

5/10/82

SENATE MEETING

ATTENDANCE

H. Gibson	/	Bertie Nalin	/
Robert Hardt	/	Mura Macroni	/
Walter Fuller	/	W. F. Hammond	/
Robert T. Storing	/	Frank Boyce	/
Dick Farrelly	/	William J. Simmonds	/
Carey Barden	/	Ree Kasten	/
Frank Kemmell	/	Philip J. Storing	/
Don Reeb	/	Frank H. Farrell	/
Walter Coburn	/	Richard D. All	/
Roy Klages	/	E. M. Loren	/
Harold L. Cam	/	John Mielke	/
ERIC KOLI	/	H. Bakhrin	/
Drew Hatren	/	Dejorn	/
Robert Jarvenpa	/	P. M. Villanueva	/
Harvey G. Stoy	/	DE Anonamu	/
H. P. Mosby	/	John Hartigan	/
Sung Bok Kim	/	Walter Miller	/
RA Bosco	/	Dean Snow	/
Alan Rosenblatt	/	Sorden Puringt	/
W. D. Cotton	/	St. Delong	/
Bonnie E. Carlson	/	Eugene K. Garber	/
Sophie Lubensky	/	J. D. ...	/
Joan Savitt	/	Benjamin Kastel	/
Stuart A. Kiril	/	Cathy M. ...	/
J. Z. NITECKI	/	...	/
Ulrich Macke	/	Gene	/
MARK WERW	/	W. Schol	/
Paul Kostel	/	P. E. Stearn	/
Neil C. Brown	/	Vernon Bush	/
L. B. ...	/	J. Leary	/



UNIVERSITY SENATE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

UNIVERSITY SENATE
May 10, 1982
3:30 p.m. - CC Assembly Hall

A G E N D A

1. Approval of Minutes
2. President's Report
3. Chairperson's Report
4. SUNY Senator's Report
5. Council & Committee Reports
6. New Business:
 - 6.1 Bill No. 8182-30 - Strategic Planning: A Five Year Perspective, 1982-87 - (EPC)
 - 6.2 Bill No. 8182-31 - Proposed Policy Regarding Taking Final Examinations - (UAC)
 - 6.3 Bill No. 8182-32 - Proposed Combined B.S./M.S. Program in Physics - (GAC & UAC)
 - 6.4 Bill No. 8182-33 - Proposed Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration Leading to the Degree of Master of Arts - (GAC)
 - 6.5 Bill No. 8182-34 - Proposed Combined B.A./M.A. Program in Political Science - (GAC & UAC)
 - 6.6 Bill No. 8182-35 - Mandatory Notification of Student When a Hold is Placed on Such Student's Record - (SAC)
 - 6.7 Bill No. 8182-36 - University Policies for Research Involving Human Subjects - (Research)



UNIVERSITY SENATE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

UNIVERSITY SENATE
May 10, 1982
Minutes

ABSENT: M. Bers, M. Kanes, H. Frisch, R. Frost, A. Grignon, P. Rogers, J. Hanley, M. Rozett, E. Cowley, B. Vonnegut, J. Zubieta, J. Jacklet, J. Uppal, D. Arnold, M. Salish, E. Christensen, A. Baldwin, J. Baer, A. Baaklini, S. Watkins, W. Kidd, F. Ohnmacht, C. Sivers, N. Gelfand, M. Hagerty, A. Brooks, A. Weiner, D. Clinton, P. Gentile, G. Goldstein, K. Grasberger, C. Jandorf, S. Rothenberg, R. Rothman, G. Silliman, J. Tierney, S. Topal, C. Volk, L. Ullman.

The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. in the Campus Center Assembly Hall by the Chair, Harold L. Cannon.

1. Approval of Minutes

A minor correction was made under #5, "Old Business", paragraph 1: a sentence was inserted stating that "The motion was seconded." (The motion which J. Tierney made.) The minutes were approved as corrected.

2. The President's Report

President O'Leary reported briefly on the Budget. He stated that the Governor had vetoed the recommended SUNY budget. The Legislature had elected not to override the Governor's veto. The SUNY restoration was lost as the result of a much larger issue with regard to additional revenues. The President stated that in a meeting that was to be held, the question on what will happen to SUNY and these issues would hopefully be resolved. He planned to work with EPC regarding these issues; the details had to wait until enough information was gathered.

The President reported on the enrollment figures and stated that the residential rate was going up; students are staying on campus longer than usual. There had been a drop in SUNY transfers which may be explained in part by people staying closer to home. Graduate enrollment will maintain its present levels; graduate applicants will pay a \$20.00 fee. Doctoral degrees were reported to be up somewhat.

In closing, the President stated that the year had been a very productive one with the Senate as a whole and with the Councils. He thanked Harold L. Cannon for the outstanding job he did as Chair of the Senate and stated that the governance system worked very effectively.

3. Chair's Report

Professor Cannon reported that a second letter had been sent out to the twenty area legislators, after the Governor's veto, asking for their support again. He also reported on the meeting of the Joint Council of SUNY State-wide Senate.

4. SUNY Senator's Report

D. Reeb reported on the 71st regular SUNY meeting which was held on April 16 and 17. Nine resolutions had been approved at the meeting and one was tabled. Some of the resolutions dealt with trying to get the Chancellor to do more work on the budget situation. Two of the resolutions dealt with the Utica/Rome campuses where they are now in the process of choosing between a new campus and a cut-back in their programs.

Professor Reeb announced that this was the last SUNY Senate meeting for which Senator Eugene McLaren was SUNYA's representative and he complimented him on the outstanding job he did.

5. Council and Committee Reports

5.1 Executive Committee - No additions to written report.

5.2 EPC - W. Hammond reported that item #4 superseded #1 and that the Council had in fact completed its review of the Budget Panel Report and the 1982-84 budget plan.

5.3 UAC - R. Gibson raised a question regarding the Honors Program in Biology. He questioned the minimum grade point average of 3.25 overall in paragraph 4, line 2: it should be a 3.5 overall minimum grade point average.

A student senator questioned the required courses for the Honors Program in Psychology in paragraph 3, line 3: the course listed as Psy 210 should have been Psy 201.

E. Koli raised a question on the May 7 report of UAC, item #2. He questioned the figure for the number of applicants admitted for Fall 1982 in the Minority Admissions Category. D. Snow stated he had been told that there will be a large number this year.

5.4 GAC - Senator Kim reported one item in addition to the written report. At the April 30 meeting, the GAC passed a resolution urging the Vice President for University Affairs to set aside at least one dormitory exclusively for graduate students. The Council had been concerned that the graduate students do not have much voice in the affairs of the University and that their housing has not been adequate.

5.5 SAC - No additions to written report.

5.6 Research - In reference to the "Guidelines for Faculty Involvement in Private Ventures Involving Proprietary Work Carried out on Campus," H. Cannon suggested that a sentence be added to Item #6, stating that: "The guidelines which follow are not approved and not actually being submitted for adoption." The Council will be working on this for a year, and it may then be presented for adoption.

5.7 CPCA - No additions to written report.

- 5.8 Library - It was recommended by the Executive Committee that Item No. 6 of the report not be accepted by the Senate. A motion was made that the Senate not approve Item #6. The motion was seconded. There was some debate on this issue. The motion was voted on and carried. P. Vaillancourt and F. Femminella abstained from the vote.
- 5.9 UCC - No report
- 5.10 CAFE - H. Staley reported that the Committee on Student Ethics and Cheating had an open hearing on April 20. The hearing and discussions provided a basis for action and policy development. Thirteen recommendations were developed with regard to cheating and academic quality.
6. New Business
- 6.1 Bill No. 8182-30 - Strategic Planning: A Five Year Perspective, 1982-87 - The document was moved by EPC. A question was raised as to what the term "knowledge worker" meant (page 19, paragraph 4, line 3.) President O'Leary stated that it would be removed from the text. The bill was voted on and carried.
- 6.2 Bill No. 8182-31 - Proposed Policy Regarding Taking Final Examinations - This bill was moved by UAC. There had been some discussion on this bill. R. Rothman made a motion to amend the bill with the following sentence, to be added at the end of the first paragraph:

"The University Senate encourages all instructors to do everything possible to comply with the above."

The motion was seconded, voted on and carried. Bill No. 8182-31 was then voted on and carried.

- 6.3 Bill No. 8182-32 - Proposed Combined B.S./M.S. Program in Physics - This program was moved by GAC and UAC. The bill was voted on and carried.
- 6.4 Bill No. 8182-33 - Proposed Graduate Program in Public Policy and Administration Leading to the Degree of Master of Arts - This bill was moved by GAC. H. Cannon stated that this was the first program to be offered jointly at SUNYA. The program was voted on and carried.
- 6.5 Bill No. 8182-34 - Proposed Combined B.A./M.A. Program in Political Science - This program was moved by GAC and UAC. The bill was voted on and carried.
- 6.6 Bill No. 8182-35 - Mandatory Notification of Student When a Hold is Placed on Such Student's Record - The bill was moved by SAC. A student senator made a motion to amend the bill in paragraph 4, to read:

"IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, That the university office placing a hold or in any other way interfering with a student's ability to take advantage of the academic or other services of the university because the student owes the university money must notify a student in writing at the time a hold is placed on a student's record."

6.6 (Continued)

There was considerable discussion following this. E. McLaren made a motion to amend the bill by changing the wording in paragraph 4 (under "It Is Hereby Resolved") from "must notify a student in writing prior to the time a hold is placed." The motion was seconded. There was further discussion. U. Mache moved to amend the amendment to read: "must notify a student in writing prior to or at the time a hold is placed." The motion was seconded. P. Krosby recommended that this bill be referred back to SAC. E. McLaren moved the previous question and moved to close debate. The motion was seconded, voted on and carried. The motion to amend the amendment, "prior to or at the time" was then voted on and carried. Professor Krosby moved that this bill be referred back to SAC for further study. The motion was seconded and voted on. There was a Division of the House and a hand count was taken. The motion to refer Bill No. 8182-35 back to SAC carried 32 to 15.

6.7 Bill No. 8182-36 - University Policies for Research Involving Human Subjects - This bill was moved by the Council on Research. R. Alba commended the Committee for the work it had done on this bill and stated that the Council had considered the issues very carefully. This bill was voted on and carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

REPORTS TO THE SENATE
May 10, 1982

Report of the Executive Committee

FOR INFORMATION:

1. The Executive Committee recommends that the Senate not accept information item 6 from the Library Council.
2. The Committee received a report on the most recent meeting of the Joint Council of University Center Senates.
3. The Chairperson reported that a second series of letters were sent to area legislators and the leadership of the Assembly and Senate following the line item vetoes of the budget by the governor.
4. Two matters addressed to the Executive Committee will be referred to the 1982-83 University Community Council.

Report of the Council on Educational Policy

FOR INFORMATION:

1. The Council expects to complete its review of the Budget Panel report (not yet written) on May 3.
2. The Council has approved a letter of intent for a Ph.D. in Organizational Analysis. The report of the Council's Long Range Planning Committee is attached.
3. The Council has reviewed with favor a proposed M.A. Program in Public Policy and Administration to be offered jointly by SUNYA and Queens College (CUNY). (This program has been recently approved by the Graduate Academic Council.)
4. The Council expects to complete its review of the Budget Panel Report and the 1983-84 budget plan on May 3.

FOR ACTION:

The Council has unanimously approved a five year strategic plan for the period 1982-1987.

The Council recommends acceptance of this plan by the Senate.



UNIVERSITY SENATE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Council on Educational Policy

FROM: Paul Marr, Chair
Long Range Planning Committee

DATE: March 25, 1982

SUBJECT: Action on Letter of Intent for Ph.D. in Organizational Analysis

The Long Range Planning Committee reviewed the letter of intent for the Ph.D. program in Organizational Analysis at its March 25, 1982 meeting.

Several schools and departments have faculty with competencies in areas of organizational studies. Among these scholars are nationally known specialists in organizational theory and behavior from Sociology, Public Administration, the School of Business, Educational Administration, Social Welfare and Criminal Justice. These faculty members have met for three years to share their research objectives and findings and have now prepared a proposal for a program in Organizational Analysis.

The proposed doctoral program in Organizational Analysis will help provide a small but very well trained cadre of researchers and teachers able to analyze the problems and opportunities for improving organizational activity in government and in private industry. The proposed program will be an important element in the public sector specialization of SUNY-Albany.

This interdisciplinary program will draw upon faculty and courses from established graduate programs but will not duplicate existing programs. Several graduate programs specialize in disciplinary aspects of organizational studies but more offer a broad approach that would characterize a doctoral program. Interest has been expressed in the proposed program by graduate students in several fields.

The program for students entering with a baccalaureate will constitute eighteen graduate courses and a dissertation. Only two new courses are planned. Course work can be taken from various participating scholars. Students will select elective seminars

Council on Education Policy

March 25, 1982

Page 2

with the consent of three members of the interdisciplinary faculty appointed by the Director of the Organizational Analysis Ph.D. program.

The proposed program will require no additional faculty. Administrative support will be provided by the School of Business and the Dean of the School of Business will serve as the program director. Campus computer facilities are adequate. Library holdings are generally adequate but additions will be necessary to support research.

The proposed interdisciplinary program is unique. It will provide an effective and intellectually stimulating use of nationally recognized faculty for training students and advancing research in organizational studies. The proposed program will enhance the reputation of the University, it will help resolve the needs of government and industry for organizational research, and it will provide well qualified students with increased opportunity for personal development.

The Long Range Planning Committee found that the Ph.D. program in Organizational Analysis was in harmony with the campus mission and approved it by a unanimous vote.

PM:ch

cc: Dean Kahalas

Reports to the Senate (Continued)

Report of the Undergraduate Academic Council

FOR INFORMATION:

1. Reviews of undergraduate programs in Social Welfare, History, and Physics are going forward and reports are expected this semester. The UAC approved a proposal to create a joint review committee with the GAC for future reviews. Appropriate changes in the description of UAC procedures will be made accordingly.
2. The issue of plus/minus grading was discussed again and at the recommendation of the Committee on Academic Standing, the UAC agreed to drop the issue until such time as strong interest in the issue was demonstrated by some part of the University community.
3. The UAC unanimously accepted the recommendation of the Curriculum Committee that transfer students from two-year colleges with an associate's degree which incorporated a comparable distribution requirement be considered to have fulfilled the general education requirements for the B.A. and B.S. degrees at SUNY at Albany. Such students would still have to separately demonstrate fulfillment of the new writing requirement.
4. The UAC unanimously approved new honors programs in Atmospheric Science, Biology, Psychology, and Sociology. Copies of the new programs are attached for information.
5. The UAC unanimously approved a combined BS/MS program in Physics and a combined BA/MA program in Political Science. The two new programs will be presented for action by the Senate through the GAC.
6. Several newly approved General Education courses were presented for information and discussed. The UAC passes these along to the Senate for information.
7. The UAC received for information from the Admissions Committee new policy guidelines regarding the enrollment of advanced high school students. The new policy is consistent with current standards in the region as well as with State Education Department guidelines. A copy of the new policy is available.

FOR ACTION:

The UAC received from the Committee on Academic Standing a proposed policy dealing with cases in which students are required to take three or more final examinations on a single day during exam week. The UAC approved an amended version of the proposed policy and recommends acceptance by the Senate.

PROGRAM LEADING TO A BS WITH HONORS
IN ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES

Students who have by the end of their fourth semester attained a cumulative grade point average of at least 3.25 and a grade point average of at least 3.5 in courses required of the Major in Atmospheric Science may apply to the Department Chairman for a program leading to a "BS Degree with Honors in Atmospheric Science". Applications must be submitted before the end of the first semester of the student's junior year and must be accompanied by letters of recommendation from at least two faculty members.

To be admitted to the program a student must have completed three semesters of physics (Phy 120, 121, 124, 125, 220 and 221), three semesters of Mathematics (Mat 112, 113 and 214), and must be enrolled in or have completed Atm 320. These requirements may be altered, upon request, for qualified transfer students. At the end of the junior year, the student's program will be reviewed by the Honors Committee to see if satisfactory progress is being made.

To be eligible for a degree with honors, students must complete a minimum of 74 credits specified as follows: (1) the physics, mathematics and chemistry requirements of the major; (2) the core sequence in Atmospheric Science (Atm 320, 321, 420 and 421) plus any three Atm courses at the 400 or 500 level; (3) a coherent core of three upper division courses in any discipline besides Atmospheric Science; and (4) six credits of Atm 499 combined with three credits of Atm 497 taken over at least two semesters cumulating in a significant undergraduate thesis and an honors seminar in the student's final semester. Students in the program must maintain both a minimum grade point average of 3.25 overall and 3.5 in biology courses taken to satisfy major requirements during the junior and senior years.

Upon completion of the requirements, the Honor's Committee will make its recommendation to the faculty to grant the degree with honors based upon the candidate's (1) academic record, (2) research project report, (3) honors seminar, and (4) faculty recommendations. The recommendation of the faculty will be transferred by the Chairman to the appropriate conferring body of the University.

HONORS PROGRAM IN BIOLOGY

The Honors Program in Biological Sciences is designed for outstanding students enrolled in the General Program leading to the B.S. degree.

