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I. The Scope of Queens College

Established in 1937 to offer a strong liberal arts education to working-class people, Queens College is now a campus of 18,000 baccalaureate and master's students. The students come from 120 different countries and speak 66 different native languages. *Disceimus ut serviamus,* "We learn so that we may serve," is the motto of Queens College. The Mission Statement which has guided the College since 1986 may be found in Chapter Four. That chapter also presents the revised Statement of Purpose developed through the current Self Study process.

Queens College, located centrally in Queens County, is one of the ten senior colleges in The City University of New York. The CUNY system also has a graduate school, a technical college, a law school, a medical school and an affiliated medical school and six community colleges. Over 200,000 students are enrolled in CUNY colleges, making it the third largest university system in the country, after the California State system and The State University of New York. York College is another CUNY senior college in the Borough of Queens; it was established in south Jamaica in 1966 as part of an economic revitalization effort. There are also two CUNY community colleges in Queens—LaGuardia and Queensborough. Over half of the new students at Queens each year are transfer students, predominantly from the two borough community colleges and neighboring Nassau Community College.

The University is governed by a chancellor appointed by the Board of Trustees. This seventeen member body consists of ten members appointed by the Governor of New York, five members appointed by the Mayor of the City of New York, and the elected chairpersons of the University Student Senate and the University Faculty Senate. The University headquarters building is located on East 80th Street in Manhattan, with the University Computer Center on West 57th Street and the central Admissions Processing Center on West 31st Street.

II. Academic Departments and Degree Programs

Queens College has 56 undergraduate major programs and 49 graduate programs. The College prepares students for graduate study and for careers in many fields and professions. The general education curriculum includes English composition, foreign language, physical education and Liberal Arts and Sciences Area Requirements (LASAR). Queens' acclaimed minor programs in Business and Liberal Arts and in Journalism combine the best traditional education with an entry to the world of work. The following programs

---

1. The chairperson of the University Faculty Senate is non-voting.
are accredited by professional associations: Chemistry and Biochemistry (ACS), Home Economics (AHEA and ADA), the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies (ALA), and Speech Pathology and Audiology (ASLHA).

The 34 academic departments of Queens College are organized into three divisions and a School of Education. The divisions and the School of Education are each administered by a Dean of the Faculty; the deans report to the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Division of Arts and Humanities
- Art
- Classical and Oriental Languages
- Communication Arts and Sciences
- Comparative Literature
- Drama, Theatre and Dance
- English
- Germanic, Slavic & East European Languages
- Library
- Linguistics
- The Aaron Copland School of Music
- Romance Languages

Division of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
- Biology
- Chemistry and Biochemistry
- Computer Science
- Geology
- Health and Physical Education

Division of Social Sciences
- Accounting and Information Systems
- Anthropology
- Economics
- Graduate School of Library and Information Studies
- History
- Philosophy
- Political Science
- Sociology
- Special Programs (SEEK)
- Student Personnel
- Urban Studies

School of Education
- Elementary and Early Childhood Education
- Educational and Community Programs
- Secondary Education and Youth Services

III. Students

Queens College enrolled 14,541 undergraduate students and 3417 graduate students in fall 1994. Sixty-one percent of the undergraduate students are female. Women comprise seventy-two percent of the graduate students. Many students enroll part-time; enrollment for fall 1994 as full-time equivalent students equalled 12,454, up 1.6% over fall 1993. There are no residence facilities; students commute primarily from within Queens and from neighboring counties.

According to the 1990 census, Queens County is the most ethnically diverse county in the country, and the College's student body is reflective of that diversity. The proportions of Asian and Hispanic students are growing; the African-American population has remained stable. Of the fall 1992 freshmen, 37% were born outside the US or in Puerto Rico.
Admission criteria for freshmen undergraduates are a high school average of at least 80 or the top one-third of the high school graduating class or a combined SAT score of 900. The Queens College Foundation now provides up to 35 merit-based scholarships for entering students, and the College is planning to develop an Honors College. A special admissions program, SEEK, is available for economically and educationally disadvantaged students.

IV. Instructional Staff

The Queens College faculty comprises 543 full-time faculty in professorial titles, 72 full-time instructors and lecturers, 444 part-time faculty and 50 Graduate Assistants. All are represented in collective bargaining by the Professional Staff Congress. An additional 42 full-time faculty and 2 staff hold appointments at the College, but their lines reside on the Graduate Center payroll for administrative purposes. Ten faculty have been named Distinguished Professors in recognition of their exceptional records of scholarly accomplishment. Two hundred and seventy Queens College faculty are also members of the doctoral faculty of the Graduate School of the City University of New York.

The non-teaching instructional staff are also represented by the Professional Staff Congress; they include persons in the following titles:

- Research Associate
- Research Assistant
- Senior Registrar
- Registrar
- Associate Registrar
- Assistant Registrar
- Chief College Laboratory Technician
- Senior College Laboratory Technician
- College Laboratory Technician (CLT)
- College Physician
- Higher Education Officer (HEO)
- Higher Education Associate (HEA)
- Higher Education Assistant (HEa)
- Assistant to Higher Education Officer (aHEO)

V. Finances

The College’s 1994-95 tax levy operating budget is $69 million, funded through New York State tax levy appropriations and student tuition ($2450 a year for full-time entering students who are New York State residents). In 1993-94, external funding for sponsored programs at the College (including research grants and contracts) totaled more than $6 million. The assets of the Queens College Foundation are currently $8.3 million.

VI. Facilities

The College’s campus proper consists of 35 buildings on 76 acres, set in a residential, middle class section of Queens. Some of the original stucco-and-tile buildings from the early 1900’s still stand, contributing to the pleasantly eclectic style of the campus. In the past decade, a major building program greatly expanded classroom and research facilities, as well as spaces for varied campus activities. New buildings include the New Science Building, the Benjamin Rosenthal Library, and the New Music Building. The renovated Klapper Hall recently became home to the Art and English Departments as well
as the Godwin-Ternbach Museum; Lloyd Delany Hall has also been completely renovated. The next phase of renovation includes Powdermaker Hall, the College's largest classroom building and home to most social science departments, and the A Building, one of the oldest buildings on campus. In April, 1995, Townsend Harris High School, a New York City magnet school for the humanities, relocated into a new building on the southwest corner of the campus. Colden Center, housing a 2147 seat auditorium and a 476 seat theatre, is the site of many community events and cultural programs.

VII. Campus Governance

The Academic Senate is the academic governance body of the College, responsible for the formulation of policy relating to the admission and retention of students, curriculum, granting of degrees, campus life, and the nomination of academic deans. It also establishes rules governing the use of the College name by organizations and clubs, and conducts all educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty. The Charter, Bylaws and actions of the Academic Senate are subject to the approval of the CUNY Board of Trustees. There are 60 faculty and 30 student Senators elected by their various constituencies; administrators are ex officio members of the Senate, with voice but no vote. Reporting to the Senate are several standing College committees. There are also six independent student governments.

The College Personnel and Budget Committee includes all chairpersons and is chaired by the President; this Committee makes recommendations to the President on appointments, tenure, and promotion, and advises the administration on budgetary matters.

VIII. Alumni/ae

While 82% of Queens College's 92,000+ alumni/ae live in the New York metropolitan area, large numbers now reside in Boston, Washington, DC, California, and Florida, and alumni/ae can also be found in every state of the US and in several foreign countries. The alumni/ae have excelled in a variety of careers: as educators, doctors, lawyers, artists, writers, journalists, engineers, anthropologists, dentists, archaeologists, comedians, musicians, business executives, real estate developers, actors, poets, legislators, manufacturers, accountants, bankers, biologists, chemists, research scientists. The College ranks 35th nationally in the number of baccalaureate graduates who have gone on to earn a Ph.D.

---

2 Data are from Doctorate Records File, National Research Council, baccalaureate degrees awarded in 1979-1988.
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I. A Re-affirmation of Mission

The mission of Queens College is to prepare students to become leading citizens of an increasingly global society. The College seeks to do this by offering its exceptionally diverse student body a rigorous education in the liberal arts and sciences under the guidance of a faculty that is dedicated to the pursuit of excellence and the expansion of the frontiers of knowledge. Its goal is that students learn to think critically, address complex problems, explore various cultures, and use effectively the full array of available technologies and information resources.

So opens the revised Statement of Purpose of Queens College, affirming the high aspirations it has for its students and embracing the substance and values of liberal education. The current comprehensive Self Study process occasioned a thorough review of the College's Mission Statement. The text from 1985 was transformed into a shorter, sharper Statement of Purpose. What remains unchanged is the fundamental character of the College: an institution dedicated to teaching and learning, to scholarship and creative endeavors at the baccalaureate and graduate levels; an institution that reaches out to, educates and serves the people of New York.

The quality of the College's enterprises matters deeply to all its constituencies. With the prospects of budget cuts of a magnitude not felt by the College since the mid-1970's, concern is currently being expressed that the quality which the College aspires to, and takes pride in, will be compromised in serious ways. It may be, although energy and creativity are being directed to meet and beat these challenges. However, it should be noted that throughout the discussions about how to deal with current fiscal exigencies, there has been no backing away from the identity that Queens College has forged for itself since 1937--to be the means by which immigrants and the children of immigrants gain access to and succeed in the leadership circles of American society.

II. The Financial Hurdles

The mid-1970's saw New York City on the verge of bankruptcy; enrollment at Queens was at an all time high, well over 30,000 students, when New York State assumed financial responsibility for CUNY senior colleges and the tradition of free tuition was ended. By the mid-1980's, the College had endured a decade of plummeting enrollments, retrenchment and attrition of faculty, and further budget cuts.

The mid-1990's find the College with significantly improved physical facilities, increasing enrollments, and very accomplished junior faculty --yet facing the accumulated consequences of budget cuts. The cuts and give-backs associated with the depressed New York economy have now given way to cuts attendant upon the agenda of a new governor that include proposing scaling back support for public higher education as part of a larger
cost-cutting/tax-cutting movement. Strategies used by the College to make its way through lean economic years can no longer serve it well as a new attitude toward the funding of higher education develops in Albany.

The College community has been, and will continue to be, seriously involved in strategic and financial planning. Decisions of the past five years have been guided by the 1988-1993 Five Year Plan, developed by ten planning committees with broad representation. There is now in place a 1994-1999 Five Year Plan; implementation of its recommendations has begun. In the past two years, the College has worked closely with the City University’s Office of Academic Affairs on the Academic Program Planning Initiative, working to integrate College and University planning and to strengthen academic programming. In addition to the College’s Academic Program Planning and Five Year Planning processes, formal program review is also linked to financial planning. A new subcommittee of the College Personnel and Budget Committee has been established to advise the President and Provost on budgetary priorities and allocation of resources. Thus, the shape of the College’s response to these difficult financial times is being determined by discussions with appropriate groups and constituencies and is integrated with ongoing strategic planning.

The past decade has seen considerable improvement in how the College manages its finances, budgeting, and information systems. Computerized systems to track and control budgetary, personnel, and student information have been implemented successfully. Through the Self Study, recommendations have emerged to invest further in the integration of financial and information systems, expansion of the capabilities of the student information management database, and enhancement of the College’s enrollment management efforts.

Historic improvements have been made in the College’s ability to raise funds from non-tax levy sources. Between 1990 and 1994, annual appeals for private support raised $19.5 million; funds raised in the fiscal year ending June, 1994 exceeded $4.4 million. A capital campaign initiated in 1992, still in its “silent” phase, has pledges in excess of $10 million. In contrast, in 1986, alumni/ae appeals brought in only $12,000. Former President Shirley Strum Kenny also instituted a renewed focus on alumni/ae, and formed external advisory boards with strong alumni/ae representation to expand programmatic opportunities in business, journalism, and the arts.

There has been steady growth in the funding of research and institutional activities. In 1994, grants and contracts exceeded $6 million, up from $5.4 million in 1990 and $3.4 million in 1985. Recommendations came forward in the Self Study to increase the support for the Office of Alumni Affairs, to encourage departments to maintain contact with alumni/ae, and to provide support and incentives for faculty to apply for research funds.
III. Educational Programs and Academic Program Review

Since the last Middle States evaluation, three new undergraduate majors (Labor Studies, Religious Studies, Women's Studies) and two minors (Business and the Liberal Arts, Journalism) have been instituted; all five new programs are interdisciplinary. A new Honors Curriculum in Mathematics and Natural Sciences was also introduced. In the past decade, substantial curricular revisions were made to many existing academic programs, often as a consequence of the process of Academic Program Review initiated in 1989. The current process used for Academic Program Review grew out of observations and recommendations from the 1986 Evaluation Team that bluntly confronted the College with its deficiencies in this area by saying:

Perhaps most surprising is the absence of academic program review procedures of the kind now widely accepted and practiced in other high quality institutions.... In summary, there is a great deal of impressionistic evidence that academic programs at Queens College are very good. The curriculum, the observations of faculty, and the reports of students are all to this effect.... Even so good an institution as Queens College can benefit from systematic evaluation of its curricula and teaching.

The College responded to this criticism by implementing a process to review all academic departments on a five year, rotating cycle beginning in 1989. Many benefits have accrued to individual departments and to the College as a whole. Recommendations in the Self Study include improving the process through preparation of annual or interim reports following each self study, expansion of institutional research services to departments, and inclusion in the review process of any academic unit offering courses (e.g., freestanding minors).

In 1986, the Evaluation Team examined LASAR, the College's Liberal Arts and Sciences Area Requirements which had been instituted five years earlier, and found that:

This general education program is broadly conceived, and it serves both to expose students to a breadth of knowledge and to acquaint them with the various methods by which knowledge proceeds in different groups of disciplines. There are surprisingly few complaints about LASAR, despite its fairly restrictive approach to student choice.

In 1991, a full decade after LASAR was instituted, there was movement to revise LASAR. While proposals were made, no action was taken. There is now renewed interest in a complete review of the College's general education requirements, coupled with development of specific learning objectives and assessment procedures.

IV. Students

Student diversity is a hallmark of Queens College. It is much more complex than the typical racial categorization; diversity comes from the intertwining of cultures, languages, religions and national origins as well. The University estimates that by the year 2000, half of all CUNY students will have been born in Puerto Rico or outside the United States—with all the attendant demands for increases in support for students whose native
usage is not English. Recommendations in the Self Study speak directly to the need for College to prepare for continuing demographic shifts.

Access to academic advising and to evening offerings and services are also matters concern, as they were in 1986. The opening and staffing of the New Office of Academic Advising in 1994 signalled a major advance toward meeting longstanding concern in this a. Moving beyond assistance in program planning and registration for freshmen, Academic Advising plans to expand services to new transfer students and to undeclared majors. Evening offerings have been reduced in recent years, but to no greater extent than offerings during the day. Financial circumstances have not permitted enhancement of evening student services, though there still are staggered hours of service by all major offices such as the Registrar and Bursar.

While the College compares very favorably to other CUNY senior colleges in its graduation rate, there is no complacency over what still remains a significant rate of dropping or stopping out of college. A Retention Coordinator was hired in 1994, and the Self Study recommends that the Retention Coordinator and the Director of Institutional Research conduct a study of student drop/stop-outs in preparation for a major effort to improve retention and graduation rates in all College programs.

Supported by College and University funds and by a three-year grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education, the College’s Freshman Year Initiative (FYI) has developed into a program serving approximately 400 freshmen per year. Conceived of as a means to foster connection and community at a commuter college and as a means to improve the retention of students, FYI has programmatic features that ensure interaction between and among students and faculty.

V. Faculty

Queens College has been able to attract a stellar group of new faculty in the past decade. Aggressive searches have been mounted to increase the number of faculty from under-represented groups, and the results have been very positive: between 1988 and 1993, almost half of all newly hired faculty were non-White, and over half were women. The Assistant Professor rank is now 21% Asian American and 16% Black. Recent additions to the rank of Distinguished Professor include physicist Azriel Genack, literary critic Morris Dickstein and Russian poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko. To support newly hired faculty, the Provost’s Office has devised a multi-faceted program that includes orientation seminars and workshops, mentoring and released time from some teaching. The Self Study recommends continuing the efforts to diversify the faculty and to provide support and services for newly hired faculty.

The national conversations over the balance between teaching and research and over how teaching is valued and evaluated for the purposes of tenure and promotion are also taking place at Queens. Recommendations came forth in the Self Study with regard to
improvements in the documentation of both teaching performance and service contributions and with regard to the accounting of faculty workload.

VI. Academic Support Resources

Funding for academic support units (Library, Academic Skills and Resource Center, Center for Instructional Media Support and Academic Computer Center) has been severely compromised in recent years, as the College has tried to cope with consecutive budget cuts. Given what were thought to be temporary shortfalls because of a depressed economy, choices were made for several years to keep/hire people, especially full-time faculty, at the expense of "things." Equipment replacement, purchase and binding of periodicals and books, introduction of new technologies and the like have been deferred. The emphasis was on maintaining service levels at almost any cost. These wrenching choices have meant that service levels remain, at least comparatively, unaffected.

In spite of the drastically reduced budgets for "things," there has been conversion to an on-line catalogue, access to new electronic databases and additional space for open access computing facilities. A new Learning Center, particularly equipped for languages, will open in fall 1995. Several of the Self Study Task Forces issued strong recommendations favoring a restoration of funding for these academic support units, especially the Library.

VII. Organization, Administration and Governance

The trend toward centralization within the City University, noted by the 1986 evaluators, has continued. This has led to improved articulation for students, joint programs and proposals for a few joint appointments between campuses. However, campus autonomy over local decision-making on issues such as curriculum, appointments, and budgeting has been reduced. A redistribution of faculty lines among senior colleges based exclusively on enrollment began in fall 1994 and precipitated intense opposition on campuses like Queens where great sacrifices had been made to keep the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty as high as possible.

There are calls in the Self Study for the new president to review the internal administrative structure of the College. The Provost is encouraged to review all deans' positions. There are also multiple calls for greater communication: within the College and from the College to local community colleges. Recommendations were also directed to the Academic Senate: to undergo its own self study and review process, to review its representation and to encourage broader participation in governance by both faculty and students.

VIII. Assessment and Planning

The slight use of institutional and management information, together with the inattention to both long and short term planning, rests on a leadership process that is informal and that operates from the instincts and
knowledge of long-serving, and very able and dedicated, campus officers. Such a leadership process is naturally attentive to what the College is and to incremental changes in that reality; it does not, however, focus on new initiatives or significant departures from present realities.

The 1986 Evaluation Team thus voiced their concerns over deficiencies in the College's planning processes. Shortly after her appointment in 1986, former President Kenny launched a major effort in campus-wide planning and recruited a Vice President for Planning. As noted earlier, two five year plans have been developed; almost 90% of the recommendations of the 1988-1993 plan were implemented, and implementation of the recommendations of the 1994-1999 plan has begun. The University's Academic Program Planning process has also enhanced the College's planning efforts. Recommendations have emerged in the Self Study to strengthen the link between long range planning and annual budgeting, to work with CUNY to integrate strategic and financial planning as well as capital and financial planning, to invest further in enrollment management and financial systems to support planning, and to expand the services of the Office of Institutional Research.

Institutional assessment procedures were investigated as part of the Self Study. Improvements through the implementation of review processes for both academic programs and administrative units were noted. However, efforts still need to be directed toward a multi-dimensional assessment of the general education curriculum, to assessment of student learning outcomes in all college courses, and to the formal and systematic linking of data collection, analysis and planning in all academic and administrative areas.

IX. Future Directions

Queens College has much to be proud of and grateful for: the quality of its educational programs, faculty and staff; the dedication of its students to their studies in the face of great financial and personal pressures; the collegiality and mutual respect that exist on campus; its strong tradition of educating students in the liberal arts tradition so that they may aspire to and succeed in any field or profession. The primary aim of planning during this present financial crisis is to make decisions that will help the College to become a stronger, more resilient and more focused institution, to maintain and enhance the quality of the educational experience for Queens College students. The College will face painful choices. The goal should be for the campus to work together to establish the priorities and to affirm the values that will enable Queens College to support the high expectations and aspirations of future generations of students.
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I. A Perspective on Self Study

*Designs for Excellence*, the Commission on Higher Education's handbook for institutional self study, provides a full description of the accreditation process used by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. In it, the benefits of self study are put forward:

Self-study is an analysis by its own members of an institution's educational capability and effectiveness. It is the most important part of the Middle States evaluation procedure for the institution, . . . The undertaking of a well-planned and clearly focused self-study should result in a common effort to assess and improve the institution.

The administration of Queens College, the Self Study Steering Committee and nine task forces took this principle to heart, stressing at each stage the importance of the process of self study. *Designs for Excellence* also suggests that: "Benefits are proportional to the incisiveness of the inquiry: the aim must be to understand, evaluate and improve, not simply to describe and defend." In this spirit, this Self Study is meant to be a critical self-examination of Queens College in 1995, balancing a sharp focus on needs and deficiencies with a healthy reassessment of the institution's strengths and special character.

II. Planning and Organization

The planning for the Self Study began under former President Shirley Strum Kenny and Provost John A. Thorpe early in fall 1993. A full recounting of this process may be found in Appendix A. Upon reflection on the options offered by the Commission on Higher Education with regard to focus and format, a decision was reached to undertake a Comprehensive Self Study. It was further agreed that one focus of the Self Study would be student outcomes assessment. In September 1994, Dr. Kenny became President of SUNY at Stony Brook, and Dr. Stephen M. Curtis was appointed Acting President of Queens College. A search for a permanent successor to President Kenny has been completed with the appointment of Dr. Allen L. Sessoms as eighth president of Queens College. Dr. Sessoms will take office about August 1, 1995.

The Provost appointed a Steering Committee and nine task forces to help develop the Self Study. Almost 100 faculty, staff and students served on one or more of these groups. A complete listing of the members may be found in the preface to this report.

The work of the Steering Committee and its nine task forces built upon that of the College's Planning Committee, which had recently completed a Five Year Plan (1994-1999). The priorities identified in the second Five Year Plan include: improving the advisement of students; supporting initiatives that will further quality teaching and research
at the College, and continuing to reassess the relationship of research, teaching, and service to the goals of the College; making computer and information technology available to all on campus; developing and implementing a College plan for maintenance and replacement of facilities and equipment; and implementing meaningful outcomes assessment practices for the College.

Task forces worked throughout the fall 1994 semester. Their reports were reviewed by the Steering Committee and assembled in edited, condensed form as the Draft Self Study report, issued to the campus community in late April 1995. The Draft Self Study was subject to five hearings in early May, and revised by the Steering Committee to reflect the suggestions made at the open hearings and in writing. In May, 1995, the Steering Committee voted to approve the final version of the Self Study for submission to the Evaluation Team. In light of the continuing uncertainty over the College's budget for FY 1996, it is the College's intent to prepare and submit an update to the Self Study during summer 1995 to provide the Evaluation Team with information as to the extent of financial exigency and retrenchment necessitated by the threatened budget cuts.
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I. The 1985 Mission Statement

The last Mission and Goals Statement of Queens College was developed in 1985 through the preceding Self Study process for accreditation by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools. It reads:

Discimus ut serviamus, "We learn so that we may serve," the motto of Queens College, reflects the College's commitment to its urban community and beyond. For qualified students of varying ages and backgrounds, the College offers a full set of undergraduate programs coordinated so as to promote the broadening of enlightenment at which liberal education aims; it also offers a wide variety of programs in graduate and professional fields for those who wish to pursue more specialized studies. With a faculty distinguished as teachers and recognized in their respective disciplines, the College strives to furnish opportunities for learning, to advance human knowledge and forms of creative endeavor, and to work with the community in matters of compelling public interest. A fundamental dimension of the College's mission is to foster understanding - understanding of oneself, of other individuals, of human civilization, and of the natural world - in the interests both of wise action and of a richer personal life. Intellectual autonomy, soundness of judgment, respect for fact and rational principle, articulate expression, aesthetic refinement, and generosity of spirit are hallmarks of the liberally educated and are prime goals of the curriculum at Queens.

It is of particular concern to the College that its students learn to appreciate the cultural heritages of humankind, the accumulated wisdom of the species about itself and the world. This is essential to a judicious perspective on issues that arise today and a just estimate of new developments occurring in the many regions of human inquiry and creativity. As the faculty seek in their scholarship to clarify and renew cultural traditions - while also exploring fresh avenues of investigation - so our students are encouraged to examine the past, as well as the present, in readying themselves to cope with the future. The College is dedicated to the proposition that learning of this kind is the best preparation for serving, for meeting one's responsibilities generally as an individual and as a citizen.

The College agrees wholeheartedly with the objectives of the City University of New York: it seeks quality and diversity in its faculty and student body; it strives to extend the frontiers of learning and to develop critical thinking; it supports a wide variety of academic offerings; and it affirms its commitment to the value of a strong liberal arts education.

General Goals of Queens College

A. With regard to its teaching function, the goal of Queens College is to provide the best possible liberal education for its diverse student body. Queens welcomes the pluralism of its teaching enterprise which includes professional as well as traditional liberal studies on the undergraduate and graduate level. The College's teaching goals are manifest in three interrelating functions:

1) Informational. The dissemination of basic and advanced knowledge in major fields of human intellectual, scientific, moral, and aesthetic endeavor; the investigation of historical processes and of the physical, cultural, political, and economic contexts within which we live.
2) Intellectual. The development of the capacity for creative and analytic thought; the study and critique of scientific and philosophical hypotheses; the investigation and testing of data and systems within the various scientific and humanistic disciplines; an awareness of one's own value system and tolerance for the views of others.
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3) Life-Enhancing. The cultivation of an informed sensitivity to literature and the arts, both traditional and contemporary; the development of sensibilities for appreciation of beauty in all its modes; the fostering of creative talent in the various arts; the recognition of the moral and intellectual as well as the aesthetic dimensions of human achievement.

B. An equally important function of the College is to support faculty and students in their efforts to extend human knowledge and insight through their own research, scholarship and creative activity. These activities are to be pursued for their own intrinsic worth, as well as for the fulfillment of teaching and learning goals.

C. In pursuit of its public service mission, the College sets itself the goal of providing an active intellectual and artistic resource for the larger community.

There followed two full pages of specific goals for Queens College, detailing the ways by which the College could develop in its students critical thinking and communication skills; enable students to acquire further knowledge independently; support teaching, research, scholarship and creative activity; provide a milieu for effective student learning; sustain itself as a collegial community; carry out its mission to serve the wider community; and encourage and facilitate intergroup relations in recognition of the increasing sensitivity regarding racial and ethnic diversity.

II. The 1995 Statement of Purpose

The Task Force on Mission, Goals and Institutional Integrity undertook a thorough revision of the College’s Mission Statement, with an explicit goal of creating a significantly shorter and more focused document. It was agreed early on that this revision of the Mission Statement would not result in, or be reflective of, a substantive change of mission; rather the aim was to add sharpness and focus to a statement of the College’s purpose.

The process by which the Task Force developed the revision is described in some detail in Appendix A. Further editing of the Mission Statement was done by the Steering Committee, which considered suggestions made by members of the campus community in response to calls for comment made in the draft Self Study. The product of this revision process is a new “Statement of Purpose for Queens College.”

