986 and thereafter, the following qualitative retention standards shall apply:

1. At the end of a fall or spring semester, any matriculated student whose cumulative grade point average at SUNYA is less than 2.0 and whose grade point average for the just completed semester is less than 2.00 and whose grade point average for any two previous semester is less than 2.00 at this time shall be academically dismissed from the University. The student's academic record shall have the words "Academic Dismissal" placed on it.

A student who has been academically dismissed shall have the right to seek reinstatement to the University by submitting a written petition to the appropriate committee on academic standing.

2. A matriculated student whose cumulative grade point average at SUNYA falls below a 2.00 at the end of a fall or spring semester and who is not academically dismissed from the University shall be placed on Academic Probation for the next semester of study.

II. That this be forwarded to the President for approval.

RATIONALE:

The current retention standards are concerned solely with the quantity of work achieved by the students. Progress toward the degree as measured by the accumulation of credit is an important concern, and the current quantitative standards are therefore being retained. Nevertheless, students, faculty, and individuals and institutions external to this campus over the years have expressed concern that our retention standards do not encourage performance at least at the "C" level. (For purposes of S/U grading, "C" is defined as the minimal level of satisfactory performance.)

Therefore, the above proposals are central to a package of proposals intended to establish qualitative graduation and retention standards on this campus, including the proposal to require a 2.00 at SUNYA for graduation. If it is accepted that 2.00 is an appropriate minimum grade point average requirement to be graduated from Albany, then the proposed additional standards follow logically.
Without the graduation requirement, a student meeting the quantitative requirements through "C" and "S" grades is, by definition, "making satisfactory progress toward the degree" no matter how low the student's GPA (through "E" and unbalanced "D" grades) may fall. With the graduation requirement, a student is not "making satisfactory progress" if his or her average drops below a 2.0 and does not then begin to rise to the required graduation index, no matter how many credits the student may be acquiring along the way.

If it is incumbent on the student to work toward improving the overall GPA toward the 2.0 goal, it is incumbent on the University to monitor this progress and to inform the student, in timely fashion, that his or her progress is being monitored.

Admittedly, it could be argued that simply sending probation notices would suffice. However, it should be considered that students performing below the satisfactory level for several semester are not doing so in a vacuum. In other words, it is not simply a matter of the University's acting "in loco parentis" by preventing a student from digging himself or herself into a hole of quality point deficiencies from which escape (even through transfer) becomes nearly a mathematical impossibility.

Rather, the student is a participant in classes, is taking a space in those classes (perhaps excluding other students in the process), may be admitted to a restricted major (thereby excluding another student), is producing, to some extent, work which must be graded by instructors, and possesses work habits and attitudes which may impact upon others in the student's classes or dormitory.

Dismissal Formula:

Albany has a large transfer student population. Many of our undergraduates at times choose to pursue work on a part-time basis for a semester or so; others complete summer work here. In addition to courses graded S/U for everyone, students may elect additional work to be graded on a pass/fail basis. Our students also have over half the semester in which to decide to drop a course.

Given these factors, using percentage formulas, sliding scales, counting deficiency points, and similar devices become almost impossible to implement, would be very difficult to explain, and still would result in numerous inequities and loopholes. In some cases, such standards might more quickly and rigidly "weed out" standards, but the Committee on Academic Standing did not feel this was the goal.

Instead, the proposed standards are relatively simple to explain: If your cumulative GPA falls below a 2.0 one semester, you had better work to raise it. You do not need to raise it all at once, but if, before you raise it to a 2.0, you obtain two more semesters with a semester average under a 2.0, you will be dismissed.

Neither a freshman nor a transfer with 90 credits will be able to accumulate an "impossible" deficiency, and both will receive warning in
time to raise their overall GPA to the 2.0 level, or to decide that they are not capable of achieving this at Albany.

To cite an extreme example, a freshman receives some "S", "D" and "E" grades the first semester and has a 0.4 average. This student needs to seriously reconsider his or her curriculum, work habits, etc. The student is not, however, faced with a perhaps impossible task of making up the deficit in the next semester or two. Quite possible, the reasons the student performed so badly first semester may require the student to attend part-time for a semester or two, in which case a time limit to make up the deficit would not be appropriate.