Students may apply for admission to the Honors Program by submitting a letter of request to the Departmental Honors Committee no later than April 15 of the freshman or sophomore year (for admission for the Fall) or November 15 of the sophomore year (for admission in the Spring). Junior transfers may apply at the time of their admission to the University. Students with advanced placement credit are encouraged to apply early. Students who are found acceptable by the committee must also find a research advisor.

The requirements for admission include: 1) the candidate must declare the major and have completed (or have in progress at time of application) 12 credits of courses required for the Biology major, including Bio 101a and 101b, 2) an overall grade point average of 3.5, 3) a grade point average of 3.5 in courses required for the major, and 4) a written recommendation from a teaching assistant if possible. Primary emphasis will be placed on indications of academic ability and maturity sufficient for applicants to complete with distinction a program involving independent research.

Students in the program must maintain both a minimum grade point average of 3.25 overall and 3.5 in biology courses taken to satisfy major requirements during the junior and senior years. The progress of participants in the Honors Program will be reviewed at the end of the sophomore and junior years by the Departmental Honors Committee. Students not meeting the standards above at that time may be precluded from continuing in the program during their senior year. These students may, of course, continue as majors.

Students in the Honors Program are required to complete a minimum of 66 credits as specified for the (B.S.) General Program in Biology and must include: 1) six credits of independent study (Bio 399, 499); the independent study must include an honors research project culminating in a written report; this will be also given orally as part of an honors seminar to be taken during the student's last semester, 2) at least three credits at the 500 level or higher (not including Bio 515) in the field of work of the student. The specific lecture course requirements may be met by examination, and 3) at least three credits of Honors Seminar (Bio 497 or other courses deemed equivalent).

After completion of the requirements above, the Departmental Honors Committee will make its recommendation to the faculty to grant the degree with honors based upon 1) overall academic record, 2) performance and accomplishments of the independent study project(s), 3) the quality of the Honors Seminar, and 4) the evaluations of departmental faculty members who have supervised these activities. The final recommendation will be made by the departmental faculty and transmitted by the Chair to the appropriate conferring body of the University.

HONORS PROGRAM IN PSYCHOLOGY

A psychology major, or double major with Psychology first listed, may file an application for admission to the honors program in the department office in the second semester of the sophomore year or in the junior year. Junior transfers may apply at the time of their admission to the University. Early application will facilitate advisement in the honors program.

The minimum requirements for admission includes completion of Psy 101, 201, 211, and a Math course, and a grade point average of 3.30 for all courses taken at the University for graduation credit and a 3.50 grade point average for all psychology courses applicable toward the major.

Students in the honors program are required to complete a minimum of 64 credits as follows: 40 credits of coursework in psychology, including Psy 101, 210, 211, 310, 497 (6 credits), and 499 or an equivalent research seminar at the graduate level, and 24 credits of coursework in Mathematics, Computer Science, Biology, Chemistry, Physics, Sociology, and Anthropology (selected as advised to fulfill the interdepartmental minor). In addition, students must submit a senior honors thesis acceptable to the Departmental Honors Committee.

Students in the honors program are required to maintain an overall grade point average of 3.30 or better during the junior and senior years and an overall grade point average of 3.5 or better for all psychology courses applicable toward the major. The work of each candidate in the honors program will be reviewed at the completion of the junior year by the Departmental Honors Committee. Students not meeting the above stated standards at that time may be precluded from continuing in the program in the senior year.

After completion of the above requirements, the records of the candidate will be reviewed by the Departmental Honors Committee who shall recommend to the department candidates for the degree with honors in psychology.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

HONORS PROGRAM

PROGRAM

The Honors Program in Sociology combines recognition of general academic excellence with demonstrated achievement in Sociology. The program is structured in terms of an honors course curriculum and a thesis, which provides exposure to the breadth of sociological modes of inquiry, while also stimulating and supporting original, student-initiated, exploration of sociological issues.

A. Selection and Evaluation

1. The student should have declared Sociology as the (or first) major and should have completed at least 12 credits of coursework in the department (or coursework from related departments required for the major). The student must have an overall grade point average not lower than 3.25 and a 3.5 in the major to enter the program and to be maintained at the end of the junior year.
2. The student should apply no later than the first semester of the junior year to the Honors Committee. At least one letter of recommendation is required.
3. The progress and academic standing of the student is reviewed at the end of the junior year by the Honors Committee. Upon satisfactory completion of the honors curriculum and of courses required of all majors, students will be recommended by the Honors Committee to graduate with Honors in Sociology.
4. The student must successfully complete the junior colloquium and show satisfactory progress on the honors thesis for retention in the honors program. The student must maintain the same grade point average overall and the same average in the major as was required for admission to the honors program.

B. Curriculum

1. A total of 39 credits in Sociology including 12 credits of required coursework (Soc 115, 221, 223, and one of the following 330, 333, 335, or 430); Junior Honors Colloquium (Soc 486), and Senior Honors Thesis Seminar (Soc 498) for 6 credits.
2. The student is to take the honors colloquium in the second semester of the junior year.
3. It is expected that the student complete Soc 221, 223, and a theory course before the end of the junior year.
4. During the senior year, the student takes two courses devoted to research on the topic of the honors thesis.

C. Administration

1. The undergraduate honors committee will administer the program, advise students, oversee the junior colloquium, and help students in selecting thesis advisers. The committee will be responsible for the evaluation of students at the end of their junior year.
2. The thesis is to be presented to the adviser and honors committee in the spring of the senior year.

Undergraduate Academic Council
Additional Courses Approved for General Education Program

Submitted by: Curriculum Committee
April 12, 1982

Literature and Fine Arts

Clc 223 Masterpieces of Greek Tragedy and Comedy
Eng 368 Women Writers
Ger 225 Goethe to Thomas Mann
Ger 230 Expressionism in the Arts
Ger 240 Hermann Hesse
Ger 242 Franz Kafka
Ger 243 Thomas Mann
Ger 246 Great Yiddish Authors in English Translation
Ger 247 Goethe's Faust in Translation
Ger 270 Nordic Saga and Myth
Ger 308A Masterworks of German Literature to 1800
Rus 359 Russian Drama in English Translation
Spn 311A Representative Spanish Authors
Spn 311B Representative Spanish Authors
Spn 316 Spanish American Literature
Thr 207 Introduction to Dramatic Art

Social Sciences

Wss 230 Women in African History

Symbolics

Csi 101 Elements of Computing
Eco 320 Economic Statistics
Soc 221 Statistics for Sociology

Values

Est 110 Knowledge and Gender
Eng 226U Technology and Literature
Eng 226V The Literature of War
Eng 289U Milton, Bacon, and the Making of the Modern Mind
Phi 116 World Views
Phy 201 Physics and Buddhism
Wss 360 Feminist Social and Political Thought

World Cultures

Hum 150A Cultural Diversity and the Human Condition
Hum 150B Cultural Diversity and the Human Condition

UNIVERSITY SENATE
UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

REPORT TO THE SENATE

TO: Harold Cannon, Chairman
University Senate

FROM: Dean Snow, Chairman
Undergraduate Academic Council

DATE: May 7, 1982

The UAC had its final meeting for the 1981-82 academic year on May 5, 1982, and forwards a number of items.

FOR INFORMATION:

1. The UAC received a report on the Talented Students Admissions Program from the Admissions Committee. The report indicates considerable success for the program and for the students admitted under it.
2. The Admissions Committee has reported that 25 of 30 applicants have been admitted for Fall 1982 in the the Minority Admissions Category.
3. The Honors Committee reported that 19 awards will be made soon for outstanding efforts in undergraduate research.
4. The UAC has received the last set of additions to the list of approved General Education courses for 1982-83, and these are attached for the Senate's information.
5. The UAC received reports on reviews of undergraduate programs in Anthropology, Chinese Studies, and Geography. The Council agreed to conduct reviews jointly with the GAC of programs in Geology and Theatre during 1982-83. Reviews of undergraduate programs in Social Welfare, History, and Physics are not yet complete because the reports of outside evaluators have not been received. These will be completed early in 1982-83.
6. As required by the Senate bill that approved General Education requirements, the UAC has agreed to allow special rules for majors in Accounting. Accounting majors will be allowed to satisfy the requirement by completing 30 credits in General Education courses, at least 6 credits in 4 of the general education categories and a minimum of 3 credits in each of the two remaining categories.

Report from UAC
May 7, 1982
Page 2

7. The UAC approved revision in the minor in Computer Science.
8. The UAC approved revision in the major in Puerto Rican Studies.
9. The UAC approved revision in the major in Inter-American Studies and a change in the major title to "Latin American Studies." Approval for the latter change will be sought at the SED.
10. The UAC approved a second minor track in Library and Information Science, to be used with a registered undergraduate major in a pending BA/MLS combined program. The UAC also approved the combined BA/MLS program and forwarded it to the GAC for its approval. If approved by the GAC, the combined program will be forwarded to the Senate for action.

ATTACHMENTS

Undergraduate Academic Council

ADDITIONAL COURSES APPROVED FOR GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

May 5, 1982

Literature and Fine Arts

Ant 268 Ethnology of Pre-Columbian Art
Mus 214 American Music

Social Sciences

Pos 101 American Politics
Pos 102 Comparative and International Politics
Pos/Paf 240 Introduction to Public Policy

Values

Mgt 481 Problems in Business Policy
Hum 248 America's Radical Past: 1848 - 1877

World Cultures

His 230a & b The Culture of the Western World

Writing Intensive Courses

Clc 223 Masterpieces of Greek Tragedy and Comedy
Gog 102 Introduction to the Cultural Environment (Professor Webb only)
Rus 162 Who Are the Soviets?
Soc 356 Sociology of the Arts

4

UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

REVISION OF MAJOR REQUIREMENTS IN PUERTO RICAN STUDIES

SUBMITTED BY: CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
May 5, 1982

IT IS PROPOSED THAT the following revision of the degree requirements for the major in Puerto Rican Studies be approved and become effective for all students graduating in May 1987 and thereafter.

General Program B.A.:

A total of 36 credits in PRS. Twenty four (24) credits of required coursework to include PRS 101 (History of Puerto Rico); PRS (SPN) 143 (Survey of Puerto Rican Literature); HIS (ANT) 145 (Continuity and Change in Latin America); PRS 150 (Puerto Rican Culture); PRS (AAS) 231 (Dynamics of Racism) or PRS (WSS) 240 (Classism, Racism and Sexism); PRS (SOC) 282 (Minority Groups); PRS 429 (The Puerto Rican Community in the U.S.); and PLC 400 Research on Contemporary Latin American Issues (formerly IAS 400). Twelve additional credits in PRS (at least 6 credits must be at 300 level or above) as advised by the faculty of the department. Courses that are offered by other departments that have been officially cross-listed with the PRLACS Department will be accepted to fulfill this requirement.

RATIONALE

The core curriculum for the major in Puerto Rican Studies has been revised to provide students with wider opportunities for interdisciplinary exploration of three basic areas of study: 1) The Puerto Rican experience as a minority group in American society, 2) Puerto Rico in the context of the Caribbean and Latin American, and 3) The relationship between the island and the United States.

The proposed changes give more breadth to the core curriculum and provide students with a better exposure to contemporary issues.

Present Requirements for a major in Puerto Rican Studies:

A total of 33 credits in PRS. 18 credits of required coursework to include PRS 101 (Puerto Rican History), PRS (SPN) 143 (Puerto Rican Literature), PRS 150 (Puerto Rican Culture), PRS 329 (Soc 379) (Urban Puerto Rican Family), PRS 346 (Crisis in Puerto Rican Identity), PRS 490 (Senior Seminar in PRS), plus at least 3 additional credits at the 300 level or above. Twelve additional credits in PRS as advised by the faculty of the department. Courses that are offered by other departments that have been officially cross-listed with the department of PRS will be accepted to fulfill this requirement.

UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

REVISION OF MAJOR REQUIREMENTS IN INTER-AMERICAN STUDIES
WITH A NEW TITLE OF LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

SUBMITTED BY: CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
May 5, 1982

IT IS PROPOSED THAT the title of the Inter-American Studies major be changed to Latin American Studies and that the following revision of the degree requirements for the major be approved and become effective for all students graduating in May 1987 and thereafter.

Combined Major and Minor Sequence:

A total of 54 credits including 36 credits in interdisciplinary coursework with Latin American content and 18 minor credits in Spanish and Portuguese. Majors may emphasize either Spanish or Portuguese, but must have a minimum of six credits in the other language. (These language requirements may be waived for students demonstrating proficiency equivalent to required coursework). Twenty four (24) of the 36 non-language requirements represent the interdisciplinary core curriculum that consists of: His (Ant 145 (Continuity and Change in Latin America); His 350 (Iberia and Latin America to 1810) or His 367 (Contemporary Latin America); His 369 (Mexico, Central America and the West Indies since 1810) or His 371 (South America since 1810); Soc 448 (Social Change in Latin America); Spn 317 (Latin-American Civilization); Prs (Aas) 301 (The Caribbean: Peoples and Cultures) or Ant 341 (Ethnology of Meso-America); Pos 357 (Latin American Politics); and PLC 400 Research on Contemporary Latin American Issues (formerly IAS 400 Current Latin American Ideas). The remaining 12 credits required for the major may be made up as advised from courses with Latin American emphasis offered in Social Sciences and Humanities.

RATIONALE

The former program in Inter-American Studies has been absorbed into the newly-formed Department of Puerto Rican, Latin American and Caribbean Studies. As now constituted, with two separate tracks in History or Spanish, the program does not fulfill the need for an integrated interdisciplinary major that would give students a broad knowledge of Latin American history, culture and institutions. The 54 credits required for the revised major, including 18 in the major Latin American languages is intended to prepare students for professional and research careers in foreign service, business, education, government, foundations and other national or international agencies engaged in developing, improving or promoting Inter-American trade and the cultural, economic, social and political life of the peoples of Latin America.

This proposal for a Latin American Studies major represents a revitalization, within the constraints of limited resources, of long-standing commitment of the SUNYA campus to this field. An Inter-American Studies program at the undergraduate level began as early as 1962, when a Center for Inter-American Studies was established on this

UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

May 5, 1982

Page 2

campus. Five years later the program was expanded to include an M.A. degree. Both the B.A. and M.A. programs continued until 1977, when the Center and its programs were retrenched. However, the undergraduate program was allowed to continue as a faculty-student initiated major until 1978, and as a discrete major from December 1978. With retrenchment in 1977, the program was also moved from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Humanities and Fine Arts. As a discrete major, Inter-American Studies has two tracks: a Spanish emphasis and a history emphasis.

In the Fall of 1980 a Dean's Advisory Committee on Latin American Studies was appointed by Dean John Webb to examine course offerings, library facilities, student interest, internal administrative support and employment opportunities and, if need and resources were felt to be genuine, to write a proposed curriculum for a revised major and minor in Latin American Studies. By agreement between the Deans of the Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences, the program was moved back to its former home in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and housed in the newly established Department of Puerto Rican, Latin American and Caribbean Studies. The curriculum committee of the department feels that as now constituted, the major will be by far the most structured and strongest, academically and in terms of post-graduate employment opportunities, of any in the SUNY system. The committee's work represented by the curriculum as outlined above -- was successfully concluded in the Spring of 1980 in time for the site visit by Prof. Joseph T. Criscenti. Professor Criscenti had previously been engaged as outside evaluator of the old Inter-American Studies Program; instead he now found himself examining a revised and expanded program in Latin American Studies. Professor Criscenti agreed with the judgment of the Dean and of the Faculty Committee that such a program was not only feasible but essential, and that, as formulated by the committee and subsequently approved at the College level, it would serve its intended purposes.

Present Requirements for a Major in Inter-American Studies:

Spanish emphasis:

A minimum of 53 credits as advised, including 24 credits of Spanish above 102b, Por 101a and b, and Ias 400. Eighteen credits of area studies to include His 100a and b, or 131a and b, 350, 369, or 371; 3 additional credits of Latin American History as advised; and 3 credits as advised from courses in social sciences dealing with Latin America.

History emphasis:

A minimum of 56 credits as advised including His 100a and b, or His 131a and b, 350, 369, or 371; 12 additional credits as advised from the social sciences dealing with Latin America; Ias 400; Spn 206, 207, 223, 316a or b; 317; Por 101a and b.

Reports to the Senate (Continued)

Report of the Graduate Academic Council

FOR INFORMATION:

The Graduate Academic Council took the following actions:

1. Approved a revision in the MA Program in Public Affairs to permit PAF 505 Quantitative and Algorithmic Reasoning in Public Policy Analysis and PAF 502 Philosophical Reasoning in Public Policy Analysis to satisfy a required course sequent of the program.
2. Approved a revision in the MA program in Political Science to require at least 4 of the 6 foundation seminars in political science to satisfy curricular requirements.
3. Approved a revision in the mathematics and science sequence in the MS program in Advanced Classroom Teaching to require E Mat 627 or E Sci 627 Perspectives in Math (Science) Education, E Tch 580 Analysis of Research on Teachers and Teaching, E Msc 550, 650, and/or 651 Microcomputers and the Math/Science Classroom to satisfy curricular requirements.
4. Approved a revision in the MA program in English to broaden the foreign language or research tool requirement to include such skills as computer science, and to increase the number of courses that may be used to satisfy the English language study requirement.
5. Approved a revision in the DA program in English to broaden the foreign language or research tool requirement to make it more relevant to a student's program of study.
6. Approved a letter of Intent for a Ph.D. program in Organizational Analysis.
7. The Council noted a proposal to continued the joint program review process of the Graduate and Undergraduate Academic Councils. The Council also approved a proposal to replace the separate UAC Review Committee and GAC Review Committee with a Joint Program Review Committee composed of four members selected by the GAC and four members selected by the UAC. (For those academic and professional areas where both undergraduate and graduate programs do not exist, the appropriate Council would augment their four members as they see fit to form a discrete committee.) Robert McFarland was approved to staff this new committee.
8. Chairman S. Kim reported that the Continuing Studies course numbering system has now been brought in line with the University Policy.