Statement of Purpose for Queens College - 1995

The mission of Queens College is to prepare students to become leading citizens of an increasingly global society. The College seeks to do this by offering its exceptionally diverse student body a rigorous education in the liberal arts and sciences under the guidance of a faculty that is dedicated to the pursuit of excellence and the expansion of the frontiers of knowledge. Its goal is that students learn to think critically, address complex problems, explore various cultures, and use effectively the full array of available technologies and information resources.
Within a structured curriculum and in an atmosphere of collegiality and mutual respect, the College fosters an environment in which students learn the underlying principles of the humanities, the arts, and the mathematical, natural and social sciences. The College also prepares students in a variety of professional and pre-professional programs that build upon and complement the liberal arts and sciences foundation.

Recognizing the special needs of a commuting student population, the College strives to create a broad range of intellectual and social communities. The College offers a spectrum of curricular and co-curricular programs that serve individuals and distinctive student constituencies.

In support of the need for advanced study in the liberal arts and professions, the College offers a variety of master's degree and certificate programs. In particular, the College recognizes and accepts its historic responsibility for providing high quality programs for the pre-service and in-service education of teachers.

As a partner with the University's Graduate School, the College provides faculty and resources in support of the University's mission in doctoral education and research. The College employs University graduate students and prepares them for careers in higher education and research, and it supports faculty who serve as mentors for doctoral students and engage in related scholarly activities.

For its faculty, the College seeks productive scholars, scientists and artists deeply committed to teaching. It endeavors to enhance the teaching effectiveness of faculty and to encourage their research and creative work. The College recognizes the importance of a diverse faculty responsive to the needs and aspirations of students of all ages and backgrounds.

As a public institution, Queens College provides affordable access to higher education and embraces its special obligation to serve the larger community. It is a source of information in the public interest; it is a venue for cultural and educational activities serving the general public. Through its graduates' contributions to an educated workforce and through the leading roles they assume in their local communities, the College is vested in the economic future and vitality of New York.

As one of the most culturally diverse campuses in the country, Queens College faces special challenges and opportunities. By balancing tradition and innovation in the service of this diversity, it represents the future of the nation.
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I. Context

The 1986 Middle States Evaluation Team concluded that Queens College was an institution which, in the face of adverse circumstances, had maintained very high quality instructional and research programs and had preserved a high degree of pride, commitment and collegiality. It would not be hyperbole to say that the team members were struck by a sense of wonderment, even awe, by the extraordinary quality, pride and commitment that have been preserved at Queens College under adverse and menacing circumstances.

In the intervening years, the College has continued to invest with vigor in the quality of its academic programs and its faculty, often at the expense of some support services, maintenance and supplies. There has been deliberate replacement of as many faculty lines as the budget would bear, and the College has been able to attract outstanding young scholars. The College community has been very committed to this strategy of resource allocation.

Preserving and enhancing the quality of the academic programs has been the focus of the College’s new system of Academic Program Review. Initiated in 1989, the first cycle of reviews of all departments and interdisciplinary programs is now almost complete. It will be described and evaluated later in this chapter (section X.B.) and in CHAPTER FIFTEEN: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND CHANGE.

The budget news since 1986 has not improved. With the State’s continuing poor recovery from the recession, tax levy budgets have not sustained College needs, as will be detailed in CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES. The new Governor’s budget, announced in January 1995, mounts a major assault on both public systems of higher education in the state, and is forcing the College to plan for the retrenchment of faculty and staff, along with the potential for elimination or consolidation of academic programs. "Adverse and menacing circumstances" are here again, and necessarily form the context for the discussion of the current state of the academic programs, as well as for hopes and plans for the future.

II. Overview, New Programs and Revised Majors

The College has 34 academic departments and 10 interdisciplinary programs that, between them, offer 56 undergraduate majors. Seventeen of the 56 majors are available in the evening as well as daytime. An additional five interdisciplinary programs offer

---

1 Three departments (the Library, Special Programs and Student Personnel) offer courses or course sequences but do not have majors or minors.
undergraduate minors. There are 2 honors programs and 10 special programs which, while not offering majors or minors, provide important coursework of one kind or another—for example, College English as a Second Language and World Studies. Master's degrees are offered in 49 fields (21 of them in the School of Education), and six departments offer combined BA/MA degrees.

Since the last Middle States visit in 1986, three new undergraduate majors have been instituted—Labor Studies, Religious Studies, and Women's Studies.

- Labor Studies focuses on analysis of the labor force, workers' organizational affiliations, and the dynamics of labor-management relations. There are core courses and specializations in economics and sociology.
- Religious Studies provides a scholarly and interdisciplinary investigation of the world's great religious traditions, Eastern and Western. Core courses are complemented by courses in such fields as anthropology, Arabic, classics, art, Hebrew, history, philosophy, and sociology.
- Women's Studies is an interdisciplinary, multicultural program dealing with the role and contribution of women to world civilizations. Its core curriculum is complemented by courses in such fields as anthropology, biology, economics, English, history, home economics, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology.

A new undergraduate Honors Curriculum in Mathematics and Natural Sciences was introduced in 1988, featuring seminars on scientific methodology and contemporary research problems and stressing individual research by students under the direction of faculty mentors. High school students of exceptional ability in mathematics and the natural sciences have been recruited into this program in impressive numbers. A $1.1 million grant from the Initiative for Undergraduate Education in the Biological Sciences of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute has provided funds for undergraduate laboratory equipment and curriculum development, for annual summer research fellowships for ten of the best science students at the College, and for one new faculty member.

Queens College has been recognized by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC/U) and other national organizations as a leader in the development of professionally-oriented minors intended to encourage students to major in any of the liberal arts disciplines. These minors provide students with an opportunity to become part of a community group through shared classes and extracurricular activities. Two such minors have been established, and others are being developed.

The minor in Business and Liberal Arts (BALA) consists of eight courses developed as a result of a corporate needs analysis undertaken by the Queens College Corporate Advisory Board in 1986. Designed to help students build bridges between the liberal arts and business, BALA infuses each of its eight courses with writing, speaking, computing and ethical problem-solving. Faculty members teaching in BALA meet regularly to discuss
innovative approaches to teaching. BALA 100, the introductory seminar, focuses on defining "work," "business," "liberal arts," and the connections among these terms. Students have opportunities to be mentored by corporate leaders and to compete for paid internships at companies such as PaineWebber, Bear Stearns, Avon and Intelsat. Foundations and corporations have provided funding for special activities, including overnight retreats, family nights, roundtable discussions and scholarship competitions. The program has grown from 25 students in 1986 to its enrollment target of 500, first reached in 1991. By February 1995, 177 students had graduated with a BALA minor. A survey taken in spring 1994 indicated that over 90% of the alumni/ae respondents were employed or in graduate/professional school.

The 21-credit Journalism minor was designed upon the advice of the Journalism Advisory Board, currently chaired by the Executive Editor of Newsday. It consists of five core courses plus two electives, and like BALA, provides a bridge to career opportunity within the context of a strong liberal arts curriculum. The program graduated its first class in 1992; since then, three graduates have been employed at CBS News; one is an editor of the Queens Courier, a community newspaper; and another has been accepted directly after his BA to the Columbia University School of Journalism—an almost unprecedented occurrence for a graduate school that normally requires several years of professional work experience before admission. For the past two years, the journalism program has published a laboratory paper, Queens World, funded by Newsday, and distributed on campus and at sites in the borough. The paper has won the Bess Myerson Journalism award from the Anti-defamation League for promoting communication among ethnic groups. Journalism students develop a sense of identification with the College through working on the newspaper, attending retreats and family nights, and communicating with top journalists who serve as mentors and teachers.

Beyond new program development, the College curriculum continues to evolve in dynamic ways. Several departments have taken advantage of the opportunities for self study associated with Academic Program Review to undertake substantial revisions of their majors. Anthropology has accomplished a thorough revision of its curriculum, with honors seminars being one of the new features. English has approved a substantial revision of its undergraduate major. Economics has strengthened the mathematics requirements for its major. Library and Information Studies has expanded its program to include business information sources and law librarianship, and is overhauling its offerings in information science and technology. Discussions with alumni/ae concerning curriculum are taking place in a number of departments, including Economics, Home Economics and Educational and Community Programs.

Undergraduate programs have also had to respond programmatically to non-academic forces. For example, Elementary and Early Childhood Education, having lost a

---

More detail about the revisions to the Anthropology major as a result of Academic Program Review may be found in section X, later in this chapter.
number of faculty in the last few years, has had to discontinue its evening undergraduate
major and now advises evening students to acquire other BA's and then enroll in its
graduate advanced certificate program. The major in Elementary and Early Childhood
Education offered during the day has become a co-major as a result of a CUNY directive
(1989) that requires students to follow a major in some liberal art or science, where
formerly only a minor was required. Having to fulfill two majors, on top of satisfying the
College's general education requirements, means that these students are allowed few free
electives and, in any case, cannot opt for co-majors with high credit-hour requirements, as
in the natural sciences. The faculty in Elementary Education continue to grapple with this
problem and are trying out alternative programs for providing students with appropriate
background for teaching science at the elementary level.

III. Undergraduate Requirements and Standards

A. The Baccalaureate Degree

A baccalaureate degree at the College entails 128 credits. Most students receive a
Bachelor of Arts degree. However, students in Computer Science and Geology have an
option to receive either a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree; all students in
Physical Education receive a Bachelor of Science degree. Bachelor of Music and Bachelor
of Fine Arts degrees are also awarded.

Besides completing a major, all undergraduates must qualify themselves with respect
to Basic Learning Skills, Advanced Learning Skills, and the Liberal Arts and Sciences Area
Requirements (LASAR).\textsuperscript{3} Basic Learning Skills, in reading, writing, and mathematics, are
demonstrated by placement tests (CUNY assessment tests and the College's mathematics
placement test). If the tests are not passed upon entry, remedial, developmental or
compensatory coursework is required (see the 1993-1995 Undergraduate Bulletin, pp. 38-
39). Requirements in Advanced Learning skills involve one course in Physical Education
and, unless conditions for waiver are met (Bulletin, pp. 38-39), two courses in English
composition and three semesters of study in a foreign language (or its equivalent).

The number of credits required for a major varies from department to department;
most are about 36 credits, but those which must meet external accrediting standards (such as
Accounting, Chemistry and Elementary Education) are much more. Minors, as a rule,
etail 18 or 21 credits.

B. The Liberal Arts and Sciences Area Requirements (LASAR)

The breadth inherent in a liberal arts education is embodied in the seven areas of the

\textsuperscript{3} Students in the Bachelor of Music program take a modified set of LASAR requirements and an
abbreviated language sequence. All other degrees require the same set of basic and advanced learning skills
requirements and LASAR.
College's LASAR requirements. LASAR calls for 28 - 31 credits to be selected from lists of courses which have been approved as "LASAR courses" by the Academic Senate (see Bulletin pp.43-44 for complete listing). The seven areas include:

- **Humanities I** (2 courses in literature and literary criticism)
- **Humanities II** (1 course in art, music, or theatre)
- **Humanities III** (1 course involving the study of language, culture, or aesthetics)
- **Physical and Biological Sciences** (2 courses, including a lab course)
- **Scientific Method and Quantitative Reasoning** (1 course in mathematics, computer science, data analysis, statistics, scientific methodology, or logic)
- **Social Sciences** (2 courses, from different departments, dealing with historical change, the economy, government, decision-making, community structure, and organization)
- **Pre-Industrial and/or Non-Western Civilization** (1 course, may be fulfilled if courses in other categories fulfill historical or geographical intent)

In 1987-88, the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee formed a subcommittee composed of students and faculty to examine and evaluate LASAR after its first seven years. This group reaffirmed the value of a "menu-driven" format in principle, but concluded that the selections had become so numerous and varied that LASAR had lost its coherence and focus as a general education curriculum. Recommendations for improvement included a tighter scheme featuring a strengthening of the requirements in world literature and natural sciences and greater attention to improving student writing.

On the face of it, world literature—at any rate, non-English literature—has actually prospered under LASAR. Over the last decade, 154 courses have been added to the list of LASAR courses. The greatest increases in any of the LASAR areas have occurred in the numbers of courses in non-English literature listed under Humanities I and Pre-Industrial and/or Non-Western Civilization with many of the latter also listed under Humanities I. In fall 1994, 47 of these Humanities I non-English literature courses were in fact offered (65% of the total of 72 Humanities I offerings), along with 23 of the non-English literature courses under Pre-Industrial and/or Non-Western Civilization (41% of the total of 56 courses offered under this heading). To determine whether the subcommittee's concern on this score is still valid, a more thoroughgoing examination of students' actual choices of LASAR courses should be undertaken.

Even if LASAR has done well by world literature, it may not be doing much for students' writing. The work of the Provost's Advisory Committee on Writing across the Curriculum supports some of the subcommittee's concern. Data gathered by this committee

---

1 The total was 507 in the 1982-1983 Bulletin and is 661 in the 1993-1995 Bulletin, counting dual listings in both cases.
in spring 1991 were of two sorts—the generally encouraging and the definitely discouraging. The generally encouraging data showed that about 85% of all courses at Queens require students to do some type of writing, 65% requiring formal papers, 55% having essay exams, and 57% having writing assignments of other kinds. As was to be expected, more writing is required in graduate courses than in undergraduate ones, and more in upper-level undergraduate courses than in lower-level ones. Formal papers are assigned in 74% of graduate courses, 66% of upper-level undergraduate courses, and 57% of lower-level undergraduate courses. Naturally a correlation was found between class size and the amount of assigned writing. Formal papers are required in 70% of classes with fewer than 40 students, but in less than 20% of classes with more than 60 students.

There were, however, three findings that are definitely discouraging. First, the required English composition courses are among the 57% of lower-level undergraduate courses that require formal papers. These English composition courses do not satisfy LASAR, and thus it seems that a disturbingly small proportion of freshmen and sophomores are required to write formal papers in either LASAR or elective courses. Second, about 75% of the lower-level courses, 64% of the upper-level courses, and 40% of the graduate courses do not require library research. Third, most of the courses that do require formal papers were found not to provide adequate guidance concerning them, with assignments structured in ways that were difficult to understand, and with students not provided opportunities to write drafts and obtain instructors' responses while developing their papers.

The proposal of the Provost's Committee—to set up three levels or tiers of work, each calling for well-guided writing of papers in courses besides English composition, with the third level involving a substantial paper of the type of a senior seminar thesis—deserves further and fuller consideration. To recruit support for its proposal, members of the Provost's Committee appeared at divisional meetings of department chairs in 1991-1992. Many chairs were open to enlisting their faculty in writing across the curriculum, but some doubted that many faculty outside the English Department have the necessary wherewithal for extensive teaching of writing, particularly when it comes to offering alternatives to English 120, English Composition II, as the Provost's Committee proposed for the second tier of the new scheme.

The Provost's Committee held workshops for faculty in 1989-1990 and in 1990-1991, the aim being to convey ways and means of helping students with their writing. Some 23 faculty from 14 departments participated in the first year, and 11 faculty from 8 departments in the second. All divisions of the College were represented in both years. These workshops and the committee's other activities did much to increase awareness on campus of what needs doing in this sphere. Efforts in the spirit of the Provost's Committee are going forward at the departmental level. Of particular interest is an experimental program to be implemented in fall 1995 by the Department of Classical and Oriental Languages. This would enable students to contract for a series of three writing-intensive courses that would fulfill the English 120, Humanities I and Humanities III LASAR requirements. Experiments of this sort within departments contribute greatly to the
College's efforts in improving the teaching of writing.

A number of other issues relating to requirements and standards are on the College's docket: whether the LASAR requirements in Physical and Biological Sciences and in Scientific Methodology and Quantitative Reasoning should be strengthened; whether passing of the College's mathematics placement test should be automatically waived for students who have passed certain Regents' exams or courses in high school; whether requirements for majors are within an acceptable range for a college offering the BA degree; whether some majors are constructed too "horizontally" while others are too "vertical;" whether the Academic Senate has tended to be more reactive than active recently in matters of curriculum; whether, when it comes to strengthening scholastic standards and grading policies, the Senate can take effective action given the tendency of its student members to unite and the tendency of its faculty members to divide. These matters and others deserve concerted attention. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should thoroughly review the College's Liberal Arts and Sciences Area Requirements and students' actual choices of courses to satisfy these requirements, with special attention to evaluating student choices and performance in writing, mathematics, natural science, and world literature. <5-1>

C. The University's College Preparatory Initiative

Policies of the City University also have impact on the College's curriculum. A prime example of this is the College Preparatory Initiative (CPI), which the CUNY Chancellor developed in conjunction with the New York City Public Schools. CPI calls for high school students who enter a CUNY senior college to come equipped with certain units of work in specified subjects. Starting in Fall 1993, students were required to have 4 "college preparatory" units of English, 1 of laboratory science, 2 of mathematics, and 2 of electives. By the year 2000, students are required to have 4 units of English, 2 of laboratory science, 3 of mathematics, 2 of a foreign language, 4 of social studies, and 1 of visual or performing arts—a total of 16 units. However, students need not satisfy CPI requirements for admission to a CUNY senior college; they must make up any CPI deficiencies in the course of their college career, fulfilling all prior to graduation from college.

The University is closely monitoring the pattern of college preparatory courses taken by high school students entering CUNY. Recent statistics on the number of CPI units fulfilled are promising. The percentage of New York City high school graduates entering CUNY with one or more units of sequential math rose from 65% in 1991 to 76% in 1994. In the same period, the number taking four or more units of social studies moved from 66% to 72%; two or more years of laboratory science, from 55% to 61%; two or more units of foreign language, from 63% to 72%; and four or more units of English, from 43% to 54%.
As it is fully implemented, CPI is expected to reduce the need for entering students to take remedial work. To date, there have been improved pass rates on the CUNY Freshman Skills Assessment Tests. In senior colleges, the overall pass rate in Mathematics went from 59% in 1991 to 64% in 1994. Results on the writing tests remained flat, although the proportion of foreign-born freshmen entering CUNY jumped from 33% to 41% in the same time-frame.

Most of the CPI requirements overlap with the College's general education requirements, with two notable exceptions—laboratory science and American history. The curricular impact of CPI will not be felt for two or four more years, when a requirement for a second laboratory science is phased in for 1997, followed by a requirement for one unit in American history among the four social sciences units that will be required in 1999. Both of these requirements are likely to increase demand for courses in these areas. As the College moves to re-examine its general education curriculum, some attention should be paid to whether changes made will precipitate additional demand for courses fulfilling CPI requirements.

IV. Interdisciplinary Area/Ethnic/World Studies Programs and Multiculturalism

The College has for many years promoted curricula dealing with a spectrum of the world's civilizations and cultural traditions. Thus BA majors have long been offered in Africana Studies, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, East Asian Studies, Jewish Studies, and Latin American Area Studies; and minors have long been offered in Irish Studies, Italian American Studies, and Puerto Rican Studies. Altogether these curricula involve an average of about 150 courses in each academic year. Also notable are the many and wide-ranging courses given by the Anthropology Department and the remarkably worldwide scope of the curricula in Art History, Classical and Oriental Languages, Comparative Literature, Economics, Linguistics, History, Political Science, Sociology, and so on.

In further pursuit of cosmopolitan aims, the College inaugurated a four-course curriculum in World Studies in 1990. Incorporating perspectives from the humanities and the social sciences, this curriculum investigates both historical and modern cultures around the world—their interactions, their differing modes of conceptualization, and their various economic and political structures. World Studies, which was developed with the help of grants from the Mellon Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, was recognized in 1991 as a model curriculum of its type by the Association of American Colleges and Universities.

All these interdisciplinary programs are well launched and are contributing significantly to the College's pursuit of its mission. They are, however, carrying on in the face of serious budget difficulties. Funds for office staff, even for basic clerical assistance, are minimal or nonexistent, as the temporary services budget which provided part time help for these programs has been especially hard hit in the past few years. The faculty who serve as program directors do practically everything single-handedly, usually with releases
from teaching not commensurate with their administrative work. Shrinking budgets for adjunct faculty make it ever harder for these programs to pay for instructors having expertise not possessed by full-time faculty, or to furnish adjunct replacement funds to departments when full-time faculty are "borrowed" for teaching in a given program. Reductions in the College’s Library budget have been damaging for all departments and programs (see below, under "The Library"), but especially for programs of ethnic and international studies, which require many items published abroad. In the interests of bolstering interdisciplinary programs, the Provost and Assistant Provost have formulated a new plan to schedule for and fund interdisciplinary programs. A roster is being prepared of full-time faculty willing and able to teach in these programs. Schedules of projected course offerings will be prepared sufficiently in advance for the Provost to take full account of them in allocating the available adjunct funds. Though additional interdisciplinary programs are recommended, along with more interdisciplinary team-teaching, in the College’s 1994-99 Five Year Plan, it is not easy to see how such additions can be made with existing resources. This will be a matter for the attention of faculty, the Provost and the deans as the College proceeds with its Academic Program Planning efforts.

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate and the administration should join forces in promoting greater coordination and further cooperation among the College’s many and various disciplines, interdisciplinary programs, and services. <5-2>

Queens College has thousands of students from a wide range of ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and many are recent immigrants to the United States. In keeping with the College’s multicultural population, many special curricula and activities are available. In fact, the ethnic and area studies programs provide strong curricula encompassing the American immigrant experience and the history, culture, and civilization of societies on every continent. Over the years, these programs have developed innovative courses and brought to the College many visiting scholars for conferences, symposia, and courses on timely topics. Community outreach projects of these programs, including lecture series, publications, and cultural activities, have linked the College with the diverse population of the Borough of Queens and the City at large. Exchange programs and travel grants have enabled students and faculty to pursue scholarly objectives abroad, and working relationships have been established by these programs with academic institutions and cultural agencies around the world.

Despite the richness of the curriculum in ethnic and area studies, some students still feel underserved, arguing that there are histories and cultures which are not among the College’s regular offerings. The Council of Club Presidents passed a motion in March 1995 that urged "every department to make a genuine effort to provide a more diverse curriculum of classes, and expand their curriculum to include the areas currently ignored." To date, the Council has taken no further action toward having the motion implemented.

---

5 See CHAPTER TEN: STUDENTS for detail on characteristics of the student body.
In 1989, the Presidential Advisory Council on Multiculturalism was formed to implement a Plan to Promote Pluralism and Diversity and to ponder additional ways of fostering campus dialogue in this field. The Council consists of administrators, students, and faculty representatives from each department. It meets regularly, publishes a calendar of multicultural events, and organizes well-attended events of its own—dramatic presentations, lectures, and readings by notable visitors, and so on. In 1994 the Council joined with the Journalism program to found Queer World, a newspaper of multicultural scope produced by Journalism students three times each semester. In 1995 the Council worked with Student Activities to introduce—aud institutionalize—a diversity component into all freshmen orientation sessions.

V. Evening Programs

As an urban public institution aware of its responsibilities to its entire community, including its increasing adult and working population, the College endeavors to maintain strong evening programs. About 40% of the College’s population attends classes in the evening. In addition, many “day” students avail themselves of evening facilities and services. Seventeen of the College’s 56 undergraduate majors are available in evenings as well as in the daytime. Currently about 300 undergraduate sections are offered each semester in evenings. This constitutes about 17% of the College’s total number of undergraduate sections—a percentage that has held steady over the last five years in spite of considerable losses in the overall number of faculty and in the total number of sections (down about 6% in fall 1994 from fall 1990). Graduate offerings mostly occur in the evening.

Generally speaking, support services are somewhat spotty across the campus during evenings. Most departments’ main offices are closed, so that evening faculty (many of them adjuncts) do not have access to secretarial services, supplies, copying machines, and so on. Faculty advisors are on hand during the evening, and their hours are published. Major student services, such as the Registrar’s and Bursar’s offices, are open for two hours on two evenings per week when classes are in session. The Rosenthal Library continues to provide specialists during evening and weekend hours. Evening advisors have been reorganized to strengthen services in the new Office of Academic Advising in Kiely Hall. These services now include registration information sessions for entering freshmen and monthly orientation workshops open to all (but principally directed at entering freshmen and transfer students).

As will be explained in some detail in CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION, the responsibility for the adequacy of evening academic services and course offerings was transferred in 1993 from the Dean of the School of General Studies to the academic deans, with overall planning and monitoring being provided by the Assistant Provost. The Task Force on Educational Programs found that this has worked well, and did not deem it necessary to appoint a dean or director of evening programming. For the future, the best plan may be to strengthen the cadre of assistant
chairs for evening programs, while increasing the responsibilities in this sphere of the divisional deans.

A CUNY task force was set up in 1992 to examine evening programs and services throughout the University. The Task Force's report showed that the evening programs and services at Queens compare favorably with those at the other senior colleges in the system. Thus, programs offering both day and evening courses were found to total 37 at Queens, 47 at Baruch, 32 at City, 41 at Hunter, 14 at John Jay, 19 at Lehman, 41 at Staten Island, and 26 at York. The College has had much experience and many successes with its evening programs, and the successes have often been taken as models for program development at other institutions. However, given the College's overall financial situation,

RECOMMENDATION:  There should be vigilance in maintaining, and imagination in augmenting, services and course offerings for evening students. There should be a strengthened cadre of assistant chairs for evening programs and a renewed emphasis upon divisional deans' responsibilities for evening programs.

VI. The Freshman Year Initiative (FYI)

Begun in 1992 with the assistance of funding from a CUNY initiative and later with a FIPSE grant, Queens' Freshman Year Initiative project aims to engage new students more comprehensively in academic life and ease their transition to college. Invitations are issued to high school seniors whose assessment test scores place them in English 110, English Composition 1. Those accepting take a block of three courses in different fields; students in a given block—a learning community—attend all three courses together. This is designed to help them develop good academic survival skills and social bonds. They also attend larger group meetings and seminars during which they talk about their work, the program, and any problems that may have arisen. Faculty from the various disciplines teaching in these learning communities are encouraged to meet together, structuring their courses so that there is some connection and overlap among them. Faculty also visit, and occasionally participate in, each other's classes. The program lasts for one semester, though there have been some sections set aside for FYI students in the following semester.

The FIPSE funding for FYI was predicated on its potential for development of a program which could serve as a national model for freshmen. Significant progress has been made. In March 1995, FYI was featured in a panel presentation entitled "Engaging Contraries: Creating an Academic Community at a Commuter College" at the National Conference on Higher Education. Response from across the country was encouraging, as other colleges, particularly urban commuter colleges, attempt to counter forces which inhibit the establishment of academic community and impede students' opportunities for success.
While the program's brief period of existence makes evaluation difficult, the preliminary results are encouraging. Both retention rates and grade-point averages are higher than those for the College's freshmen generally. The program has grown from five faculty and 32 students in fall 1992 to 47 faculty and 360 students in fall 1994. Much has been learned that will help the College generally in its efforts to improve freshman orientation, retention, and services of all kinds. The whole system of student advising should profit from the new thinking inspired by the program. The hope is that the program can be given a permanent footing, that it can be expanded, and that something similar can be developed for transfer students. Additional sources of outside funding are being vigorously pursued.

VII. Alternative Credit-Bearing Programs

Under this heading five credit-bearing programs will be discussed. Although none involves a major or minor, each is of prime importance in the College's efforts to meet its responsibilities to an exceptionally diverse community. A sixth credit-bearing course sequence, College English as a Second Language, is discussed in the section on Academic Skills in CHAPTER SIX: ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES.