Provided the student meets any quantitative (credit-total) standards which apply, the student need only achieve 2.0 semesters to avoid dismissal (and could even fall once below that level in a semester). By definition, 2.0 semesters constitute "improvement" since they bring the student closer to a 2.0 overall GPA. From then until graduation, the student must also obtain some "B" or "A") grades to graduate. Until the student does this, the student will continue to receive probation letters and will not be considered in Good Academic Standing.

If the student in our example exceeds the 2.0 overall GPA, the student is no longer on probation, even if a subsequent semester GPA total should again dip below the 2.0. Similarly, students who were never on probation and maintain a 2.0 overall may at times acquire less than a 2.0 within the semester.

Probation:

In the absence of qualitative standards, a large number of student have less than a 2.0 cumulative average each semester. Once students realize another standard applies to them, this number presumably will decrease. Current totals also include students who have maintained less than a 2.0 for several semesters (and who would be dismissed under the proposed standards) as well as students who realize they may now graduate with less than a 2.0.

Even if this number is not dramatically decreased, it will still be necessary to warn students via probation letters at the end of each semester. Probation once a year makes no sense academically or functionally and would be unfair given the number of students who begin study in January. New transfers with 64-90 credits, for example, must receive immediate feedback concerning their need to raise their GPA, both to avoid dismissal and to reach the 2.0 they will (for them shortly) need for graduation.

Good Academic Standing:

Unlike the students who formerly were placed on probation for credit total standards and who could simply change the rate of work by going part-time or accumulating credits in summer sessions, the students performing at less than a 2.0 level have not demonstrated their capability to achieve a degree from this institution. As such, they should not be considered "in good academic standing."
IMPLEMENTATION

Since prior grades acquired elsewhere by freshmen or transfers have no impact on the standards, it is recommended the standards apply to all students matriculating in Fall 1986 and thereafter. It is not at all clear how to implement such standards fairly by graduation date (particularly since probation and dismissal cannot depend on whether a student graduates early or on time or late.)

In the case of transfers from Continuing Studies, whose prematriculated grades at Albany are currently calculated into the overall GPA, presumably such students with less than a 2.0 at Albany would not be admitted anyway. There appears to be no great inequity in allowing these students to apply non-matriculated Albany "A" and "B" grades toward cumulative matriculated grade point averages. (Should the College of Continuing studies wish to do so, the same standards could be applied to that non-matriculated population.)

Use of the matriculation date has the added advantage of allowing CUE to phase-in the required end of semester action. In January 1986, for example, only first semester freshmen and transfers with less than a 2.0 would be placed on probation, and no dismissals could occur under the proposed standards until January 1987, since before that time it would be impossible to violate the new dismissal standards.

The above assumptions are based on the premise that a 2.0 graduation requirement be implemented based on matriculation date as well. Should this not be the case, some additional probation or notification standards will be needed to be established for continuing students who graduate late and for readmitted students. "Ex post facto" concerns, however, would appear to prohibit using a graduation date for either standard.
IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That beginning with the academic review which will occur at the end of the Fall 1985 semester, the words "Academic Probation" be replaced by the term "Academic Warning" for full-time students failing to meet the minimum total credits specified under the "Probation" column in the Academic Retention Chart.

II. That this be forwarded to the President for approval.

RATIONALE:

"Academic Probation" implies the student is not in good academic standing and is being proposed as the term which will apply to students whose overall Albany GPA falls below a 2.0.

Historically, the current quantitative retention standards were initially proposed with the term "Academic Warning" (cf. the continuing use of that term in the definition of Good Academic Standing). The misnomer "Academic Probation" was substituted simply because it was felt "Albany ought to have some sort of probation standards." A student with 21 credits of "A" after two full-time semesters needs to be warned that he or she may possibly be in danger the next full-time semester of failing to meet the total 30 credits required to avoid dismissal, but such a student is almost certainly not to be considered in "bad" academic standing. In some cases the student has incomplete grades and/or plans to make up credits in summer school.