Reports to the Senate (Continued)

GAC Report (Continued)

FOR ACTION:

1. The GAC approved a new combined degree B.S./M.S. program in Physics:

BS requirements for major/second field: 65 credits;
MS requirements: minimum of 30 graduate credits; (Up to 12 graduate credits may be applied to both the B.S. and M.S. requirements.)
2. The GAC requests that the Senate approve a new MA program in Public Policy and Administration that will be jointly offered by SUNYA and Queens College.
3. The GAC approved a new combined B.A./M.A. program in Political Science.

Report of the Student Affairs Council

FOR INFORMATION:

1. The Council met on Tuesday April, 20th and discussed the issue of computerized student address printouts. It was reported that these printouts are presently available to only valid university groups. The decision to grant such lists is currently an administrative one. While these printouts are not available, the university phone directory is available to all. The Council encountered no reason to take any action.
2. The Council discussed the possibility of selecting a Mayfest date one year in advance so as to accommodate the physical education department. The past implementation of a one dollar service charge by the University Health Service was also brought up. It was indicated that this charge was implemented in an attempt to balance the Health Services budget.
3. The Council again met on Tuesday, April 27th and underwent the lengthy process of revising Student Guidelines.

Reports to the Senate (Continued)

Report of the Council on Research

FOR INFORMATION:

1. Acting on a recommendation from the Committee on Centers and Institutes, the Council approved the establishment of the Center for Stress and Anxiety Disorders.
2. The Council approved the request from the Committee on Research Incentives that it be allowed to forward its recommendations for SUNYA Benevolent Association Fellowships directly to the Association.
3. The Council began its discussions of review policies and procedures for human-subjects research and of proposed guidelines for faculty involvement in private ventures on campus.
4. The Council approved the proposed distribution of the Biomedical Research Support Grant.
5. Acting on a recommendation from its Committee on Centers and Institutes, the Council approved the proposal to establish an Institute of Archaeological Studies.
6. The Council approved preliminary use of the "Guidelines for Faculty Involvement in Private Ventures Involving Proprietary Work Carried out on Campus" by its Committee on Industrial Linkages. The Committee will use them on a trial basis to evaluate proposed linkages. A copy of the guidelines are attached. If the Council agrees to accept such guidelines they will be forwarded to the Senate for adoption.

FOR ACTION:

The Council approved the statement, "University Policies for Research Involving Human Subjects," for forwarding to the Senate. The Council also approved for forwarding its report on the survey of faculty responses. Both are attached.

Guidelines for Faculty Involvement in Private Ventures Involving Proprietary Work Carried Out On Campus

Recognizing the impossibility of anticipating all contingencies and also the evolution of thinking about University-Industrial relationships, it is felt that detailed rules for faculty and student involvement in private venture companies are not appropriate at this time. Each case should be carefully considered in the context of general guidelines designed to protect the broad mission and purpose of the University. Each case should be reviewed upon initiation by the Committee on Industrial Linkages which will then make a recommendation to the Vice President for Research and Educational Development and report its recommendation to the Council on Research of the University Senate. Annual review of each approved program will be carried out by the Committee on Industrial Linkages.

Recommended guidelines for the initial and subsequent reviews are indicated below. These guidelines are based on the belief that primary responsibility for supervision, guidance and accountability of research and student education must reside in the appropriate college, department or research center. The reviews at the University level are principally to ensure that appropriate standards and mechanisms for organization and oversight of private venture endeavors involving faculty, students and facilities are established and implemented by the college, department or center. It is recognized that significant potential danger exists in the establishment of private venture programs on the campus, but it is felt that to preclude such programs because of this potential would be a mistake in view of the potential benefits which include: attraction, stimulation and retention of outstanding faculty; development of increased educational, research and career opportunities for students; augmentation of the facilities, expertise and reputation for research; and stimulation of local economy and climate for research and technology. Maximizing the benefit and minimizing the risk places a special and important responsibility on the individuals, administrators and review bodies involved, especially at the college, department and research center level.

Guidelines

1. The primary function of the University faculty on the University campus and of the facilities on the campus is training of students and free inquiry and effective communication. This must be kept uppermost in any contractual arrangement. Net interference with this function, direct or indirect, as concluded from careful review by appropriate faculty or administrative bodies will be grounds for non-approval or non-renewal of any contract.
2. Student participation shall be in the context of thesis research and preparation. Insurance that this requirement is met is a special responsibility of the particular department. The thesis program and progress of each student involved in such programs must be reviewed and approved through established departmental procedure involving at least one faculty member not associated with

the venture program. It is recommended that a research committee of at least three members be appointed, one of which should be the thesis supervisor and only one of which should be associated with the venture program (this may be the thesis supervisor). For small departments such a structure may be impractical, in which case the review may be carried out by the department chairman or his or her designee.

The student shall be free to discuss his or her thesis work with other students and faculty, and to make reports to the department on the status and progress of the work. It is furthermore required that student thesis work will be published. It is expected that the department would not approve projects primarily proprietary in nature. This is not meant to imply that the student could not be peripherally involved or knowledgeable about proprietary work which he or she would not be allowed to discuss freely; it should not, however, comprise the thesis research project.

Student support from venture research programs will not be exceptional, i.e., will be within the established range for other student teaching and research stipends.

Exceptions to student thesis, free communication and fundamental research requirements may be made for short periods such as summer employment or introductory involvement. This should be approved by the department chairman or appropriate departmental committee.

3. Faculty involved in private venture programs shall not permit such involvement to interfere with instructional, dissertation direction or committee responsibilities. Any exception to this will be through a release-time support arrangement that has the prior approval of the department chairman and college dean. It is recognized that established practice permits 20% (1 day/wk) consulting time.
4. Use of University facilities will be allowed only through proper remuneration to the University as provided by a contract with the University Research Foundation and designated campus officer. Such remuneration will generally include (but not exclusively) commitments of all or part of royalty and licensing fees for discoveries resulting from work carried out on the campus.
5. Contractual arrangements for private venture programs utilizing University facilities will be for a specified period not to exceed five years with renewal or extension subject to review by the department, college, Council on Research or University administration. As with the initial approval, such renewal or extension will be at the discretion of the University president subject to State University of New York and State Education Department regulations. In any case, it is felt that very long term on-campus arrangements are not appropriate but that successful ventures will move to off-campus facilities after an initial period. Movement off-campus, of course, will not remove responsibility for adequate and appropriate approval and oversight of student and faculty involvement.

Reports to the Senate (Continued)

Report of the Council on Promotions and Continuing Appointment

FOR INFORMATION:

A request from the Chairman of the Mathematics Department that promotion, tenure, and retention decisions concerning faculty be made solely on the basis of academic criteria as a matter of policy was recently forwarded to this committee for possible action. Members of the committee discussed the request in some detail. We did not feel that the committee's function encompassed a formal action with regard to this request. The committee, however, did express support for such a policy in general principle, recognizing that certain conditions germane to administrative concerns might make other factors relevant. Given that assumption, the conditions when such might be the case and what the factors might be should be delineated by the administration jointly with the faculty. The committee in its deliberations regarding promotion and continuing appointment restricts itself to academic criteria as delineated by the Board of Trustees.

Report of the Library Council

FOR INFORMATION:

1. The Council heard from the Chairman of the Library Steering Committee who presented the Library faculty's ideas for revising the nominating procedures of the Chancellor's Award for Excellence in Librarianship.
2. The Council heard a report that: a Friends of the Library group had been formed; and that the Millionth Volume will soon be added to the collection with a celebration scheduled for September 24, 1982.
3. The Committee on the Quality of Library Life, chaired by Drew Hartzell, sent a questionnaire to the faculty members. The Council is hopefully that all recipients will respond quickly.
4. The Council heard the Director's report. Among the items reported was that the current periodicals move should be completed by June.
5. All Committees reported
 - 5.1 The Chair of the Committee on Quality of Library Life reported that good response had been received on the questionnaire. However, all are urged to return questionnaires, completed as soon as possible as the cut-off date will be the end of this Spring semester. The deadline for the receipt of the questionnaire has been extended to the end of the current academic year.
6. The Council passed a motion to include the Chairman of the Library's Promotion and Tenure Committee to the Council when the screening of candidates for the Chancellor's Excellence Award in Librarianship is made.

16

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STRATEGIC PLANNING: A FIVE YEAR PERSPECTIVE
1982-87

Submitted by: Council on Educational Policy

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

1. The attached five-year strategic plan be adopted.
2. This be referred to the President for his approval.

ATTACHMENT

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY
STRATEGIC PLANNING: A FIVE YEAR PERSPECTIVE

1982-87

April 26, 1982

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Assumptions.....	2
Size and Scope.....	2
Demand for University Services.....	3
Resources.....	4
Human Resources.....	5
Criteria for Resource Allocation & Program Development.....	6
The Allocation and Reallocation of Resources.....	6
Maintaining Excellence and Diversity.....	9
A Five Year Strategy.....	10
Undergraduate Education.....	10
Graduate Education.....	13
Public Service and Community Collaboration.....	15
Maintaining the Quality of Campus Life.....	17
The Effective Use of Resources.....	18
Prospectus.....	20

Introduction

One characteristic of this University's development since the mid 1970's is the extent to which it has been informed by a systematic, ongoing planning activity. Planning can represent a number of different things, but the essence of planning at this institution involves an orientation to the future, a commitment to rationality in decision making, and an adaptive capacity to respond to future conditions which may or may not have been anticipated. While planning is intrinsically futuristic in orientation, its primary purpose is to inform today's decisions.

To this end the University employs a one-year rolling plan within a multi-year perspective. This "strategic planning" requires setting short-term priorities within the context of longer-term trends and institutional goals. Planning requires a multi-year perspective in order to avoid the tendency for day-to-day concerns to obscure our longer term goals. By the same token, a rolling plan suggests that these longer term goals and more immediate priorities need to be adjusted at least annually to keep them responsive to reality.

In 1977 the University published a Mission Statement which affirmed the fundamental values and goals of the University. These goals are central to the University's purpose and they have been the basis of our subsequent planning and program development. The basic tenets of this Mission Statement can be summarized in the following terms.

- .A commitment to the discovery and advancement of knowledge
- .A commitment to the teaching of students
- .A commitment to the larger society through public service
- .A commitment to freedom of thought and inquiry
- .A commitment to standards of quality which earn respect in all of its communities of interest.

None of these basic purposes can be viewed in isolation. First and foremost, the commitment to excellence applies to all facets of the university's mission and lays a foundation for its claim as a university. Similarly, quality academic programs and supporting activities can only be sustained in an environment which protects freedom of inquiry and intellectual conduct. Third, the Mission Statement underscores the integral relationships among the three primary functions of a university: instruction, research and public service.

The Mission Statement also includes a section entitled Programs and Priorities which described some of the assumptions about the environment in which the university would be operating as it sought to implement these goals. Further, this section of the Mission Statement spelled out the criteria with which priorities would be set and programs assessed. These assumptions and criteria set the broad policy dimensions within which the university operates, particularly in its programmatic and budgetary decision-making.

Five years have elapsed since the publication of the Mission Statement. We have made reference to these basic goals and criteria in our annual planning documents, but for the most part these annual updates have treated them as givens. Sufficient time has now elapsed to warrant a re-examination of this section of the Mission Statement in light of contemporary conditions so that these assumptions and criteria can more adequately inform our plans.

This document has a second purpose as well. For the past several years we have directed much of our attention to relatively short-range campus-wide priorities set within a three year context. Having reassessed the priorities and criteria contained in the University's Mission Statement, we are now concerned with focusing more consciously on the long-term prospects in order to make an initial assessment of the directions in which the University will need to move during the next five years.

Assumptions

Our Five Year Plan is informed by a set of broad ranging assumptions about the future. These are predicated on our assessment of the recent trends, and a review of available evidence regarding the more fundamental changes which are likely to occur within the next five years. These assumptions have also been the subject of discussion and review during the planning process of the 1981-82 academic year.

Size and Scope

SUNY Albany will maintain approximately its present size in terms of enrollment, facilities and program diversity.

1) Undergraduate Enrollment: This university has historically maintained a remarkable attractiveness for prospective students. It has established a reputation for the highest standards of selectivity in admissions and for quality educational offerings following admission. Our analysis of admissions trends indicates that Albany should not need to compromise admissions standards. Even assuming a worst case (i.e. the number of applicants to Albany declines by 20%, exactly proportional to the projected statewide drop in high school graduates), we could still garner the approximately 2,000 new freshman needed annually to maintain a constant undergraduate level by admitting less than 60 percent of our applicants. This rate of acceptance is roughly 10 points less selective than the 50 percent rate achieved for Fall 1981. However, it is within the average range for acceptance rates for the previous three years.

Such a "worst case" scenario is unlikely. The number of applicants has increased steadily during the past three years. If this institution maintains its attractiveness, it can be expected to draw a growing share of the declining pool of applicants of traditional college age. This is particularly likely if recent federal financial aid policies continue. Rather than allowing a concern with prospective enrollment decline to cause us to tinker with our current high standards of student quality, the best insurance for maintaining numbers is to continue to strengthen the quality of the undergraduate experience.

Whatever the prospects for enrollment of the traditional college-age group, it is incumbent upon the university to encourage expanded participation by older adults and other nontraditional clientele. As a strategic consideration, it is prudent to lessen our dependence on one segment of the state's population. Moreover, enhancing diversity by attracting highly qualified adults who bring the benefit of rich life experiences to their learning is desirable on educational grounds as well. Finally, expanding educational access to broader segments of the community is consistent with the University's mission of educational outreach.

In a related vein, we should attempt to broaden the geographic origin of our student body, by attracting increasing proportions of students from out of state and foreign countries. Moreover, as the energy crisis continues, Albany's geographic accessibility should help in maintaining the University's strong enrollment draw.

2) Graduate Enrollment: It is more difficult to generalize about graduate enrollment since it is more sensitive to fluctuations in demand in specific fields and to general economic and social conditions. It seems fairly clear that overall demand for new Ph.Ds in academic employment will not increase during the remainder of the decade. However, we can expect to see some adjustments in the employment market which will accommodate the graduates of doctoral programs. At the same time, shortages in some technical fields can be expected to continue. For example, new occupations in high technology industries, the professions and services can be anticipated. We anticipate further demand for graduate level programs in a broad range of fields for professional development, retraining associated with career changes, and for personal development.

3) Facilities: This campus is not likely to have any major capital construction, aside from badly needed recreational and research space. Construction of student housing, on the other hand, could open up if more creative financing mechanisms were devised. The demands on existing space and the conversion of space to more intensive uses (such as research) is likely to continue. The deterioration of the Plant due to age and intensive use will accelerate.

Within the next five years significant changes in facility scheduling and the academic calendar may be required in the interest of energy savings. Reallocation of resources to support energy costs and preventive maintenance may also be required.

Demand for University Services

1) The entry and re-entry of women into the labor force will continue to grow, although perhaps not as dramatically as in the recent past. Career mobility will increase, as well as demands for continuing education and retraining.

2) Higher education will be profoundly affected by developments in information technology. An increasing percentage of our students will be computer-literate upon entry to the University. Demand for computer usage and applications for instruction and research will expand exponentially. Automation of administrative processes and information will become imperative

as administrative demands become more complex and our society at large becomes more computerized. Our current methods for providing computing services, information acquisition, storage, and retrieval will change. The growing compatibility of the formerly discrete functions of computation, information processing and communication will have far-reaching implications for library, educational technology and computing services.

3) There will be a continued demand for curricula with an applied orientation. This will affect most directly programs in the sciences and in the more occupationally oriented professional schools. At the same time, the accelerating pace of social change associated with technological innovation will raise new social questions, and pose problems of social organization and personal adjustment. This will place new demands upon the human service oriented disciplines, the behavioral sciences generally, and the arts and humanities, particularly in fields dealing with symbolics, value systems, and aesthetics.

4) The arts in their several forms will continue to make important contributions to the quality of cultural life on the campus and in the community. If the recent cutbacks in federal support for the arts continue, arts organizations, particularly at the community level, are likely to face difficulty in expanding their funding base in the face of ever rising costs. As a long term strategy the university may need to consider new means of collaboration with community arts programs, to ensure their continued vitality to the mutual benefit of the university and the community.

5) Cultural Diversity: New York is one of the most heterogeneous states in the nation, and this diversity is expected to increase during this decade. Members of ethnic and cultural minorities will be making a growing contribution to the state's culture, economy and political life. As a public university, Albany has a unique responsibility and capability to contribute through its programs to the educational, economic and social mobility of members of minority groups.

At the same time, New York continues to grow as a center for international trade and the exchange of ideas. We live in an increasingly interdependent world, and a focal point of our educational mission will be to prepare our students for successful participation in an international society. Consequently, we will continue to emphasize world cultures in our curricula and in the cocurricular life of the campus.