A. Adult Collegiate Education (ACE)

The ACE program, established in 1963, is a separate track for students over the age of 25. ACE students satisfy most general education requirements by taking eight basic ACE seminars, and then proceed to the general College curriculum for majors and other requirements. ACE is well-suited for meeting the needs of students following the national trend toward "life-long learning" and of so-called "non-traditional students" who want a bachelor's degree. Approximately 1,500 students are currently working on degrees through ACE, a figure that has remained fairly constant over the last decade. Most ACE students are part time, balancing complex work schedules, family and other commitments with college. These adults often stop out for a semester or two but many return to complete their degrees. ACE's resources are heavily skewed toward serving the needs of evening students, although courses are also available during the daytime and on Saturdays. All ACE classes are taught by contracted adjuncts, many from the regular College faculty.

The ACE Office serves students from recruitment, admission, orientation, registration, entry-level requirements, and advising through to graduation. In fact, considerable resources are directed toward professional advising for ACE students during four evenings and one afternoon each week. However, ACE evening students report serious erosion of College-wide services for them, and courses and some majors are no longer available to evening students. This is a trend that needs careful attention.

ACE is administered under the aegis of the office of the Assistant Provost. It has a faculty Advisory Board, which provides direction and evaluation. Students regularly submit formal course and faculty assessments and also participate in the College-wide course
evaluation system. ACE students also engage in social activities and workshops, and have a campus political voice through membership in the ACE Student Association. A measure of the academic success of ACE students is reflected annually at the ACE commencement, where a typical graduating class of 125 students will yield approximately 50% with top college-wide honors (cum laude, magna, or summa). About 25% of these then proceed to graduate school.

A serious problem that has developed over the last eight years has been the trend toward ever-enlarging classes and bottlenecks in critical, required areas. Enrollment statistics (Table 4-1) reveal that ACE has declined in number of sections offered, from 82 in 1986-87 to 65 in 1993-94. The average section size in 1986-87 was 25; in 1993-94 it was 37. At the same time that FTE's grew from 661.4 to 728.8, ACE's budget decreased by almost 20%. ACE would like to return to manageable section sizes. This situation is, of course, driven by reversals in the economy and budget. Enrollment statistics also reveal bottlenecks in required sequential courses, where large numbers of students are forced to wait for openings or simply drop out, resulting in a retention problem.

TABLE 5-1: ACE PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Enrollments</th>
<th>FTE's</th>
<th>Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>661.4</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>2060</td>
<td>645.6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>2111</td>
<td>658.7</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>2168</td>
<td>657.0</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>722.8</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>617.2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>648.8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>728.8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Special Programs / SEEK

The Department of Special Programs is home to SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge), which provides an opportunity for college education to students having inadequate high school preparation (averages below 80) and low levels of family income. Enrollment in SEEK now exceeds 1000 and the students represent an ethnically diverse population, many of whom are new Americans. Besides its director and office staff, SEEK consists of a counseling unit, tutoring and financial aid staff, and instructors in reading. In other departments (e.g., English, Mathematics, and several social science departments) there are additional faculty whose primary responsibility is to the SEEK curriculum.
Courses offered within SEEK are classified either remedial, developmental or compensatory. Credit is assigned on the basis of the amount of college material included, ranging from no credit for courses in the remedial category to four credits in the compensatory one. The subject matter includes Reading, English, Mathematics, Social Sciences, and Spanish. Students are assigned to courses using CUNY assessment tests and other placement exams. Extended hours are offered in generally smaller classes, and special instructional techniques are employed to raise the students' academic level.

In the past five years there have been modifications in the English and Reading curricula mainly as a result of English-as-a-second-language demands. Efforts have been made to coordinate materials and assignments in Reading and Social Science courses. The SEEK faculty in English are particularly proud of their curriculum, which has been a model for the College in the area of multicultural literature.

The SEEK Learning Skills Center provides individual and pro-active group tutoring. New technologies have been added to the SEEK labs for reading and computing. Counseling is a primary part of the SEEK program; faculty counselors lead Student Life Workshops and are responsible for academic program planning and for personal and career advising for individual students assigned to them throughout a student's career at the College.

LASAR offerings in SEEK are limited to two Social Science courses (counted as equivalent to one LASAR course). This is not regarded as a problem, for SEEK recognizes its role as primarily the providing of pre-college instruction. A need is frequently expressed, however, for more courses of a "bridging" type, as in precalculus and the natural sciences, to enable students to move ahead into certain areas of study.

C. Worker Education / Labor Education and Advancement Project (LEAP)

The Office of Worker Education, established in 1984, provides educational services to union-sponsored, working adult students, both undergraduate and graduate. The Office does this through LEAP on campus and through an Extension Center in Manhattan. The curriculum of Worker Education furnishes a sequence of courses that satisfy the College's general education requirements, preparing students for regular departmental majors of their choosing; many choose Labor Studies or Urban Studies. The Office assists in the admissions process and provides academic counseling throughout students' academic careers. The program has grown from 54 students in 1984 to more than 550 in 1995.

The Extension Center, opened in 1992, continues a program formerly affiliated with Hofstra University. Ninety students are currently enrolled at the Center; new and sufficiently spacious quarters have been acquired for a targeted enrollment of 200 students (130 FTE's). Library resources are to be greatly augmented by arrangements, currently under negotiation, whereby students will have access to the CUNY Graduate Center's excellent library on 42nd Street. The College's Academic Senate has approved a new
degree program for the Extension Center, a BS in Applied Social Sciences, which awaits CUNY and State approval. The Center is also awaiting formal status as a branch campus.

D. The Senior Citizen Program

The Senior Citizen Program is a CUNY-wide program whereby State residents over 65 years of age, who possess high school diplomas or GED's, may enroll in any college course on a space available basis for a flat fee of $52.00. In recent years Queens has been enrolling about 600 of these students (about 100 of them matriculants), which is about a third of the CUNY total. The State has funded the program through a budget for tuition waivers; for 1995-96, the program will function on an audit basis. Students will still be accommodated on a space available basis and may take a full load of courses. Senior Citizens who wish to remain in full matriculated status will have to pay tuition; this represents a minority of the total number of Senior Citizens served.

E. The Cooperative Education Program

The Cooperative Education Program, begun in 1987, offers courses and internships designed to promote understanding of the business community-management theories and practices, obligations of both employers and employees, problems and prospects of diversity in the workplace, and so on. Currently in the third year of a five-year grant of half a million dollars, Cooperative Education enrolled 413 students in 1994 and placed 247 of them in internships, many of which were paid. The goal for 1995 is 500 enrollments and 325 internships. The program is being coordinated with other experimental and pre-professional programs at the College.

Evaluations are a strong point of Cooperative Education. The staff make site visits, provide constant monitoring of students' performance, and have developed protocols for program assessment both by employers and by students. Students evaluate their experiences twice each semester by responding to protocols. Moreover, students are required to keep journals in which they define five objectives and then assess in writing the degree to which they have achieved their goals, the problems they encountered, and the methods they developed for improving performance or relations with employers and fellow employees. Employers are also required to evaluate each student each semester. Some difficulties for the students have been created by the College's shortage of business journals and books concerning work and the business world. At the moment, Cooperative Education is using some of its grant funds to establish a small library of its own.

VIII. Graduate Studies

A. Master's Programs and Advanced Certificates

The graduate division currently serves over 3400 students in the New York Metropolitan Area. The New York State Department of Education Inventory of Registered
Degree and Certificate Programs lists 24 Master of Arts degree programs, 21 Master of Science in Education degree programs, two Master of Library Science degree programs, one Master of Fine Arts degree, one Master of Arts in Liberal Studies degree, six BA/MA programs, 10 post-baccalaureate advanced certificate programs, and six post-master's advanced certificate programs.

Three M.A. programs, Latin American Area Studies, Economics, and Political Science and Government, are not now accepting applications for admission. Three post-master's advanced certificates (Latin American Area Studies, Learning Technologies in Education, and Marriage and Family Counseling) are also not accepting applications for admission, and pending final decisions on the hiring or redeployment of replacement faculty, are likely to be withdrawn.

New programs added since the 1991 Periodic Review Report include a Master of Science in Education in Bilingual Elementary Education, and ten post-baccalaureate advanced certificates. A proposal for a new interdisciplinary Master of Arts in the Social Sciences was recently approved by the Academic Senate and has been sent to the CUNY Office of Academic Affairs. This is an exciting prospect, offsetting the suspension of M.A.'s in Economics and Political Science and Government and opening up a new alternative for students, particularly those who are secondary school teachers. New proposals are contemplated for post-baccalaureate advanced certificates in Music Education.

Graduate degrees awarded peaked in 1992 after a long climb upward, but they still remain at a high level. The data are shown in Table 5-2.

TABLE 5-2: GRADUATE DEGREES AND CERTIFICATES CONFERRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA Degrees</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Certificates</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Issues Raised by the 1986 Middle States Evaluation

The 1986 Middle States Evaluation Report expressed a number of concerns. The following areas were cited for possible focused effort: the pace of curricular change, the level of financial support for graduate students, the need for greater resources and extended hours in the library, and the adequacy of evening support services. These areas will be addressed here, but they have also been addressed in the various self study and interim reports that the College has prepared since 1986.
1. Curricular Change

The process for curricular change is admittedly cumbersome. The structures of the College, the University, and the State Education Department taken together could be viewed as hindrances to speedy implementation of desired changes. On the positive side, this review structure provides the maximum opportunity for careful scrutiny by all concerned. When all bodies—departmental curriculum committees, the College’s Graduate Curriculum Committee and Academic Senate, University oversight bodies, and the offices of the State Education Department—serve appropriately, the result is thoughtful, thoroughly considered change. Significant curricular change has, in fact, been enacted in the preceding decade, including successful initiation of the programs previously mentioned (see section II), formal withdrawal of two Master’s degree programs (M.A. in Teaching of Speech and Hearing Handicapped, and M.A. in Drama and Theatre), and numerous other program alterations.

A 1993 resolution of the CUNY Board of Trustees mandated the regular review by CUNY colleges and schools of their bulletins and related publications to ensure that all listed academic programs and courses are available and offered with reasonable frequency. On November 11, 1993, the Queens College Academic Senate approved a follow-up resolution calling on all departments of the College to implement the resolution. Graduate programs were asked to review their degree structures and course offerings in light of these resolutions. As a result, some courses were withdrawn, some placed on reserve and designated in the bulletin as courses that will not be offered in 1994-96, and a number of graduate programs were restructured. In its curricular structure, the College has the means to ensure that the integrity of graduate curricula is maintained and needed changes are made.

2. Financial Support for Graduate Students

The lack of adequate financial support for master’s level graduate students has been harder to address. Available funding is woefully insufficient to serve for the recruitment of outstanding applicants, to support enrolled students, or to enlarge opportunities for students to do research under faculty guidance. The College has made every effort to hire graduate students on adjunct lines and to maintain some support with graduate teaching assistantships. Students in the sciences are often supported on faculty research grants. However, the overall picture for graduate student support will not improve appreciably until allocation patterns of the State and University change.

3. Library Resources and Hours

Both issues are dealt with in more detail elsewhere in this study. With respect to the dependency of the graduate program on adequate library resources and longer hours of service, cited both in the 1986 Evaluation Report and subsequent self studies, the Library has acted with determination to ensure adequate coverage and accessibility, despite
continuing financial constraints. Hours on Monday through Thursday are 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., on Fridays 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., and on Saturdays and Sundays noon to 5 p.m. The Music Library is open Monday through Thursday 11 a.m. to 7 p.m. and on Fridays 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. In addition, during examination times, the Library's reading room is kept open 24 hours a day. This schedule has greatly helped graduate students, whose on-campus hours are mostly in the evening. Further, while library resources have suffered greatly under present modes of allocation, cause for hope is provided by the multiplication of resources that increased computer access should bring. The Library is currently completing its Academic Program Review; the external review, combined with the internal self study, is expected to yield a specific long range plan in fall 1995.

4. Evening Administrative Support

Since the 1986 Evaluation Report, the College has furthered its effort to become more accessible to evening and graduate students. When classes are in session, offices of the Registrar, the Bursar, Financial Aid, and Admissions remain open two nights a week until 7:30 or 7:45 p.m. A number of departmental graduate advisers set advising hours in the late afternoon and evening, and the Office of Graduate Studies is open daily until 5:30 p.m. and by appointment until 9:30 p.m.

C. Administrative Reorganization

As indicated in the 1991 Periodic Review Report, the College's graduate division was reorganized substantially in 1989 after the resignation of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. Because of financial constraints, the dean was not replaced. Immediate authority for the Graduate Division fell to the Provost and Associate Provost. In addition, a Council of Deans was constituted as a committee on academic and fiscal oversight. The former assistant to the Graduate Dean was designated Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies. Reporting directly to the Associate Provost, the Assistant to the Provost functions in association with the Graduate Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Scholastic Standards Committee in the areas of graduate curriculum and graduate scholastic standards, in the advising and monitoring of students, and in various other administrative areas; she also works closely with the Graduate Admissions Office and with graduate advisors in each department. The research component of the dean's position was transferred initially to the Vice President for External Relations, and more recently to the Provost.

Total graduate student enrollment, matriculated and non-matriculated, during and since this period of reorganization has been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 5-3: GRADUATE ENROLLMENTS *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FALL 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3476</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Numbers represent headcount, not FTE students.
Despite the drops of fall 1990 and fall 1993, the reorganization has not significantly affected enrollment, and administration of the graduate division has proceeded effectively. The reorganization nonetheless brought certain important issues to the fore. The interests of graduate students and programs will always be best represented by an officer of academic stature, and designation of the Associate Provost as chief officer for graduate studies was a positive and necessary offset to the loss of the dean. The health of the Graduate Division depends upon the Provost's and Associate Provost's continuing clear commitment to graduate studies. Both need to keep the divisional deans informed and engaged with respect to the educational and administrative issues of the Graduate Division.

In the long term, issues highlighted by the dean's departure can be addressed only as the College's future funding realities take shape. (See also CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.) For the present, the vitality of the graduate enterprise is real, attesting both to its stability and the College's commitment to it. Master's and advanced certificate recipients in the many hundreds, be they educators, computer scientists, librarians, musicians, artists, scientists, or social science and humanities theorists, have enriched and will continue to enrich the life of the metropolitan area.

D. Doctoral Programs

While Queens College itself does not offer the Ph.D. degree, about 270 of its 650+ faculty hold appointments on the doctoral faculty of the CUNY Graduate School and University Center located in mid-town Manhattan. Doctoral students typically take courses at the Graduate Center, and many receive financial support for teaching at Queens as adjuncts and Graduate Assistants. Outside the laboratory sciences, the connection of doctoral students with the educational programs of the College is primarily through their teaching role. In the laboratory sciences, however, the Ph.D. programs are strongly--physically--tied to the College, as there are no centrally-appointed science faculty and no teaching or research laboratories at the Graduate Center.

More than 100 doctoral students conduct their laboratory research at Queens in the programs of Biology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Physics and Psychology. In the case of the Biology, Physics and Psychology programs, these students take the core doctoral courses on campus as well. The doctoral students form an integral part of the research effort at Queens. In addition to carrying out their research, they contribute to the projects and training of undergraduate research students who work with faculty. They participate in journal clubs and seminar series, and advance the research activities of the faculty who sponsor them.

The funding of doctoral education in the unique consortial arrangement that exists among the Graduate School and the senior colleges of CUNY is insufficient and problematic. A serious and thorough review of the funding structure is taking place at the
request of the President of the Graduate School. It is hoped by all involved that additional and stable support for graduate students can be provided and that funding mechanisms can be put into place that accurately reflect the costs of supporting doctoral education. For additional discussion, see CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES and CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

E. The Academic Future of Graduate Studies

Diminishing resources and the movement toward a more central focus within the University will inevitably raise questions about graduate programs. Financial difficulties already have forced departments to close some graduate programs and have limited some course section offerings. Many others have wrestled with the competing interests of their undergraduate and graduate programs as they have undergone Academic Program Review. Hard choices have been made.

At the same time, new programs have been developed and are proceeding successfully. The Bilingual Elementary Education Master's is meeting real community needs and attracting an enthusiastic and dedicated group of students. The M.A. program in Clinical Behavioral Applications in Mental Health Settings has been providing leadership and expertise in applied behavioral analysis in educational and treatment settings in the community. The M.A. in the Social Sciences, whose approval is pending, will draw on the strengths of all departments within the Social Sciences, and will provide a means for professional advancement to students dealing with disciplinary shifts in their own fields. The post-baccalaureate advanced certificates in education constitute formal programs enabling students without undergraduate preparation in education to obtain provisional certification as teachers. These new programs attest to the College's ability to address societal needs despite hard times and to provide quality programs of study in areas important to individual students and the community.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should commit an adequate level of support for graduate education at both the master's and doctoral levels.

IX. Program Enrollments and Degrees Conferred

The following observations are based upon information given in the Queens College Fact Book, 1994-1995, produced by the College's Office of Institutional Research. The accompanying table (Table 5-4) shows comparative (1987 and 1993) data on full-time equivalent (FTE) students, average section sizes, and degrees conferred for each department and the College as a whole. Data for both undergraduate and graduate programs are shown.
### TABLE 5-4: DATA ON ENROLLMENTS AND DEGREES CONFERRED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals of Fall FTE Students (Number in parentheses shows number of graduate students included in totals.)</th>
<th>Average Section Size</th>
<th>Total Degrees Conferred (Number in parentheses shows number of graduate students in totals.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts and Humanities Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>376 (39)</td>
<td>353 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class&amp;OrLang</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComArt&amp;Sci</td>
<td>488 (46)</td>
<td>446 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CompLiterature</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DramaTh&amp;Dan</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1064 (39)</td>
<td>922 (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GermanSlavic</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>136 (31)</td>
<td>176 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>301 (65)</td>
<td>335 (63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RomLanguages</td>
<td>414 (31)</td>
<td>455 (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVISION</strong></td>
<td>3200 (251)</td>
<td>3182 (253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mathematics and Natural Sciences Division</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>255 (11)</td>
<td>288 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChemBiochem</td>
<td>226 (7)</td>
<td>276 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComputerSci</td>
<td>524 (185)</td>
<td>493 (131)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>109 (5)</td>
<td>166 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HealthPhysEd</td>
<td>276 (52)</td>
<td>216 (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HomeEconim</td>
<td>224 (15)</td>
<td>203 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>678 (34)</td>
<td>549 (41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>188 (3)</td>
<td>192 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>633 (26)</td>
<td>687 (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIVISION</strong></td>
<td>3113 (338)</td>
<td>3072 (301)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Totals of Fall FTE Students</td>
<td>Average Section Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibrInfoStudies</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PoliticalScience</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Studies</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIVISION</td>
<td>3028</td>
<td>3538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdCommProgr</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ElemEarlyEd</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SecondaryEd</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>1106</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE TOTALS+</td>
<td>11307</td>
<td>11773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figure for 1988.
# Underestimated as students' second majors are not counted in totals.
+ For departmental majors only.

There was an increase of 7.5% in the total headcount enrollment of the College from fall 1987 (16,613) to fall 1993 (17,870), which made for a modest increase of 2.3% in the total of FTE students (from 11,507 to 11,773). But the number of degrees conferred per
annum increased by 12.8% (from 2562 degrees in 1987 to 2892 degrees in 1993).
Graduate degrees conferred increased by an even greater rate of 31.5% (from 730 to 960),
despite a 4.4% decrease in the total of FTE graduate students (from 1643 to 1570).

Since 1987, each of the College's three divisions has retained around 30% of the
College's total of FTE students, with Social Sciences (32.8% in 1993) gaining just a little in
comparison to Arts and Humanities (29.2%) and Mathematics and Natural Sciences
(28.2%). The School of Education has continued to enroll about 10% of the FTE students.
As for degrees conferred, Arts and Humanities has continued to account for about 20%,
Mathematics and Natural Sciences for about 24%, Social Sciences for about 30%, and
Education for about 26%. Average section sizes have increased most of all in Education
and in Social Sciences, the average for Social Sciences being the highest in any of the
College's divisions.

From fall 1987 to fall 1993, very sizable increases in FTE students occurred in 19 of
the College's 34 departments. For example, in the Division of Arts and Humanities, there
were increases in Classical and Oriental Languages (53.3%), Drama, Theatre, and Dance
(17.2%) and Linguistics (29.4%); in Mathematics and Natural Sciences, in Geology
(52.2%) and Chemistry (23.0%); in the Social Sciences, in History (22.9%), Library and
Information Studies (48.3%), and Urban Studies (104.8%); and in the School of Education,
in Secondary Education (11.8%).

In the same time frame, average class size has risen in 29 of 34 departments,
reflecting an increasing student body taught by fewer faculty. Increases of more than 35%
ocurred in Biology (38.1%), Comparative Literature (43.3%), Educational and
Community Programs (35.9%), Elementary and Early Childhood Education (56.1%),
Geology (115.7%), Germanic Languages (41.0%), History (38.5%), Graduate School of
Library and Information Studies (74.8%) Linguistics (78.0%), Philosophy (42.4%),
Psychology (49.2%), Secondary Education and Youth Services (35.9%) and Urban Studies
(60.5%).

For the College as a whole, the picture is one of modest growth in FTE students,
notable growth in degrees conferred, stability among the various divisions, high (sometimes
alarming) increases in average section sizes, and substantial increases of FTE students in
some key liberal arts and sciences as well as in certain pre-professional fields.

X. Means of Maintaining Quality

A. Departmental Review

Departments and programs, with their curriculum committees and advisory
committees, have primary responsibility for monitoring the quality of courses and proposing
changes in curriculum. The Academic Senate, with its undergraduate and graduate
curriculum committees, passes upon departments' and programs' proposals of curricular
change. This ensures substantive review of curricular proposals within the College.

Departmental P & B Committees, of which department chairs are the presiding members, are responsible for conducting semesterly teaching observations of untenured faculty and annual evaluations of all who are not full professors, as required by the contract between the City University and the Professional Staff Congress. Student evaluations of courses and faculty are regularly conducted under the auspices of the Academic Senate. Quite a few departments and programs (and individual instructors, too) have additional instruments of their own for eliciting student opinion. Senior faculty are appointed as mentors for all junior full-time faculty, in large part for the purpose of fostering the growth of junior faculty as teachers. Additional information may be found in CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY.

B. Academic Program Review

All aspects of a department's or a program's character and performance come under examination in an Academic Program Review, conducted through a system inaugurated at the College in 1989. By spring 1995, such reviews have been accomplished (or are under way) for 33 of the College's 34 departments and for 8 of its 10 interdisciplinary programs. A brief account of the process follows; a full account is found in the Provost's Guidelines for Academic Program Review (Appendix B).

An Academic Program Review, meant to be completed within 18 months, begins with a meeting of the Associate Provost with a department's P & B Committee (or with a program's director and advisory committee). A timetable is provided along with detailed instructions for the preparation of a self study—a comprehensive document examining matters of mission, curriculum, library, faculty, staff, facilities, funding, students, alumni, and so on. The final draft will have incorporated such improvements as the Provost and Dean may have suggested after seeing preliminary drafts. A panel of external reviewers is selected by the President in consultation with the Provost, the Dean, and the departmental (or program) committee. The reviewers are on campus for two full days of meetings, whereupon they prepare an evaluation to which the department formally responds. The department (or program) committee then meets with the President, the Provost, Associate Provost and the Dean. Needs, new directions, and feasibility of changes are discussed. The department proceeds accordingly, doing whatever available resources permit to effect the agreed-upon changes. Experience with academic program reviews over the years since 1989 has resulted in certain changes in the process, for example, in the specific topics to be addressed in self studies and in the selection of external reviewers.

6 In the years prior to the last Middle States visit in 1986, the College had undertaken a number of departmental reviews but had not followed through with a regular plan for such reviews. The recommendations emanating from the 1986 review team included one that the College develop a systematic review process for all academic programs. This recommendation was embraced in the College's Five Year Plan, 1988-1993, and was implemented by the Office of the Provost in 1989.
Benefits of the process are notable. The College's reduced financial resources can be more wisely allocated given the accurate and detailed information about departments and programs that is presented in the self studies. Priorities in hiring and in the upgrading of facilities can be established on a sound basis of collective deliberation, helpfully informed by the fresh perspectives of external reviewers. Lines of communication are improved between faculty and administrators, resulting in a better understanding all around of what needs doing and of how (or whether) it can be done. Within some departments more collaboration has been fostered among distinct curricula. Reflection upon curriculum, informed by the views of students, alumni, and external reviewers, has prompted some departments and programs to make desirable changes of emphasis or direction. Curricula or parts of curricula that are no longer viable can more readily be identified, and appropriate redeployments can be effected with better feeling on all sides. Very importantly, the system of Academic Program Review puts the College in a strong position vis-à-vis an aggressive campaign of University-wide analysis of academic programs lately mounted by CUNY's central administration. The College has been able to show that it has a rigorous system whereby academic strengths are being made all the plainer and weaknesses are more systematically addressed.

These generalities are supported by some specific outcomes. In the case of Anthropology, the external evaluation team noted four areas of concern: curriculum, space, faculty replacement and advising. In spring 1995, a sweeping overhaul of the curriculum was approved by the College's Academic Senate, including changes in courses and in the degree programs themselves. In particular, there was a rethinking of the topical courses and a change in the required theory sequence in keeping with reviewers' suggestions. Changes were also made to the minor. On space, there has been no improvement to date; plans for the renovation of Powdermaker Hall include consolidation and upgrading of the department's space. As to faculty replacements, the department has been quite successful in obtaining permission to hire and in attracting strong replacement faculty. As suggested in the self study, the department has focused on hiring symbolic/interpretive anthropologists; recent appointees have come with backgrounds in religion, ethnomusicology, psychological anthropology, gender studies, and ethnicity, and work in culture areas (South Asia, East Asia, the Caribbean and Europe) that supplement other departmental interests. Through the self study, the department identified advising as an area that needed to be improved. In fall 1994, the Anthropology Department implemented pre-registration tied to advising for the first time. During the week of pre-registration, all faculty members signed up for extra office hours. Eighty students pre-registered; a number of students filled out concentration forms or talked to an advisor for the first time. The department plans to continue and build upon this process.

Another example is Geology. The department made a convincing case to the external reviewers and to the administration that their most serious problem by far was the loss and non-replacement of faculty, which had occurred over a long time span. The department has been able to recruit and hire two new faculty members in the past two years, the first "new blood" for the department since 1975. These newly hired faculty fill
some of the critical gaps in specialties lost over the years and bring the potential for increased external funding.

One review in spring 1995 resulted in the recognition of a special asset. The Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies program has always been recognized as one of the strongest interdisciplinary programs the College has. However, the external review process brought out its unique qualities forcefully. The reviewer wrote: "Queens has the most dynamic, extensive undergraduate program in Modern Greek Studies in the States... The curriculum is one of the broadest in the field of Modern Greek Studies in the New World." The reviewer extolled the quality of the faculty who had been leading and teaching in the program, and focused on the critical need for replacement of a faculty line in Modern Greek language. This kind of recognition and advice from an outside expert will help inform the decisions of the President and Provost about authorizations to hire in the years to come.