In contrast, a student with 24 credits and a 1.5 cumulative Albany GPA after two full-time semesters will not be "warned" about credit totals but will receive a notice of Academic Probation indicating that he or she clearly has not been performing at a level that would predict the student's eventual graduation from SUNYA. (Incomplete grades will not help the student unless completed with "B" or "A" grades and, as for summer work, this would help the student only if completed at Albany and with better grades.)
IMPLEMENTATION:

There appears to be no good reason not to implement this change as soon as possible. The current "Academic Probation" like this proposed "Warning" has no impact on the student's good academic standing or, as far as the Committee on Academic Standing could determine, or anything else.

By implementing this in January 1985, the University will go for one year with no students on probation, thereby further differentiating the warning on credit totals for full-time non-EOP students from the proposed Academic Probation which will apply to all matriculated students with GPA deficiencies.

The fact that the bulletin next year will describe Academic Probation seems of little importance, since students who receive a warning letter are unlikely to complain that they should have received a notice of probation instead. In the 1986–87 Undergraduate Bulletin, the current section "B. Academic Probation" would read:

B. Academic Warnings: A full-time matriculated student is required to complete for graduation credit the number of credits in the Academic Retention Chart under "Academic Warning" for the corresponding number of full-time semesters since matriculation at the University. Failure to meet this standard by the last day of the semester will result in the student's receiving an "Academic Warning" notice.

(The chart itself will read "Warning if Less Than" instead of "Probation if Less Than" for the column heading in question.)
PROPOSED DEFINITION OF GOOD ACADEMIC STANDING

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That beginning with the 1986-87 edition, the following definition of "Good Academic Standing" be printed in the Undergraduate Bulletin:

"Good Academic Standing"

The term "in good academic standing" (satisfactory academic standing) means that a student is making satisfactory progress toward a degree, is eligible or has been allowed to register and take academic coursework at the campus for the current session, and is not currently on Academic Probation.

Students who receive an "Academic Warning" are considered to be in good academic standing since they are making satisfactory progress toward a degree. The warning merely serves to inform students that they may be in danger of not meeting the minimum academic credit-total retention standards and of being terminated from the University at the end of a future full-time semester.

Only those students on "Academic Probation" (for having less than a 2.0 cumulative average at Albany) and, of course, those students who are officially terminated from the University are considered not to be in good academic standing.

(The above definition should not be confused with the academic standing criteria for eligibility for New York State financial awards as detailed in the expenses and financial aid section of this bulletin.)

II. That this be forwarded to the President for approval.

RATIONALE:

This proposal is of a housekeeping nature and is required only if the other proposed changes in retention and graduation standards are adopted.
The proposal does not penalize the student for grades of "U", even though this grade by its definition cloaks work equivalent to "D" or "E" level work. However, the grade of "S" at times may reflect "B" or "A" level work and also has no bearing upon the GPA. It was felt that attempting to weigh S/U graded work could not be achieved fairly, and, in any case, tended to create prohibitive implementation problems.

There is also no penalty for "W" or "Z" grades. The former was defined as not being a penalty grade; the latter may reflect some carelessness on the student's part but is not an indicator of academic ability. Moreover, it is not proposed that the current credit-total retention standards be eliminated.

IMPLEMENTATION:

For new graduation requirements based on curricular requirements, it has been the practice to adopt the student's graduation date for implementation. This is inappropriate for the proposed 2.0 requirement for several reasons:

1. A graduation date such as May 1990 would be unfair to part-time, EOP and Continuing studies students as well as to any other current or former students who found it necessary to discontinue their education for awhile. Although a complex set of exceptions could certainly be created to cover most or all of these cases, it would be cumbersome to implement and to explain.

2. Since no coursework acquired elsewhere applies to the Albany GPA, there is no good reason to wait until May 1990 for those transfers matriculating in Fall 1986, most of whom will graduate long before that date.

3. The implementation of the 2.0 requires concomitant changes in retention standards both to monitor and inform students who are in danger of acquiring prohibitive qualitative deficiencies. Such standards require a matriculation date for implementation. The only way to ensure timely notification of everyone who might fall short of a 2.0 for graduation based on graduation date would be massive mailings for each semester to all students with less than a 2.0 cumulative GPA, even though only a tiny fraction of these students would be affected by the legislation.