Resources

1) State Support: The longer range pattern of State support for higher education in New York will be dependent upon population trends, economic conditions, and political priorities. It is possible, assuming economic recovery and a more favorable political climate, that State support for SUNY could exceed mandatory cost increases and inflationary adjustments in some years. However, over the long run, some reduction in the size or scope of the SUNY System may be required.

24

2) Resource Development: In an environment of resource constraint, the availability of private funds can make a critical difference in supporting modest expenditures in strategic areas which add so much to the intellectual milieu of the University. The University needs to systematically pursue private support from the community, alumni, and friends.

3) Centralization: There will be growing pressures for administrative accountability, governmental regulation, and state-wide centralization of information. Within SUNY, we will experience greater pressures to coordinate our programs with sister campuses. There appear to be strong centralizing tendencies on the part of the governmental apparatus of New York State. The new centralization of information associated with the recent implementation of the state's new accounting system (GAAP) may be a bellweather of a drive toward centralization of information, reporting, and financial control. Should this trend continue, it will clearly inhibit the flexibility required for effective management of limited resources; and this loss of administrative flexibility will ultimately affect the instructional and research programs of the university.

4) While federal support of student aid will continue to encourage students to seek lower-cost public education, some recognition of the financial plight of middle income families in meeting educational costs is possible, which may balance this pressure to some degree.

5) Support for research and training from governmental sources can be expected to decline. This may be partially offset by increases in mission-oriented research. We can also expect to see greater collaboration with the private sector particularly in those industries which rely on university research. The university is uniquely situated to provide certain forms of research of benefit to industry, often in tandem with shared use of specialized facilities and equipment. This can also provide excellent training for graduate students.

Human Resources

1) The university's staffing patterns will become more stable (lower turnover, higher rates of tenure) with an increasing median age of faculty and staff. Faculty and staff development and, in some cases retraining, will need to play a significant role in educational leadership.

2) There is some concern that such stability may have deleterious effects on the hiring and advancement of minority and women faculty and staff. The University will need to redouble its Affirmative Action efforts to guard against any erosion of equality of opportunity.

3) Incentives for early retirement or semi-retirement should be developed for those individuals who would seek such opportunities.

4) While the university may experience stability overall, there will be increased mobility and growing competition for qualified faculty in certain fields. While Albany's average faculty salaries have remained competitive nationally, this university and others will be adversely affected by a widening salary gap vis a vis industry in high demand fields.

Criteria for Resource Allocation and Program Development

It is quite clear, in light of the resource constraints this campus and others are likely to experience over the next five years, that difficult choices will be required among competing claimants for university resources. Consequently only those new programs which meet contemporary criteria will be supported. This does not imply, however, that the University can be content to stand still during this period.

In the future the University will face increasingly a dual challenge. On the one hand we must develop new programs and reorient existing ones to remain responsive to, and where possible to shape new societal expectations toward higher education. The simple adherence to current standards and expectations may prove necessary, but not sufficient to achieve this leadership. Not only must we provide high quality research and training, we must conduct significant research which defines and addresses new problems, prepare our students for meaningful participation in tomorrow's disciplines, and train them in those new skills and technologies which will form the basis of future professions. At the same time, we must strive for this leadership during a period of stable or declining resources.

The clear implication of these conflicting imperatives is that all programs - established, new or contemplated - must be subject to periodic and rigorous tests. The University cannot pursue everything, but in those strategic areas where we chose to move forward, we must choose to do it well. In some cases, this will require the de-emphasis or possible discontinuance of existing programs which fail to meet these necessary standards.

The Allocation and Reallocation of Resources

The University has undertaken an ongoing process of program review since the mid 1970s. Beginning with the Mission Statement in 1977 and throughout the annual cycles of planning, campus-wide budget review, and resource allocation a fairly consistent set of criteria have emerged.

One of the most fundamental of these is student demand. Difficult to measure and requiring consideration of legitimate differences among disciplines, it is the dimension that drives the academic budgeting system of the state of New York. But resources cannot be apportioned only by a simple mechanical formula; other vital criteria exist which justify some variations in their allocation.

The three principles are centrality, quality, and productivity. In stating three criteria, it must be understood that no one criterion stands alone. The three are complementary and interdependent. While each of these basic criteria are essentially co-equal in principle, their application necessarily entails some degree of balance and discretion. These criteria are intended to inform professional judgement, not to supplant it.

Centrality:

This criterion deals with the extent to which a program is essential or central to the institution's identity as a university center. It has several dimensions.

26

- 1) Core disciplines - The extent to which the program belongs to the core of academic disciplines (e.g. English, Mathematics, History) which every university must offer its undergraduate students.
- 2) Strategic importance - The extent to which the program contributes to the strategic position of this campus in relation to the SUNY system or the educational system across the state or nationally. The uniqueness of a program or its complementarity with comparable programs in the region or throughout SUNY are relevant considerations.
- 3) Contributions to Campus Mission - This is related to the strategic criterion above. It deals with the extent to which a program contributes to facets of the mission of this university, or otherwise supports the university's claim to distinctiveness. (The university's commitment to public policy is one case in point.)
- 4) Complementarity - Certain programs, although not in themselves central to the campus, nonetheless play a necessary function in providing service to students in other programs or provide a necessary balance and complementarity to the curriculum, particularly at the undergraduate level.

Quality:

A defining characteristic of a university, which separates it from other educational institutions, is the vigorous and sustained pursuit of excellence in graduate education and research, and in undergraduate programs which foster high standards of intellectual development and personal growth. To that end programs which have achieved, or demonstrate a strong potential to achieve eminence in their respective fields must be sustained and encouraged. The University will continue to maintain a balanced array of programs, but emphasis will be placed in those areas which contribute most to the strength and credibility of the University's claim to excellence.

While academic quality can not be measured satisfactorily in any scientific sense, it can be seen to have several dimensions. For the purpose of assessing the quality of academic programs we are concerned with the following departmental indicators.

- 1) The quality of teaching - This includes direct classroom instruction as well as other settings in which teaching and learning take place.
- 2) The quality of research and scholarly activity - This can be indicated by indices of research productivity, scholarly publication, the scholarly reputation of academic programs, and evidence such as citations, honors, awards, leadership in national and international professional associations.
- 3) Service to the University and the Community - Quality educational institutions are characterized by shared governance and the active participation of faculty in the affairs of the university. In addition, the university's mission includes bringing the fruits of scholarship to bear on the broader community beyond the campus. This commitment to university service is an important element of quality.

Productivity:

Academic planning and resource allocation cannot rely upon industrial models of productivity, but criteria dealing with the effective utilization of academic resources need to be taken clearly into account. Productivity will be measured by several indicators such as the following:

1) Departmental or School Workload - Current and anticipated enrollment demand will continue to be an important, but not exclusive indicator of academic workload. In addition to direct instruction, due consideration will be given to academic advisement, research productivity and performance and service to the university and the community. We need to develop indicators of departmental or school demand which recognize the interdependence of these activities and reward productivity as measured by quantitative and qualitative methods.

2) Current and Anticipated Program Cost - Cost and quality are not always positively related. Considerations of cost cannot be absolute, however, and extreme variations in cost need to be weighed in light of disciplinary considerations, program quality and centrality. Nonetheless, cost is one necessary and legitimate factor in considerations of resource allocation, program size, or continuance.

3) Extramural Support - The University does not operate as an enterprise with each cost center wholly responsible for its own support. We are also conscious of the need to recognize legitimate differences among disciplines in their ability to attract outside funds. Nonetheless, those quality programs, which by virtue of their academic contributions and scholarly productivity generate non-state resources to offset educational costs will be rewarded.

Maintaining Excellence and Diversity

The University currently offers a balanced array of graduate and undergraduate programs in the arts and sciences, which form a strong base for professional programs in social science related fields. At the undergraduate level, undergraduate majors are offered in 40 arts and sciences disciplines and seven professional fields. At the graduate level there are 49 master's programs, 9 certificates of advanced study and 22 doctoral programs in carefully selected fields consistent with the University's mission. Programs within the humanities, the social sciences, mathematics and the natural and physical sciences are interdependent, and some emphasis has been directed to those programs which contribute to the University's growing presence in public policy.

This program array is a product of ongoing reviews conducted during the past five years consistent with the above criteria. It was also guided by a coherent strategy articulated in the Mission Statement. Specifically our statements of program priorities reflect the fact that, during a given period of the institution's life, some programs need additional resources or attention more than do others. There are two principal factors to be considered in identifying those academic units which are primary claimants on resources:

.The obligation of the institution to provide to those programs which continue to meet the three criteria discussed earlier the resources needed to achieve an acceptable level of quality and to accommodate planned enrollments.

.The obligation of the institution to facilitate the attainment of national leadership in programs which are at or near that level of quality already.

The first of these establishes a floor, a threshold of resources which must be provided to academic units being maintained in the future. The question which must be given a satisfactory answer can be stated thusly: What is the critical mass of scholars and support resources needed in a given unit to (a) provide the needed breadth and depth of intellectual expertise, (b) accommodate planned enrollments, and (c) accomplish the range of intellectual activities expected of all faculty at a major university center? Some quantitative indices can be employed to help answer this question, but all such factors must be weighed in relation to the unique features of a given discipline or field.

The second factor to be considered in delineating priorities takes cognizance of (a) the University's commitment to achieve peaks of excellence among its programs and (b) the obligation of the institution to facilitate and sustain extraordinary achievements on the part of its faculty. There are academic units on campus which have attained national stature. Still others have strong potential to become recognized as among the leaders in the discipline or professional field. The University must nurture extraordinary accomplishments, including the provision of increased resources when appropriate.

A Five-Year Strategy

In addition to these planning assumptions and criteria, the University is developing a long-range strategy: a set of initiatives to be taken in anticipation of the new problems and opportunities which are likely over the next five years. The following is an outline of future goals and programmatic emphases in each of five functional areas: Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education and Research, Public Service and Community Collaboration, Maintaining the Quality of Campus Life, and the Effective Use of Resources. These institutional strategies flow from the five year planning assumptions and are consistent with the program planning criteria.

Undergraduate Education

Our strategic planning has identified imperatives for further programmatic emphasis and development in at least four areas:

- .The need to foster and celebrate academic excellence.
- .The need to continually update the undergraduate curriculum
- .The need to relate liberal education to career development
- .The need to prepare students for universal computer literacy.

Celebrate Excellence: The University is committed to the highest standards of academic quality, and this commitment has been particularly evident in our undergraduate program. This quality can be sensed in the general milieu of the campus, in the excitement of students and faculty alike in the process of intellectual discovery, and the searching, probing, critical orientation of students in approaching intellectual problems or a new body of knowledge. The University's commitment to quality is reflected in its growing reputation among scholars and students as a center for excellence in undergraduate education and by the quality of the students which the University continues to draw. Since 1973 Albany has ranked among a select group of public and private colleges and universities nationally in the quality of its entering students as measured by SAT scores. Other indicators, such as high school rank in class, indicate that this University has maintained very high standards of quality among the new freshmen admitted each year.

The quality of education received, once admitted, is indicated by the University's strong rate of student retention. According to available SUNY data, the University at Albany has consistently shown one of the highest rates of retention of any SUNY institution for the past several years. At Albany, over 60 percent of each entering class successfully completes a bachelor's degree within four-and-one-half years, compared to the national average of approximately 50 percent.

One indication of the outcomes or results of Albany's educational programs is the high rate of acceptance of our graduates to medical and dental schools. In Fall 1980 two-thirds of Albany's applicants to medical schools and over 90 percent of our applicants to dental schools were accepted, and the average MCAT scores of these applicants exceeded the state and national norms.

As a long term strategy we need to give renewed emphasis to the recognition and support of academic excellence. The continued development of honors programs and encouraging undergraduate research and scholarship through publication, awards, or other forms of recognition are possible approaches. Further, we must expand our efforts to attract exceptional students on a national basis. Albany's current participation in the SUNY honors scholarship program is one example among several of the type of efforts which will be undertaken.

Curricular Reform: The university has made considerable progress over the past several years in strengthening the quality and diversity of the undergraduate program. The development of a General Education curricula, the initiation of several interdisciplinary majors and minors, combined bachelor's-master's programs, and the emphasis on multi-cultural and international aspects of the curriculum all exemplify this effort. Most of these initiatives have dealt with the content and form of the undergraduate curriculum.

During the next several years, we can expect to see fundamental changes in the economics of higher education, especially with regard to federally funded student financial aid. This, together with the long-term pressures for increases in educational costs, may require some adjustments to the structure of the undergraduate program.

First, we may see an increase in the proportion of students attending parttime. We may wish to consider alternate academic calendars, such as trimesters or a January semester, to enable students to "stop out" for intermittent periods to work to support their educational costs. Further, we should explore educational programs which incorporate internships or other educationally related work experiences more directly into the academic program.

Second, in order to maintain a stimulating educational experience and to prepare students for successful participation in a changing society, the university will need to explore alternative modes of teaching beyond the traditional lecture-discussion format. Any number of possibilities may present themselves, such as computer-assisted instruction (where useful and appropriate); opportunities for self-directed learning, including greater use of practica; and student-initiated research. Whatever the form these innovations may ultimately take, we need to be open to new modes of instruction which broaden opportunities for students and at the same time are consistent with standards of quality appropriate to a university center.

Articulating Liberal Education and Preparation for Careers: It is very difficult to predict whether the current degree of vocational anxiety among students will persist into the decade. The vocationalism we observe today may be ameliorated under more positive economic conditions, and due to less competition for jobs among a smaller number of college graduates entering the job market by the second half of this decade. At the same time, we are living in a society characterized by specialization and rapid obsolescence of skills.

A university education should complement the needs of students to prepare for the world of work, without an undue emphasis on specific employment skills. A rapidly changing labor market will require broadly educated persons with basic skills in critical thinking and oral and written communication; a broader understanding of our institutions, values, and culture; and an ability to adapt to changing occupational requirements. While there will always be demand for specialists, government and industry have begun to recognize the value of broadly educated, articulate graduates who can learn specific job-related skills during their initial professional experience.

While it is not the function of universities to train students for particular jobs, we should expose them to those intellectual and practical skills which may be useful in subsequent employment. To this end, the university should explore the following strategies. First, regardless of the degree of direct vocational applicability of a given field, all our degree programs can provide skills which should later prove useful in an occupational setting; computer programming or related applications, statistics and quantitative methods, modeling, symbolic logic, foreign language, public speaking, and writing skills are illustrative.

Second, we need to achieve a better utilization of minors in occupationally related fields (e.g. business, computing, economics). We should match these minors with majors emphasizing broad academic preparation in complementary arts and sciences fields.

Third, we should explore articulation agreements and more extensive use of cross registration or visiting student programs with area institutions. For example, students could be provided opportunities for exposure to engineering or other applied science curricula through a semester at a cooperating institution. Similarly, this university could exploit a potential for transfer articulation agreements in two directions, by providing pre-professional arts and science curricula leading to transfer into more vocationally oriented colleges or universities, or for topping off a four year program in the sciences, social sciences or humanities by students transferring from community colleges.

We would also do well to strengthen cocurricular programs for values clarification and career exploration. Rather than encouraging students to major in fields which appear to have a vocational reference, we should develop curricula in career exploration on a credit or non-credit basis.

Our current difficulty in dealing with student's career anxieties is at least partly due to a lack of systematic information on the career patterns of graduates of our liberal arts programs. The collection of such data will be an institutional priority. The experience their graduates can also serve as one indicator, albeit an indirect one, of the effectiveness of many educational programs.

Computing Literacy: Within five years much of what we now teach regarding computers may be deemed unsuitable for an institution of higher learning. Basic computer literacy will become as mundane as students' typing skills are today. Nonetheless whether tomorrow's students require elementary training in

computing or whether they arrive on campus with basic skills, the form and content of the instruction provided should be fundamentally different from today's labor intensive, technologically innocent methods of teaching. For example, we estimate that the current volume of access to instructional computing will need to triple later in this decade if we are to support computer literacy by the majority of all our students, and provide a higher level of proficiency to a sector of our student body. Determining how this instruction is to be provided, and developing the curricula to meet this need is likely to be a major challenge for the University during the next five years.

Graduate Education and Research

The scope and quality of graduate education and research at a university center is a major determinant of its character and of the credibility of its claim to excellence. In a university, graduate education and research are highly interdependent and mutually supportive. The phenomenal growth and specialization of science and scholarship requires faculty to be engaged directly in frontier research in order to keep abreast of their respective fields. This not only contributes to good scholarship, but also to meaningful teaching. Graduate education in a research environment stimulates students to become involved directly in research and intellectual discovery, and this is true for undergraduate education as well. This University offers challenging opportunities for students regardless of their level of proficiency to have access to teacher-scholars of high caliber and to share in the process of discovery. Similarly, faculty research is enhanced by the testing and criticism of ideas by graduate students and faculty peers. The continued vitality of graduate education and research is central to the University's purpose.

Graduate Enrollment: Despite a declining trend in graduate enrollment nationally, the University has been able to maintain stable graduate enrollment over the past three years. There has been a gradual shift in enrollment distribution from education toward the other professional schools, and to a lesser extent to the arts and sciences programs. In addition, we have also experienced a gradual but steady diminution in the proportion of graduate students studying full-time and in degree programs. Major priority will be placed on stabilizing this trend in order to maintain a strong base of high quality graduate students in degree programs. Future resource allocation needs to take the experience of departments in maintaining a strong base of graduate enrollment more directly into account.