Among faculty in departments and programs that have undergone Academic Program Review, there appears to be general agreement that some such process is desirable, having benefits such as those just enumerated. Nevertheless, interviews with many of the chairs in question have turned up dissatisfaction with some aspects of the present process. Recommendations included: reducing the volume of material required in self studies; increasing the ease by which statistics on enrollment and on degrees awarded could be obtained; and developing fuller guidelines as to the kinds of quantitative data (budgetary and otherwise) which departments should be keeping. One can surmise that many of the complaints of chairs over data issues associated with the first cycle of review will not recur, as both the departments and the Office of Institutional Research will be more cognizant of what is required to prepare a thorough and searching review. There is considerable sentiment that departments are deserving of more in the way of formal responses to their self studies by the higher administration; this criticism has, in part, been addressed by recent changes in the process.

The Associate Provost, who has been responsible for the coordination of the Academic Program Review process, has indicated that a review of the process will take place before a second round of reviews takes place. The Task Force suggested that the Executive Committee of the College P & B might be an appropriate place to initiate such a review.

It seems in order also to suggest that, in the meantime, the administration should consider ways to enhance the spirit of the whole process. The Task Force suggests, for instance, that the administration show as much concern for comprehensive, college-wide academic planning as it has shown for inspections of existing programs and for the promotion of certain new ones. A renewed sense of common institutional purpose and direction, properly appreciative of the contributions of the various elements of the College, would be right in itself and would make for a healthier climate for Academic Program Reviews. The Academic Senate should also rise to this occasion.
RECOMMENDATION: **The Provost's Office, working with the Executive Committee of the College Personnel and Budget Committee, should engage in a review of the Academic Program Review process.**

A question comes up as to the frequency with which academic program reviews should occur. There are at least 53 elements of the College that would seem to qualify for Academic Program Review: 32 regular academic departments, 11 interdisciplinary majors, 5 interdisciplinary minors, and at least another 5 academic programs that do not, however, offer majors or minors. (Programs offering only minors have not to date been subject to the regular system of review.) The College's original cycle was to be complete in five years. New CUNY regulations dictate a schedule of Academic Program Reviews not to exceed ten year intervals. Given the expansion of the review process to include non-departmentally based programs, a cycle of five to seven years appears to be the best choice.

RECOMMENDATION: **The College should adopt a five to seven year cycle for Academic Program Reviews.**

A question has arisen as to whether there should be a system whereby, in the years between Academic Program Reviews, a department or program examines itself and periodically reports on various aspects of its character and performance. Deans, chairs, program directors, and faculty committees have evident roles to play in respect to follow-up of reviews, and the indications are that on the whole they are acquitting themselves well. Those deans, however, who do not already ask their chairs and directors for annual reports on teaching, research, and service, as well as for rationalized budget requests, should do so. And chairs and directors should certainly be informed about the kinds of important records and accounts pertaining to their departments and programs that are not maintained by other College offices, or are not readily obtainable from them.

RECOMMENDATION: **All department chairs and program directors should provide their deans with annual reports on teaching, research and service; the reports should place particular emphasis on follow-up to academic program reviews.**

and

RECOMMENDATION: **The Provost and deans should advise department chairs and program directors about the kinds of records and accounts they should maintain for the purpose of developing annual reports and self studies.**

The self studies of individual departments or programs and reports of their outside reviewers are treated as confidential documents at the College. One aggregate data source available to the College community for discussion and analysis is that acquired through ETS
program-assessment questionnaires that departments and programs have given to their 
faculty, students, and alumni/ae as part of Academic Program Review. A summary is 
available of all the responses obtained during the period from July 1990 through December 
1993—responses from 402 faculty, 1229 students, and 783 alumni/ae. The responses from 
students and alumni/ae, who were not polled on any uniform basis across departments, are 
of less value than the responses from faculty. Responses from faculty were, for all intents 
and purposes, limited to those on full time appointments. The Task Force on Educational 
Programs felt that limiting the data gathering to full time faculty depriected the views of 
about 40% of the faculty, and should certainly not continue. This is another element of the 
process deserving of open review.

Passing over these defects of the data, it should be noted that the responding faculty, 
students, and alumni/ae were quite in agreement in evaluating as "good" (around 3.0 on a 
four-point scale) such aspects of their departments as "environment for learning," "scholarly 
excellence," "quality of teaching," and "faculty concern for students." Slightly higher 
ratings were accorded to "satisfaction with program" by both students (3.22) and alumni/ae 
(3.24). Rather lower marks were given to "curriculum" by faculty (2.83), students (2.47), 
and alumni/ae (2.71), and similar marks were given to "departmental procedures" and 
"available resources." Under these headings, students gave the lowest marks to "frequency 
with which courses required for the degree are offered" (2.27), "opportunities for student 
participation in departmental decisions affecting the program" (1.96), and "overall adequacy 
of financial resources in support of this program" (1.89). Nevertheless, 79% of the 
students and 77% of the alumni/ae were prepared to say they "agree" or "agree strongly" 
with the proposition "If I were starting over, I would enroll in this department/program 
again." Curiously enough, even higher percentages of students (86%) and alumni/ae (96%) 
indicated agreement or strong agreement with the proposition "I would advise a friend with 
similar interests to major in this department/program." And it is heartening indeed that 
88% of the students and exactly the same percentage of alumni/ae agreed or agreed strongly 
that "most faculty are genuinely interested in departmental majors' welfare and professional 
development." Mixed responses of students, faculty and alumni/ae (average of mean scores 
of all three: 1.91) were obtained on the matter of "opportunities for student participation in 
departmental decisions affecting the program." Departments and programs at the College 
differ significantly in this respect. In some instances, there are curriculum committees, for 
example, that have student members elected as representatives by departmental student 
organizations. The Task Force on Educational Programs felt that this ought generally to be 
the case, and new efforts to that end on the part of chairs and directors is strongly 
recommended.

C. Course and Faculty Evaluation Questionnaire

Students' participation is definitely sought via the Course and Faculty Evaluations 
periodically conducted under the auspices of the Academic Senate and published in booklet 
form. The questionnaire as it exists today was designed by the Senate in the early 1980's to 
help students choose courses. The number of questions (now eight) was greatly reduced
from earlier versions because the Senate believed that many were not valid measures of educational value.

For many years, the College has included the average scores of students' responses to the aforementioned questionnaire in the material that supports candidacy for tenure and promotion. Some are concerned that use of the Senate's questionnaire in tenure and promotion consideration puts the questionnaire to a use for which it was never intended. This issue is being examined thoroughly by the Senate's Committee on Course and Faculty Evaluation. The Committee is also reviewing the questions themselves, and will likely be recommending changes to the Academic Senate.

It should be noted here that the College P & B has recently passed a motion concerning a department's responsibility in evaluating the quality of teaching for tenure and promotion. It calls for departments and programs to develop their own methods and instruments for documenting the quality of instruction, with due testimony from students. (See CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY) This should ensure that the amount and value of evidence in the sphere of teaching will soon be in keeping with the great importance teaching has had in the faculty reward structure.

XI. Summary List of Recommendations on Academic Programs

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should thoroughly review the College's Liberal Arts and Sciences Area Requirements and students' actual choices of courses to satisfy these requirements, with special attention to evaluating student choices and performance in writing, mathematics, natural science, and world literature. <5-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate and the administration should join forces in promoting greater coordination and further cooperation among the College's many and various disciplines, interdisciplinary programs, and services. <5-2>

RECOMMENDATION: There should be vigilance in maintaining, and imagination in augmenting, services and course offerings for evening students. There should be a strengthened cadre of assistant chairs for evening programs and a renewed emphasis upon divisional deans' responsibilities for evening programs. <5-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should commit an adequate level of support for graduate education at both the master's and doctoral levels. <5-4>
RECOMMENDATION: The Provost’s Office, working with the Executive Committee of the College Personnel and Budget Committee, should engage in a review of the Academic Program Review process. <5-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should adopt a five to seven year cycle for Academic Program Reviews. <5-6>

RECOMMENDATION: All department chairs and program directors should provide their deans with annual reports on teaching, research and service; the reports should place particular emphasis on follow-up to academic program reviews. <5-7>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost and deans should advise department chairs and program directors about the kinds of records and accounts they should maintain for the purpose of developing annual reports and self studies. <5-8>
CHAPTER SIX

ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES
CHAPTER SIX: ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES

There are four major academic support services on campus. The Queens College Library and the Academic Computer Center report to the Vice President for Campus Affairs, Planning and Information Systems. The Academic Skills and Resource Center and the Center for Instructional Media Support report to the Associate Provost. All are suffering from grave shortages of funds for staff or equipment (or both). All should by rights receive substantially increased budgets at the earliest possible moment.

I. The Queens College Library

A. Structure

The Queens College Library consists of the Benjamin S. Rosenthal Library and the Music Library. The award-winning Rosenthal Library opened in 1988. The six-floor building contains the general reference, reserve, and circulating collections, periodicals, microforms, and government publications. It also houses two library classrooms, the Art Library and Art Center, the Archival Center, a large reading room open both during library hours and during times when the library is closed, 11 group study rooms, 2 seminar rooms, 59 faculty carrels, the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies, a 230 seat auditorium for campus and public events, and two conference rooms for campus events. The Music Library, opened in 1989, is located in the Aaron Copland School of Music. It has two levels, houses a collection of books, scores, journals, records, and compact disks and has a listening facility and a seminar room. Both buildings and libraries were opened since the last Middle States Association visit and provide well designed and aesthetically pleasing spaces for research, instruction, and study as well as adequate space to house collection growth well into the future. The facilities seat 1800 students with a variety of options for individual and group study.

While functioning as an essential academic support unit, the Library is also an academic department. The appointed Chief Librarian is also the department chair, and the librarians are on faculty lines. The Library, therefore, has voting representation on governance bodies, the College P & B and the Academic Senate; this is not the case for the other three academic support units.

B. Collections

The Queens College Library's mission is to provide collections and services to support the instructional programs and curriculum of the college. To the extent possible with funding allocated, the Library also tries to support faculty and advanced graduate student research, including that of doctoral students and faculty in the laboratory sciences based on campus. In recent years, it has become increasingly difficult to maintain
collections in support of undergraduate and graduate instruction; faculty research needs are not currently given high priority in acquisitions. Generally, the Library has emphasized traditional print collections, but video cassettes and electronic media are now a growing part of the collections. The Art and Music libraries collect related media (LP's, CD's, slides, pictures) but have not added laser discs or CD-ROM's because of a lack of requisite equipment. External evaluators of the music school, commenting favorably on the basic collection, noted the lack of appropriate equipment for viewing video and multimedia materials. Gifts from the Friends of the Library and the School of Education have provided requisite equipment for the Education Curriculum Center. The Library is currently seeking development funding for additional and replacement equipment to use with electronic media.

Through the mid 1980's, a network of subject bibliographers and faculty liaisons built strong undergraduate collections of monographs and serial publications following the tenets of the Library's Collection Development Policy, created after a thorough consultation with the faculty. Art, education, music, Romance languages, and science collections were particularly strong and supported advanced instruction and research. The library also purchased printed curriculum materials, English as a Second Language (ESL) materials, ethnic studies materials that supported cross-disciplinary needs, course textbooks, and recreational reading.

In the decade since the last Middle States review, the collection has grown by over 100,000 volumes to 672,400 volumes. The acquisitions budget grew through 1989/90 but has since declined steadily to less than half of that a decade ago. Consequently, the rate of collection growth has slowed considerably in the later part of this period. The journal collection grew through 1988. At 4142 titles, it was the largest within CUNY. It has declined precipitously during the last three years. Journal cancellations have been made every year since 1988, but were most dramatic in 1993-94 and 1994-95 (Table 6-1). Decreasing acquisitions budgets, rising serials costs, and the introduction of electronic databases have combined to make it difficult to sustain journal and print collections at the levels necessary to support curricular and research needs. The 1994 U.S. Periodical Price Index (USPPI), collected annually by the Library Materials Price Index Committee of the Association of Library Collections and Technical Services (a division of the American Library Association), shows a cumulative increase of 238.1 percent between 1986 and 1993, whereas the Higher Education Price Index grew 73.5 percent, and the Consumer Price Index grew 34 percent. These price increases have decreased the purchasing power of all academic libraries and have been particularly devastating when library budgets remain level or decrease as has been the case with Queens College.

Support of science programs and all graduate programs dependent on journals has diminished dramatically as journals that once represented 70% of the acquisitions budget have been cancelled. Support for doctoral studies and advanced undergraduate research in the sciences requires access to increasingly expensive research materials. Yet the Library has had to cancel key journals and indexes (e.g. Biological Abstracts; Science Citation...
Index) in order to preserve equity among the disciplines. Although articles are available free of charge to faculty and graduate students via document delivery services, this substitution does not fully meet research needs; nor does it provide access to undergraduate students. Within this fiscal climate, it has been difficult to support new curricular initiatives such as East Asian languages and business, and many of the small interdisciplinary programs that require foreign language publications. The Library no longer routinely acquires materials in foreign languages, ESL materials, multiple copies, textbooks, recreational reading, or other materials not closely allied to course requirements or faculty requests.

**TABLE 6-1 - COLLECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Volumes Added</th>
<th>Total Volumes</th>
<th>Volumes per FTE</th>
<th>Journal Titles</th>
<th>Serial Titles per FTE</th>
<th>Microforms</th>
<th>Total $88 for Library Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84-85</td>
<td>15,721</td>
<td>573,813</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>4011</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>527,135</td>
<td>$683,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-86</td>
<td>9159</td>
<td>583,973</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4028</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>553,772</td>
<td>$688,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-87</td>
<td>14,849</td>
<td>594,632</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4106</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>568,732</td>
<td>$710,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-88</td>
<td>9922</td>
<td>601,742</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>4142</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>593,627</td>
<td>$721,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>12,956</td>
<td>617,241</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>4079</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$821,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>14,741</td>
<td>630,791</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>631,766</td>
<td>$694,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>12,336</td>
<td>643,127</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>4007</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>637,302</td>
<td>$648,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>653,806</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>4015</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>570,131</td>
<td>$822,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92-93</td>
<td>9680</td>
<td>663,486</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>3963</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>612,424</td>
<td>$876,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>8910</td>
<td>672,396</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3256</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>651,887</td>
<td>$788,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$425,000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mid year estimate. Does not include allocation of $100,000 from Queens College Foundation. Totals do not include computer files.

Complicating this situation is the actual cash flow. Acquisitions funds have been released as supplements to the Library late in the College fiscal year. It has become difficult, and in some years impossible, to purchase books at the time of publication. This funding situation has made it impossible to collect systematically in key areas, and the collection has many gaps. While all divisions suffer as a result of an inadequate budget, the Arts and Humanities faculty has been particularly vocal about adverse effects on the acquisition of needed titles from abroad, from publisher backlists, and from antiquarian sources. It has also been impossible to use approval plans that aid in systematic and economical acquisition.
In view of the reduced funding to the Library in spring 1993 and in order to involve a broad cross-section of the college community in deliberations about funding collections, former President Kenny appointed a committee of deans, faculty, librarians, the Vice President for College Affairs, Planning, and Information Systems and the Acting Provost to review the allocations of the library acquisitions budget among the divisions. That committee reviewed the past and current allocations to the college divisions and the literature on fund allocation formulas but did not change distribution of allocations for the 1993-94 academic year.

The Committee was reconvened after the arrival of the new Chief Librarian in fall 1993 to recommend changes in the structure of allocation that would promote equity and meet curricular needs. The Committee made re-allocations at the divisional level, reducing the allocation to the sciences, but recognized that the root problem was the amount of overall funding available. It recommended a minimum acquisitions budget of $1.5 million to support the current academic programs. In reality, the acquisitions budget for FY 1995 is approximately $425,000.

Responding to the seriousness of a situation in which, for 1993-94, the initial acquisitions budget was 50% less than the previous year's, the Committee broadened its scope of activity to look at the future of library collections as well as the immediate fund of allocation issue. Its recommendations included: (1) restoration of the funding to a base adequate to support curricular, if not faculty and research needs; (2) acknowledgement that the collection development policy as well as library and teaching faculty assumptions need to be revised dramatically to take into account sustained underfunding of the Library, the emergence of electronic resources, and the Library's new capability to supply articles on demand; and (3) stability in the acquisitions funding process so that collection building can be planned and not be reactive to budget crises and late-in-the-year releases of reserve funds. The Committee's recommendations were sent to the President in May 1994. The Committee received an acknowledgement of the report but no formal action was taken by the administration on the recommendations. The Queens College Foundation, in recognition both of the Library's important role and of its significant resource issues, approved a one-time donation of $100,000 for 1994-95. This action facilitated the purchase of needed books, maintained the employment of some part-time staff at key public-service desks and led to the establishment of a new computer laboratory for students, complete with access to databases and the Internet.

In August 1994, the Library received a budget that was insufficient to sustain the acquisitions level of 1993-94 and far below the funding recommended by the Committee. The 1994-95 acquisitions budget required further journal cancellations including titles initially cancelled and then restored in 1993-94.

The library's strong network of bibliographers and faculty liaisons still exists. Bibliographers continue to work closely with faculty, developing coping strategies for weathering the budget cuts. Bibliographers have begun to advise faculty of the availability
of document delivery services, the table of contents service on CUNY+, and relevant resources available via the Internet. The most recent journal cancellations have delayed systematic work with faculty on a fundamental revision of the collecting policy. This process, outlined by the Collections Planning Committee, will require reexamination of basic assumptions about use of materials, research and study assignments and about the role that electronic resources and access to resources off-campus must play in the provision of information to Queens College students and faculty.

C. Access to Resources Outside Queens College

Two strengths of the library program are its full participation in the CUNY Libraries cooperative public access catalog, CUNY+, and the CUNY Open Access and Interlibrary Loan programs, which are supplemented by use of commercial document delivery sources funded centrally through the CUNY Office of Library Services. The collections of the CUNY senior colleges and the Graduate Center total over 5,600,000 items and are represented in the CUNY+ catalog, which also includes access to a number of journal newspaper indexing services. Queens students and faculty may request materials via interlibrary loan (ILL) or travel to other CUNY units to borrow materials directly and return them at Queens. The CUNY Office of Library Services has acquired the PACLOAN software which will enable validated users at each campus to request materials online from other CUNY colleges.

Faculty may request materials via an e-mail ILL request form on the campus VAX. Interlibrary loan among CUNY and other New York City institutions is strong with a daily delivery service bringing materials to campus. Most interlibrary loan needs are filled within the region of New York and New England through the reciprocal borrowing programs of the SUNY/OCLC and NELINET networks. However, borrowing material from other libraries and providing articles on demand will address only some of graduate student and faculty needs for access to research materials. Interlibrary loan and document delivery cannot supplant the need for strong local collections built in support of undergraduate curricular needs.

In the last two years, document delivery services have increasingly functioned to supply current articles to faculty and graduate students in all disciplines, and as these services are publicized, their importance will continue to grow. Faculty can receive articles directly on their office or home fax through arrangement with the ILL office. The use of commercial document delivery sources has been funded by the CUNY Office of Library Services (OLS) so that no local acquisitions funding need be reallocated to document delivery fees. The increased use of these services throughout CUNY has increased OLS costs. The program is currently being evaluated by OLS and the Council of Chief Librarians to determine how future funding should be allocated and how individual campuses should share responsibility for costs. The Council is also working with OLS to develop means for delivering full text journal articles as a substitute for selected subscriptions at individual campuses.
Faculty and students have on-site access to the rich resources of the New York Public Library research collections and limited access to the collections of academic research and special libraries through the METRO referral program, which provides access to other libraries for specific materials. The Library has a long standing reciprocal borrowing arrangement with Adelphi University and an open access agreement with St. John's University.

D. Physical Condition of the Collections

The 1985-86 Middle States Report indicated that the collections were in poor physical condition due to heavy usage, vandalism, and deterioration caused by excessive heat and lack of air conditioning in the old Library, and the acidic and brittle paper on which many items were printed. Lack of space meant that major parts of the collection were inaccessible in storage areas. Reductions in the binding of journals created thousands of unbound and unprotected issues on the shelves.

The new building has addressed the issue of better housing of the collections, and an area was created for processing, binding and book repair. However, financial resources have not been sufficient to provide adequate staff to repair books; nor have funds been adequate for commercial binding and book repair. To address the binding issue, key titles are now being acquired on microform to insure availability and conserve space. As the microform collection grows, the demand for reader/printer equipment also grows. Microform reader/printers are provided through a contractor so that equipment can be adequately maintained and upgraded. In fall 1994, two additional reader/printers were installed, but the total is inadequate for peak demand periods.

The two new buildings have addressed most of the issues raised in the last Middle States review concerning crowded, ill-housed collections, but one major problem remains: Rosenthal's temperature and humidity control. The building's HVAC does not accommodate the temperature and humidity needs of the microforms, archives, and special collections. From May through September and at other times when many people occupy the microforms reading area, humidity increases, adversely affects microforms storage and creates reader/printer malfunctions. The temperature and humidity in the Archival Center fluctuates but is generally too high for the needs of collection storage. Throughout the building, the temperature fluctuates widely with attendant problems for staff and patrons.

The elements of a preservation program have been identified but have not been implemented fully. Collection management staff routinely identify damaged materials as they return from circulation. Bibliographers review materials for repair, replacement, or withdrawal. Because funds for repair and replacement are limited, materials are usually returned to the shelves or are held in the binding unit until funds are available for repair. After a hiatus of several years, funds were allocated in 1993-94 and 1994-95 for binding current and back volumes of journals and for use of commercial book repair services for books requiring skills beyond those of the staff. Progress was made but a backlog of binding still remains.
E. Services

The Rosenthal Library is open 66 hours per week (9 am - 9 pm, Monday-Thursday, 9 am - 5 pm Friday, and 12 pm - 5 pm Saturday/Sunday). These hours have remained constant over the last decade. Queens College is the only CUNY senior college to have Sunday service. In addition, the Rosenthal Reading Room is open one hour before and after the library opens and closes, and for 24 hours a day during examination week. The only library service available in the Reading Room during this time is access to the resources of CUNY+ via terminals accessible to students familiar with QCNET (but not to those only familiar with the library’s public catalog access terminals). The Music and Art Libraries are open fewer hours, generally 11 am - 7 pm (Monday-Thursday) and 9 am - 5 pm (Fridays). The Louis Armstrong Archives, located in Rosenthal, are open from 10 am to 4:30 pm weekdays. During intersessions and summer sessions the Library is open 9 am - 5 pm, Monday - Friday. Additional stipends from Summer Session fund two evenings of service per week during summer sessions. The 66 hours of public service per week place Queens College in the lowest 10% of its Carnegie Classification. The recent external review of the School of Music commented negatively on the reduced staffing and consequently reduced hours of the Music Library. In response to one of their concerns, hours have been added to the listening facility during periods when music students have examinations.

Regarding access to the Library in general, there is a demand for additional hours on weekends, and during intersessions and summer sessions. However, with faculty and support staff declining and temporary services budgets already under pressure, it has not been possible to increase the hours of service.

The organization of library services changed dramatically when the library occupied its new building. Separate subject divisions for Science and Education were merged into one collection and one reference desk. The Art Library was retained as a separate entity on the sixth floor of Rosenthal, and the Music Library moved to the new Music Building. Subject specialists who had worked in the Education and Science libraries retained their specialties but broadened the scope of their responsibilities to include general reference and instructional activities. This organizational structure and faculty resilience have provided the flexibility to continue to offer services.

Circulation, Reserve, and Collection Management services have benefited from the implementation of an integrated system for public access catalog, circulation, and technical services processing. With loss of professional staff in technical services areas, efforts to complete retrospective conversion of the catalog records for music, educational curriculum materials, and juvenile titles slowed, as did linkage of circulation records from an earlier system to CUNY+ bibliographic records. As these projects are completed over time, the accuracy of the Queens holdings in the CUNY+ catalog will increase, as will the efficiency of access service units that use these records in their daily work.

During fall 1994, the Library expanded the number of databases available via CD-ROM and installed the long awaited CD-ROM local area network. Workstations were networked to
provide access to 6 databases (Psychlit, Sociofile, ERIC, MLA, PAIS, America: History & Life). A separate CD-ROM workstation provides access to government statistical and textual publications. Also during 1994, the number of journal databases available via CUNY+ was expanded from two (general periodicals and newspapers) to twelve. In an innovative approach, OLS programming provides a NOTIS interface for 10 OCLC First Search databases (Medline, Contents First, Article First, and 6 Wilson Indexes) and connections to SUNY Binghamton (ABI Inform), Stony Brook (Dissertation Abstracts) and Buffalo (ERIC). The CUNY+ databases are available throughout campus and from home through dial access so that faculty and students have excellent access to the databases. The increased number of databases available through CUNY+ and CD-ROMs increases the complexity of these systems, and hence the demand for instruction in their use. Despite the excellent tutorials contained in CUNY+ and the CD-ROMs, students often prefer immediate answers to their specific problems. During fall 1994, special CUNY+ workshops were offered in October and November to assist students in learning the fundamentals of these systems.

Statistics reported annually to the NY State Education Department do not indicate a dramatic increase in the number of reference questions, but librarians report the nature of the contacts has changed. Students now require more basic information on types of information available, the concept of a computerized catalog, and the use of an online catalog and its multiple databases before they can address the actual subject at hand. The Reference Librarians are considering different service models so that they can provide personal assistance to a wide range of users, maintain their collection development and liaison responsibilities, and teach classes and workshops.

The core of the professional service program is individualized reference service during all hours the building is open, group instruction through scheduled classes, a two-credit elective course for upper level freshman and above, and a pilot program of workshops on electronic information resources. Cooperative programs with area high schools lay foundations for future independent library users at Queens and other CUNY institutions.

The instructional program continues to be anchored in English 110, SEEK, CESL, ACE, and other skills-based courses. Expansion of the program requires both change in the College's view of incorporating information management skills into its curricular requirements and the ability of the library faculty to increase the number of classes it can teach while sustaining other reference services. The Freshman Year Initiative program is being used as a pilot for changes in the basic approach to library course-related instruction. A positive note is the recommendation of the 1994-1999 Five Year Planning Report to create an experimental course for freshmen that would include an information management-library component as one of the skills necessary for college success. The recommendation has been referred to the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for its consideration.

The credit-bearing course, Library 150, is a model for the type of instruction all students should receive. However, as an elective, it enrolls between 20 and 25 students each semester. Because this is a very faculty-intensive activity, the Library has not been able to sustain the course as one of the core activities of the Information Services Department.
Adjunct funding had in the past been provided to hire staff or compensate reference librarians for additional assignments but is no longer available. Without adjunct funds, the course is taught as a voluntary overload by a librarian who receives compensatory time as the department schedule allows. The course will not be offered during spring 1995 because of continuing faculty vacancies.

F. Faculty and Staff Resources

Since the last Middle States review, the Library's staff dropped from 30 faculty librarians and 40 civil service to 20 faculty and 31 civil service staff. Six vacancies occurred since the beginning of the 1995 fiscal year, and all positions were frozen for the year. The dollars allocated to the Library per student FTE has dropped from $272 in 1985-86 to $235 in 1992-93; these figures are not adjusted for inflation. The number of students per librarian has risen from 408:1 to 567:1 in the same time period. With the recent departures, this latter figure will be even higher.