In short, it is proposed that the University address what some consider a flaw of long-standing. In doing so, the University can afford to have a small dwindling trickle of students who matriculated prior to Fall 1986 graduate with less than a 2.0, particularly if to do otherwise will call for massive, complex, heroic and possibly unfair measures to "catch" this tiny number of individuals.
IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That the current B.S. program for the major in Computer Science be changed to a B.A. program.

II. That the following new program become the B.S. program for the combined major and minor in Computer Science.

General Program - B.S. (combined major and minor program): A minimum of 75 credits as follows: Csi 201Y, 202, 210, 300P, 310, 311, 401, 402, 403, 404; Mat 112Y, 113Y, 220, 361; Phy 120N, 122, 124N, 126; and two additional courses in Physics or a two-course sequence in a second science as approved by the department.

III. That this be forwarded to the President for approval.

RATIONALE:

The two principal professional societies pertaining to computer science, the ACM and the IEEE Computer Society, have jointly issued guidelines for computer science baccalaureate programs which are eligible for accreditation. Neither of the existing two computer science degree programs (Computer Science and Computer Science and Applied Mathematics) contain sufficient science or sufficient credit hours to qualify for accreditation. Therefore, the Department of Computer Science is proposing that three options become available for students majoring in the Computer Science area: (1) B.A. major in Computer Science - 41 credits, (2) B.S. combined major and minor program in Computer Science and applied Mathematics - 66 credits, and (3) B.S. combined major and minor in Computer Science - 75 credits.

No change is proposed for the current B.S. combined major and minor program in Computer Science and Applied Mathematics.

It is proposed that the current B.S. program in Computer Science (41 credits) become a B.A. program in Computer Science. The requirements would remain unchanged. Students in this program need to complete a separate minor and this can be anything: e.g., English, Urban and Regional Planning, etc. Compared to the new proposed B.S. in Computer Science, the B.A. program would require much less mathematics and science and be considered more general in nature. This would be similar to the current situations in Biology, Economics, and Mathematics where the B.S. options require either minors or concentrated study in the
natural sciences or business whereas the B.A. programs permit more diversity of study outside the areas of science and business. The proposal conforms to current University expectations regarding distinctions between B.A. and B.S. degrees offered in the same major field.

Accreditation mandates that a registered program exist for the major. For this reason, the new set of requirements has been proposed as the B.S. program in Computer Science. This program would require 75 credits (as compared to 41 for the B.A.) distributed as follows:

**Computer Science -- 45 credit hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Csi 201Y</td>
<td>Intro to Computer Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Assembly Language Programming</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Discrete Structures</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(new) 300P</td>
<td>Social Implications of Computing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Data Structures</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Programming Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>Numerical Methods or 409 Automata</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Systems Programming</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Analysis of Algorithms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Computer Organization</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 electives (list attached)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | 45                                         |        |

**Mathematics -- 14 credit hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mat 112</td>
<td>Calculus I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Calculus II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Linear Algebra</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Discrete Probability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | 14                                         |        |

**Science -- 16 credit hours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phy 120N</td>
<td>Introduction to Physics I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Problem Solving I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124N</td>
<td>Introduction to Physics II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Problem Solving II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two additional courses in physics or a two-course sequence in a second science as approved by the department, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phy 220</td>
<td>Introduction to Physics III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Introduction to Physics IV</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phy 220</td>
<td>Introduction to Physics III</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>Microprocessor Applications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chm 120N</td>
<td>General Chemistry I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121N</td>
<td>General Chemistry II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total   | 16                                         |        |
ELECTIVES

Any course with Csi prefix in range 300-450; 500-550:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phi 432</td>
<td>Symbolic Logic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy 353</td>
<td>Microcomputer Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phy 454</td>
<td>Microcomputer Laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 311</td>
<td>Ordinary Differential Equations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 372</td>
<td>Linear Programming &amp; Game Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 374</td>
<td>Operations Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 380</td>
<td>Systems Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 401a,b</td>
<td>Numerical Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 409</td>
<td>Vector Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 410</td>
<td>Partial Differential Equations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 412</td>
<td>Complex Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 464</td>
<td>Applied Stochastic Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat 465</td>
<td>Applied Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csi 306</td>
<td>Advanced Cobol Programming Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csi 405</td>
<td>Introduction to Information &amp; Coding Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csi 410</td>
<td>Database Management Systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COURSE DESCRIPTION FOR CSI 300P:

CSI 300P Social Implications of Computing (3)

The ethical and moral implications of using computers to affect the lives of individual and collective members of human society. Data banks vs. rights to privacy. The computer as a dispenser of "expert" legal and medical advice. Software piracy, unauthorized access, and other computer crimes. The course will be both reading and writing intensive. Prerequisite: Csi 201Y.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Symbolics:</td>
<td>Satisfied within the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Culture:</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature &amp; Fine Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values:</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even after satisfying the above 75 + 21 credits = 96 credits, the student will still have 24 credits (approximately 8 courses) of free electives. This number of free electives is identical to the number currently available for majors in computer science and applied mathematics. A student in a combined major/minor program does not need an explicitly stated minor (one that appears on the transcript instead of the words "combined with major") but may elect one.
Since the major and minor may overlap (when the minor is merely optional), our students may qualify for an explicitly stated minor quite easily, through the investment of from 4 to 7 credits.

**To Qualify for** | **Our students must take**
--- | ---
Minor in math | only Math 214 = 4 credits
Minor in physics | elect Ph 220 & 224 as part of major, + two 300-level physics courses = 6 credits
Minor in electronics | elect Ph 220 & 353 as part of major, + Ph 221 (1), Ph 315 (3), Ph 316 (3) = 7 credits

Although this major option exceeds the maximum of 66 credits for a combined major and minor program, the UAC felt it should be approved as a third option for students majoring in the computer science area. There would still be two programs available within the credit maximum.

In considering this proposal, the College of Science and Mathematics felt that although the proposed curriculum exceeds guidelines by 9 credits, those credits are returned to the student as satisfying 6 credits of natural sciences and 3 credits of the values general education requirements. Dispensation for exceeding the customary 66 total credits has been previously granted for the Accounting major and to those enrolled in Medical Technology.

The Department of Computer Science anticipates that approximately 20 students in each class might choose this program. Admissions requirements for entrance to this program will be identical to those now existing for the other two computer science programs. The quota for the total number of majors in computer science, as determined by the University administration, would remain unchanged. Therefore, there would be no additional support needed for the department to introduce this new major option. Since only 20 students per year are expected in the program, a substantial increase in instructional demands on physics would not occur.

The availability of a program leading to an accredited degree in computer science may serve to enhance the prestige of the campus and, therefore, the desirability of the University to prospective students generally interested in science and mathematics. This enhanced desirability is to some extent offset by the potential degradation of the integrity of the University as a liberal arts oriented institution. Other examples of the need to satisfy external professional agencies may be found in the School of Business whose programs are accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business and the Department of Chemistry whose program is approved by the Committee on Professional Training of the American Chemical Society.
Degree Requirements for the Major in Computer Science

General Program. B.S.: A minimum of 41 credits including CS 201Y, 202, 210, 310, 311, 402 or 499, 404; two additional CS courses numbered in the range 400-450 or 500-550; Math 122Y and 113Y, or Math 116Y and 117Y; and 11Y; Math 361.

Degree Requirements for the Major in Computer Science and Applied Mathematics

B.S. (Combined major and minor sequence). A minimum of 66 credits as follows: Math 112Y and 113Y, or Math 116Y and 117Y; Math 214, 220, 361; CS 201Y, 202, 210, 310, 311, 401, 402 or 499, 403, 404, 408; 15 additional credits, as advised, from the following list of courses, including at least 9 credits in mathematics: any course with an A Math prefix numbered 300 or above, any course with an A CS prefix numbered 300-450; CS 499; Phys 382Y; Phys 404Y Phys 432Y.
IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED:

I. That the attached report of the Student Conduct Model Committee required by Bill No. 8384-02 be accepted.

II. That Bill No. 8384-02 be amended as recommended in that report.

III. That this be referred to the President for approval.

RATIONALE:

Bill No. 8384-02 specified the composition and operations of a Student Conduct Model Committee. It also specified that the operations of that Committee on Student Conduct would be reviewed by the Senate in the spring of 1985; the attached report is in response to that mandate.