At the same time the University needs to be responsive to the changing character of graduate education. Demand for graduate preparation leading to traditional academic careers will probably continue to diminish. Part of this softening in demand will be offset by new professional outlets for graduates of Ph.D or comparable advanced graduate programs. Beyond that, however, the population of the mid 1980's will be the most highly educated group in history. We can expect to see growing participation in graduate education by mid-career professionals, persons in transition and persons re-entering the job market. In addition, the demands for skill development, refresher and retraining programs will continue to grow. These new segments of our graduate

student population may avail themselves of parttime or full time study on a degree or non-degree basis depending upon their individual circumstances or needs.

New Formats: In light of these prospective changes in the character of our graduate student profile, we need to consider ways in which to provide greater flexibility in graduate programming. This university has not done much to date in moving beyond the traditional three credit semester course offered on weekdays. New schedules and formats including weekend seminars, evening degree programs, and modular scheduling should be employed more extensively, where feasible.

Interdisciplinary Research: Significant research problems increasingly transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries. This growing multidisciplinary emphasis is evident in several of the research programs of the University, particularly in centers and institutes, many of which marshal the disciplinary strengths of several academic departments. The University currently has over 30 centers and institutes which together attracted over \$7 million in extramural funds last year. In addition to encouraging the formation and continuance of formal centers, the university will seek to identify incentives to stimulate research collaboration by faculty researchers focusing on new problem definitions.

Research Collaboration: The growing scale and complexity of fundamental research also requires researchers to seek resources and expertise available beyond a single institution. Collaborative research with other institutions provides the critical mass needed for significant frontier research and capitalizes on the strengths of, each participating institution. University faculty are engaged in a number of collaborative research efforts with educational institutions in the Capital District, including Albany Medical College and Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute.

There is a growing complementarity between industry's need for high-quality basic research and the resources and expertise available at research universities. Industry support for university research has been increasing recently, largely in recognition of the cost-effectiveness of university-based research. New York has more high-quality research universities than any other state, a large concentration of research scientists (10 percent of the nation's doctoral scientists and engineers are located in New York State), and a strong base of high-technology industries (electronics, communications, computers, chemicals, health, etc). We need to marshal these industry and university resources more effectively to improve our competitive position in national research and development.

National visibility at Albany is becoming a major center for graduate education and research. Albany ranks second among the SUNY centers and 26th among public universities nationally in total number of graduate students. Albany has the highest proportion of graduate enrollment to total enrollment of any SUNY institution (approximately 30 percent), with a national rank of fourth among public universities on the same dimension.

The quality of faculty research and scholarship has been recognized by numerous honors and awards. During the past five years, total extramural funding for research and training nearly tripled from \$6.3 million in 1975-76 to \$16.5 million in 1980-81. Research productivity, as measured by total external funds per full-time equivalent faculty, was the highest of the four university centers in 1979-80. Albany ranked second among the university centers (excluding the health sciences programs) in NIH Biomedical Research Support Grants.

Notwithstanding this progress, due to its relative newness, this University's reputation still lags behind its accomplishments. Our future priorities center on two mutually reinforcing needs: to further enhance the intellectual milieu on campus, and to increase the visibility of this university in the academic community. A number of efforts will continue to support these goals. We will continue to sponsor national and international conferences; support visiting appointments, lectures and symposia by prominent scholars, explore the establishment of post-doctoral fellowships, and encourage faculty to attain leadership in their respective disciplines through publication of research, participation on editorial boards, and sponsorship of scholarly journals where feasible.

Public Service and Community Collaboration

The responsibilities of a public university extend beyond the boundaries of the campus, addressing the needs and concerns of the community and the state. The Mission Statement clearly articulates a three-fold mission of teaching, research, and public service. At Albany this third dimension is interpreted broadly, incorporating the first two; i.e. to extend instructional programs beyond the campus and to apply University research and expertise to the problems of society. This public service function is carried out through a variety of programs and services including public-policy analysis and consultation, instructional programs and training addressed to the needs of clientele in the community, and applying university expertise to problems of regional economic development.

Commitment to Public Policy: The University at Albany has a number of programs which bring the resources of the University to bear on problems of public policy, particularly with respect to New York State government. One recent manifestation of this mission was the formation of the Rockefeller College of Public Affairs and Policy which brings together the Schools of Criminal Justice, Social Welfare, and Public Affairs and their associated organized research centers, including the Institute for Government and Policy Studies, Center for Women in Government, the Center for Financial Management, and the Ringel Institute of Gerontology. Rockefeller College is associated with a SUNY-wide Rockefeller Institute of Government, which will administer programs of internships, senior fellowships, publications, and policy research.

In addition to coordinating the activities of these three professional schools and related centers and institutes, Rockefeller College will draw faculty from across the campus with a strong interest in public policy. It will serve as a catalyst to focused interdisciplinary research and technical assistance to governmental agencies and provide a solid academic base for the

activities of the SUNY-wide institute. We envision this forming the centerpiece of a growing presence in public policy at this University over the next several years.

Regional Economic Development: The future of the University is linked closely to the economic condition of the state and the Capital Region. A major effort has been made in recent years to expand services to area business and industry and to strengthen University capability to contribute to the sustained development of this region. These efforts will continue and be accelerated. In addition to programs directed to the economic sector, the broader impact of the University on the general educational level and quality of life in the region contributes to an attractive climate for economic development, particularly for high technology industry.

Extending the University: The University provides an impressive variety of opportunities for adults and other special clientele to study on a credit or non-credit basis. The University's College of Continuing Studies provides credit courses to approximately 1,500 part-time students per semester and serves approximately 7,000 adults enrolled annually in non-credit courses through the Community Education Program. The Capital District Humanities Program, an innovative approach to providing credit and non-credit programs and experiences in the arts and humanities to a broad spectrum of adults in the community, has attracted national attention as a model for continuing education programs in the humanities.

The University has also developed a number of programs targeted to the professional development needs of area employees. The School of Social Welfare's Continuing Education Project offers training for practicing professionals in state and local social service agencies throughout northeastern New York. Several other professional schools in cooperation with the College of Continuing Studies provide specialized training for public agencies, area businesses, and professional associations, including courses, workshops, seminars, and conferences designed for supervisors and managers. As a growing proportion of the professional workforce attains full credentials, professional development programs such as these will play an even more prominent role in the university's educational mission.

University Alumni: The University's alumni represent a special constituency which reflects positively on the institution and is a source of continuing participation and support. The University currently has over 50,000 alumni, and this body is increasing by approximately 3,500 graduates annually. Special efforts will be made to introduce undergraduates to the responsibilities of Alumni. Second, new methods to maintain contact and collect information about alumni will be pursued.

The alumni of the relatively new graduate programs at Albany present a special opportunity for assistance in placement of recent graduates and enhancement of the stature of the programs in which they received their professional training. Particular emphasis will be given to fostering closer relations with graduate alumni.

Maintaining the Quality of Campus Life

The quality of life is influenced by the quality of teaching, research and university services, and it affects the University's ability to engage in public service and outreach. The University is committed to fostering a positive, supportive, intellectually exciting environment in which to study, work, and live. This is being accomplished in a variety of ways: by increasing the interaction between the academic and extracurricular life of the campus; by strengthening programs which contribute to student development; by improving access and support services for "non-traditional" students; and by enhancing health, safety, and the attractiveness of campus facilities.

Student Development: The quality of campus life requires an environment in which the emotional, social, recreational, and physical development of the student can occur. The University provides a range of student services designed to facilitate fuller participation by the individual student in the life of the campus, to promote a sense of civic responsibility, and to provide skills for coping with the stresses of academic life and the life-long process of self-development. We will continue to support students and their organizations through advisement, counseling, personal development, and leadership-training programs. Similarly, the university will continue, through its curricular and cocurricular offerings, to provide opportunities for learning life skills such as values clarification, career exploration, interpersonal communication skills and self-awareness.

Student Diversity: During the past decade, higher education has experienced a gradual but significant transformation. New groups within society have begun to make demands upon the educational system; colleges and universities across the country have made conscious efforts to reduce the barriers to participation in higher education by a broad spectrum of new constituencies. We believe these demands will accelerate during this decade. The University will continue to encourage participation in its programs by older adults returning to higher education (many of whom carry significant occupational and personal responsibilities outside higher education); by students who face barriers due to physical disabilities; and by foreign students. The University is committed to creating a campus environment which is supportive to their successful participation in the total life of the University.

In a similar vein, New York is one of the most heterogeneous states in the nation. Demographic and migratory patterns are expected to accentuate this ethnic and cultural diversity during the decade. As a public university, this institution carries a particular responsibility to recruit members of minority groups and facilitate their successful educational performance. Enhancing cultural diversity and fostering awareness and understanding also have clear benefits from an educational standpoint.

The Physical Environment: The University has an architecturally impressive and functional facility. The aging and deterioration of the physical plant will continue to require an ongoing program of preventive maintenance. Similarly, the ever present risks of hazards to people and property underscore the continuing priority of recent campus initiatives for fire, radiation, chemical and personal safety.

Beyond these concerns, from a strategic perspective, our greatest challenge may be in dealing with the longer term implications of the campus' dependence on energy. Energy conservation measures since 1975 have yielded a 23 percent reduction in consumption and a cumulative cost avoidance of over approximately four million dollars. In response to dramatic increases in the costs of energy, this campus has become one of the most efficient in the SUNY system. We cannot afford complacency, however. An extrapolation of present trends in energy costs versus state budgetary appropriations indicates that the percentage of the University budget needed for energy could grow from approximately 7 percent in 1980 to as high as 25 percent by 1990.

We must continue to conduct energy audits and perform energy improvement plant modifications where feasible. More importantly, we may need to modify institutional behavior within the next five years, including consideration of changes in the academic calendar, temporary shutdowns of selected buildings, and public information efforts to encourage conservation.

The Effective Use of Resources

The functions of management, planning, budgeting, and evaluation reflect an institutional commitment to rational decision-making and the effective use of the human, financial, capital, and intellectual resources of the campus. This requires the collective commitment of faculty, students, administration, and staff. Universities operate under a tradition of shared governance, which implies a shared responsibility by faculty, students, and staff to participate in the formulation of policy and oversight of its implementation, and by the administration to be open, accountable, and effective in the marshalling of resources to support the objectives of the University.

Many of the strategic considerations in this area were referenced earlier in the discussion of long range planning assumptions. The following priority areas require additional emphasis here.

Faculty and Staff Development: As the faculty and staff profiles become more stable and fewer new people are recruited into the junior ranks, the University will need to become more flexible in the deployment and utilization of its human resources. The University will increasingly resemble a matrix organization in which individuals perform multiple roles which cut across traditional disciplinary or organizational boundaries. Faculty development, and in some cases retraining in closely related fields, will become more necessary as a means to maintain individual and institutional vitality. Incentives for early retirement will be developed in those cases where individuals express such an interest.

Finally, we need to employ visiting appointments and temporary leaves as devices to refresh our own faculty and staff, while attracting new people to the campus on a rotating basis.

In this regard, it is instructive to consider that the same "greying" of the American workforce will be occurring in government and industry as in higher education. The University should actively explore faculty and staff exchanges with industry and government as a means of providing professional development and institutional flexibility.

(38)

Affirmative Action: As an educational institution, the University carries a special responsibility to set an example in the conduct of personal policies. The University is committed to the energetic practice of affirmative action in the employment of minorities, women, the handicapped, and Vietnam veterans.

Resource Development: In an environment of resource constraint, private giving significantly enhances our ability to sustain high-quality educational programs and public service. We are encouraged by the increasing level of support to the University by the community, faculty and staff, alumni, and friends. At the same time, we believe there is a significant potential in this area which can make a critical difference in the University's responsiveness to emerging needs. A well structured, sustained effort of soliciting increased levels of private support for the University will be a major priority during the coming years.

Academic Support Services: Each academic support unit on campus plays an integral role in furthering the primary functions of instruction and research. The future roles of these units will be fundamentally affected by the following trends. First, we appear to be in the early phases of a profound change in the way society lives, works, solves problems, and organizes its affairs. This change is prompted at least in part by the advances in technology and associated changes in the form of acquiring, manipulation, communicating and storing information. With respect to the former, the presence of large "main frame" computers enables people to work on problems never before attempted because life was too short. Similarly, rapid advances in the utility and availability of micro-computers will extend many of these capabilities for communication and problem solving to an ever growing segment of the population. With respect to the latter, the very form and character of knowledge and information is changing, and this will have important implications for how we teach and conduct research as well as the content of that teaching and research.

As a result of the availability of new technology and the new intellectual problems technology enables us to address, we are likely to see increased "capitalization" of the knowledge worker analogous to the previous increases in capital equipment supporting each worker in an industrial setting. Such capital investment will not supplant the skilled professional; on the contrary it will extend the effectiveness of teacher-scholars and also enhance the role of supporting professionals skilled in the applications of technology to teaching and research.

We may see a growing specialization of labor and interdependence of roles as the educational enterprise becomes more complex. The demands for training students and faculty in the utilization of technology will be enormous. In this respect we may expect a more direct participation by information specialists in our educational research programs.

The three academic support units most profoundly affected by these trends are the Computing Center, the University Library and the Educational Communications Center. The Computing Center will become less a custodian of a central computer and more a university-wide service function to facilitate the

productive application of computer technology in academic and administrative settings. Increasingly, computing hardware and services will become decentralized as new technology supports a multifunction network of computing and communication devices. In addition to facilitating the acquisition and development of new hardware and software, the Center will be more involved in training students and faculty in the uses of computing.

The functions of libraries will change in response to the availability of decentralized retrieval systems, and regional and national networks for sharing materials and cooperative collection development. More fundamentally, the media of information dissemination will become more varied, ranging from the printed word in traditional hardcopy, to electronically or photographically stored text, to audio and visual information on magnetic tape or disc. The long range strategy for the University Library includes increased automation of transactions and processing, participation in national information networks, more selective acquisition of new materials consistent with university program priorities, and a decentralization of information access through a campus terminal network.

The University has excellent facilities and staff for supporting advances in instructional technology and educationally oriented telecommunications. The Educational Communications Center will continue to play an integral role in producing educational materials for presentation through various media on campus, the local media, and through any future SUNY-wide educational distribution systems such as cable television or video cassettes.

Prospectus

One of the costs of strategic planning is that it is never brought fully to closure. This document is one attempt to articulate a set of criteria and guidelines for future program development within the context of some reasonable expectations of what that future may require. This is not the culmination of planning, it is a beginning. We do not pretend that this is a final statement of that probable future. We will need to remain open and flexible; the specifics of this plan will be adjusted as circumstances require and experience permits.

We need to allow for failure in at least two respects. In many cases we will fail in our ability to accurately anticipate the future. In some cases we will need to allow for failure in meeting our expectations by falling short of the goals we originally set for ourselves. What we cannot afford is a failure of will, to keep pressing our institutional claims upon the future, and the courage to continue to push our planning horizons forward beyond the comforts of certainty.

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

PROPOSED POLICY REGARDING TAKING FINAL EXAMINATIONS

Submitted by: Undergraduate Academic Council

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

I. The following policy be adopted:

If a student has three examinations on one day as a result of a department exam or the official rescheduling of an examination after the initial final examination schedule has been published, then that student may request a make-up examination from the instructor of that course. The make-up examination should be given within the final examination period.

If a student has three examinations on one day as the result of the unofficial rescheduling of an examination by the instructor, then that student has the right to have the examination given at the originally scheduled time, or to take a make-up examination at an acceptable time during the final examination period. If the student is not permitted to do so, then the student has the right to petition the Dean for Undergraduate Studies for official resolution.

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

42

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

PROPOSED COMBINED B.S./M.S. PROGRAM IN PHYSICS

Submitted by: GRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL &
UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

- I. A combined B.S./M.S. program in Physics with the attached requirements be approved and become effective immediately upon registration by the State Education Department.
- II. That this resolution be referred to the President for his approval.

ATTACHMENT

SUNY/ALBANY

COMBINED B.S./M.S. PROGRAM IN PHYSICS

STANDARDS AND REQUIREMENTS

1. In qualifying for the baccalaureate, students will meet all university and college requirements, including the stated requirements for the major, the minor requirement, the minimum liberal arts and sciences credit requirement, and residency requirements.
2. In qualifying for the master's degree, students will meet all university and college requirements, including completing a minimum of 30 graduate credits, and any such conditions as a research seminar, thesis, comprehensive examination, or other professional experience where required, and residency requirements.
3. Students may be admitted to the integrated degree program at the beginning of their junior year, or after the 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 recommendations from faculty are required.

B.S./M.S. IN PHYSICS

B.S. requirements for major second field: 65 credits

M.S. requirements: minimum of 30 graduate credits.

(Up to 12 graduate credits may be applied to both the B.S. and M.S. requirements.)