Temporary Services funds have been used to fill selectively some of the gaps created by lost or unfunded clerical lines, allowing for the hiring of student aides and college assistants for stack and collection maintenance activities and as access service desk attendants for evenings and weekends. These measures are insufficient to address the needs in the technical services and systems support operations. Morale of the full time civil service staff declines as they are asked to increase the scope of their duties and take on assignments of those who leave.

Faculty vacancies once had been provided for by substitute librarians hired during the vacancy period or by an infusion of funds to hire adjunct librarians. However, the substitute salaries are no longer available. Therefore, temporary services funds have been stretched to provide for adjunct library faculty for reference desk coverage, while book selection activities and instruction have been absorbed by overloads of several librarians. Each semester a service plan has to be devised for most efficient deployment of professional staff for instructional and other service activities. Each redeployment creates pressure and reduces service somewhere. When the cataloging skills of the music librarian were shifted halftime to compensate for looses in the central technical services unit, it decreased the efficiency of the music library. As a consequence, the external review of the music school commented unfavorably on the number of music librarians and support staff.

The faculty and staff continue to be motivated by a strong sense of service to the college community and continue to try to sustain a high level of service. They are often frustrated by their inability to increase service and outreach especially in the area of basic instruction in library use. The changing technologies of information provision also create a need for ongoing continuing education at all levels and a continual upgrading of staff and public access equipment. There has been significant progress in implementing new technologies in the last two years and in increasing faculty and staff abilities to retrieve networked information and communicate electronically with the campus community and their peers at other institutions.
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G. Future Directions

A planning process initiated in February 1994 has produced recommendations for priorities, actions, and resources in areas of services, collections, staff development, assessment of service and program effectiveness, and internal and external communication. Some of the recommendations cannot be implemented because of the continuing fiscal situation; others must be implemented because of that situation. A full revision of collection policies is required to address the realities of the library budget, new access options, and specific instructional needs of academic programs. The committee leading the department's Program Review1 has documented the need for continuing assessment of the effectiveness of internal and external activities and services in order to focus the department's collective energies on efficient delivery of essential services and revision or elimination of activities that cannot be supported with current resources.

II. The Academic Computer Center

A. Overview of Facilities and Services

Academic and personal computing services are administered through the Academic Computer Center (ACC). User facilities managed or co-managed by the ACC are located in I-Building, the New Science Building, Rosenthal Library, and Powdermaker Hall. Two large central computing systems are available: the on-campus DEC VAX 6000-420 system, which runs the VMS operating systems, and the IBM systems located at the University computer Center in Manhattan. The ACC supports a DEC 8600 which runs the Ultrix (Unix) operating system, and operates a growing Ethernet network that connects many departments and computer labs. An asynchronous data communications network, known as QCNET, allows any connected on-campus terminal to access any of the central computer systems. This network can also be accessed via dial-up ports.

Extensive personal computer facilities are available. Those located in NSB A-135 and the second floor of I-Building are managed by the ACC. The facility in Powdermaker Hall is operated jointly by the ACC and the Social Sciences Division. Others are operated by various departments including Academic Skills, Biology, Computer Science, Education, Physics, Psychology, and Sociology. Systems include various IBM PCs and compatibles, and Apple MacIntoshes. Numerous laser printers are available, as are dot-matrix printers, text and graphics scanners, and CD-ROM readers. A wide range of software is provided.

The ACC provides seminars and workshops, self-paced instruction, free documentation, and documentation libraries. Other services for personal computer users include consulting on hardware purchases, setting up hardware acquisitions, supplying certain software packages, installing software, distributing computer supplies, running a telephone help line, diagnosing hardware and software problems, and doing repairs. Each semester the

1 The Library recently completed its comprehensive Self Study and was visited by an external evaluation team in May 1995. The entire Self Study will be available to the Middle States Evaluation Team.
ACC conducts a series of seminars and workshops for faculty, staff, and students to familiarize new and continuing users with the central and personal computing systems supported at the College. Special topics workshops focus on particular applications such as inter-system communication, statistical packages, graphics, and document preparation. The ACC conducts classes for novice and advanced personal computer users, maintains information on commercial training products, and provides self-paced instructional materials on specific programs.

B. Analysis of Facilities and Services

The College has been faced with an explosion in the demand for personal computer facilities. It has been successful in significantly increasing access to such facilities, as evidenced by the new labs opened in NSB and Rosenthal Library. With space available in I- Building, the College is positioned to expand its facilities further should funds become available. Declining financial resources have presented the major difficulty. Much of the ACC budget is tied to fixed costs for software contracts, supplies, and maintenance of the VAX system, leaving little for other needs. An external evaluation (EDUCOM, 1992) found that the expenditure for academic computing per student at Queens College was considerably below the national average.

There has been a strong planning process for addressing academic computing needs, though full implementation of measures has been hampered by financial constraints. The Implementation Committee for the Queens College Five-Year Plan cited greater incorporation of computers into the College's academic program as one of the two highest priorities. Similarly, the separate planning committees on faculty, students, facilities, and computers recommended that the College take steps to create computer classrooms accessible to all departments; increase the number of open-access computers; add a requirement to the curriculum that all students demonstrate proficiency in the use of word processors, data bases, and spreadsheets; and that a "computers across the curriculum" campaign be initiated that would parallel similar "writing across the curriculum" efforts. Unfortunately, such ambitious plans cannot be implemented without increased funding.

Other computing problems have also not been addressed because of inadequate funding. For example, campus-wide telecommunications are incomplete, notwithstanding improvements made over the last five years. Approximately half of the faculty and administrators still do not have computers at their desks, and do not have access to e-mail, to campus or CUNY-based networks, and to external networks. In addition, the asynchronous and 3270 networks must be coordinated with Ethernet and eventually phased out. Furthermore, while computer labs have increased, there still remains insufficient computer equipment for learning and teaching. College facilities, particularly for open-access laboratories and multi-media equipped classrooms, are not keeping up with student and faculty demand. The Queens College ratio of 1 PC for every 180 students is well below the standard of 1 to 45 (EDUCOM/USC Survey of Desktop Computing, 1990). An infusion of funds is necessary to address these needs.

At the same time, the ACC has coped with financial adversity, accomplishing much
with limited resources. Its strength lies in its flexibility and in its willingness and ability to meet individual needs. As computer facilities become more decentralized on campus, the effectiveness of the ACC staffing model, which is still very much centralized, will be tested, and it may be necessary to revise the existing operations arrangement. The proliferation of personal computers also raises serious issues of standards, maintenance, and training of users. As presently structured, the ACC cannot control what people buy, and every personal computer purchase implies a maintenance strategy. Users must also be comfortable with and informed about manipulating the technology. A coherent plan needs to be formulated to address these issues in a time of bleak fiscal prospects.

III. Academic Skills and Resource Center (ASRC) and College English as a Second Language Program (CESL)

A. Administrative Structure and Services

The ASRC consists of three administrative units: the Reading and Writing units and the Office of Assessment Testing. The ASRC director also serves as Director of CESL; support and instructional services for non-native speakers of English are, therefore, thoroughly integrated. The Reading unit offers the College Reading course, administers the Reading Laboratory, and provides tutoring support in reading. The Writing unit operates the Writing Skills Workshop, a tutorial center for students needing assistance with English composition skills. The Testing Office is responsible for administering the University-mandated basic skills examinations in reading, writing, and math, known as the CUNY Assessment Test (CAT), which must be passed by the time a student earns 61 credits. It also administers the College Math Placement Test. The CESL Program offers credit-bearing and non-credit courses in reading, writing, and communication skills, at various levels, to non-native speakers with limited facility in English. Placement is based on performance on the CAT. The emphasis in the ASRC tutoring programs is on preparing students to pass the CAT in Reading and Writing. Ninety percent of the students partaking of the services are ESL students, most of whom are concurrently taking courses in the CESL Program or in English Department composition courses. Others have gone through the College's CESL, reading, and composition sequence, but still need assistance in passing the CAT.

ASRC also administers the very successful skills immersion programs, offered during the summer and the January intersession. These intensive non-credit courses are designed to help students pass the CAT or improve their placement level in the CESL sequence. Skills courses in math have a pass rate on the math section of the CAT of 85-90%. While the post-course scores on the reading and writing portions are not as high, a majority of students either pass or improve their placement levels, helping them to accelerate their mastery of English. This program is funded through a separate University allocation to the College.

B. Analysis

In fall 1994, ASRC/CESL completed its self study report as part of the College's Academic Program Review process. The Self Study thoroughly describes both the ASRC and
the CESL sequence, and analyzes the challenges that have faced the program in a period of declining funding. This unit was particularly hurt by recent cuts because much of the budget was dependent upon the Temporary Services and adjunct budgets—categories which were hit much harder than the full-time personnel budget was. External evaluators confirmed the administrative and academic effectiveness of the programs, pointing out that they are well-managed, efficiently run, and instructionally sound. However, the reviewers expressed concern over the pattern of declining financial support in recent years. In the face of increasing numbers of ESL students, a trend that is expected to continue through the year 2000, the reviewers strongly recommended that the College increase its support of these programs to ensure their viability. Planning is needed so that sufficient full-time and part-time staff can be hired to respond to the growing demand for services and to develop programs. If the College wants to retain language-minority students and have them achieve academic success, such planning must be made a high priority. In response, the President released a small additional allocation for FY 1995, and the President and Provost have established hiring more full time faculty for this program as a high priority.

IV. The Center for Instructional Media Support (CIMS)

A. Overview of Facilities and Services

CIMS, like the Academic Skills and Resource Center, reports to the Provost’s Office. It is responsible for providing all audiovisual and media-related services on campus in support of the College’s instructional and research programs, special College events such as conferences, seminars, and commencement, and the College’s external affairs and public relations efforts. The five divisions of CIMS are Audiovisual, Film Library & Technical Services, the Individualized Learning Resources Laboratory (which houses the College’s language labs), Multimedia Services (computer authored and multi-projector design and presentation functions), Photographic Services, and Video Production Services. CIMS is in operation during all of the hours that the College is open, as well as by special arrangement on weekends or holidays when particular College events require support.

The full-time staff of the Center consists of higher education officers (HEOs), tenured senior and regular college laboratory technicians (CLTs), and a professional administrative assistant. In order to manage the variety and quantity of services provided (last year over 6500 classroom-related services alone), CIMS also relies heavily on its part-time support staff. The Center has fully equipped secure storerooms throughout the campus, and it services virtually all College buildings where classes are offered.

CIMS is actively involved in all aspects of emerging information technologies. Satellite tele-conferencing (both C-band and Ku-band) is supported. The staff are becoming increasingly conversant in the use of multimedia computers and related authoring software (Macromedia Authorware, Asymetrix Toolbook, etc.). CIMS administrators provide extensive consulting services in media program design, hardware specification/purchase, and
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conference/special events planning for all elements of the College community; this includes, of course, assisting faculty with those portions of their grant proposals relating to media equipment and services.

B. Analysis of Facilities and Services

The strength of CIMS lies in the professionalism, dedication, and high level of technical expertise of both its full-time and part-time staff. Despite severe staffing shortages, CIMS commits itself to provide the best possible media services to the Queens College community, and between 95% and 98% of all services requisitions submitted by faculty are honored for the original date requested. The Center, which has been in operation (under one name or another) since 1948, has always benefited from the active support of a media-conscious and technically sophisticated faculty and administration who recognize the important role that instructional media technologies play in higher education.

The major problems confronting CIMS are akin to those confronting the College's other support services. Funding has steadily eroded. In the mid-1980's, CIMS regularly received an annual combined equipment, supplies, and temporary services budget of approximately $200,000. That figure was cut three years ago to $89,000 and then cut again last year to about $50,000. During the last seven or eight years, the full-time staff of the Center has declined from 21 employees to 14. This reduction came about as a result of the University's early retirement incentive programs, and none of the retirees (highly skilled technicians) has been replaced. In order to remain "in business," CIMS has had to make a number of very painful decisions, such as first reducing, and later entirely eliminating, all film and videotape rentals and purchases. The College used to provide the academic program with a $16,000 per year rental budget for classroom instructional materials, and an additional $16,000 per year for acquisition of new film and video titles. Today, if an instructor wants to show his or her class a film or video not available from the College or University Consortium collections, he or she must use either departmental funds or personal funds (as many faculty do) to rent these materials.

CIMS has undergone a number of major internal reorganizations in an effort to continue to provide the College with necessary support services despite diminishing resources. Full-time professional staff have been redeployed on a rotating basis to lend assistance in the delivery of audiovisual equipment and services to classrooms. For example, the College's photographer and videographer, in addition to their technically-specific daily responsibilities, now also regularly deliver equipment to classrooms, project films, etc. The Director and Assistant Director also perform delivery services where necessary and often provide all technical support for conferences and special events, so that daily classroom support activities can continue unimpeded. Creative redeployment of CIMS staff have filled gaps elsewhere in the College. For example, the Film Librarian has been relocated to the Library where she fulfills all the film reference activities she previously had and is assuming additional functions which help to fill the voids created by the loss of library staff who have not been replaced. The budget problems of recent years have dictated that virtually all funding received be expended for part-timers' salaries, except for a small sum to purchase essential supplies. Very little new
equipment has been obtained. If this trend continues, the reliability and professional quality of services will be severely compromised, as aging equipment reaches the end of its usable life-span.

V. Needs of the Academic Support Services

The preceding sections have documented clearly that the academic support units are serving the instructional needs of the College to the best of their abilities. Each unit holds to high professional standards of service and makes excellent use of the resources it receives. Each knows what it could be doing better with more resources.

There is a broad sense on campus that the trend toward diminished resources for these units must be stopped, and to the extent possible, reversed. While some faculty still feel that preservation of faculty lines is the top budget priority, many faculty from all divisions and senior administrators feel that resource allocation or re-allocation is needed. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should give high priority in resource allocation or re-allocation to increased funding for the Library, particularly for acquisitions and faculty lines. <6-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should give priority for resource allocation or re-allocation to increased funding for academic skills, academic computing and instructional media. <6-2>

VI. Summary List of Recommendations on Academic Support Services

RECOMMENDATION: The College should give high priority in resource allocation or re-allocation to increased funding for the Library, particularly for acquisitions and faculty lines. <6-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should give priority for resource allocation or re-allocation to increased funding for academic skills, academic computing and instructional media. <6-2>
VEN: SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAMS

This chapter describes and analyzes programs and activities affiliated with, and formal credit-bearing programs of the College: the research centers and comprise the College's organized research efforts, the non-credit programs of the College, the College's special collaborations with schools, and the wide cultural enrichment to the campus community and the public at large.

Research

The College has nine research centers and institutes that operate under these designations. Centers are considered to be campus-based, while institutes are university-wide resources. Most are dependent upon external support for 50% of their funding; four receive some tax levy support for staff and salaries. In addition to these formally designated research entities, a group led with the College's History Department has been working on The Morris Project; a brief description of their accomplishments is also given.

American Center

In 1987, the Asian/American Center supports community-oriented research of diaspora experience of Asians in North, Central and South America and the Center is one of only three university-based Asian American research centers. Emphasizing an interdisciplinary cultural studies approach, the center’s knowledge is both rooted in local experience and broadly. Center's outreach activities include its Translations Program, Resource Services, and the Asiam American Center. Current Sources include the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the, and Queens Borough President's Office.

Calandra Italian American Institute

End by a grant in 1979, the John D. Calandra Italian American Institute was the efforts of New York State Italian American legislators to address the and concerns of Italian American students and faculty at CUNY and in
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*the Center for Labor and Urban Programs, Research and Analysis is in the process of being named its director, Professor Herbert Bienstock.

*Estimates have been receiving substantial funds from the University's organized research.

*Asian/American Center, the Calandra Institute, the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems,
the community at large. The Institute became affiliated with Queens College in 1994. Its mission—to foster higher education among Italian Americans—is accomplished through its Career Counseling Center, Campus Based and Outreach Counseling Programs, Resource Center, Research Library and various community projects. Funding is derived exclusively from the tax levy budget.

C. Center for the Biology of Natural Systems

The Center for the Biology of Natural Systems (CBNS) conducts a program of research and education relating to environmental, energy and resource problems. Besides analyzing the origins of and devising alternative solutions to environmental, energy and resource problems, CBNS assists governmental agencies and community organizations concerned with these problems and provides community organizations, and the community generally, with educational services on the technical and economic background of environmental, energy and resource issues.

CBNS is currently undertaking two new initiatives: environmental audits of the New York City budget and generation of more accessible publications for the community. Current sources of external funding include the Pew Charitable Trusts, the New York Community Trust, the Joyce Foundation, the New York City Department of Environmental Protection and the New York Legislature (member's item). In addition to University funding from Organized Research, CBNS also receives an allocation from the CUNY Workforce Development Initiative.

D. Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies

The Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies promotes and supports Byzantine and neo-Hellenic scholarship and publications, provides student support and relates academic teaching and research to the Greek American community in New York and beyond. The Center sponsors lectures and symposia, issues a newsletter and maintains a special library collection. It also publishes an annual, Journal of Modern Hellenism, which first appeared in 1984. The Center is self-sustaining through gifts from private individuals, corporations and foundations.

E. Center for the Improvement of Education

The Center for the Improvement of Education is involved with innovation, implementation and research in curriculum design, administration and effective school/family/community relationships. The Center conducts experimental projects and collects and analyzes data on the creative, intellectual, emotional and physical growth of pre-adolescent and early adolescent children, and has close working relationships with the Louis Armstrong Middle School in Queens. Recently it has established partnerships with elementary, middle, junior high and high schools. Its funding comes from the New York City Board of Education and individual school districts.
F. Center for Jewish Studies

The Center for Jewish Studies promotes scholarship, conferences, seminars and publications connected with the various disciplines related to Jewish Studies. By bringing together humanists, social scientists, theologians and others sharing an interest in Jewish Studies, the Center provides a means for dialogue and for the cross-fertilization of ideas. The Center has a long history of sponsorship of the Jewish Lecture Series, aimed at both the college and local communities. The Center is self-sustaining through gifts, endowment income and foundation support.

G. Center for the New American Workforce

Begun in 1991, the Center for the New American Workforce is devoted to making diversity work in corporate America. Its mission is to enable employers, primarily large corporations in the New York metropolitan area, to become more efficient, responsive, productive, profitable and competitive in domestic and foreign markets by understanding and effectively utilizing America's diverse workforce. The Center provides continuing education through training and seminars, and sponsors public events on the issues of workforce diversity. The Center obtains support from corporations and foundations.

H. Michael Harrington Center for Democratic Values and Social Change

The Michael Harrington Center for Democratic Values and Social Change is a policy research, educational and advocacy organization established in 1989 to link equity and social justice to public policies. While the Center's activities have an international component, they largely focus on issues relevant to the United States. The Center publishes a newsletter and a working papers series, and sponsors conferences, workshops and discussion groups. It serves as a resource to those concerned with the poverty of inner cities and that derived from ethnic, racial and gender subordination. Funding comes from foundations, contributions and tax levy support.

I. Labor Resource Center

The Labor Resource Center provides labor-related resources and educational services to the College, the public and the labor community. It collects, prepares and distributes educational material and promotes discussion and debate on labor issues. This includes housing a special library and film collection, developing instructional materials, providing a clipping service and distributing labor-related documents and publications. The Center organizes conferences and special lecture series. The Center is supported by grants from labor unions and by support the New York State Legislature (member's item).

J. The Papers of Robert Morris Project

The Papers of Robert Morris Project, founded in 1968, is publishing the papers of
Robert Morris as Superintendent of Finance (Secretary of the Treasury) and Agent of Marine (Secretary of the Navy) of the United States from 1781-1784. Seven volumes have been published to date; volume eight is in press; and the work on the final volume, microform supplement and cumulative index is well underway.

Supplementary project activities have included student training, articles, papers, lectures, exhibits and essay contests. Primary funding is from the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Historical Publications and Records Commission, with matching funds from private foundations, businesses and individuals. Since its founding, the Project has raised nearly $3 million in external funding.

II. Non-credit Programs

In pursuit of its outreach mission to the Queens community, the College offers a variety of non-credit programs, courses, and conferences for both children and adults. These include the various components of the Continuing Education Program (CEP)—plus the Center for Preparatory Studies in Music (CPSM), the Athletic and Recreation Program, and the Center for Environmental Teaching and Research. All of these programs, except for the Athletic and Recreation Program, are fee-based and self-supporting. The Athletic and Recreation Program also includes credit-bearing college athletic programs.

The non-credit programs operate through Income Fund Reimbursibles (IFR’s) and are charged for operating costs by the State and the College—11.6% to the State and 5.9% to the College. This contribution, 17.5% of income, has created a financial hardship, especially with decreasing enrollments, contractually mandated faculty and staff salary increases, and realistic limitations in course fee increases. Despite this significant overhead cost, the Continuing Education Programs have made substantial fiscal contributions to the College, totaling in the millions. See CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES.

A. Continuing Education Programs

The Executive Director of the Continuing Education Programs reports to the Provost and oversees the programs and administration of the College’s Continuing Education Program (CEP), the English Language Institute (ELI), English as a Second Language (ESL), and the Center for Unlimited Education (CUE).

1. The Continuing Education Program (CEP)

CEP offers non-credit courses for professional and personal development. Certificates can be earned in Business Development, Management & Supervision, Nonprofit Management, Microcomputer Programming, Word Processing, Desktop Publishing, Paralegal Studies, Medical Billing & Reimbursement, Medical Office Management, Chiropractic Assistant, Medical Records, Child Care Assistant, Real Estate, Alcoholism Counseling, and Interior Design. Personal Development courses include academic skills,
languages, consumer survival, money management, adult counseling, arts and humanities, and cultural/religious studies.

Courses and certificate programs are demand-driven at the request of students or according to the needs of the local business community. The continuation of the weak economy has resulted in an increase in certificate programs that enable an individual to learn a new profession or advance in the current one. During the last Middle States evaluation, 6 certificate programs were available; currently, there are 17. Conversely, personal development courses have shown a marked decline in registration, as participants gear their resources toward professional needs. CEP has grown to 4000 student enrollments during the fall and spring semesters, and 2500 during the summer, for a total of approximately 11,000 student enrollments a year. Students are from all social and economic strata, and include residents from all the racial, ethnic, and religious communities found in Queens. Ages range from 7 to 83. CEP has expanded its services to include children and adolescents. High school tutorial and test preparation courses have been offered since the last Middle States evaluation. In 1994-95, a special academic program was implemented for young children, including improvement and enrichment of math, reading, and computer skills.

Areas of concern for CEP involve the need for more classroom and office space. CEP has modernized the Temp 1 building so that many more courses can be offered during the day. Office space for CEP personnel in Kiely Hall presents a significant problem: often two or three managers are housed in an office originally designed for one person, creating problems of morale and productivity. The College has tried to alleviate the situation; however additional space would have been in a location other than Kiely, and the program's director has not wanted to relocate the program away from its current central location.

2. English as a Second Language (ESL)

ESL\(^2\) is a non-credit program whose mission is to enable the Queens non-English speaking population to improve reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills in English. About 15% of the ESL students enter credit-bearing programs in the College. The huge increase of new immigrants in the Borough of Queens in the last ten years has created a large and diverse population of students who must learn English to be able to lead successful and productive lives. The average class size of ESL has grown from 18 to 25 in the last decade. ESL offers three semesters of courses a year, with enrollments in fall 1994 standing at approximately 1000; 25% are evening, 35% day, and 40% Saturday. This is a decrease from previous years, as many persons in the student population cannot afford even the current reasonable costs of this program.

\(^2\) ESL is not to be confused with College English as a Second Language (CESL) which is credit-bearing, and administered in conjunction with the College's Academic Skills and Resource Center; see CHAPTER SIX.
3. The English Language Institute (ELI)

ELI, celebrating its fiftieth anniversary in 1995, is an intensive non-credit English program to prepare students to perform at college level. Most students in the program are on foreign visa status. The ELI has moved recently into computer-assisted language learning and has developed programs with teacher-training in the Department of Linguistics and the School of Education. ELI plans to offer new mini-courses to take better advantage of the College’s intersession periods. Serious problems include severe limitations on available classroom and office space as well as growing competition from other language programs outside the college.

4. Center for Unlimited Enrichment (CUE)

CUE was founded in 1981 to provide educational, cultural, and social programs for older adults. At that time, 75 students registered for courses. Since then the program has expanded greatly, and the registration for fall 1994 was 775. Typically, courses are offered in such fields as music, art, literature, theater, philosophy, social geography, writing, law, politics, and fitness. Students have access to the reading rooms at the College Library and are able to participate in the College’s recreational and cultural events.

B. The Center for Preparatory Studies in Music (CPSM)

Located in the new building of the Aaron Copland School of Music, CPSM is a comprehensive music school which offers a wide variety of programs for children, from preschool through high school. CPSM began in 1981 with 75 students and currently has an enrollment of 375. Classes meet on the weekend, and private lessons are also arranged for either weekend or after-school hours. Lessons are given on all instruments of the band and orchestra, in voice, piano, musicianship, chorus and chamber music. The curriculum includes six levels of expertise, grouped according to capability. Evaluation of students and the program include performance juries, mini-concerts, homework, and tests. In addition, evaluation forms are mailed to parents and teachers.

Functionally, the CPSM operates within the Copland School; certain administrative functions are performed on a contractual basis by CEP (see above). Of special note is the participation of CPSM students in the recent premiere of The Village, an opera with libretto by Professor Susan Fox (English), composed by Professor Joel Mandelbaum (Music) and directed by Professor Susan Einhorn (Drama, Theatre and Dance).

C. The Athletic and Recreation Programs

The College’s Athletic and Recreation Programs have both credit and non-credit elements and are administered by a single director. The credit-bearing athletic element consists of varsity programming, available to matriculated students. These varsity
teams, some of which have established names in regional competition. Larger yet, however, is the program's non-credit recreational element, which offers activities to faculty, students, and the local community on a fee-paying basis. The recreation program was established in 1980 and has doubled in population since the last Middle States evaluation. Programming is offered seven days a week and most nights. In addition, since 1989, a summer children's camp has been offered and has been a major success. Enrollment has increased from 90 per week in 1989 to 1000 per week in 1994.

During the last few years, the Athletic and Recreation Program has evaluated itself through a departmental review, and it conducts an annual evaluation of its faculty. In addition, it periodically surveys the users of its facilities and programs, and it keeps headcounts of its clients' use of various facilities. The program has identified problems and concerns with its physical facilities. The pool and gym are inadequate to meet the needs of the program and are not well maintained. The program has plans for improvement and expansion during the next few years. In 1995, it hopes to open a new tennis center, and it currently has a capital request before the University to renovate Fitzgerald Gymnasium, which includes adding another swimming pool and installing racquetball courts.

D. The Queens College Center for Environmental Teaching and Research

The Center is located at the former home of Marshall Field, a facility leased to the College in what is now Caumsett State Park on Lloyd Neck in Huntington, Long Island. This facility serves as a field station for student and faculty research, and as a conference center with sleeping accommodations and food service. Weekend seminars there have been a great success with Queens students. It is heavily used for field trips by groups of school children from all over the region, and summer programs for children are provided.

III. Collaboration with Schools

A. Townsend Harris High School

Townsend Harris High School, closed in 1942 but remembered for its excellent humanities program and distinguished alumni (e.g., Jonas Salk), was reopened in 1984, through the joint efforts of Queens College and the New York City Board of Education. In spring 1995, Townsend Harris moved into a new building located on the College's campus. This will provide opportunities for the school's students to participate daily in the life of the College, and it will give them easy access to numerous research and service projects and programs.