The report makes seven specific recommendations to amend Bill No. 8384-02. The first would extend 8384-02 for two years (through May of 1987). The other recommendations would enlarge the Committee, change the reporting channels, clarify the appeals process, arrange for appointments to the Committee each spring, and change the number of required reports.
UNIVERSITY SENATE

PROPOSED REVISION OF DEAN'S LIST QUALIFICATIONS

Submitted by: Undergraduate Academic Council and
Senator Sam McGee- Russell

IT IS PROPOSED THAT The following substitution be made for statements 1, 2, and 3 on page 17 of the 1984-85 Undergraduate Bulletin (beneath the heading of Dean's List) as follows:

A full time or part time matriculated student shall be placed on the Dean's List if that student has achieved an average of 3.30 or better in courses for which the grades of A, B, C, D, or E were received within the given semester.

RATIONALE:

Attached.
RATIONALE FOR SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENT OF DEAN'S LIST QUALIFICATIONS

1) Improvement of Standards: (From 3.0 to 3.30)

It was generally agreed that a major function for Dean's List notification each semester was to encourage and reward academic achievement. Consultation with undergraduates in general and with undergraduate members of Council demonstrated that the opinion was widely held that the standard for achieving Dean's List was too easy, and that the notification would be held in greater respect and more highly regarded and valued if the standard were improved.

An improved standard level of 3.30 was chosen after an extensive review of the standards associated with Honors Programs requirements, and consideration of the range (3.0 to less than 3.4) associated with Cum Laude Honors. Attention was also paid to the averages required for Phi Beta Kappa and combined B.A./M.A. and B.S./M.S. programs. The figure 3.30 represents a significant but not swinging improvement, which, hopefully, will encourage a somewhat more selective group of undergraduates who have achieved a more satisfactory degree of short term academic success, to continue to work at or above the level commended.

2) Recognition of Part-time Student Achievement of Academic Success.

In response to student concern, expressed to UAC, which pointed out that the current qualifications did not allow a part-time student or EOP student to gain the encouragement of Dean's List Qualification, the UAC found little justification for the exclusion, since the main purpose of Dean's List notification appeared to be to encourage and reward, on a semester's basis, work well done in regular courses, and an EOP student (by definition full-time) who achieved A's and B's in regular course work certainly deserved such encouragement. (The new standard of 3.30 would ensure this level). So too, the "mature student", heavily loaded, who achieves good grades deserves as much encouragement as the system can give.

The proposed new criteria for Dean's List deliberately include part-time students in the considerations for Dean's List Commendation, and these new criteria achieve the difficult task of both broadening and raising the standards.

The UAC strongly recommends passage of this change which will allow the Dean's List to function as a vehicle for encouraging achievement in education at all levels.

SMMR/25th April 1985
3) **Why Students Should Not Be Penalized for Dropping Courses**

The discussion of the dean's list issue was based on certain premises, among which was the belief that a greater emphasis on qualitative (vs. quantitative) standards would be desirable for the University. Indeed, the proposed changes in retention standards go in this same direction.

In terms of equitable treatment, it was felt to be an impossible task to distinguish certain part-time students from others, or distinguish the part-time student from the full-time student who may need to carry several S/U Graded credits. The EOP student population, for example, could not appropriately be placed within a part-time category.

Finally, the basic premise was accepted that grades will be assigned appropriately. For example, just as governance cannot presume that some "A" grades are wrongly assigned, so governance cannot assume that some faculty will assign "I" grades illegally.

Given the above premises, and since the University a year ago established that the "W" grade shall not be a penalty grade, it is clearly inappropriate to penalize a student for "W" grades.

There of course is also the issue of the "sliding scale" of work mandated by the 3.3 criterion for dean's list. A student who completes only one course, for whatever reason, will be on dean's list if and only if the grade in that course is an "A". Similar, a student with grades in only two courses can do no worse than an "A" and "B" grade if the student wishes to make dean's list. In other words, the standards themselves ensure a student with fewer than a full-time load of course work will need to complete work at a higher qualitative level.

The above seemed sufficient reasons not to draw distinctions among students. However, there is also the matter of probability. It seems most improbable that a student would drop several courses "to make dean's list." Many Albany students are receiving financial aid which requires maintenance of more than minimum end-of-semester credit totals, and even those who are not probably would prefer not to throw away good graduation credits merely to receive a post card notification of dean's list for the semester.