SAMPLE PROGRAM

Freshman Year

Phy 120, 124 Intro. to Physics I, II (6)
Phy 121, 125 Intro. to Physics I, II Lab (2)
Mat 112, 113 Calculus I, II (8)

Sophomore Year

Phy 220, 224 Intro. to Physics III, IV (6)
Phy 221, 225 Intro. to Physics III, IV Lab (2)
Phy 315 Electronics (3)
Mat 214 Calculus III (4)
Chem 121 a and b General Chemistry (6)
Chem 122 a and b General Chemistry Lab (2)

Junior Year

Phy 319. Physical Analysis (3)
Phy 321 Intermediate Mechanics (4)
Phy 332 Intermediate Elec. and Mag. (4)
Phy 344 Intro. to Quantum Mechanics (3)

Senior Year

Phy 421 Modern Physics I (3)
Phy 431 Thermodynamics and Statistical Physics (3)
*Phy 519 Experimental Techniques (3)
Phy 510 a and b Math. Methods in Physics (6)
Phy 520 Nuclear Physics (3)

Fifth Year

- Phy 610 a and b Classical Physics (8)
- Phy 615 Quantum Mechanics I (3)
- Phy 680 Seminar in Physics (4)
- Phy 553 Microprocessor Applications (3)

*Applies to both the B.S. and M.S. degrees requirement.

REQUIRED UNDERGRADUATE COURSE SUBSTITUTION

Phy 519 Substitutes for Phy 403

LL
2/82

H6

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

PROPOSED GRADUATE PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY
AND ADMINISTRATION LEADING TO THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

Submitted by: Graduate Academic Council
April 12, 1982

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

1. A Master of Arts Program in Public Policy and Administration, which will be offered jointly by Queens College of the City University of New York and SUNY/Albany, be approved.
2. That the program be submitted to the President of the University for his approval.

ATTACHMENT

M.A. Program in Public Policy and Administration
Jointly Offered by Queens College and SUNY/Albany

The Purpose of the Program and Career Objectives

For a particular group of potential students in New York State the education they want and require is a composite of what is offered in several degree programs but not in any one program. These potential students are legislators, legislative staff, journalists, and representatives of interest groups. They wish a curriculum that consists of several components: first, a continuum of knowledge regarding the political process, the legislative process, the administrative or implementative process, and the evaluative process; second, a general perspective, at the master's level, that includes an introduction to the methodologies of the social sciences and a more intensive look at specific policies; and third, the experience of bringing together the knowledge of process and of policy purpose, in an extended piece of writing in which the methodologies of the social sciences are employed.

Such a curriculum does not now exist. To have such a curriculum in New York State for the particular constituency envisioned requires four forms of mobility. First, there is a need for mobility across curricula. Master's degrees in political science, planning, public administration, public affairs, or in the public-policy-based professional schools (e.g., social welfare) do not comprehend in any one degree the range of course work that is needed; nor are these degree programs considered especially appropriate by the particular degree-seekers and employers alike. To combine, however, salient elements from each of these programs, under proper supervision, constitutes a major opportunity for this public policy-oriented constituency. Second, the range of policy interests is such that no single university can provide for the needs; whole university systems need to be accessible to fulfill the requirements of students. Urban development policy, for instance, might be better handled (perhaps only handled) at one university and social welfare policy only at another. A third mobility is the mobility of faculty to bring at certain times of the year the education to the students rather than the reverse. Holding classes whenever possible at the Legislative Office Building in Albany, for example, would allow an important student clientele to pursue their education and their policy-related professional lives simultaneously. Finally, given the physical mobility requirements of the potential students -- the core shuttling between New York City and Albany -- there is need to be able to continue one's education regardless of location -- at least regardless of whether the student is in the Capital District or New York City.

The graduates of the program would be employed, in most instances, already in place, in the policy process -- as lawmakers, legislative staff, implementers and critics. Those not already in place would use the program for attaining positions in the policy process. We know from legislators that they would look favorably toward such preparation in those they hire. In either case, the participation of graduates in the policy process should enhance the process itself, bringing to bear the results of the decade-long public policy movement, of insights into the legislative and implementative process, into special policy areas, and knowledge of forecasting and evaluative technologies. While one can wish for more of every aspect of formal preparation for those who are to perform public responsibilities, the proposed program is a considerable positive advance over most alternatives.

Administration

Three keys to quality are important. First, the Advisory Committee, made

up of three SUNYA and three CUNY-Queens representatives, will assume a steady flow of appropriate, quality courses to be given at the Legislative Office Building. There is an agreement that, except in rare circumstances, all instruction will be provided by regularly appointed faculty from SUNY and CUNY. Second, a specifically appointed program coordinator would be a dedicated adviser to students to guide their completion of the program. Third, each student would have a SUNY or CUNY adviser in the program and a specific faculty adviser for the proposed master's essay.

Background

The need for the proposed program was first identified by Queens faculty associated with the New York State Legislature. It was their observation, since borne out by student preferences, that there were literally hundreds of people associated with the policy process who had not completed advanced education in the area and were unable or unwilling to pursue their graduate education in existing programs. As a gesture to public sector cooperation in the venture and recognition of the superiority of offering both CUNY and SUNY combined forces to meet the need, it was proposed that the two units offer at the outset their individual degrees but recognize courses from each other on a more liberal basis than normally. From experience of the first year and one-half, it was concluded by the CUNY/SUNY Advisory Committee that the existing degrees were not appropriate to meet the needs and wishes of the potential student body and that the institution of a joint degree by the public universities would set an important precedent at the same time that bureaucratic limitations of each system could be overcome.

Requirements

Students, with the assistance of their advisers, will develop a sequence of courses that will best reflect their needs and interests. The basic requirements would be:

1. Proof of Knowledge of basic statistics;
2. A minimum of ten courses, including:
 - a. Master's Essay (3 credits);
 - b. Methodologies of the Social Sciences (as applied public policy analysis);
 - c. At least two courses in each of the following three groups:
 - I Public Administration and Management;
 - II The Policy Process;
 - III Public Policy Analysis.

1. Public Administration and Management

- PAD 500 Theories and Processes of Public Administration (SUNYA)
or
P.S. 640 Public Administration (CUNY)
- PAD 607 Concepts and Issues of Public Administration (SUNYA)
- PAD 610 Organization Behavior (SUNYA)
- P.S. 715 Organization Theory (CUNY)
- PAD 642 Budgetary Systems (SUNYA)
- POS 628 Administrative Law (SUNYA)
or
P.S. 741 Administrative Law and Regulation (CUNY)
- P.S. 776 Comparative Public Administration (CUNY)

II. The Policy Process

- P.S. 733 The Legislative Process in the United States (CUNY)
or
POS 531 The Legislative Process (SUNYA)
- POS 522 State Government (SUNYA)
- POS 540 Urban Politics (SUNYA)
- P.S. 651 Government of the City of New York (CUNY)
- POS 722 New York State and Local Government (SUNYA)
- POS 530 The American Judicial System (SUNYA)
- P.S. 722 Comparative Federalism (CUNY)
- P.S. 730 The United States Party System (CUNY)
- P.S. 731 Policy Formation in United States Government (CUNY)
- P.S. 735 Politics and Public Opinion Formation (CUNY)
- P.S. 732 The Presidency in the United States (CUNY)
- P.S. 747 Metropolitan Areas and Community Power Analysis (CUNY)

III. Public Policy Analysis

Civil Liberties and Rights

- POS 526a American Constitutional Law - Federalism and Separation of Powers
- POS 526b American Constitutional Law - Liberties and Civil Rights
- P.S. 720 U.S. Constitutional Law I (CUNY)
- P.S. 721 U.S. Constitutional Law II (CUNY)

Urban Policy

- P.S. 74E Planning for Metropolitan Areas (CUNY)
- PAF 511 Land Use Policy (SUNY)
- P.S. 780 Colloquium in American Politics: Urban Policy Making (CUNY)

Welfare Policy

- SSW 600-601 Social Welfare Policy and Services (SUNY)
- P.S. 780 Colloquium in American Politics: Health Policy Analysis (CUNY)
- P.S. 790 Seminar in Selected Topics in Political Science: Housing Policy Analysis (CUNY)

Educational Policy

- ADM 371 Public School Finance (SUNY)
- ADM 607 Collective Bargaining in Educational Administration (SUNY)

Public Finance

- PAD 643 Governmental Finances (SUNY)
- PAD 648 Analysis of State and Local Fiscal Policy
- or
- PAD 649 State-Local Fiscal Relations (SUNY)

Energy Policy

- POS 595 International Political Economy (SUNY)
- PAD 678 Energy Policies (SUNY)

Regulatory Policy

- PAD 690 Regulatory Administration (SUNY)

Science and Technology Policy

PAF 543 Science, Technology, and Public Policy (SUNY)

- d. Two electives to be distributed in any of the above three groups or in advanced work in the methodologies of the social sciences.
- e. Substitutions in the above courses, including additional policy areas, may be granted on the recommendation of the program coordinator and with approval of the Advisory Committee.

Students

1) Enrollment: Projection for a five-year period.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Matriculants</u>	<u>Total Students</u>
1	8-12	30-40
2	12-15	30-40
3	15-18	40-50
4	20-25	40-50
5	20-25	40-50

It is expected that approximately 20 to 25 students will have matriculated by the fourth year and will have completed or will be in process of completing the degree. Additionally, it is anticipated that another 20 to 25 students will register for courses provided by the joint program each year without being degree candidates.

Students for the program will be drawn from the following sources:

- a) Elected members of the Legislature seeking advanced degrees.
- b) Staff of the Legislature wishing to upgrade their skills and knowledge.
- c) Agency personnel who wish to qualify for promotion.
- d) Journalists seeking an improved understanding of state government.
- e) Lobbyists interested in increasing their effectiveness.
- f) Other interested persons.

Admissions

Graduate applicants are expected to hold a bachelor's degree from a college or university of recognized standing. Their preparation must be appropriate to the program and their academic record such as to promise success in this joint program. Applicants must submit an official score of their Graduate Record Examination Aptitude Test.

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

PROPOSED COMBINED B.A./M.A. PROGRAM IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

Submitted by: GRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL &
UNDERGRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

- I. A combined B.A./M.A. program in Political Science with the attached requirements be approved and become effective immediately upon registration by the State Education Department.
- II. That this resolution be referred to the President for his approval.

ATTACHMENT

POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

Joint B.A.-M.A. Political Science Program

Eligibility and Admissions

A student is not eligible for admission prior to the beginning of the student's junior year or after the successful completion of 56 credits, and is no longer eligible after the successful completion of 100 credits. To be eligible for admission, the student must have completed at least one semester in residency at SUNY/Albany. It is expected that the student will have spent at least one semester in residence at SUNY/Albany immediately prior to applying to the program. The student must also have completed at least six (6) hours of Political Science (POS) courses at SUNY/Albany. An overall GPA of at least 3.2 is required, as is a GPA of at least 3.2 in SUNY/Albany courses. Three letters of recommendation, must be submitted.

Admission may be deferred pending completion of further undergraduate study in political science, admission may be made conditional upon completion of certain specified courses with a grade of B or higher.

Program Requirements

1. The minimum number of credit hours required in this program is 149.
2. In qualifying for the baccalaureate, students will meet all university and school requirements, including the Second Field (Minor) requirement, the minimum liberal arts and sciences credit-hour requirement, and residency requirements.
3. In meeting the requirements for an undergraduate major in political science, students shall take a minimum of twenty-seven (27) credits of undergraduate political science courses. In so doing, they will meet the requirements of the undergraduate major that they take POS 101 (American Politics) and POS 102 (Comparative and International Politics); at least six courses at the 300 level, distributed to cover three or more of five sub-fields (American, Theory, Comparative, International, Public Law); and at least one 400-level POS course in which a major research or writing project will be required. The requirement of courses at the 300 level may be satisfied with additional courses from the 400 level.
4. In meeting the requirements for an M.A. degree in Political Science, the student shall satisfy all the requirements for the regular M.A. in Political Science, with a minimum of thirty-eight (38) credit hours. The 38 hours will thus include four of six foundation seminars, five other courses at the POS 500 and 600 levels, and the research seminar (POS 697) (2 credit hours).
5. Students in the joint degree program may not enroll in a graduate seminar without at least one appropriate previous course in the subject-matter domain of the seminar.

Program Administration

There shall be a specific faculty adviser for the joint degree program, to serve as the focal point for the program.

There will be an Admissions Committee of at least three faculty. The committee will examine each application and recommend appropriate disposition.

UNIVERSITY SENATE

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

MANDATORY NOTIFICATION OF STUDENT WHEN A HOLD IS
PLACED ON SUCH STUDENT'S RECORD

Introduced by: The Student Affairs Council

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT:

I. The following policy be adopted:

WHEREAS, The ability of a student to pre-register for courses is an important factor in ensuring students can fulfill their academic desires, and take courses they want to take, that they will enjoy, and that they will learn from; and

WHEREAS, When a university office places a hold on a student's record that prohibits or delays the student from pre-registering, the student is often closed out of courses that he or she wants, and is forced to take courses which they do not wish to take; and

WHEREAS, Certain university offices do not notify students when there is a hold on their record, leaving students unaware that there is a hold on their record until they attempt to pre-register;

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED, That the university office placing a hold must notify a student in writing at the time a hold is placed on a student's record, or in any other way interferes with a student's ability to take advantage of the academic or other services of the university because the student owes the university money.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the university office placing the hold must provide the student with a written release form upon removing the hold.

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

58

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

University Policies for
Research Involving Human Subjects

INTRODUCED BY: Council on Research

IT IS HEREBY PROPOSED THAT THE FOLLOWING BE ADOPTED:

- I. That the attached policies for research involving human subjects be approved.

- II. That the Council on Research and the Institutional Review Board be charged to implement the following by the end of the 1982 calendar year:
 - (1) Insure that a handbook be published which describes current policies, procedures, and guidelines for developing acceptable human subjects research projects;
 - (2) Conduct a vigorous educational program to increase faculty awareness of the University's policies and procedures, especially the implications of recent changes;
 - (3) Appoint and charge a task force, composed of representatives from the IRB, the Council, and the School of Education, to study and develop policy options governing research on minors in school settings;
 - (4) Appraise emerging state and federal laws and recommend changes as allowed and appropriate for facilitating research involving human subjects; and

- III. That this resolution be referred to the President for his approval.

Attachment

Policies:

UNIVERSITY POLICIES FOR RESEARCH
INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

- I. In accordance with state and federal regulations and professional standards of ethical conduct, it is the responsibility of the University reasonably to insure that, in research conducted under its auspices, the rights and welfare of human subjects are adequately protected. The primary responsibility for protecting human subjects, however, rests with each individual who initiates, directs or engages in research.

- II In order for the University to fulfill its responsibility, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) is authorized to review and approve ALL research involving human subjects conducted under the auspices of the University, regardless of the source of funding. This includes student research involving subjects from outside the class.
 - A. "Human Subjects Research" is defined as a systematic investigation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge, which involves the collection of data from or about living human beings. It does not include research utilizing published or publicly available documents or research on elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office.
 - B. The members of the IRB are appointed by the Vice President for Research in consultation with the Council on Research. In addition to other requirements of state and federal regulations, the membership of the IRB shall be composed of individuals of varying backgrounds who are qualified through maturity, experience, expertise and the diversity of the members' racial and cultural backgrounds to assure complete and adequate review of activities commonly conducted under the University's auspices, and to insure respect for its advice and counsel for safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects. The IRB shall possess the professional competence necessary to ascertain the acceptability of proposals in terms of institutional commitment and regulations, applicable law, standards of professional conduct and practice, and community attitudes.
 - C. The determination regarding whether a given activity should be considered human subjects research must be made by the IRB or its designee.
 - D. Certain categories of research involving little or no risk to subjects need not be reviewed and approved by the full IRB, but, rather, may be eligible for less intensive review procedures. The IRB shall develop and promulgate appropriate categories of research eligible for these procedures.

III. The IRB, with approval by the Council on Research, shall adopt appropriate procedures to implement these policies.

IV. The Council on Research shall maintain oversight of the IRB.

A. At timely intervals, the Council shall review the operation of the IRB and shall report to the University Senate the results of that review.

B. When necessary, the Council shall recommend to the IRB appropriate changes in the review procedures within the constraints imposed by law and regulation.

Rationale:

Research involving human subjects is governed by federal and state regulations as well as professional standards of ethical conduct. Since 1977, the University at Albany has complied with these regulations by requiring all human subjects research to receive prior review and approval through an institutional process involving a committee of faculty, student, and community representatives called an Institutional Review Board (IRB). In January 1981, changes to applicable federal regulations reduced the scope of research that must receive prior approval and gave more autonomy to institutions to design and implement more efficient and less burdensome review procedures. With the changes in federal regulations there remained some ambiguity concerning the applicability of state statutes. After considerable deliberation, the IRB and the Council on Research decided that the University's policies should go somewhat beyond the government's minimum standard. As a result, a policy statement was recommended which (1) continued to require all research involving human subjects to receive prior review; but that (2) instituted a revised set of procedures to provide for "expedited" review of approximately 60% of the research formerly considered by the entire Board.

In October 1981, the University Senate adopted this revised campus policy, to be effective for a provisional period of six months, after which the Council on Research was directed to report to the Senate on the impact of the new procedures. During the Spring 1982 semester the Council conducted a review of the campus' policy. The Council's report (attached) was informed by an examination of data from records of the campus' Institutional Review Board (IRB) as well as from a poll of faculty opinion regarding SUNY/Albany human subjects procedures.