Townsend Harris continues today its tradition of intensive humanities education and high student achievement. It was rated 4th highest in average SAT scores (after only Stuyvesant and Bronx Science), and highest in the City for math and reading scores.

---

Against a City average of 62% in math and 74% in reading, students at Townsend Harris were number one in the City, averaging 100% in math and 99.2% in reading.

The collaboration between Queens College and Townsend Harris High School has many advantages. There is regular interaction between faculty at the College and the faculty, students, and staff at the school. Faculty at the College are afforded opportunities to examine the implications of applying rigorous academic standards to an entire high school population and to observe the benefits of accelerated learning, high scholarly expectations, and a college environment. Seniors at Townsend Harris are eligible to take, besides their courses at the school, two courses per semester at Queens. A Humanities Seminar, team-taught by College and high school faculty, is the centerpiece of the senior year. Many Townsend Harris students participate in College events and service projects, both on campus and off. Other contributions of the College to the Townsend Harris experience include teacher training in the sciences, the mentoring of students in several fields (science, social studies, mathematics, computer science, art, and music), and access for students and faculty to the Internet through QCNet arrangements. Many new projects are planned for the near future—in educational technology, in community service, and in writing, to mention but a few. Special workshops on teaching are being set up. An arrangement is being made for placement of Counselor Education interns in the school. And the Humanities Seminar is currently undergoing evaluation by a committee of faculty from both the College and Townsend Harris.

B. The Louis Armstrong Middle School

For sixteen years the College has maintained a collaborative relationship with Intermediate School 227, the Louis Armstrong School, which was declared a model among middle schools by the U.S. Department of Education in 1983. Located in East Elmhurst, the school has a student population that is representative of the ethnicities and achievement patterns of the Borough of Queens. A third of the students are drawn from the lowest third of elementary schools in achievement. Queens faculty and staff from the School of Education offer a unique on-site teacher preparation program for persons choosing teaching as a second career; staff development programs for teachers in the areas of mathematics, special education, physical education and science; special enrichment activities for students in art and music; and consultation with teachers and administrators in implementing the principles of middle school education.

C. Project SCOPE

Project SCOPE (School-College Operation in Physical Education) is a comprehensive partnership program between school practitioners and College faculty. The partnership focuses on the school's curriculum, staff development, and pre-service and in-service teacher education, integrating them to effect change and improvement. The partnership has been recognized nationally by the American Association for Higher Education and was honored by the Chancellor of the City University of New York.
IV. Cultural Enrichment

A. Colden Center for the Performing Arts

Colden Center was established in 1961 to provide accessible and affordable cultural enrichment to the region by presenting the world’s finest performing artists in the fields of classical music, dance, theater, jazz, popular entertainment, and children’s and family programming, including much-needed arts education programs. The Center makes its spaces available to the community for rental, while supporting the cultural initiatives of the College’s academic programs. The Center has three main venues: Colden Auditorium (2143 seats, the largest indoor performance space in the Borough of Queens); the new Samuel J. and Ethel LeFrak Concert Hall (a 490-seat state-of-the-art recital hall with a glorious pipe organ, shared with the School of Music and in its building); and the Queens College Theater in the Colden complex (seating 476, used also by the Department of Drama, Theater and Dance for classes and productions).

Approximately 300,000 people attend events at Colden Center each year. The Center has been especially responsive in recent years to multicultural programming, especially for young audiences, building bridges where cultural commonalities and differences can be appreciated and respected. Although fund-raising for the events presented under its auspices remains a constant concern, Colden Center faces other difficulties in the coming years, primarily problems with its physical plant. Built in 1961, Colden Auditorium and the adjacent Queens College Theater have undergone minimal renovations since then, and much work needs to be done if Colden Center is to remain competitive in the marketplace.

B. The Fine Arts Departments, Art Center and the Godwin-Ternbach Museum

The Department of Drama, Theatre and Dance, in addition to its academic mission, provides numerous cultural events for the whole community in the main Queens College Theater, the Little Theater (100 seats), and several smaller performance spaces. The Department annually produces two plays, a musical or opera, and a dance performance. A summer Rep Theater usually produces a musical or play. Moreover, eight or so student-directed productions are staged in the Little Theater each year. As finances become available, the Department is slowly converting a large part of Rathaus Hall into a new, large performance space. Two excellent dance studios have already been created in Rathaus (in space inherited when the School of Music moved into its new building several years ago). Owing to severe reductions in budget, the Department has in recent years been compelled to change its philosophy and approach to production. The events schedule has moved more toward student-produced works, especially where budget cuts have resulted in the loss of faculty who have not been replaced.

The Aaron Copland School of Music is the home for several important and active organizations, including the Queens College Choral Society, founded in 1941. A
community-wide group of around 180 voices, the Society performs two choral works each year. Its December performance of Handel’s Messiah has become a seasonal tradition. The Copland School offers some 160 student, faculty and alumni recital concerts each year, mostly in the daytime. The new Music Building, with its LeFrak Concert Hall, provides excellent spaces for musical events. The Queens College Orchestra and the Choir, for instance, offer numerous special concerts. Budget problems threaten such programs.

The Department of Art (including both art history and studio art) recently moved from inadequate spaces in Kiely Hall and an off-campus location to new quarters in Paul Klapper Hall. The Department regularly mounts exhibits, many of them in a spacious new student gallery. MFA thesis exhibitions and lectures are also presented here.

The Art Center offers about a dozen exhibitions a year in a remarkable new gallery on the top floor of Rosenthal Library, especially promoting artists who reflect the cultural richness of New York City and the College. The Center also provides exhibitions and lecture programs elsewhere, presenting works by both new and established artists in diverse media.

The Godwin-Ternbach Museum is a teaching museum with a permanent collection of nearly 3000 works of art in all media from antiquity to the present. The collection was stored for several years and then moved into a new, magnificent two-story gallery in the rebuilt Klapper Hall in fall 1992. The facility includes state-of-the-art working and storage areas. A new director has been appointed, and the Dean of Arts and Humanities is working vigorously to increase private funding to the Museum.

C. The Arts Advisory Board

In 1993, former President Kenny appointed an Arts Advisory Board, including several illustrious arts alumni: musicians Paul Simon and Marvin Hamlisch, author Susan Isaacs, and others. The Board has been chaired by Milton Glaser, nationally recognized designer and promotional expert; the current chair is Nathan Leventhal, President of Lincoln Center. The aim is to bring new resources to the campus arts scene.

D. Public Art on Campus

In recent years, there have been five art projects tied to new building construction on campus. A state program called “Percent for Art” has financed three large paintings and two sculptures (one outside and one inside) in the New Science Building, a major outdoor sculpture at the entrance to the Aaron Copland School of Music, two important sculptures near Rosenthal Library, and a whole range of works throughout campus interiors. A sculpture is also planned for the north entrance of Klapper Hall, following the recent installation of a provocative assembly of spheres on the south plaza. Another sculpture is planned for the recently refurbished Delany Hall.
E. The Queens College Evening Readings

The Evening Readings is a program created in 1975, often drawing packed audiences to hear renowned authors read and discuss their works. The series, which author Susan Sontag recently called among the best of its kind in New York, is also constantly struggling with budget problems. Efforts have recently been made to augment its modest subscription income and College funding by selling attractive t-shirts and tote bags. For 1994-95, authors included Edward Albee, John Barth, Jamaica Kincaid, Jayne Anne Phillips and Jane Smiley.

F. The Louis Armstrong Archives

After the deaths of jazz great Louis Armstrong and his wife, Lucille, their estate asked the College to assume responsibility for their home in Queens (which became a national landmark in 1977) and to preserve and catalog the jazz literature and memorabilia therein. The Louis Armstrong Archives, with over 20,000 items, was opened to the public in Rosenthal Library in 1994. Plans include opening Armstrong's home (in nearby Corona) as a museum. With the acquisition of the Armstrong Archives, the important jazz artists who have been drawn to the campus, and the strength of its music performance programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels, the College has emerged as an important center of jazz studies and performance.

G. Other Organizations Contributing to Campus Culture

The Queens College Women's Club, whose slogan is "Not Just for Women Only," is an organization composed of faculty, staff, and retirees. It sponsors various cultural activities for the community. It has focused recently on events that raise funds for the College.

The Friends of the Library are faculty, students, alumni and others devoted to raising funds for the College's Library. They also promote and facilitate contributions of books, and organize literary, artistic and musical events. For example, the Friends sponsor talks and programs each spring during National Library Week. In spring 1995, the Friends produced a remarkable program, with concerts, readings, talks and exhibits in connection with anniversaries of Scott Joplin, Henry Purcell, Oscar Wilde and Tennessee Williams.

Other cultural enrichment activities include lectures organized by ethnic and area studies programs. For instance, Africana Studies has organized a new lecture series at the Langston Hughes Library in Corona in conjunction with CEP. The lectures have been well-received, drawing sizable audiences from the community. The Jewish Studies Program has a long-established series of endowed lectures open to the community. Distinguished scholars and writers are featured, and audiences range from 200 to 800. The Center for Jewish Studies and the Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies organize scholarly conferences open to and much attended by the general public.
The College’s events calendar is packed with projects sponsored by academic departments, student clubs and societies, the Student Union and student governments. A growth of news and information organs and services in recent years has improved publicity for campus and community events. For instance, the College now produces a multicultural calendar listing events reflecting cultural diversity. In 1993, students of the Journalism program began producing Queens World, a newspaper devoted to multicultural activities and issues at the College and in the community. The new Q magazine, produced by the Office of Institutional Relations in collaboration with the Office of Publications, has grown from a periodical brochure to a substantive magazine that goes out once or twice a year to 66,000 alumni and friends of the College. Its purpose is to explore and convey the many facets of events, research, creativity, and life at Queens.

H. Perspectives on Change

In 1985, the College reported that cultural activities that had waned because of the New York City financial crisis of 1976 had once again begun to flourish. Since that time, of course, there has been a serious national recession, one that hit the local area especially hard. Remarkably, most programs have continued to thrive. Audience development is a difficult, perennial problem, related largely to the commuter nature of the College. There is the feeling that students also are more and more distracted by commitments to outside work. Parking and security problems are also factors. Campus security has been improved significantly, and extensive new outdoor campus lighting has been installed. Better advertising and audience-development strategies are being developed. During the 1994-95 academic year, an ad hoc arts committee has been meeting with Acting President Curtis to focus on marketing, fund-raising and audience building for the performing arts programs. One visible outcome has been a page of arts programming information which now appears in the student newspaper. Recognizing the strong history of the College in cultural programming for the community, the College can be proud of what has been accomplished, and it should maintain its support for activities which provide cultural enrichment to the College and local communities.
CHAPTER EIGHT

FINANCIAL RESOURCES
CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

I. Background Information on Revenue Sources

A. Budget Overview

Prior to the New York City fiscal crisis of the mid-1970's, Queens College and the other units of the City University of New York were tuition-free, receiving all their public funding from the City of New York. In order to alleviate the fiscal burdens on New York City, by 1982 the State of New York had assumed full responsibility for public funding of CUNY's senior colleges. Queens College and the other CUNY senior colleges within CUNY now receive the majority of their funding in the form of a budget allocation from the Central Office of the City University. CUNY itself bases its allocations on state appropriations and tuition revenues. Tuition revenues are collected by the colleges but transferred to the CUNY Construction Fund; a small portion goes to pay off bonds with the remainder indirectly returned to the College as part of its annual operating budget. The funds allocated by CUNY to the College are referred to as "the tax levy budget," accounting for 72 percent of the College's revenues in FY 1994 (Table 8-1). In that year, the College received $66.3 million in State funding, towards which it contributed $36 million in tuition revenues.

As Figure 8-1 indicates, state funding was at a peak level of $73.6 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 1990 and fell to a low of $62.9 million in FY 1993. Both FY 1992 and FY 1993 were extremely difficult years financially for the College as a result of serious financial problems encountered by the State of New York. Over the course of FY 1992, the College was hit with budget reductions totaling more than $5 million. Most of the financial difficulty in the next fiscal year is reflected in the low initial budget allocation of $62.9 million; however, there were additional cuts during that year, which were not as severe as those in the previous year.

The increases in state funding in the two most recent fiscal years reflect, for the most part, increases in collective bargaining contracts (some of which represent accumulated obligations from previous years). Thus, the increases do not really represent additional revenues for improving the College's academic programs (although such

---

1 Data in this section were provided by the Queens College Budget Office unless otherwise specified.

2 Figure 8-1 utilizes a consistent series of initial budget allocation figures. A consistent series of end-of-year figures is currently available only for FY 1992, FY 1993, and FY 1994. Those numbers are, respectively $63.5 million, $63.2 million, and $67.7 million. Initial allocations are reflective of trends, with the exception of the deep cuts in FY 1992.
### TABLE 8-1: SOURCES OF FUNDS—FISCAL YEAR 1994\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dollars (in thousands)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>$66,309</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Foundation</td>
<td>$6,161</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College Foundation</td>
<td>$4,473</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colden Center</td>
<td>$911</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
<td>$324</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic and Recreation Fund(^4)</td>
<td>$1,180</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Unlimited Education</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Services Funds</td>
<td>$4,282</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises Association</td>
<td>$428</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Donations</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Corporation</td>
<td>$2,562</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College Association</td>
<td>$562</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Disabled Students</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Fund Reimbursables (IFR)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>$2,531</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Hearing Center</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Preparatory Studies in Music</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,705</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) The revenues in Table 8-1 do not represent the sources of all financial support of the College. The Central Office of CUNY expends funds on behalf of the College. The major item is fringe benefits for employees, which are paid from Central Office funds. These totaled $18.3 million on wages and salaries of $60.9 million for FY 1993-94. The figures are from University-compiled IPEDS data and include the CUNY Law School. See section II.E, below.

\(^4\) $1.1 million transferred from Athletic and Recreation Fund to IFR Sports Account.
### FIGURE 8-1

**STATE FUNDING OF QUEENS COLLEGE FY 1985-86 THROUGH FY 1994-95**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Current dollars</th>
<th>Annual trend for current dollars</th>
<th>Constant (1985) dollars</th>
<th>Annual trend for constant dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>$57,881,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,881,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>$62,327,020</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
<td>$59,519,536</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>$66,029,740</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>$61,473,688</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>$69,787,570</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>$61,622,424</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$73,831,840</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>$61,850,746</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$72,061,700</td>
<td>-2.11%</td>
<td>$57,304,952</td>
<td>-7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$68,880,200</td>
<td>-4.44%</td>
<td>$51,729,030</td>
<td>-9.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>$62,881,700</td>
<td>-8.71%</td>
<td>$45,589,233</td>
<td>-11.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>$56,308,400</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>$46,416,580</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>$68,885,500</td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>$47,048,787</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
increases are important in bolstering morale!). When the budget figures are adjusted for inflation, the changes from peak funding go from nearly -15 percent to -26 percent, and the recent increases since FY 1993 are significantly lower (+3.2 percent in real terms compared to +9.5 percent in current dollar terms).

Funding per FTE and inflation-adjusted funding per FTE (constant dollars per FTE) follow a similar pattern, although the fall-off in funding per FTE began about a year earlier than total state funding (see Figure 8-2). The fall in constant dollar funding per FTE was -31.2 percent from its 1987-88 peak to the FY 1993 trough. The graph indicates this sharper decline.

The initial allocation of tax levy funds to the College for FY 1995 was $68,885,500; with adjustments for special line items, the annual budget for FY 1995 was $71,211,700. However, the new Governor of New York State, George Pataki, requested that the City University reduce its budget during the current fiscal year by $15 million, nearly two percent of the University's state funding; Queens' "share" of that reduction was over $1 million. The University requested a revised financial plan from the College to ascertain how the budget would be reduced between March and June 1995. The budget in College's revised financial plan totaled $70,301,800.

In conjunction with CUNY's allocation of the FY 1995 budget in July 1994, the University instituted a new policy of Base Level Equity to determine the level of full-time faculty at each of the senior colleges. The program is designed to equalize the proportion of teaching at each campus done by full-time faculty. According to the formulas developed by CUNY, the over-all proportion of full-time to part-time teaching for the senior colleges is 62.4 percent, while for Queens it is 70.6 percent. (Only Brooklyn College has a higher percentage of teaching done by full-time faculty—76.4 percent, as calculated by the Central Office.) The result is that the College's number of full-time faculty lines was reduced by seven, from a budgeted 523 to 516 for FY 1995.5

In addition to tax levy funding, the College receives funds from grants and contracts provided by the federal, state, and local governments and by private foundations and corporations. (Refer to Table 8-1.) In FY 1994 grants and contracts totaled $6.2 million. Private donations through the Queens College Foundation (including investment income) added another $4.5 million. Details of these funding sources are discussed below in Sections I.D. and I.E. All other sources of revenue (e.g., the Continuing Education

5 Memorandum on Initial Allocation of the 1994-95 Operating Budget, from Richard Rothbard, Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance, and Information Systems, to Senior College Presidents and Professional School Deans, City University of New York, July 7, 1994, (redistributed as Attachment 6 to a memorandum from Vice Chancellor Rothbard on 1994-95 Operating Budget Allocations, August 1, 1994.)
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Program, Colden Center) added $14.8 million to College revenues in FY 1994.6

The Governor's budget request for FY 1996 reduced state appropriations to the University by $158 million and called for a tuition increase of $1000.7 If this had held, the Queens College budget would have been cut between $5 million and $17 million. The lower amount reflects the College's share of the base cut; the higher would have obtained if the Trustees did not approve the tuition increase upon which the Governor's budget was predicated. All estimates assumed that there will not be adverse effects on enrollment – an unlikely event to be sure. The Governor's budget also eliminated central funding ($15.1 million) of the SEEK program.

Soon after the Governor's budget was released, the University declared financial exigency, and colleges were called upon to draw up retrenchment plans. The College prepared a preliminary plan. However, since the State Legislature passed the budget over two months after the April 1st deadline, the College is not likely to know its budget, and whether implementation of a retrenchment plan will be required, until shortly before the start of the fiscal year on July 1, 1995. The State budget now calls for a $750 tuition increase for undergraduates, and there was partial restoration of SEEK funding and of the cut to the base budget. With these changes, the College expects the cut to be closer to the $5 million figure, as opposed to the $17 million cut possible under the Governor's original plan. This report is being finalized in early June without knowledge about the College's actual operating budget for FY 1996; therefore a separate document will be prepared for the Evaluation Team during the summer that will provide details about the FY 1996 budget.

B. Tuition and Tuition Revenues

Another aftermath of the City's fiscal crisis of 1976 was the institution of tuition starting with the fall 1976 term. Tuition charges from 1976 to the present appear in Table 8-2. In the first year that tuition was imposed, full-time undergraduate tuition was $462.50 per semester for New York State residents. For the fall 1994 semester, tuition for full-time incoming resident students was $1225—more than three and one-half times the 1976 level, with the sharpest increases coming in the past few years. At the time of the last tuition increase in the fall 1992, a two-tiered tuition plan was instituted in which only incoming students paid the new higher tuition; they would then have the semester in which they complete their undergraduate studies be tuition-free. Comparative data from the College Board indicate that CUNY's 1993-94 tuition was near the median for public institutions—56.6% of all public four year institutions had tuitions which were $2499 or less.

---

6 Many of the items under "Other Revenues" are included in the College's accounting system as Department Services Funds or Income Fund Reimbursables. The Department Services Funds are raised by departments or centers from sales of services or from material and transportation fees. Income Fund Reimbursables are accounts into which funds from self-sustaining activities such as the Continuing Education Program flow.

7 Memorandum on 1995-96 Executive Budget, from Richard Rothbard, Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance, and Information Services, CUNY, February 1, 1995.
TABLE 8-2

ANNUAL TUITION, FALL 1979 - PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.Y. STATE RESIDENT</td>
<td>NON-RESIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PER CREDIT</td>
<td>FULL-TIME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '76</td>
<td>$354.00</td>
<td>$925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '82</td>
<td>$460</td>
<td>$1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '83</td>
<td>$466</td>
<td>$1,225.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '84</td>
<td>$472</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING '89</td>
<td>$472</td>
<td>$1,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING '91</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '91</td>
<td>$677</td>
<td>$1,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUING FALL '92</td>
<td>$922</td>
<td>$2,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '97</td>
<td>$1000</td>
<td>$2,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st TIME</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESENT: SAME AS FALL '92 1ST TIME, EXCEPT FOR STUDENTS ENTERING BEFORE FALL '92

Tuition waivers are granted by the University for senior citizens, high school students, employees, and cooperative teachers. (There is also a partial waiver for foreign students without financial resources implemented in 1989 "because of a disproportionate increase in non-resident tuition." \(^6\) The State does provide a line in its budget for these waivers, and the City University has added to this allocation from its own budget flexibility (meaning that it is "taken off the top" before CUNY units receive their individual allocations). CUNY reduced its allocation for tuition reimbursement to colleges in FY 1995 below the FY 1994 level and plans further reductions in future years. In addition, it is requiring colleges that have historically overspent their tuition waiver reimbursements "to unallocate funds within their budgets as a safeguard against such practices." \(^9\) Tuition waivers have been particularly important to the College because of its large number of senior citizen students and because of its programmatic links with Townsend Harris High

\(^6\) Memorandum from Vice Chancellor Richard Rothbard, op. cit., July 7, 1994, p. 25.

\(^9\) Ibid., pp. 16-17. Reduced funding of tuition waivers is included in reductions associated with failure to meet the College's tuition revenue target, as discussed below.
School. The College has had to reduce the number of senior citizen waivers it offers due to these new constraints. The situation will be ameliorated next year as the senior citizen tuition waiver program is replaced by a system that allows senior citizens to audit courses on a space available basis. FTE's from senior citizen registrations will no longer be included in College totals.

In FY 1994, tuition and fee revenues had grown to $36.4 million, a doubling of their FY 1987 level. During that same period, FTE enrollments increased from 11,138 to 12,090, an increase of 8.3 percent. Thus, tuition increases are the major force behind the increased revenues. CUNY sets enrollment and tuition revenue targets for each of its units relying in part on enrollment projections provided by the College and in part on the enrollment goals in the University's Master Plan. If the tuition revenue target is not met by the College, the University may decrease the College's tax levy funds by an equal amount. To the extent that the tuition revenue target is exceeded, a recently instituted University policy allows the College to keep 50 percent of the excess.

C. Fees

Students pay fees in addition to tuition. The student fee for a full-time undergraduate was $93.35 in FY 1995, up from $61.75 in the fall of 1979. This fee is the sum of fees that go to support student Governments, the College Association, the Student Services Corporation, the Sports Allocation Board, the Committee for Disabled Students, the Child Development Board, the New York Public Research Interest Group (NYPIRG), university student government, and a consolidated service fee that goes to the University. The largest component of this fee is the $56 that goes to the Student Services Corporation and is used to pay the operating and capital expenses of the Student Union and to pay off the bond debt on the Student Union. The activities fee is somewhat lower for evening students. Graduate students pay a student activity fee of only $52.10, but it includes most of the same categories of fees. Senior citizens pay a non-instructional fee of $52 if they are registered for no more than six credits (and also receive a tuition waiver, as noted above). Students also pay Materials/Film and Transportation/Field Charges (MAT fees) if they are enrolled in certain courses. These fees are subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees. Seventeen departments have instituted such charges, ranging from $5 to $50, depending on

10 Annual Report of Tax Levy and Non-Tax Levy Fund Activity, Queens College, for fiscal years ending June 30, 1987, and June 30, 1994 (Fee Income Fund Balance Sheet), prepared by the College's Accounting and Business Office.

11 Data on enrollments provided by the Office of the Senior Registrar, Queens College.

12 Students may request a refund of this $3 fee.

13 The University is currently concluding an agreement to have the Student Union mortgage taken over by the State Dormitory Authority. The portion of the student activity fees previously used to pay off the debt will now become available to support needed renovations and repairs and to increase programming for students.
D. The Queens College Foundation and the Office of Development

The Queens College Foundation is an independent not-for-profit corporation established to assist in developing and increasing the resources of Queens College in keeping with its educational purposes and objectives. The Queens College Foundation is administered by the Queens College Foundation Board of Trustees, consisting of the President of Queens College, an elected chair, and other elected officers and members. The Board has twenty-seven members, most of whom are alumni of the College. Funds donated in support of the Foundation are raised each year primarily through an annual appeal which from FY 1990 to FY 1994 totalled $19.5 million. The total of new funds raised in FY 1995 exceeded $4 million (see Figure 8-3). The College’s Office of Development oversees all private fund-raising for the College (gifts and grants from individuals and corporations), and the Foundation serves as the depository for these funds.

Restricted contributions to the Queens College Foundation from individuals, corporations, and foundations are administered in accordance with terms established by the donor. From FY 1990 through FY 1994, 64 percent of funds raised through the annual campaigns were restricted; for FY 1994, only 50 percent of funds raised were for restricted purposes. Restricted gifts support scholarships (e.g., the Howard Hughes grant supporting undergraduate education in the biological sciences) and programs such as BALA (Business and the Liberal Arts) and the Asian/American Center.

Contributions which are not restricted are allocated by the Allocations Committee of the Queens College Foundation Board of Trustees in consultation with the President, Provost, and Vice President for Administration. Unrestricted funds are used for a variety of purposes, for example, department needs, undergraduate scholarships for 250 students in FY 1994, Presidential Teaching Awards and Mini-Grants, external College programs (such as the Colden Center for the Performing Arts and the Godwin-Ternbach Museum), college facilities, and activities such as development, publications, commencement, and homecomings. The Foundation recently made a $100,000 emergency allocation to the College’s Library to support its collections and allow increased hours of operation.

In addition to the annual giving campaigns, the College initiated its first capital campaign in 1992. The funds raised from this campaign will be used for endowments of chairs and scholarships, for program support, and for the purchase of laboratory equipment and other similar kinds of facilities funding. Since August 1992, $10,165,000 has been pledged to this capital campaign, with $1,437,000 received from these pledges. The initial goal of the capital campaign was $15 million (originally a two-year goal), and the long-

---

14 Funding of building construction and rehabilitation is the responsibility of the State Dormitory Authority.
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range goal is $25 million. One of the recent major gifts to the College was $1 million donated by Samuel J. LeFrak to support music programs and scholarships, including the Hope and Pride Program of outreach to pre-college music students. Three other $1 million commitments have been made by William E. Thiele, Edwin M. Cooperman and Irving Goldstein.

In FY 1994 the Foundation spent $325,000 on operating expenses (salaries, printing, fund-raising costs). The amount raised in that year was approximately $4.1 million, indicating that less than eight cents of every dollar raised was applied toward expenses.

One of the most important efforts of the Office of Development and the Queens College Foundation has been developing the College's alumni/ae data file. In 1985 this data file contained fewer than 38,000 names with acceptable mailing addresses and little additional information. Over the past years, with considerable effort in research and corrections, the file has increased to over 69,000 acceptable mailing addresses that, in most instances, include business address, home and business telephone numbers, degree and class year information, and histories. For further information, see CHAPTER FOURTEEN: ALUMNI/AE. In recent annual fund mailings, the Office of Development has invited and encouraged departments to include a letter to their alumni/ae to promote financial support of the department. Thus, departments have been able to benefit directly from annual giving campaigns that can be used to supplement such important educational support initiatives as tutoring, laboratory and computer development, and scholarships.