The Latin honors for graduation do not distinguish full-time from part-time, or from full-time who dropped many courses, and there seems no compelling reason to draw these distinctions for the potential dean's list population.

Lastly, if dean's list is viewed primarily as an incentive, an encouragement, then surely it is important that all who deserve this honor receive it. If a few students choose to manipulate the system in wasteful fashion simply to receive this honor, it is better they be on the dean's list than that some who deserve the recognition be excluded.

R.C. & S.M.M.R.
MEMORANDUM

August 30, 1985

TO: Executive Committee, University Senate
    Student Affairs Council
    Vice President Ramaley

FROM: Alice R. Corbin, Director of Judicial Affairs

RE: Committee on Student Conduct Summary, 1984-85

This summary is submitted in accordance with Senate Bill #8384-02. The Committee on Student Conduct is a standing committee of the Student Affairs Council. Disciplinary cases forwarded to the Committee for review include: academic dishonesty, graduate students, referrals initiated by University offices, and most cases where students have been suspended pending hearing. In addition, the Committee has been responsible for reviewing appeals of University disciplinary action and making recommendations concerning student conduct. The Committee is composed of teaching faculty, professional staff and students. A member of the Student Affairs staff serves as Executive Secretary.

During 1984-85, eighty-three (83) cases were assigned to the Committee on Student Conduct. The attached data describes the nature and resolution of those cases as of the specified date. You will note the dramatic increase in the number of cases of academic dishonesty compared to 1983-84 (11 vs. 52).

The Committee was, once again, needed over the summer. During July, 1985, members reviewed six appeals of disciplinary action. Three of those appeals involved disciplinary suspension and two involved disciplinary removal from residence.

I am available for further questions or comments.

cc: Vice President Pogue
Committee on Student Conduct
1984-85
(as of August 15, 1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>Non-Academic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>50 (9) *</td>
<td>26 (11)</td>
<td>76 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>5 (7)</td>
<td>7 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52 (11)</td>
<td>31 (18)</td>
<td>83 (29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting homework</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of stolen exam</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>School of Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collusion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Social/Behavioral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating during exams</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3 Soc/Beh, 7 Bus, 3 Sci/Math</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Academic</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to ID</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening Behavior</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possess. stolen property</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False information</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Resolution</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Non-Academic</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee hearing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Officer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Consent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Withdrawn</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in parentheses reflect 1983-84 figures
## Disciplinary Action Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Dishonesty</th>
<th>Non-Academic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible, no action</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Warning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Warning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Probation</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral Withdrawn</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incomplete</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT TO THE SENATE

by the

COMMITTEE ON STUDENT CONDUCT

Senate Bill 8384-02, Proposed Student Conduct Model, was adopted by the Senate on September 19, 1983, for a two-year period with the provision that the matter "be reviewed by the Senate in the Spring of 1985." Provisions of that bill were implemented in the Fall of 1983 upon approval of the President.

The Committee on Student Conduct, after conducting business for slightly more than one year, has met to consider a recommendation to the Senate in relation to the review required.

The Committee on Student Conduct recommends:

1. That the Committee on Student Conduct be retained under the general guidelines as in Bill 8384-02 for a period of two additional years (through May 1987) and that it make a recommendation on the structure to the Senate no later than May 1987.

   (RATIONALE: The committee feels that although it has gained much experience over this period of time, it would appreciate additional time and experience prior to making a recommendation to continue in any exact manner. In addition, it is aware of reviews now under way which might cause changes in various aspects of the current charge or makeup of the committee. It would seem advisable to continue "as is" for a period of time as other reviews which might have an influence on any recommendation are concluded.)

2. That the membership of the committee (currently listed as ten members of the teaching faculty, six students, and three members of the non-teaching faculty) be changed to twelve members of the teaching faculty, ten students, and four members of the non-teaching faculty.

   (NOTE: This does not change the membership of hearing bodies but simply creates a larger pool from which to draw members of hearing bodies.)

   (RATIONALE: It is difficult to obtain the proper mix for hearing bodies with the limited number from which to draw. In addition, it is felt that more individuals should probably have the experience of dealing with these matters.)