From its review, the Council concluded that a majority of faculty who conduct research involving human subjects favor the campus' current procedures, even though they may not be mandated by state or federal law; however, a significant minority, 24% of respondents to the Council's poll, do not favor current policies and procedures. The Council determined that negative opinion centers mainly on the perception that a great deal of time and effort is required to obtain review and approval for routine and innocuous research; the perception that the University's IRB tends to intrude into areas which are inappropriate to its function; the perception that current review procedures unduly impede student research; and the perception that the Board requires more than is necessary for conducting research on minors in school settings.

The preceding Senate Resolution, which includes a revised policy statement and specific steps to be undertaken by the Council and the IRB during the next academic year, was developed as a result of discussions within the Council and between the Council and institutional officials and the University's IRB.

Report to the University Senate
from the
Council on Research

HUMAN SUBJECTS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AT SUNY/ALBANY
A Review and Assessment

April 22, 1982

Prepared by:
William Hedberg
Jeffrey Cohen
Valerie Melburg

Section One: Highlights of Poll of Faculty Opinion Regarding
SUNY/Albany Human Subjects Policies

Background

In March 1982, a two-page questionnaire was sent to faculty members of selected academic units at SUNY/Albany to assess opinion regarding the campus' policies and procedures for obtaining required reviews and approvals of research involving humans as subjects. (a copy of the questionnaire and transmittal letter is provided in Appendix A). A total of 414 questionnaires were distributed to all faculty in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the School of Education, the Graduate School of Public Affairs, the School of Criminal Justice, the School of Social Welfare, the School of Business, the School of Library and Information Science, the Department of Rhetoric and Communication, and the Department of Biological Sciences. As of April 1st, 147 questionnaires were completed and returned, providing a response rate of 36% (see Table I for frequency response by academic unit).

Table I: Frequency Response by Academic Unit

Academic Unit	Instruments Distributed	Frequency Response	"Experienced"	
			IRB	vs Survey
Social & Behavioral Sciences	137	53	44	35
African & Afro-American	6	1	1	0
Anthropology	14	6	3	5
Economics	26	6	0	0
Geography	9	2	2	1
History	25	6	3	3
Psychology	32	19	23	16
Puerto Rican Studies	3	1	0	1
Sociology	22	12	12	9
Education	87	30	32	24
Counseling Psychology	15	10	9	9
Educational Administration	11	1	2	1
Ed Psychology & Statistics	19	7	6	4
Prog Development & Evaluation	13	4	6	3
Reading	7	3	5	3
Teacher Education	22	5	4	4
Rockefeller College	80	22	14	9
Political Science	22	5	2	1
Public Administration	16	6	1	1
Criminal Justice	16	3	1	3
Social Welfare	26	8	10	4
Business	50	10	3	2
Library & Information Science	15	7	0	3
Rhetoric & Communication	13	4	5	4
Biological Sciences	32	7	1	2
Unidentifiable	NA	14	NA	9
TOTALS	414	147(36%)	100	87

(64)

Representativeness of the Response

Of the 147 respondents, 87 (59%) reported having submitted a protocol to the campus' Institutional Review Board (IRB) at least once. A review of IRB records over the past two and one-half years, checked against a current listing of faculty in relevant departments, yielded a total number of 100 faculty who have had contact with the Board.

Moreover, of the subset of 87 "experienced" respondents, 53 reported having submitted a protocol to the IRB since last September. This number also compares favorably with Board records, which show that 54 faculty have had contact with the IRB since last July, the beginning of the Board's record-keeping year.

Thus, it is believed that the poll successfully obtained responses from most faculty who have had contact with the IRB in recent years. Since most faculty responded to the survey anonymously, as requested, it is not possible to state more precisely the degree to which the responses received represent the views of faculty whose work is directly affected by the campus' human subjects policies. For purposes of comparison, percentage distributions for "experienced" and "inexperienced" respondents are presented in Appendix B.

Knowledge of Regulations and View of Procedures

As expected, respondents who reported "some" or "no" knowledge of either applicable regulations or the campus' review procedures were more likely to respond "no opinion," "don't know," "not applicable," or some other similar response to other questions on the survey instrument. Overall, the more knowledge a respondent reported having of the relevant regulations and procedures, the more likely he or she was to deliver an essentially favorable view of the policies and their operation; however, even among those with "some" or "considerable" knowledge of the campus' procedures, a sub-population of 128 respondents, 31 (24%) do not favor current policies if they are not required by law, 34 (27%) agree that the Board tends to be concerned with areas inappropriate to its function, and 29 (23%) agree that current review procedures have impeded student research.

Opinion Regarding Adherence to Strict Legal Minima

A plurality of all respondents (46.5%) favored the University's policies even though they may not be mandated by federal or state law; 22.9% voted negatively, 21.5% registered "no opinion," and 9.1% did not answer or provided some other response. Respondents who had never submitted a protocol to the Board were more likely to indicate "no opinion" on this item. Of the sub-population of 87 "experienced" respondents, 58.6% indicated they would favor the campus' policies, 24.1% said not, 8.0% reported "no opinion," and 5.7% provided other qualified responses.

The Negative Response: Its Size and Focus

An effort was made to identify a subgroup of the total number of respondents which, according to the most generous definition, registered a negative view of the campus' current policies and procedures. Respondents were included in the subgroup if they did not favor current campus policies beyond what is legally mandated, or if they "disagreed" with item 12, "agreed"

with items 13 through 17, or responded affirmatively to item 18. A subgroup of 59 respondents (40% of the total response) was thus created. Of this special population, 42 respondents reported having submitted a protocol to the IRB at least once. It is important to note that this subgroup is composed of persons holding varying degrees of negative opinion and that the design of the questionnaire provided no systematic means for determining the depth, basis, or precise nature of opinions. Tabulated responses for the subgroup to selected questionnaire items are provided in Table II.

Table II: Tabulations for Selected Items from Negative Subgroup
(numerator = "experienced" respondents; denominator = "inexperienced")

Questionnaire Item	Yes	No	No Opinion	Other
#8) Favor Human Subjects Policies Beyond Legal Minima	12/3	21/11	4/2	5/1
#12) Procedures Run Efficiently	31/5	10/4	1/5	0/3
#13) Unwarranted Intrusion	15/10	26/3	2/0	1/2
#14) Inappropriate Functions	29/8	9/2	2/4	2/3
#15) Unqualified Judgements	18/7	16/2	4/4	4/4
#16) Impedes Respondent's Research	19/5	19/6	1/1	3/5
#17) Impedes Student Research	23/8	12/4	2/3	5/2
#18) Abandoned Inquiry	11/2	29/11	0/1	2/3

The subgroup's concerns fall primarily in two areas: the first is a rather substantial view that the IRB gets into areas that are inappropriate to its function; the second is that the review procedures unduly impede student research. The subgroup generally agrees that the current procedures run with reasonable efficiency. Opinion is nearly divided on the issue of whether the procedures unduly impede their own research, as well as on the question of whether the Board makes judgements it is not qualified to make. The subgroup voted almost two-to-one against maintaining University policies which may not be mandated by state or federal law. Curiously, "experienced" respondents of the subgroup felt, by nearly a two-to-one margin, that the review procedures are not an unwarranted intrusion on an investigator's autonomy, while other respondents who have not had contact with campus procedures registered, by a vote of 10 to 3, a perception that the procedures are unwarranted and intrusive.

Significantly, 13 respondents indicated they have abandoned a line of inquiry because of the current policies and procedures. Descriptions of the nature of the abandoned investigation were not always provided. Of those that were, the list includes:

- studies involving deception, the use of electric shock, and pain;
- student directed research, including simple surveys and small routine studies, which faculty felt discouraged from assigning because of the perception that it takes too much time to gain required approvals;

- field studies and standard surveys because of the perception that the review and approval procedure is time-consuming, bureaucratic, and potentially problematic;
- routine research on minors in school settings; and
- surveys of attitudes towards homosexuality and other topics in socio-biology.

Respondent's Comments

Seventy four (50%) respondents provided comments of varying length in response to the poll. Table III presents tabulated frequencies for a classification scheme developed after reading all comments received.

Table III: Respondent's Comments

Category of Comment	Frequency
Essentially Favorable Comments and Compliments Examples: "After going through the process once or twice it's no big deal." "Exempt categories are a major improvement."	15
Clarification of Little Knowledge and/or Impact Examples: "Since I have only been on campus for a few months I have had no occasion to be involved in review procedures nor have I had any dealings with the IRB." "Very limited impact because I do not in general work with human subjects."	8
Inconvenience Issues (e.g., time, bureaucracy, forms, costs) Examples: "Although the review procedures have not unduly impeded progress of my research, they have caused considerable inconvenience. Many questions asked are redundant and are not always applicable. Forms are very lengthy, especially for an involved study." "Totally discouraged our use of opinion surveys and some interviews. They would probably be approved, but the time and bother of clearance is discouraging."	12
Research Involving Minors (e.g., consent, "normal" classroom activity) Examples: "Insofar as the Board serves to prevent abuse of subjects it serves a useful purpose. It puts far too many additional constraints on researchers, especially in education. Especially when school-based research is approved by the participating teachers and administrators, the Board's involvement is superfluous at best." "There has been a substantial improvement in turnaround time and lessening of paperwork this past year. Since I deal primarily with human subjects who are minors and who are in public schools, the number of prior permissions sometimes severely hampers research. Since this kind of research is primarily instructional or curricular in nature, it is difficult to understand the necessity of some of the red tape."	5

Student Directed Research

7

Examples: " When questionnaires are routine and those we have used over a period of years, the time, effort and paperwork are unwarranted, particularly at the masters degree level. This is especially true when response is voluntary and confidential." "Student projects, except for doctoral dissertations, should not require University clearance."

Lines of Inquiry Abandoned

7

Examples: (see above).

Miscellaneous Comments

12

Procedures for checking equipment were inefficient (1)
Membership of the IRB is against research (2)
Board's decisions are inconsistent over time (1)
Faculty and students circumvent the procedures (2)
Required consent procedures are unreasonable (2)
Researcher's First Amendment rights are being violated (4)

Suggestions for Improvements

6

Approve series of studies instead of each study separately (1)
Prepare and distribute sample protocols (1)
Provide clarification of definitions and applicability of regulations (3)
Conduct more analyses of IRB past decisions (1)

Preliminary Conclusions

- (1) A majority of respondents feel that the current procedures run with reasonable efficiency.
- (2) Nonetheless, there exists a significant minority of researchers who registered some negative opinion with regard to the campus' current procedures.
- (3) Negative opinion appears to be clustered particularly around the following areas:
 - (a) the perception that a great deal of time and effort is required to obtain review and approval for routine and innocuous research (e.g., standard questionnaires and survey protocols);
 - (b) the perception that the Board tends to intrude into areas which are inappropriate to its function, including differences of opinion concerning the need to review "exempt" categories of research;
 - (c) the perception that current review procedures unduly impede student research; and
 - (d) the perception that the Board requires more than is necessary for conducting research on minors in school settings (e.g., parental permission).

Section Two: Highlights of the Activity of the IRB

IRB Activity in Recent Years

Table IV summarizes statistical data documenting the IRB's activities during the period 1 June 1981 - 11 March 1982, as compared to the previous academic year (1 June 1980 - 31 May 1981). It is projected that by 31 May 1982, the IRB will have reviewed approximately 280 proposals, which is somewhat less than the preceding year but consistent with average totals for the previous three years. Most proposals continue to be submitted by researchers in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the School of Education, and a large percentage (58.5%) continues to involve student researchers. The most common research methodology (about half of the protocols submitted) involves the use of surveys or interviews on normal adults without any psychological or physiological intervention. About 13% of the projects involve minors in school settings, and a small percentage (3%) involve other vulnerable populations. Over 90% of the research submitted was approved as involving no risk to subjects.

Impact of New Human Subjects Policies

In terms of IRB activity, the primary impact of the new human subjects policies has been the introduction of "expedited review," which allows some categories of research to be reviewed by one IRB member rather than the entire Board. Of the 200 projects reviewed since 1 June 1981, 129 (64.5%) were submitted for approval under this new procedure; twelve of these proposals were found not to be eligible for expedited review and were reviewed by the entire Board.

As a result of this new procedure it has been possible to reduce both the burden of paperwork required from a researcher and the time necessary to secure approval for nearly two-thirds of SUNY/A human subjects research. Under expedited review, a researcher is only required to submit one copy of a one-page form accompanied by a brief description of his/her research, as well as a copy of any data-gathering instrument. During the period under study, the average delay between submission and approval under expedited review was less than four days (range: 0 - 15 days, median: 3.57). In previous years, all proposals were reviewed by the full IRB at a regularly scheduled meeting (usually weekly), and eight copies of a much more extensive form were required to initiate the process.

Table IV: Statistical Summary of IRB Activity

	<u>6/81 - 3/82</u>	<u>6/80 - 5/81</u>
Total No. of Projects Reviewed	200	329
Total No. of Subjects	26,314 (160/proj.)	68,336 (207/proj.)
Projects Using Psych. 101 Pool	51 (25.1%)	60 (18.2%)
Subject Populations		
Adults	181 (90.5%)	289 (87.8%)
Minors	27 (13.5%)	35 (10.6%)
Mentally Ill	4 (2.0%)	13 (4.0%)
Physically Ill	1 (0.5%)	4 (1.2%)
Mentally Retarded	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)
Disabled	0 -	3 (0.9%)
Prisoners	0 -	2 (0.6%)
Other	0 -	8 (2.4%)
Departments		
Education	82 (41.0%)	98 (29.8%)
Counseling Psych.	24 (12.0%)	24 (7.3%)
Ed. Psych.	8 (4.0%)	21 (6.4%)
Other Education	50 (25.0%)	53 (16.1%)
Psychology	73 (36.5%)	118 (35.9%)
Sociology	9 (4.5%)	33 (10.1%)
Social Welfare	9 (4.5%)	14 (4.3%)
Rhetoric-Communication	6 (3.0%)	19 (5.8%)
Criminal Justice	4 (2.0%)	8 (2.4%)
Business	4 (2.0%)	5 (1.5%)
Library	3 (1.5%)	2 (0.6%)
Public Affairs	2 (1.0%)	8 (2.4%)
Administration	2 (1.0%)	2 (0.6%)
Counseling Center	2 (1.0%)	1 (0.3%)
Library Science	1 (0.5%)	5 (1.5%)
History	1 (0.5%)	4 (1.2%)
Biology	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.3%)
Geography	0 -	5 (1.5%)
Anthropology	0 -	4 (1.2%)
Math	0 -	1 (0.3%)
Non-SUNYA	0 -	1 (0.3%)
Researchers		
Faculty/Staff	80 (40.0%)	139 (42.2%)
Grad. Students	81 (40.5%)	114 (34.6%)
Undergrad. Students	0 -	26 (7.9%)
Combination	36 (18.0%)	48 (14.6%)
Other	3 (1.5%)	2 (0.6%)
Sponsor		
No External Funding	176 (88.0%)	260 (76.0%)
Government	19 (9.5%)	53 (16.1%)
Private Foundations	2 (1.0%)	9 (2.7%)
Other	2 (1.0%)	20 (6.1%)

Site			
On Campus	118	(59.0%)	212 (64.4%)
Off Campus	95	(47.5%)	162 (44.2%)
School	25	(12.5%)	23 (7.0%)
Data Gathering			
Questionnaire	121	(60.5%)	228 (69.3%)
Task	57	(28.5%)	65 (19.8%)
Interviews	43	(21.5%)	99 (30.1%)
Test	27	(13.5%)	33 (10.0%)
Observation	12	(6.0%)	46 (14.0%)
Files	4	(2.0%)	15 (4.6%)
Other	15	(7.5%)	29 (8.8%)
Intervention			
Psychological	25	(12.5%)	60 (18.2%)
Physiological	0	-	13 (4.0%)
Both	9	(4.5%)	11 (3.3%)
Deception	17	(8.5%)	29 (8.8%)
Equipment	13	(6.5%)	20 (6.1%)
Full Review	83		329
Initial Decisions			
No Risk	50	(60.2%)*	200 (60.8%)
At Risk	7	(8.4%)*	14 (4.3%)
Not Hum. Subj Research	0	-	4 (1.2%)
No Risk Pending	19	(22.9%)*	67 (20.4%)
Time Until Final Approval:			
Range	1 - 7 weeks		1 - 20 weeks
Average	1.5 weeks		2.9 weeks
Tabled	7	(8.4%)*	38 (11.6%)
Time Until Final Approval:			
Range	1 - 5 weeks		1 - 12 weeks
Average	1.5 weeks		2.4 weeks
Expedited Review	129		0 -
Approved No Risk	117	(90.7%)	
Time Until Final Approval:			
Range	0 - 15 days		
Average	3.57 days		
Required Full Review	12	(9.3%)	
Final Decisions			
No Risk	193	(96.5%)	273 (83.0%)
At Risk	7	(3.5%)	24 (7.3%)
Not Human Subjects Research	0	-	4 (1.2%)
Still Pending	N.A.		21 (6.4%)
Not Done	N.A.		7 (2.1%)

*Percentages in this section reflect a percent of those considered under full review.

Appendix A: Transmittal Letter and Questionnaire



STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, N. Y. 12203

Dear Colleague:

I am writing to request your cooperation and participation in assisting the Council on Research in its efforts to assess the impact of SUNY/Albany's policies on human subjects research. This assessment follows a directive from the University Senate, which approved changes to the campus' human subjects policies last October. These policies were approved for a trial period of six months, at which time the Council on Research will report to the Senate on the effects of the policies and a resolution to adopt them permanently will be debated and voted upon.