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs, whose other functions are discussed immediately below, serves as an administrative agent for the Foundation, disbursing funds for their various purposes throughout the College.

E. Research and Sponsored Programs15

Grants and contracts are obtained by individual faculty members, by the College's research centers, and by the institution. Obtaining funding to support research is an important activity, not only because of the stimulation provided to faculty and students, but also because it generates funds that allow graduate student support, equipment purchases, individual faculty research, and innovative curricular development.

In 1963 the State of New York mandated the establishment of the Research Foundation of CUNY, an independent not-for-profit corporation devoted to the management of all grants and contracts from external funding sources to CUNY members.

15 Much of the data in this section are taken from the Research and Sponsored Programs Office's Grants and Contracts Report 1994. Copies of the 1994 report and those of preceding years will be available for inspection by the Evaluation Team.
In 1971, the Grants and Contracts Office, which later became the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), was established at the College to facilitate attempts to obtain external funding. In FY 1985, 139 proposals were submitted; 57 awards totaling $3,401,249 were received from sources external to CUNY. In FY 1994, 149 proposals were submitted and 90 awards were received totaling $6,160,571. (This figure does not include PSC-CUNY Research Awards, discussed below.) Through March 1995, external research grants are exceeding last year’s total for the same period by over $550,000. Over a ten year period, then, there was a seven percent increase in proposals submitted and a 34 percent increase in awards received. The total dollar increase was 81 percent; adjusted for inflation, the real increase was 24 percent. Additional information on external funding may be found in Figures 8-4 through 8-7.

The federal government provides the largest portion of the College’s external funding for grants and contracts, 67 percent in FY 1994, and its share has been a relatively consistent part of the total over the past decade. NIH and the Department of Education are the largest sources of the College’s federal research dollars. For FY 1994, 59 percent of grant and contract funding supported research; program development was the second largest category (15%) followed by community outreach (8%).

While the College’s total amount of external funding for grants and contracts is well below the funding of two other CUNY units (both Hunter and City Colleges received over $25 million), it should be noted that both colleges have professional schools and units not represented at Queens that contribute heavily to their grant and contract totals. Nevertheless, Queens College and its faculty should increase the rate at which grants are sought and won. Some faculty maintain that heavy teaching loads make it difficult to write grants. Greater institutional support and incentives for writing grants would help address this problem. The ORSP, the College P & B Committee and the Administration need to make conscientious efforts to determine what the obstacles are to greater productivity in raising external funds and to devising ways to overcome the obstacles identified.

ORSP assists the Research Foundation in administering the College’s participation in the PSC-CUNY Faculty Research Awards Program, a competitive program mandated by the PSC-CUNY contract and funded by the University. In FY 1996 the University budgeted $2.8 million for these awards. The bulk of this funding goes to support research assistance, supplies and certain equipment. For FY 1996, of the 120 Queens faculty members who applied for grants, 105 (88%) won awards totaling $436,758, averaging

---

Grant and contract funding in both the CUNY Research Foundation and the Queens College Foundation.


The Professional Staff Congress (PSC) is the bargaining unit for faculty and other instructional staff.
FIGURE 8-5
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TOTAL 1985: $3,401,255
TOTAL 1994: $6,150,571
FIGURES 8-6
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FISCAL YEAR 1985

PRIVATE $539,234
CITY $160,000
STATE $182,370
FEDERAL $2,519,651
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PRIVATE $698,577
CITY $656,454
STATE $473,293
FEDERAL $4,132,247
FIGURE 8-7
FEDERAL GRANTS AND CONTRACTS BY MAJOR AGENCIES
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$2,519,645

FISCAL YEAR 1994
$4,132,247
The College's new faculty members have had an exceptionally good success rate in winning awards.

The Research Foundation negotiates the indirect cost rate for all CUNY units with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The rate for each unit within the University is negotiated separately. Queens College's rate on Modified Total Direct Cost (MTDC) is currently 56 percent on campus and 26 percent off campus; all direct costs except stipends, equipment and subcontracts in excess of $25,000 are included in the base. The indirect cost rates negotiated are for all federal agencies and are also applied wherever feasible with any other organization to which the College may be applying for grant/contract funding. When an award is received by the Research Foundation on behalf of the College, indirect costs are collected based on direct cost expenditures.

The indirect cost funds are deposited into the College Earnings Account from which state-advanced monies and expenses for the Research Foundation and the College's research office are deducted. The balance is then distributed at the beginning of the next fiscal year as follows: Vice President for Administration, $10,000; grant writers, as needed; President, 20%; Dean's Council, 20%; divisional deans, 20%; department chairs, 30%; project directors, 10%.

F. Financial Aid

The relatively low tuition of the City University allows many Queens students to attend without financial aid. However, for academic year 1993-94 just over 40 percent of Queens College students received financial aid, the total in excess of $22 million. In contrast, in 1989-90, 26 percent of the student body received $12.5 million in financial aid from the federal and state governments. Table 8-3 displays the amounts received and number of recipients for the federal and state financial aid programs that help support students. The largest source of financial aid came from the New York State Tuition Assistance Program (TAP) ($7.510 million), followed closely by federal Pell Grants ($6.839 million). (Prior to FY 1993 funding from Pell Grants had exceeded funding from TAP.) The increase in tuition led to the sharp rise in TAP from $3.430 million in FY 1991 to $5.025 million in FY 1992. (The number of students receiving TAP rose, but not as dramatically as the dollars of support.) Similarly, the total for Pell Grants jumped sharply between those two years, from $4.373 million to $5.864 million. Financial aid dollars are crucial to the ability of students to attend school and are of great importance to the College because of their contribution to tuition revenues. In addition, the federal

19 All funds going to deans, chairs and project directors are distributed in direct proportion to how the funds were earned. Guidelines for the distribution of overhead have been developed by the President and Provost and must be in compliance with both State of New York and University guidelines.

20 Data for this section were provided by the Office of Financial Aid, Queens College. A more detailed report on financial aid, "Queens College Financial Aid Office Self-Evaluation Report," prepared by Doug Strauss, April 1993, is available.
monies that support the College Work-Study program expand the College's resources by providing additional support staff to carry out the administrative work of the College. In 1993-94, 457 students received a total of $373,000 in support through College Work-Study.

**TABLE 8-3**

**FINANCIAL AID TO QUEENS COLLEGE STUDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL AID RECEIVED, BY PROGRAM (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>3,139</td>
<td>3,430</td>
<td>5,625</td>
<td>6,784</td>
<td>7,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>4,373</td>
<td>5,864</td>
<td>6,465</td>
<td>6,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSI*</td>
<td>3,415</td>
<td>3,921</td>
<td>4,277</td>
<td>3,219</td>
<td>5,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTA</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APTS</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS LOAN</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOG</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NUMBER OF STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID, BY PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>4,727</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>4,794</td>
<td>5,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>2,181</td>
<td>5,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSI*</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTA</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APTS</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS LOAN</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOG</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Guaranteed Student Loans (GSL) subsequently known as Federal Family Education Loans (FFELP) and Stafford Loans.

Source: Office of Financial Aid, Queens College.
Other important sources of federal financial aid are Guaranteed Student Loans (subsequently known as Federal Family Education Loans and Stafford Loans), Perkins Loans, and Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG). Other forms of state support come through SEEK (Search for Education Elevation and Knowledge), Aid for Part-Time Study (APT), and the City University Supplemental Tuition Plan (CUSTA) which plugs the gap between tuition charged and the maximum TAP award for our very neediest students. (Currently, the maximum TAP award per semester is tuition less $137.50; previously it was tuition less $100. Thus, the maximum TAP award for a Queens College undergraduate is approximately $2000.) Recent cuts in the TAP program increased the maximum CUSTA grant from $200 to $275 per academic year.

As tuition has risen, it has become increasingly difficult for low-income students to afford the cost of a college education. As the federal and state governments cut back on financial aid (as has been the case in recent years and is likely to be the case in the near future), it will be increasingly difficult for students to pay for their college educations. A 1988 random sample survey of Queens College undergraduates indicated that 75 percent work part- or full-time. During the course of their undergraduate years, it is estimated that 95 percent of undergraduates have worked at one time or another. The rising cost of education will induce many students to increase their hours of employment; still others will find themselves priced out of a college education, even one which is of relatively modest cost.

II. The Budget Process and Financial Controls

A. The State and University Budget Process

In order to understand the process governing the determination of the College’s state funding, it is useful to follow through time the process for FY 1995. Preparation of the FY 1995 budget began in April/May of 1993 when CUNY developed the “technical budget” for each college, based on a snapshot of the College’s Personal Services—Regular (PSR) position at that time; it also includes temporary services and “other than personal services. The adjunct budget is prepared separately at a later date, using an Instructional Staff Model (ISM) that includes full-time faculty and University-wide ratios of enrollments/FTE by discipline. The ISM ratios are relatively highly aggregated over “discipline,” with the result that some are high compared to actual practice at Queens College. Summer funding, based on the previous year’s enrollments, is also separately done. However, as state

---

21 Data on employment provided by Professor Dean Savage, Department of Sociology.

22 For example, the CUNY model has one category for health sciences and biology. Because many of the health science courses taught elsewhere in the University are done in very large lecture-only sections (as in the nursing programs), the ratio applied to Queens’ biology sections is too high. As discussed below, the College employs its own Adjunct Model which uses more detailed discipline-specific CUNY-wide ratios that are closer to College practice. The College model recognizes, for example, that its biology sections are more appropriately compared to sections of physics or chemistry here and elsewhere in the University.
Chapter Eight - Financial Resources

As funding has declined, the practice of under-funding the adjunct model means that the adjunct budget and summer funding fall short of actual College needs. The colleges are presented with their technical budgets, which they review and return with their written budget requests including new programmatic initiatives under the University's procedure of Academic Program Planning instituted in FY 1994. A college may find some, all, or none of these requests incorporated into its allocation from CUNY. Some initiatives may be incorporated into the initial budget allocation; others may be added during the course of the fiscal year.

In September 1993, the University submitted its budget request to the Governor. The Governor completed the Executive Budget around February 1, 1994. Usually the Governor's budget does not fully fund the University's request. Legally, the State Legislature must pass the budget by March 31, in time for the start of the State's fiscal year on April 1, three months before the beginning of CUNY's fiscal year. However, the legislature generally does not meet this deadline, being sometimes up to several months late.

While Queens College appears as a line-item in the Governor's Budget, the Central Office of the City University is given flexibility for allocating the entire CUNY budget, and it is able to retain portions of the line-item allocations to each of its units for subsequent distribution according to University priorities. In addition to line-items for each of the CUNY units, the University receives appropriations for a large number of programmatic items, many of which are to be distributed to CUNY units as "lump sums" according to University formulas, contractual commitments, and discretionary priorities. The State's line item for Queens College in the FY 1995 Executive Budget was $73.3 million, more than the College's initial allocation from the University (including lump sum distributions) of $68,885,500. During the course of the budget year, the College can usually expect to receive additional allocations that somewhat increase the total tax-levy operating budget.

In May 1994 the College was to have received its initial budget allocation from CUNY for FY 1995 so that it could have its budget firmly in place by the start of the fiscal year on July 1. However, delays in both the passage of the State budget and in CUNY's subsequent budgetary determinations meant that the College's initial allocation was not received until July 7, 1994, after the start of the fiscal year. As noted in an earlier section, the College's initial budget allocation for FY 1995 was $68,885,500, composed of a basic initial allocation of $67.5 million plus an additional $1.4 million in "lump sums" for particular programs and new initiatives. The major lump-sum allocations were $415,000 for the Coordinated Freshman Year Program (the College's Freshman Learning Communities project and the Skills Immersion programs), $260,000 for organized research the bulk of which is for the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems), and $693,000 for

---

\(^3\) In a number of years, the June (end of year) budget figures have exceeded allocations. For example, the allocation for FY 1993 was $62,881,700. The June 1993 figure was $63,234,625 (Queens College Budget data).
the College's SEEK program.24

The College's financial plan for FY 1995, a month-by-month plan of College expenditures, was developed once the College received its initial budget allocation. Usually the financial plan is done before the start of the academic year; this year, the process was delayed, and the College submitted its financial plan in September. A revised financial plan, reflecting a request to cut an additional $1,070,000 in mid-year, was submitted to and accepted by the University in spring 1995.

Shortly after receiving the FY 1995 budget, the FY 1996 budget process began. The Chancellor sent out her "Call for 1995-96 Budget Requests" on August 19, 1994, indicating each college's adjusted base budget for that year in terms of full-time positions, Base PSR Budget, and Base Budget.25 The calculation of full-time positions for Queens included a second reduction of 7 positions in accordance with Base Level Equity bringing the number of full-time positions to 1176. The Chancellor's call letter placed a 3 percent limit on the College's program request, indicating a limit of 35 additional full-time positions and $1,976,800 of additional funding. The College's Program Request totaled $2,236,000 and 37 new positions.26 The request exceeded the guidelines because it included additional positions (5) and funding of $261,000 for the Calandra Institute, newly affiliated with the College and not reflected in previous budgets. The largest single program request was for library acquisitions. Other major items in the request were support staff, faculty recruitment and faculty development, graduate student support, and academic advising.

B. The College's Internal Budget Process

When the College receives its budget from the Central Office, the budget is broken down into five basic categories, Personal Services Regular (PSR), Other than Personal Services (OTPS), Temporary Services (TS), adjuncts and Summer. However, with the approval of the University Budget Office, the College may reallocate among categories. The College's initial financial plan for FY 1995 allocates the budget as indicated in Table 8.4. Nearly 84 percent of the budget this fiscal year was originally allocated to Personal Services Regular and another 4 percent to regular (non-summer) adjunct teaching, leaving just 12 percent ($8.4 million) for all other operating needs. PSR has taken an increasing share of the budget over time (up from 79 percent in FY 1992), with the burden being most

24 The other lump-sum funds are allocated to the CUNY Counseling Assistantship Program and to the Neighborhood Work Project (VERA). In addition to lump-sum SEEK funds, the College allocated $1.627 million to support the SEEK program.


26 President's Statement, 1995-96 Budget Request, Queens College (undated). A summary statement is included in Task Force Report Appendix A.
severely felt through reductions in OTPS. This was a deliberate set of decisions--to hire new faculty at the expense of replacing non-instructional staff and at the expense of allocations to OTPS/TS. A 15 percent across-the-board cut was made in OTPS/TS allocations and a hiring freeze instituted in October 1994 in order to accommodate the greater-than-anticipated filling of full-time replacement positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8-4: FY 1995 BUDGET ALLOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allocation of the Personal Services Regular budget is determined by existing commitments, including the new hires for the current academic year. (The procedure by which departments are allocated positions is discussed in the next section.) Thus, it is the adjunct and the OTPS/TS budget which remain to be allocated within the College. These decisions are made by the President in consultation with the vice presidents. In the past few years, allocations among vice presidents have maintained roughly the same proportionate shares, with the exception of a larger allocation to support the Library. The Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs receives the largest share (66 percent in FY 1995). It is his responsibility to allocate it to the various academic departments and programs.

C. The Allocation of the Provost's Budget to Deans and Chairs

When the Provost receives the budget from the President, he then assigns it to the various Deans, Associate and Assistant Provosts, and the Directors who report directly to him. Separate allocations are made for adjuncts, OTPS/TS and postage. The OTPS/TS budget reductions of the past few years have been passed along to the divisional deans and other academic support offices. In general, these reductions have been spread evenly among the various groups involved, but they have not always been exactly equal. Each year the various needs of each constituency have been taken into consideration. The deans and directors are given a lump sum funding for OTPS/TS and are allowed to make their determinations in consultation with departmental chairs as to how much goes into one area or the other. Because of PSC-CUNY contractual guidelines, the deans are told to set aside a certain sum for faculty travel. Because of the reduction in OTPS/TS funding, the divisions have had to make hard choices about how to meet their needs. In a division like Mathematics and Natural Sciences, which has several departments with many laboratories,
this reduction has had a major impact and lessens departments’ abilities to offer the necessary classes and to engage in research. Even in the Division of the Arts and Humanities, departments like Art, Drama, Theater and Dance, and Music depend upon OTPS funding in unique ways. In Social Sciences and in Education, most of the funding in this category goes to Temporary Services, and there is little left over for OTPS. With the increasing reliance on personal computers in all disciplines, the greatly reduced OTPS budget has been unable to meet the needs of the academic administrative offices, the teaching laboratories and the faculty.

In the case of the adjunct budget, an "Adjunct Model" based on a student/faculty ratio has been used to determine how much funding each division receives. In 1986, under Provost Stewart Gordon, Associate Provost Marvin Taylor and William Imbriale, Director of Institutional Research, developed a method by which future adjunct needs could be apportioned across academic divisions based on the prior year's actual student demand. The new allocation model was presented in spring 1987 for application to the adjunct budget for FY 1988. The initial model relied upon the College’s student FTE’s generated the previous year by discipline and a discipline-specific student-faculty ratio set by the New York State Division of the Budget. The student-faculty ratio was changed in 1991 to one derived from actual CUNY senior college practice in fall 1988 (i.e., actual student FTE’s by discipline and actual FTE faculty teaching in each discipline); the rationale behind the change was that the "CUNY experience data" better reflected College practice. Other modifications have been incorporated over the years to fine-tune the model, e.g., adjustments for graduate center teaching, administrative responsibilities and leaves, and graduate assistantships.

When the adjunct model was introduced in 1987, the College was able to allocate sufficient dollars to hire adjuncts to fill all the demonstrated need. Since 1987, however, the College’s full tax levy allocation and the University’s calculation of adjunct need have declined substantially. To moderate the impact of cuts to the adjunct budget, the College has provided additional funds ($1.119 million in FY 1995). Yet, even with these additional funds, only 36 percent of “demonstrated adjunct needs” are being accommodated. The sharp decline in the past two to three years in the percent of need which can be funded has raised questions about whether use of the model continues to be appropriate, and whether the model has become dysfunctional because of the widening gap between available resources and the predicted need for adjunct dollars. This matter is being scrutinized by Provost John A. Thorpe; the Provost has indicated that before significant changes are made in the allocation process, a full discussion and analysis of the issues will occur.

---

27 Memorandum from Associate Provost Marvin Taylor, to Deans and Department Chairpersons, on Adjunct Allocation Process, Queens College, February 25, 1987. See Item 3 in Task Force Report Appendix B. Special thanks to Associate Provost Elizabeth Boylan for her assistance in developing this discussion of the College’s adjunct model.

The insufficiency of adjunct funding has meant fewer class sections and increased class size.\textsuperscript{29} The Division of the Social Sciences is offering approximately fifty fewer sections than it did three years ago (this reduction occurs in a division that offers 550 sections per semester). In addition, average class size, which was 31 students three years ago, is now 36. In the School of Education, introductory courses have gone from an average of 25 students to 38-40, and may go as high as 45-50. The Mathematics basic courses have gone from 25-30 to 30-35. In some cases, however, it is not possible to increase limits, e.g. laboratory courses have a fixed number of seats, and students in the Bachelor of Music program have one-on-one training. In addition, the size of a given classroom often determines class limits. Finally, classes, particularly at the elective level, are often offered every three or four semesters rather than every two semesters. The effect of all of this on the students is that they are often closed out of classes or have considerably larger classes. In addition, they may have to remain in college longer than usual in order to complete their programs, despite concerted efforts by departments and the academic administration to fund differentially courses needed by students to graduate.

Some departments do not receive their own OTPS/TS allocations. Rather the dean retains control of these funds and responds to specific requests from a department. The fact that some departments have only sporadic needs and that funds are scarce are among the reasons for this more centralized management. The Task Force on Financial and Physical Resource's survey of department chairs (discussed in detail below) indicates that, over the years, fewer department chairs have received their own budgets and that, when given their own budgets, fewer are given the freedom to determine how they allocate their OTPS/TS funds. These responses of chairs need to be examined by the deans as there has been no change in the College's practice of allowing departments to determine the distribution of funds between OTPS and TS.

One other area of funding is also provided from the Provost's office—that of full-time line appointments. At the beginning of the academic year, the Provost asks the dean of each division to provide a list of full-time line appointments that are needed with justification for each request. The dean surveys the departments and, based on the information received, turns in a list, generally in ranked order. The Provost and President determine which departments will receive authorization to search. When lines are vacated by resignation, retirement or death, they revert to the central pool of the College.\textsuperscript{30} In some departments, there have been a considerable number of retirements, and the departments have not been able to make sufficient appointments to offset the retirements. As a result, major areas of specialization are not covered in some departments.

\textsuperscript{29} See CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS for details on average class size by discipline.

\textsuperscript{30} There is an exception to this general practice of line reversion; when a department has not reappointed someone for cause or has not recommended tenure, the department will retain the line and, generally, is allowed to search for an immediate replacement.
The CUNY Bylaws have long specified that the College Personnel and Budget Committee (P & B) has an advisory role in shaping the College's budgetary policies. However, because of delays and uncertainties in the budget, the P & B's role has been difficult to integrate into the process. For example, because of delays in receiving budget information from the State and University, many decisions are now made during the summer months when it is not feasible to assemble the P & B. Consequently, College P & B involvement in the budget process had been somewhat sporadic. As noted in CHAPTER TWELVE: GOVERNANCE, the College P & B recently created its own Advisory Subcommittee on Budget, designed to offer advice to the President and to the Provost concerning various budget items. The President and Provost continue to meet with this group regularly with regard to the current fiscal year's allocations (and reductions) as well as next year's budget forecasts.

D. Allocations to Interdisciplinary Programs

The budget reductions and the non-replacement of retired faculty have especially affected the interdisciplinary programs at the College, such as Honors in the Western Tradition, the ethnic and area interdisciplinary programs, and the World Studies course sequence. These interdisciplinary areas draw upon faculty from different departments to teach their courses. With departments facing situations where they are not able to offer the required numbers of sections for their basic courses, they are understandably reluctant to lend faculty out to other programs. As a result, these interdisciplinary groups often have to change the way that they function, negatively influencing their program offerings.

E. Budget Summaries and Financial Audits

The College produces no single document that summarizes the various components of its budget. The IPEDS (Integrated Post-secondary Education Data Systems) report prepared on behalf of the College by the University's Accounting Office is one document that partially summarizes College revenues and expenditures. However, these data exclude the Queens College Foundation and the grants and contracts that flow to the College through the Research Foundation. They do include the Law School, which is not otherwise considered in this report. The FY 1994 IPEDS data appears as Table 8-5. The University prepares this report to incorporate revenues and expenditures made on behalf of the College that never pass through the College's own budgetary and accounting systems. For instance, fringe benefits, which total approximately 30 percent of personal services

---

31 By-Laws of the City University of New York, Section 8.10.c., September 1993.

32 The entire Research Foundation, which serves all units of CUNY, is incorporated into the University administrative data in the IPEDS report of CUNY.

33 The CUNY Law School formerly reported to the President of Queens College and its budget was a subsidiary line item under the College's budget. The Law School is now a separate constituent unit of the University and its dean reports to the Chancellor.
TABLE 8 - 5
QUEENS COLLEGE IPEDS REPORT - FY 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES OF FUNDS</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition and fees</td>
<td>$43,824,000</td>
<td>35.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>$53,457,000</td>
<td>43.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government support</td>
<td>$557,000</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants and contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>$7,638,000</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private gifts, grants and contracts</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises</td>
<td>$3,701,000</td>
<td>2.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other sources</td>
<td>$14,235,000</td>
<td>11.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CURRENT FUNDS REVENUES</td>
<td>$123,880,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURES</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational and General Instruction</td>
<td>$59,225,000</td>
<td>47.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$243,000</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>$2,350,000</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>$3,464,000</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services</td>
<td>$14,979,000</td>
<td>12.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Support</td>
<td>$15,434,000</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O&amp;M Plant</td>
<td>$13,251,000</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship &amp; Fellowship</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
<td>7.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>$580,000</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Mandatory Transfers</td>
<td>$449,000</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Educational and General</td>
<td>$120,895,000</td>
<td>97.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises</td>
<td>$3,569,000</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Current Funds</td>
<td>$124,464,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Provided by Vice President for Administration, Queens College from report prepared by CUNY Accounting Office.
expenditures ($18.3 million in fringe benefits on wages and salaries of $60.9 million in FY 1994), are managed by the University. In addition, the University directly pays certain rent and utility costs. Because funds from the Queens College Foundation ($4.473 million) and from the Research Foundation ($6.156 million) are not included, it is not appropriate to compare the IPEDS data to data aggregated from other (public) institutions. Inclusion of these funds would dramatically increase entries for governmental grants and contracts and for private grants, contracts, and gifts. On the expenditures side of the ledger, expenditures on research would increase significantly. IPEDS data from FY 1989 through FY 1994 have been used to construct Figure 8-8, which indicates the declining contribution of state appropriations and the rising contribution of tuition and fees to support the College. 

F. Financial Management and Controls

The College's finances are all under the supervision of the Vice President for Administration. Since the last Middle States visit, the College has instituted a number of major systems and procedures in order to improve financial management within the College:

- The Bursar's lock box system with Chemical Bank allows students to pay their tuition bills by check or credit cards by direct mail to the College's lock box with Chemical Bank. About 45 percent of the students now use this method.

- The College's purchasing and accounts payable system allows the College's departments to prepare their purchase requisitions on their computer and forward the requisition with a floppy disc or on-line to Purchasing and Accounts Payable directly. The system allows the preparation of bid documents and purchase orders in accordance with State of New York guidelines. A monthly report is prepared providing the budgeted amount, transfers, encumbrances, vouchers expended, and the budget balance available. Purchase requisitions are encumbered when received and adjusted when a purchase order is issued.

- Recording and billing of postage and telephone usage has changed. Departmental budgets were established, and departments are held accountable to stay within their allocations. Adjustments are made to tax levy OTPS budgets at the beginning of the new fiscal year for over- and under-spending in the previous year. The College plans to institute a similar system for central receiving of supplies that are currently not departmentally budgeted.

34 Queens College IPEDS (HEGIS) Report prepared by the Accounting Office, City University of New York, and provided to the Task Force by the Vice President for Administration, Queens College.

35 The state appropriations in the IPEDS data, which includes appropriations for the Law School, are not the equivalent of tax levy funding. Tax levy funding is based on both tuition revenues and state appropriations.
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**FIGURE 8 - 8**  
**IPEDS REPORT DATA FY 1989 - 1994**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(A) Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>(B) State Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>$22,926,000</td>
<td>$72,565,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$27,364,000</td>
<td>$74,768,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$28,138,000</td>
<td>$70,718,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$37,402,000</td>
<td>$62,071,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>$41,861,000</td>
<td>$58,245,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>$43,824,000</td>
<td>$53,457,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% change from 1988-89 to 1993-94:  
- Tuition & Fees: +91.15%  
- State Appropriations: -26.36%
The Bursar’s "point-of-sale" system provides cash control, revenue accounting information, and maintenance of students’ historical accounts. It is linked to QUASAR, the College’s student information management system, allowing the Bursar’s Office to determine a student’s bill based on registration and to determine whether scholarship students are registered for the appropriate number of courses.

Budget Office systems for personal services and OTPS have been created in the Budget Office to allocate and track tax levy funding for personal services as well as OTPS.