3. That any reporting function of the committee be directed to the Senate Executive Committee.

   (RATIONALE: Since appointments to the committee are jointly the responsibility of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Chair of the University Senate Executive Committee, the appropriate body with which to file reports would seem most logically the University Senate Executive Committee.)
4. That appeals stemming from cases of academic dishonesty be adjudicated by members of the Committee on Student Conduct not involved in the original hearing.

(RATIONALE: The current requirements are that appeals be heard by a subcommittee of the Student Affairs Council. Experience has found that this is both unrealistic and unworkable. Quorum requirements have rarely, if ever, been met, and the need to appoint the subcommittee by four persons is entirely too cumbersome, as is the need to name a chair. Equity will also more likely be attained when experienced bodies handle appeals.)

(If approved, that portion of Bill 8384-02 should then read:

Appeals arising from cases of academic dishonesty will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the Committee on Student Conduct not otherwise involved in the case. 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.)

(RATIONALE FOR LAST SENTENCE: It is conceivable that both the Chair and the Vice Chair of the Committee might be unable to serve as chair of the subcommittee. Provision should be made for such occasion, although it seems unlikely to be required.)

5. That appeals stemming from cases which do not involve allegations of academic dishonesty also be adjudicated by members of the Committee on Student Conduct not involved in the original hearing.

(RATIONALE: Same as paragraph 4 rationale above.)

(If approved, that portion of Bill 8384-02 should then read:

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 otherwise involved in the case. 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.)

(RATIONALE FOR LAST SENTENCE: Same as rationale for last sentence in paragraph 4 above.)

6. That appointments to the Committee on Student Conduct be made in the Spring of each year with the understanding that members would normally serve for two years (staggered terms may be arranged this Spring in order to accomplish an approximately equal number of turnovers each year).

(RATIONALE: The staggering of terms would achieve a balance of new and experienced members and would ensure continuity. The Spring appointments would come closer to assuring that there is an identifiable group that could be available in the Summer and would avoid the typical time lag of organizing in the Fall semester.)
Student membership should be approximately split between juniors and seniors to also help to achieve a mix of new and experienced members. Graduate students would be expected to be included in the pool but would not be required.

7. That the reports mandated in Bill 8384-02 be revised to be required once each semester rather than monthly.

(RATIONALE: Although the committee recognizes the importance of frequent reporting, generally speaking, semester reports would seem more feasible than would monthly reports. Since the adoption of the Bill, monthly reports have not been made.)

The Committee on Student Conduct recommends that if this report is accepted and implemented that the Committee address particularly two points:

1. The possibility of reinstating a penalty grade (e.g., "Z") which is not the result of achievement in class but might be used in cases of academic dishonesty.

2. Ways in which work of the committee receives more publicity, since it is the general opinion of the committee that too little is known about the committee, its work, its recommendations, etc. It is felt that if students were more aware of the final disposition of cases such knowledge might serve as a deterrent as well as provide information to faculty.
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UNIVERSITY SENATE
MINUTES

May 6, 1985


The meeting was called to order at 3:04 P.M. by the Chair, Kendall Birr, in the Campus Center Assembly Hall.

1. Announcements

The Chair announced that the sole purpose of this organizational meeting is to act on proposed Council memberships presented to the Senate by the Executive Committee; that the list of Senators is not yet complete, and that replacements must be made for those who will be on leave during 1985-86.

The Chair stated that at this time, the 1985-86 Senate is without graduate student Senators and requested that names be forwarded of those who would be interested in being a Senate representative.

Dr. Birr described the procedure by which Council members are selected and asked Professor Birn, 1985-86 Chair-elect, to formally move the approval of each Council's members.

2. Approval of Council Membership

Dr. Birn moved for acceptance of the proposed Executive Committee slate for each of the following:

Council on Academic Freedom and Ethics
Council on Educational Policy
Graduate Academic Council
Library Council
Council on Promotions and Continuing Appointment
Council on Research
Student Affairs Council
Undergraduate Academic Council
University Community Council

Seconds were provided by P. Rogers, A. Roberts, and M. Elbow; all were unanimously approved.

The Chair made available a list of the times and places reserved for each Senate Council to meet to elect a chair on May 7, 1985.

3. **Adjournment**

Pat Rogers moved that the meeting be adjourned. It was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Beverly Roth
Recorder