As you may know, federal and state regulations assign responsibility for reviewing and approving human subjects research conducted at or by the University to the SUNY/Albany Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB is a campus-wide committee made up of faculty, students, administrators and community representatives. Last year federal regulations were revised and, instead of mandating all the IRB's policies and procedures, the government shifted more of the responsibility for insuring the protection of human subjects to individual institutions. In order to fulfill this responsibility, the University policies, as provisionally adopted, require IRB approval for all human subjects research but streamline the review process, reducing burdens and inconveniences to investigators.

A brief questionnaire, attached to this letter, has been prepared to poll faculty opinion regarding SUNY/Albany's human subjects policies and the impact of the review process on their work. You will note that, in addition to specific questions, we invite you to submit more extensive comments and suggestions for improvements. Your participation in this poll is voluntary and anonymous.

We believe that this effort is the first systematic attempt to poll faculty on this subject at any university in the country since 1976. Therefore, in addition to serving procedural and policy purposes at this campus, the data may also be disseminated to serve broader research and academic purposes.

We would be grateful for your time in completing this questionnaire, which is being sent to all faculty in academic units where research involving human subjects is conducted. Please return the questionnaire to the Council on Research in the attached envelope. We would deeply appreciate receiving your response by Monday, March 22nd.

Sincerely,

Professor Richard Alba
Department of Sociology
Chair, Council on Research

SUNY/ALBANY COUNCIL ON RESEARCH
 POLL OF FACULTY OPINION CONCERNING THE CAMPUS' HUMAN SUBJECTS PROCEDURES

- 1) Please give us the name of your department/school: _____
- 2) Have you ever submitted a protocol to the campus' Institutional Review Board?
 ___ Yes ___ No
- 3) If so, how many protocols do you usually submit to the Board each year?
 ___ One To Three ___ More Than Three
- 4) Since last September how many protocols have you submitted?
 ___ None ___ One To Three ___ More Than Three
- 5) Have you ever supervised student research submitted to the Board?
 ___ Yes ___ No
- 6) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of state and federal regulations governing human subjects research, including recent changes.
 ___ No Knowledge ___ Some Knowledge ___ Considerable Knowledge
- 7) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of the campus' human subjects procedures.
 ___ No Knowledge ___ Some Knowledge ___ Considerable Knowledge
- 8) Do you favor the University's current human subjects policies, even though they may not be mandated by federal or state law?
 ___ Yes ___ No ___ No Opinion

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE:

- | | <u>Agree</u> | <u>Disagree</u> |
|---|--------------|-----------------|
| 9) The human subjects review procedures have protected the rights and welfare of human subjects at SUNY/Albany. | _____ | _____ |
| 10) The review procedures have helped to improve the quality of scientific research conducted at this campus. | _____ | _____ |
| 11) The review procedures have affected your attitudes and behaviors with regard to the human subjects involved in your research. | _____ | _____ |

(over)

- | | <u>Agree</u> | <u>Disagree</u> |
|---|--------------|-----------------|
| 12) The SUNY/Albany review procedure runs with reasonable efficiency. | _____ | _____ |
| 13) The review procedure is an unwarranted intrusion on an investigator's autonomy. | _____ | _____ |
| 14) The Institutional Review Board gets into areas which are not appropriate to its function. | _____ | _____ |
| 15) The Institutional Review Board makes judgements it is not qualified to make. | _____ | _____ |
| 16) The review procedures have unduly impeded the progress of your research. | _____ | _____ |
| 17) The review procedures have unduly impeded student research. | _____ | _____ |
| 18) Have you ever abandoned a line of inquiry or research question because you believed such studies would not be approved by the Institutional Review Board? | | |

Yes
 No

If so, please describe briefly:

Finally, we would be grateful for your further comments and suggestions about the impact of the campus' procedures in this area on your research. Your suggestions about modifications to the procedures would be particularly helpful. Please use additional pages, if necessary, to record your views.

Please return your completed response to Professor Richard Alba, Chair, Council on Research, c/o Department of Sociology, SS 340, by Monday, March 22nd. Thank you for your assistance.

74

Appendix B: Percentage Distributions for "Experienced" (upper numbers) and "Inexperienced" (lower numbers) Respondents*

SUNY/ALBANY COUNCIL ON RESEARCH
 POLL OF FACULTY OPINION CONCERNING THE CAMPUS' HUMAN SUBJECTS PROCEDURES

- 1) Please give us the name of your department/school: _____
- 2) Have you ever submitted a protocol to the campus' Institutional Review Board?
 N=87 Yes N=60 No
- 3) If so, how many protocols do you usually submit to the Board each year?
 65.5 27.6
1.8 One To Three 0.0 More Than Three
- 4) Since last September how many protocols have you submitted?
 39.1 40.2 20.7
50.0 None 1.8 One To Three 0.0 More Than Three
- 5) Have you ever supervised student research submitted to the Board?
 77.0 23.0
10.7 Yes 85.7 No
- 6) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of state and federal regulations governing human subjects research, including recent changes.
 8.0 67.8 24.1
21.4 No Knowledge 60.7 Some Knowledge 16.1 Considerable Knowledge
- 7) Please give us a self-assessment of your knowledge of the campus' human subjects procedures.
 1.1 48.3 50.6
23.2 No Knowledge 60.7 Some Knowledge 14.3 Considerable Knowledge
- 8) Do you favor the University's current human subjects policies, even though they may not be mandated by federal or state law?
 58.6 24.1 8.0 5.7
28.6 Yes 19.6 No 42.9 No Opinion Qualified Response

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS PLEASE INDICATE WHETHER YOU AGREE OR DISAGREE:

	Don't Know	Agree	Disagree	Qualified Response
9) The human subjects review procedures have protected the rights and welfare of human subjects at SUNY/Albany.	9.2 19.6	77.0 50.0	9.2 7.1	2.3 5.4
10) The review procedures have helped to improve the quality of scientific research conducted at this campus.	13.8 19.6	29.9 28.6	49.4 30.4	0.0 1.8
11) The review procedures have affected your attitudes and behaviors with regard to the human subjects involved in your research.	1.1 10.7	34.3 30.4	63.2 25.0	1.1 1.8

(over)

*Note: percentages do not add up to 100 because non-responses are not shown.

	Don't Know	Agree	Disagree	Qualified Response
12) The SUNY/Albany review procedure runs with reasonable efficiency.	1.1 28.6	85.1 33.9	11.5 7.1	1.1 1.8
13) The review procedure is an unwarranted intrusion on an investigator's autonomy.	0.0 10.7	17.2 17.9	78.2 50.0	0.0 1.8
14) The Institutional Review Board gets into areas which are not appropriate to its function.	5.7 25.0	33.3 14.3	48.3 32.1	3.4 1.8
15) The Institutional Review Board makes judgements it is not qualified to make.	9.2 23.2	20.7 12.5	56.3 28.6	3.4 5.4
16) The review procedures have unduly impeded the progress of your research.	1.1 8.9	21.8 8.9	67.8 46.4	4.6 1.8
17) The review procedures have unduly impeded student research.	5.7 17.9	26.4 14.3	56.3 39.3	3.4 1.8
18) Have you ever abandoned a line of inquiry or research question because you believed such studies would not be approved by the Institutional Review Board?	12.6 3.6	82.8 75.0	2.3 0.0	0.0 1.8
	Yes	No	Qualified Response	Don't Know

If so, please describe briefly:

Finally, we would be grateful for your further comments and suggestions about the impact of the campus' procedures in this area on your research. Your suggestions about modifications to the procedures would be particularly helpful. Please use additional pages, if necessary, to record your views.

Please return your completed response to Professor Richard Alba, Chair, Council on Research, c/o Department of Sociology, SS 340, by Monday, March 22nd. Thank you for your assistance.

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

1981-1982 Membership

EX OFFICIO SENATORS

Vincent O'Leary, President of State University of New York at Albany	Joseph Nitecki, Director of University Libraries
Stephen DeLong, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Acting	Eugene McLaren, SUNY Senator (1982) (Alternate: John Morgan)
John Hartigan, Vice-President for Finance and Business	Donald Reeb, SUNY Senator (1983) (Alternate: Arthur Collins)
Warren Ilchman, Vice-President for Research and Dean of Graduate Studies	Eugene Garber, Past Chairman of the SUNY-Albany University Senate
Lewis Welch, Vice-President for University Affairs	

ELECTED SENATORS

Elected: At Large

Melvin Bers (1982) Economics	Vernon Buck (1983) Educ. Opp. Program	Robert Frost (1984) Chemistry
Dorothy Christiansen (1982) University Library	Martin Kanés (1983) French	Robert Gibson (1984) CUE
Richard Farrell (1982) Graduate Studies	Harry Frisch (1983) Chemistry	Albina Grignon (1984) GSPA
Harry Staley (1982) English	Richard Tastor (1983) Financial Aids	Patricia Rogers (1984) PEAR

Elected: Humanities and Fine Arts

Jerome Hanley (1982) Theatre	Warder Cadbury (1983) Philosophy	Ulrich Mache (1984) German
Joan Savitt (1982) French	Edward Cowley (1983) Art	Ronald Bosco (1984) English
Sophie Lubensky (1982) Slavic	Drew Hartzell (1983) Music	Joseph Woelfel (1984) Rhet. & Communications
Martha Rozett (1982) English		

Elected: Science and Mathematics

Hassaram Bakhru (1982) Physics	William Hammond (1983) Mathematics	William Closson (1984) Chemistry
Bernard Vonnegut (1982) Atmospheric Science	Wilfried Scholz (1983) Physics	Nelson Cue (1984) Physics
Jon Zubieta (1982) Chemistry	Richard Stearns (1983) Computer Science	Jon Jacklet (1984) Biology

Elected: Social and Behavioral Sciences

Sung Bok Kim (1982) History	Peter Krosby (1983) History	Richard Alba (1984) Sociology
	Jogindar Uppal (1983) Economics	Robert Jarvanpa (1984) Anthropology
	Frank Pogue (1983) African & Afro-Amer. Stud.	William Simmons (1984) Psychology

Elected: Business

Donald Arnold (1984)
Harold Cannon (1982)
Roy Klages (1983)

Elected: Cont. Studies

Marc Salish (1984)

Elected: Criminal Justice

Robert Hardt (1982)

Elected: Education

Edward Christensen (1982) Counseling	Alexinia Baldwin (1983) Program Development	Gordon Purrington (1983) Educ. Administration
Frank Femminella (1982) Educ. and Social Thought	Morris Finder (1983) Teacher Education	Bertha Wakin (1983) Teacher Education

Elected: GSPA

Judith Baer (1982)
Abdo Baaklini (1982)

Elected: Library Science

Pauline Vaillancourt (1982)

Elected: Social Welfare

Bonnie Carlson (1984)
Aaron Rosenblatt (1983)

Elected: University Libraries

Mina LaCroix (1983)
John Mielke (1982)
Stephen Watkins (1984)

APPOINTED SENATORS

Neil Brown
Student Affairs

William Kidd
Geology

Ronald Farrell
Sociology

Helen Desfosses
Undergraduate Studies

Stuart Kirk
Social Welfare

Dean Snow
Anthropology

Educational Policies

Fred Ohnmacht
Educational Psychology

Cathryne Siviers
Educational Psychology

ELECTED UNDERGRADUATES

Neil Gelfand

David Clinton

Rob Rothman

Michael Hagerty

Philip Gentile

Graham Silliman

Corey Bandes

Gail Goldstein

Jim Tierney

Karen Grasberger

Steve Topal

Andy Erooks

Charna Jandorf

Carol Volk

Steve Kastell

Paul Kastell

Mark Weprin

Al Weiner

Eric Koli

Lawrence Ulman

Scott Rothenberg

ELECTED GRADUATE STUDENTS

UNIVERSITY SENATE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

1981-1982 Membership

COUNCIL ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ETHICS

Teaching Faculty: *Alexinia Baldwin, Program Development - Education
*Melvin Bers, Economics - Social and Behavioral Sciences
Dwight Ellinwood, History-Social and Behavioral Sciences
*Robert Hardt, Criminal Justice
John Mackiewicz, Biology - Science and Mathematics
*Harry Staley, English - Humanities and Fine Arts
Cathryn Sivers, Ed.

Non-Teaching Faculty: Gloria DeSole, Affirmative Action
Richard Farrell, Graduate Studies

Undergraduate Students: *Andy Brook

COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Ex Officio: Vincent O'Leary, President
Stephen DeLong, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Acting
John Hartigan, Vice-President for Finance and Business
Warren Ilchman, Vice-President for Research
Lewis Welch, Vice-President for University Affairs

Teaching Faculty: *Judith Baer, Political Science - GSPA
Christopher Buss, Business
*William Hammond, Mathematics - Science & Mathematics
Mina LaCroix, University Library
Paul Marr, Geography - Social & Behavioral Sciences
*Frank Pogue, African and Afro-American Studies -
Social and Behavioral Sciences
*Joan Savitt, French - Humanities and Fine Arts
*Wilfried Scholz, Physics - Science and Mathematics
Bruce Oliver, Business
*Joseph Woelfel, Rhetoric and Communication - Humanities
and Fine Arts

Non-Teaching Faculty: *Robert Gibson, CUE
John Tucker, Counseling
Nancy Wolters, Registrar

Undergraduate Students: *Corey Bades
*Al Weiner
*Charma Jandorf
*Eric Koli
Beth Britt

Graduate Students: *M. Aslan Dar

Asterisks indicate senators
Italics indicate first-year appointments

GRADUATE ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Ex Officio: Stephen DeLong, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Acting
Warren Ilchman, Dean of Graduate Studies

Teaching Faculty: *Donald Arnold, Business
Lester Brown, Social Welfare
*William Closson, Chemistry - Science and Mathematics
Jagdish Garg, Physics - Science and Mathematics
*Ronald Bosco, English - Humanities and
Fine Arts
*John Mielke, University Library
John Rosenbach, Educational Psychology - Education
*Sung Bok Kim, History - Social and Behavioral Science

Non-Teaching Faculty: Lillian Orsini, Library and Information Science

Graduate Students: Jon Baer, Political Science
Virginia Ryan,

LIBRARY COUNCIL

Ex Officio: Warren Ilchman, Vice-President for Research
Joseph Nitecki, Director of University Libraries

Teaching Faculty: *Hassaram Bakhru, Physics - Science and Mathematics
William Haboush, Mathematics - Science and Mathematics
*Frank Femminella, Educ. Policy - Education
Arnold Foster, Sociology - Social and Behavioral
Science
Mojmir Frinta, Art - Humanities and Fine Arts
*Drew Hartzell, Music - Humanities and Fine Arts
*Robert Jarvenpa, Anthropology - Social and Behavioral
Sciences
Max Siporin, Social Welfare
*Pauline Vaillancourt, Library and Information Science

Non-Teaching Faculty: Kathryn Lowery, Computing Center

Undergraduate Students: *Graham Silliman

COUNCIL ON PROMOTIONS AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENTS

Ex Officio: Stephen DeLong, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Acting

Teaching Faculty: Bruce Dudek, Psychology - Social and Behavioral Sciences
*Jon Jacklet, Biology - Science and Mathematics
Boris Korenblum, Mathematics - Science and Mathematics

COUNCIL ON PROMOTIONS AND CONTINUING APPOINTMENTS--contd.

Hugh Maclean, English - Humanities and Fine Arts
*Fred Ohnmacht, Educational Psychology - Education
*Sara Schyfter, Hispanic and Italian Studies -
Humanities and Fine Arts*
*Ronald Farrell, Sociology - Social and Behavioral
Sciences
*Aaron Rosenblatt, Social Welfare

Undergraduate Students: *Artie Banks
Carol Volk

COUNCIL ON RESEARCH

Ex Officio: Warren Ilchman, Vice-President for Research
Frank Lucarelli, Director of Research
Jeffrey Cohen, Chair, Research Safety Committee

Teaching Faculty: *Richard Alba, Sociology - Social and Behavioral Sciences
Walter Gibson, Physics - Science and Mathematics
*Ulrich Mache, German - Humanities and Fine Arts
John Seagle, Business
Susan Sherman, Social Welfare
Lynn Tamor, Reading - Education
Joseph Zacek, History - Social and Behavioral Sciences
*Jon Zubieta, Chemistry - Science and Mathematics
*Meredith Butler, Library

Non-Teaching Faculty: Ronald Stewart, Atmospheric Sciences Research Center
Gene Winter, Two-Year College Development

Undergraduate Students:

STUDENT AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Ex Officio: Neil Brown, Dean for Student Affairs

Teaching Faculty: Harold Howes, Counseling Psychology - Education
Paul Leonard, Business
*Edward Cowley, Art - Humanities and Fine Arts
*Patricia Rogers, PEAR
*Steven Watkins, University Library

Non-Teaching Faculty: *Vernon Buck, Educational Opportunity Program
*Albina Grignon, GSPA
Rich Ohlerking, Registrar's Office
Dave Render, Residence

Undergraduate Students: Mary Frances Cotch
*Phil Gentile
*Neil Gelfand
Steve Gross
*Paul Kastell
*Scott Rothenberg
*Steve Topal