Automated time and leave systems have been set up in the Office of Human Resources; they have resulted in reduced staffing and more accurate and expanded data collection.

While the College has made progress in improving its information management systems, it still has significant needs in terms of improving its financial and other information systems, with a goal of being able to integrate financial and academic planning. Although most administrative and fiscal units are automated, they are often unable to share information because they are not networked. Nor do they have the capacity for electronic transmission of data to other systems such as the CUNY Financial System or New York State fiscal offices. For example: Non-tax levy monies and Income Fund Reimbursables (see Table 8-1) cannot be processed in the College’s automated purchasing and accounts payable system. The lack of sufficient financial resources hinders the College’s ability to improve networking and integration of systems. However, as improvements are made throughout information and financial systems, staff at all levels will require additional training to use the systems most effectively and productively.

III. Task Force Survey of Department Chairs on Budget

The Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources sent a questionnaire concerning budgets and facilities to 34 department chairs in mid-November 1994. The questions were concerned with the impact of the budget and facilities on teaching and research and on the chair’s views on budgetary and planning processes. As of mid-January 1995, 28 of 34 had responded. Among the many findings were these on budget:

- Chairs had highly varied views on whether they would prefer to be able to allocate more funds to adjuncts vs. OTPS/TS.
- One-third of the chairs (9 of 28) reported that they did not receive a departmental allocation of OTPS/TS funds. Of the 19 who did, eleven said they were not allowed to decide how much to allocate for OTPS versus TS.

36 The questionnaire may be found in Task Force Report Appendix A.
> Half the department chairs reported that they receive indirect cost money from external sources. More than half receive adjunct replacement funds from external sources, and two-thirds report that their departments receive individual gifts. One third of the departments have endowments of some sort.

> Fifteen of the 28 chairs said they did not receive adequate information about how the College allocates funds to the division. (Two said they didn't know if the information was adequate.) Twelve of the 28 said that it was not clear how funds were allocated within the divisions.

> Eight of the 28 said that they did not feel that their departments were treated fairly in the budgetary process—even recognizing the current constraints on funds. Eleven were unsure of whether they were being fairly treated. Only nine said that they felt their departments were being fairly treated.

> Nine of the 28 said that inadequate office space hindered teaching effectiveness. Twenty two of the 28 said that facilities, equipment, and supplies limited effective research.

IV. Summary Analysis

A. Declining State Support

Since the last Middle States Review of the College, the tax levy budget saw a period of improvement through the late 1980’s as the budget of New York State benefited from a growing economy, especially in New York City. However, when the city and state economies went into decline after 1988, serious deterioration in the State’s budgetary position translated into deterioration in the budget of the City University and of the College. Despite some improvement in the College’s budget since 1992-93, constant dollar funding per FTE has eroded substantially since 1988-89.

B. The Burden on Students

Currently, the University is raising an increasing share of its tax levy funding through tuition rather than state appropriations. While it is difficult to develop comparable data on sources of revenues, it appears that CUNY students are paying a higher share of the cost of education than are students in public institutions outside New York State. Moreover, while CUNY tuition is in the median range for public institutions, many (though not all) Queens’ students probably have incomes (taking into account cost of living differences!) below students at the typical public college or university.

C. Impact on the College’s Educational Mission

It is the tax levy budget that provides the basic financial support fundamental to the College’s educational mission. With the severe restrictions on tax levy funding, it sometimes feels as if the logic of budget being the servant to educational programs has been

---

37 For Queens College (using the IPEDS data reported in Table 8-5) tuition and fees accounted for 45 percent of the total of tuition and fees and state appropriations. For 1991-92 the figure was nearly 38 percent. Data for 1991-92 on revenue sources at public colleges and universities indicate that tuition and fees accounted for only 30 percent of the total of these two sources of funding. (Almanac, Chronicle of Higher Education, September 1, 1994, p. 37.)
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turned on its head: the budget too often dominates the discussion, and the educational programs must adjust to its demands. One purpose of this Self Study is to evaluate whether and to what extent this has happened, and if so, to consider how Queens College can right this process.

One indication of the College's ability to carry out its mission is the pattern of increasing student enrollments and declining faculty FTE's, shown graphically in Figure 8-9. A major way that the College has adjusted to the increasing ratio of students to faculty is through increased class size. In addition, despite increased enrollment, fewer courses and sections are now being offered; consequently, students are more likely to be closed out of courses, and it may take more time for them to complete their majors and to graduate.

The other task force reports (in particular the reports on Educational Programs, Students, and Faculty) document the impact of declining resources—physical and financial—on the College's ability to serve its students and the community and on the ability of Queens' faculty to teach, do research, and provide service to the College. The Task Force's survey of department chairs and its interviews with deans have provided additional insight into the costs associated with inadequate financial and physical resources—their adverse impact on class sizes and offerings, teaching effectiveness, and research.

D. Trade-offs: Personal Services vs. OTPS/TS vs. Adjuncts

Despite the erosion in full-time teaching staff, the personal services budget has absorbed an increasingly large share of the total tax levy budget, a function of declining state support and rising contractual commitments as a result of collective bargaining agreements, coupled with deliberate investments in new faculty. As these commitments have grown and state funding has declined, the result is reduced University allocations for adjuncts, OTPS/TS, and the summer program. Moreover, because the adjunct budget is not fully funded, and because the formula on which it is based assumes higher student/faculty ratios than are the practice (and are pedagogically practical) for the College, the College has been forced to sacrifice funds from an already substantially reduced OTPS/TS budget to support the adjunct budget and (in FY 1995, because leave and attrition rates were below normal) the personal services regular budget.

E. The Pressure of the Tuition Target

Meanwhile, the University continues to set increasing enrollment and tuition revenue targets for the College, with financial penalties for not reaching these targets. Yet, the basic determination of the budget is not tied to the level of enrollments. This puts the College between "a rock and a hard place," with a strong incentive to meet the tuition target, yet with the consequence of putting increasing burdens on a shrinking full-time faculty and providing students with fewer and larger classes. (In FY 1995 the College also had to absorb six lines that had previously been funded by the Graduate Center, putting additional pressure on the personal services budget.)
FIGURE 8-9

COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN FULL-TIME FACULTY AND FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS
1985-1994
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F. Base Level Equity

CUNY’s July 1994 introduction of Base Level Equity moves the proportion of full-time faculty at each senior college toward a University-determined average. Because the College has in past years made a significant effort to maintain the quality of instruction by utilizing full-time faculty (in accordance with earlier University objectives), the College’s proportion of full-time faculty is relatively high within the University. In its first iteration, Base Level Equity threatens to reduce the College’s full-time faculty by as many as 54 lines. The loss of lines leads to a reduction in the PSR budget with an associated increase in the adjunct budget; but the adjunct formula, which is not fully funded, is inadequate budgetary compensation.

Even more important, adjunct replacement “buys” less in terms of quality of instruction and the greater educational support of students provided by full-time faculty members. The proposed reallocation of resources within the University will damage the ability of the College to provide the high quality undergraduate instruction that the College views as its hallmark.

G. Centralization of Budgetary Authority in CUNY’s Central Office

In addition, over the past ten years budgetary authority has been increasingly centralized in the University Budget Office. The holding back of sums for University priorities hinders the College in being able to set its own priorities. The College has limited autonomy in linking its strategic planning to budgetary planning, not only because of the centralized control but also because of the shrinking support received by the University. CHAPTER SEVEN: FACULTY and CHAPTER NINE: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION address a number of issues concerning the centralized determination of educational priorities and University-wide initiatives.

H. Budgeting and Planning

The general context of budgeting and planning is not very different from what it was in 1986. As the 1986 Self Study reported:

> The majority of the College’s operating costs are fixed through faculty tenure, union contracts and other labor obligations longer than the budget year. The Budget Request is incremental, that is, it mainly reflects additions to and subtractions from the previous year’s Tax Levy budget. Changes in the College’s operating budget are driven primarily by the future plans of its academic programs. On the other hand, the operating budget the College eventually receives is derived from a variety of formulas usually (but not always) based on student enrollment. As a result, requests and receipts bear little relationship to each other, and because both enrollments and the Chancellor’s formula vary from year to year, receipts cannot be accurately anticipated and long range planning is seriously impaired.

38 “Finance,” Chapter 7, Self Study, Queens College of the City University of New York, April 1986, p. 143.
That paragraph suggests little opportunity for planning and progress. Unfortunately, at current writing, the situation is even more circumscribed. A larger share of the budget is in the form of fixed contractual obligations, and the margin is in too many years a negative rather than a positive increment.

The College's ability to plan even in the short-run is further constrained by the delays in receipt of its budgetary allocations. These delays are often the result of delays in the passage of the State budget. The College does not know what its budget will be until well after contractual obligations are made—and sometimes it begins the fiscal year without its budget in place. In years of severe fiscal difficulties for the University and the State, the College has been faced with significant reductions in the middle of the year.

I. Perceptions of the College's Budget Process

The survey of department chairs conducted by the Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources revealed two somewhat disconcerting findings: first, that a majority of chairs feel they do not receive adequate information about how the College allocates funds to their division; 12 out of 28 felt that it was not clear how resources were allocated within their divisions; eight of the 28 felt that their departments were not fairly treated, even recognizing the severity of budget constraints. One important rule for maintaining morale in difficult times is to let people know what is happening, and reduce uncertainty, while making them feel they are being treated fairly. Of course, one problem with the notion of fair treatment when resources are shrinking is that it often encourages across-the-board cuts rather than hard decisions about what the institution's priorities should be.

J. Increases in External Funding and Alumni/ae Support

There is some good financial news for the College: increased support for enrichment of its academic and community-outreach programs through funds raised through the Queens College Foundation. These have grown four-fold since 1985 and added $4.473 million to the College's resources in FY 1995. One important reason is the increased ability to reach College alumni/ae through the conscientious efforts of the Office of Development. In addition, the College administration and faculty have also been able to increase outside research and programmatic support to the College through grants and contracts.

K. How Does the Future Look?

Given the current budgetary situation—a State-imposed cut in the University budget midway through FY 1995 and a significant reduction proposed for FY 1996, the ability to

---

30 The Task Force realizes that these responses are subjective rather than objective. It does not necessarily mean that the chairs are not adequately informed nor that the departments are unfairly treated. However, it does mean that the chairs feel that such is the case—and how people feel about their situations is important.
carry out the College's mission in accordance with its expectations of quality is seriously undermined. Obviously, everyone will have to continue to attempt to do more with less—something which takes creative thought and intestinal fortitude. However, it is clear that no matter how efficient the College becomes, there is little alternative but to provide less to the students than is desirable.

The College must turn increasingly to external funding—not as a substitute for basic funding, but as a way of enriching certain aspects of the learning process (new laboratories, new programs, research opportunities for students and faculty, scholarships to assist our students). In addition, the generally high morale—because people here believe what they are doing is worthwhile and important—must continue to motivate the College community in how it adapts to change and how the process is managed. This is essential to the future of the College.

V. Recommendations

How can the College help shape its future? The purpose of this chapter was to understand the dimensions and nature of the College's financial resource constraints—as well as to determine in what ways the College has done well, either in obtaining new resources or in coping with limited resources. The recommendations do not address specific details, such as how the budget should be reallocated among divisions or departments, or what specific actions should be implemented to improve efficiency in budgetary and planning processes. Rather, they are broader in scope to help give the College direction in terms of future financial and academic planning.

A. Recommendations Requiring Cooperation and Coordination with the Central Office of the City University of New York

As an outgrowth of the previous Middle States review, the College has implemented a strategic planning process and has just completed a second five-year plan. The ability to implement this plan is constrained to a great extent by the fact that the College operates subject to budgetary priorities shaped by the Central Office. The College must work with the Central Office to ensure that its decisions about University priorities are not made independent of the plans of the individual colleges. In the current context, it appears that the priorities are set by the University, and institutions must respond to those priorities. What this will require is a healthy discussion during the period in which the University is developing its academic program planning priorities to make sure that the needs of the College receive full consideration. Thus,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should work with CUNY to integrate strategic and financial planning. <8-1>

A major problem identified during this inquiry is the failure to have sufficient linkage between expansion of the physical plant and the necessary adjustment of the
operating budget to provide adequate support for maintenance of new facilities. The College must work with the University Budget Office, DASNY, and the New York State Division of the Budget to build such a relationship. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should work with CUNY and the New York State Dormitory Authority to integrate capital planning and financial planning. <8-2>

The College's Acting President, Stephen M. Curtis, served as a member of a committee of presidents that recently submitted a report to the Chancellor recommending many modifications of the Base Level Equity initiative. The College must continue to engage the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in a healthy dialogue to consider how the University can improve the level of full-time faculty at other colleges without detriment to those colleges that have attempted to preserve academic quality by reducing reliance on adjuncts. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should argue strongly for the elimination of the University's Base Level Equity plan in its present form. <8-3>

B. Recommendations That Can Be Implemented by the College

Rather than deal with the budget through across-the-board increases or decreases, there must be a full discussion of College priorities. Rational budget allocations should not rely on a law of equal, proportionate pain. Rather, they require taking more of a zero-base approach for each allocation and justifying the current appropriate level. Because many of the vice presidents administer activities that support the academic programs, the Dean's Council and the Executive Committee of the College Personnel and Budget Committee (or its Advisory Subcommittee on Budget) should have a more important role in advising the President on these allocations.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should re-assess annually the internal allocation of funds. <8-4>

The survey of chairs has indicated their feeling that information on the budget and on planning of facilities is inadequate. Improved communication on budgetary issues will facilitate the generation of ideas on how to carry out the College's mission more efficiently. The College P&B's Advisory Subcommittee on Budget can play an important facilitating role.

RECOMMENDATION: Deans should improve the information flow regarding budget and facilities planning to department chairs. <8-5>
The College has made substantial headway in the area of financial systems. It is the kind of up-front investment that allows reduced staffing in the long-run; but such changes require investment in the short-run. Building on the improvements made,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should upgrade its financial systems and integrate financial and information systems to promote efficiency in management and planning. <8-6>

Personal Services Regular and adjunct funding have taken first budgetary priorities and have resulted in inadequate funding of maintenance of facilities and of supplies and equipment. The College must consider whether there is a way to prevent OTPS/TS from bearing the brunt of the budget shortfalls and cuts. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should address the serious under-allocation of funds to OTPS/TS. <8-7>

However, there are ways to make existing OTPS funds go farther. The College is already moving to improve its accounting system for supplies provided through Central Receiving. In addition,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should investigate the possibility of joining with other institutions to form a buying consortium to allow bulk purchase of supplies. <8-8>

Obviously, the needs of other institutions may differ, and the nature of contracting may make it difficult to coordinate such an effort with institutions outside the CUNY system. Nevertheless, this idea should be pursued.

Given the overall budget deficiencies, those human and other resources available to the College must be husbanded wisely. In CHAPTER FIFTEEN: INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND CHANGE, there is discussion of the College's need to assess the quality of service of its support units. In support of this recommendation, the vice presidents are urged to review on an annual basis (and more often as needed) the management and quality of service of each of the support offices reporting to them. Where indicated, a plan for improvement or a special commendation should be issued.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should assess and seek ways to improve its administrative, academic and student support services. <8-9>

The management of enrollment and the impact of enrollment on budgets has acquired new significance for both the University and the College in recent years. The University has set expectations of rising enrollment accompanied by tuition targets which, if not met, result in financial penalties. Because the basic budget of the senior colleges is not
driven by FTE’s, and because there are continuing "real dollar" reductions in the budget, further increases in enrollment only intensify the pattern of falling revenues per FTE and rising student-faculty ratios.

The relationship between revenues and enrollments has additional complications. Some portions of the budget are enrollment-based, and differential tuition structures (e.g. residents vs. out-of-state) affect the College's ability to achieve tuition targets. Given the complex interplay of enrollments and revenue, the College must develop more sophisticated means to take into account, and make best use of, information regarding admissions, enrollment trends, retention data, etc. This will require the integrated planning of many offices, including (but not limited to) the offices of Admissions, Institutional Research, Registrar, Provost, Dean of Students and the Vice President for Administration.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should invest in enrollment management planning. <8-10>

The budget stringencies that the College has already had to cope with have resulted in extraordinary reductions in OTPS. Coping has meant implementation of efficiencies, prioritization of needs and doing without. There is general agreement that additional efficiencies should be sought, and that further and refined prioritization of needs should continue. However, there is also a general sense that past reductions have had—and future cuts will continue to have—negative impacts on the quality of the academic programs, the academic support units, student services and facilities. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College must address the harsh reality of shrinking budgets by continuing to seek ways of minimizing the impact of these cuts on the quality of the educational programs. <8-11>

Among the directions that must be considered:

> Restructuring with more very large classes to allow for maintenance of a sufficient inventory of smaller classes. Restructuring of the curriculum so that fewer—but more intensive or comprehensive courses—are required to complete a degree.

> More sharing of library resources with public libraries and with other colleges and universities through inter-library loans and through computerized networking.

> Coordination on campus and across campuses in providing specialized electives that would otherwise be cancelled because of low enrollments. Distance learning (two-way audio-visual communications between campuses) is a tool with the potential to allow

---

<8-11> The Physics Department has set a good example for this with its coordination of its Master’s curriculum with Hunter and Lehman Colleges.
the College to expand the educational boundaries of the campus.\textsuperscript{41}

> Expanding the opportunities for academic credit for student research assistantships in research and teaching. The benefits accrue to both students and faculty. Students learn about their fields of interest and can get a better sense of whether they wish to pursue their studies at the graduate level. Faculty receive assistance in their work—and have the opportunity to know their students better.

If Queens College wishes to remain on the educational cutting edge, it must provide its students with opportunities to use and to understand the technology that is appropriate to a state-of-the-art education. In addition, the faculty and staff must look to technology to help do more with reduced budgetary resources; as suggested above, distance learning, improved information systems networking, and the application of technology to library needs are important directions for the College. The problem is that it costs money to prepare for a more efficient future. While CUNY has been able to earmark some funds for technological development initiatives,\textsuperscript{42} it is not surprising that funding is currently inadequate to move the University ahead at more than a snail's pace. In spite of this,

RECOMMENDATION: \textit{The College should continue to look to technology to help shape the future.} <8-12>

Many departments that have faculty in disciplines that are likely to be able to attract research funds do not do so. Deans must develop a way to promote this. The Queens College Foundation has recently made a commitment to provide matching funds, essential for certain grants, in instances when a faculty member is otherwise unable to obtain them. ORSP has a fund to hire professional grant writers to assist faculty. These are steps in the right direction. However, overall

RECOMMENDATION: \textit{The College should provide support and greater incentives for faculty to apply for research funds.} <8-13>

Recent trends in giving to departments have indicated that alumni/ae are willing to help the College provide for students of the future the first-class education that they received here in the past. Departments must think about the ways in which this alumni/ae support can be tapped so that donors can feel that they are making concrete contributions to improving the College. Therefore,

\textsuperscript{41} The College is currently participating in a University-wide initiative to expand the use of technology funded by a $150 million bond issue. While distance learning was one option the College could have undertaken, it chose to promote faculty development through training in an open systems multimedia laboratory relying on high-speed connectivity with the Internet. However, distance learning remains an important technological enhancement that the College should pursue. The University did have an earlier (not very successful) experiment with distance learning in the 1970's; fortunately, the technologies have improved significantly since then.

\textsuperscript{42} See previous note.
Departments should work with the Office of Development to increase communications with alumni and to develop projects that will encourage their financial support. <8-14>

VI. Summary List of Recommendations on Financial Resources

RECOMMENDATION: The College should work with CUNY to integrate strategic and financial planning. <8-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should work with CUNY and the New York State Dormitory Authority to integrate capital planning and financial planning. <8-2>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should argue strongly for the elimination of the University's Base Level Equity plan in its present form. <8-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should re-assess annually the internal allocation of funds. <8-4>

RECOMMENDATION: Deans should improve the information flow regarding budget and facilities planning to department chairs. <8-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should upgrade its financial systems and integrate financial and information systems to promote efficiency in management and planning. <8-6>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should address the serious under-allocation of funds to OTPS/TS. <8-7>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should investigate the possibility of joining with other institutions to form a buying consortium to allow bulk purchase of supplies. <8-8>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should assess and seek ways to improve its administrative, academic and student support services. <8-9>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should invest in enrollment management planning. <8-10>
RECOMMENDATION: The College must address the harsh reality of shrinking budgets by continuing to seek ways of minimizing the impact of these cuts on the quality of the educational programs. <8-11>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should continue to look to technology to help shape the future. <8-12>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should provide support and greater incentives for faculty to apply for research funds. <8-13>

RECOMMENDATION: Departments should work with the Office of Development to increase communications with alumni/ae and to develop projects that will encourage their financial support. <8-14>
CHAPTER NINE

PHYSICAL RESOURCES
CHAPTER NINE: PHYSICAL RESOURCES

I. The Evolution of the Campus

A. The Facilities from 1937 to 1985

Queens College opened its doors in 1937 on the campus of a reform school for boys. The College's signature Spanish stucco and red tile-roofed buildings date from 1907. The first phase of new campus construction to accommodate its growing student body was delayed by World War II; it was completed by about 1960, at which time there were about 2500 full time students enrolled at the college. The Open Admission Policy adopted by the Board of Higher Education in 1970 generated an explosive growth in the student population at Queens College, which, at its peak, reached a head count of about 30,000 students in 1975. Five temporary buildings (T-1 through T-5) and leased space in buildings off the main campus were put into service as a direct result of this rapid student population growth. New York City's financial problems in the mid-1970's brought all City University construction to a halt. Plans for the College's New Science Building were allowed to be completed but construction was postponed. This building was the second CUNY building and the first Queens College building approved for construction following the complete takeover of financing of the City University by New York State. The Dormitory Authority of The State of New York (DASNY) was given responsibility for all new CUNY construction.

B. Facilities Changes Since 1986

Since the last Middle States review in 1986, about 780,000 square feet (gross) of new or renovated space have been added at Queens College—accounting for over one third of all campus space. First was the New Science Building in 1986, followed in quick succession by the Benjamin Rosenthal Library (1988) and the New Music Building (1991). Klapper Hall and D Building (one of the original stucco buildings, now Delany Hall) were totally renovated and reopened in 1992. During the same period, a number of smaller renovations were completed and the infrastructure (consisting of electrical distribution, fire alarms, steam tunnels, telephone system, and heating plant) expanded and upgraded. Over $180 million of capital construction projects were completed in this ten-year period.

The New Science Building is a multi-departmental building for teaching and research in the sciences. Six departments (Biology, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Computer Science, Geology, Physics and Psychology) have all or part of their laboratories and offices in this building. The Academic Computer Center has a satellite facility in this building in addition to occupying its own I Building facility. Of special note is a core of five lecture halls, excellent research and teaching laboratories, special laboratories for scanning and transmission electron microscopes, an X-ray diffractometer system and instrumentation for
molecular spectroscopy, modern machine shops, electronic shops and a glass-blowing facility. The New Science Building was the first centrally air-conditioned building added to the campus since the 1970's.

The Benjamin Rosenthal Library, a six-level open-landscape library, has open stacks fully accessible to students with disabilities, and it contains a large auditorium, several conference rooms, research cubicles for faculty, the art library and exhibition space, the Department of Library Sciences, the Louis Armstrong Archives and the latest equipment for reproduction, library research and communications. The Rosenthal Library replaced the College's main library which had been located in Klapper Hall.

The 125,000 square foot (gross) New Music Building permitted the Music Department to move from the 45,600 square foot Rathaus Hall and consolidate all its teaching, practice, office and library facilities in one building. This building houses the 489 seat state-of-the-art Samuel J. and Ethel LeFrak Concert Hall, Choral and Orchestra Rehearsal rooms, practice rooms, and an expanded two level music library. In addition to academic activities, the College sponsors numerous cultural and social events in the building's atrium and public halls.

In 1992, two existing buildings were totally reconfigured and renovated for new occupants. Paul Klapper Hall was renovated for the consolidated activities of the Art Department and for English departmental and faculty offices. Thus, the Art Department relocated its studios, classrooms and offices from a number of buildings into one location, and practically doubled its previous space. The English Department with its large faculty had been located in several buildings; one was a temporary building with mostly open office spaces. English faculty are now located in the same building with individual offices. Klapper Hall also contains a small auditorium, classrooms, the Godwin-Ternbach Museum, and student galleries and studios. Later that year, the D Building (now Delany Hall) was renovated to provide space for the SEEK Department, The Honors Program in the Western Tradition, and the Office of Special Events; it also houses a number of classrooms.

While these major capital construction projects were in progress, the College continued to modify and improve existing facilities: accessibility of roadways and sidewalks for the disabled was improved, and new elevators for the use of disabled individuals added; interiors of buildings were changed to provide adequately sized offices for faculty; the 1 Building was renovated for the Academic Computer Center; parking fields were modified; emergency power generators were added; and site security lighting was greatly enhanced. Improvements were made also to the campus infrastructure to enhance the reliability of power, heating, and telephone services and to improve lighting through energy conservation funding. Some amenities were added: landscaping was enhanced, benches for seating on the Quadrangle added, new walkways constructed, vehicular traffic rerouted so as to avoid the Quadrangle, and a coordinated signage plan implemented.

The expansions and improvements made in the past ten years have allowed the
College at last long to eliminate some of the temporary facilities and to reduce the amount of off-campus space it leases. Several buildings were razed (T-4, T-5, Q, and houses on Reeves Avenue) and the amount of leased space reduced. Today Queens College occupies 35 buildings on its main campus and two leased buildings off campus, one across the street, the other several blocks away. An inventory of campus buildings may be found in Table 9-1. An accounting for the major space changes in the past decade is presented in Table 9-2. A campus map is located in the Undergraduate Bulletin, pp. 218-219.

Current and future construction will concentrate on the upgrading of existing older buildings to comply with current building codes, removal of old violations (some of which existed from the time of original construction), replacement of obsolete building envelope components, mechanical systems upgrading, removal of environmental hazards such as asbestos, upgrading of laboratories, and renovations for new and modern usage. A listing of active capital projects is shown in Table 9-3. The University has approved planning dollars for the renovation of Hortense Powdermaker Hall and B Building. The College is still awaiting approval for the renovation of Fitzgerald Gymnasium and Remsen Hall.

II. Existing Facilities Highlights and Concerns

A. Community-Oriented Facilities

Queens College has a number of facilities whose primary or secondary function is to provide linkages with the community through innovative programming. Colden Center for the Performing Arts is a complex of buildings that houses the Colden Auditorium with its 2,143 seating capacity; the Queens College Theater with a stage and 476-seat house; the Gertz Speech and Hearing Center, which is a teaching/research facility that also serves the borough of Queens; the Rufus King Hall with its 70-seat black box space, TV studio, classrooms and faculty offices; and Rathaus Hall with its own rehearsal hall, classrooms and new dance studios used by the Department of Drama, Theatre and Dance.

Colden Center was built in 1961 and has never been renovated. The Center is soon to get a new chiller for its air conditioner. With respect to the structure, the bathrooms are in need of modernization. However, a more important concern is with the inadequacy of parking for people with disabilities. Currently, the only convenient parking is in temporary lots across Reeves Avenue, with access to Colden by way of steps. These steps were considered to be in dangerous condition and have been temporarily repaired.

The Student Union serves the College community and the neighboring community by providing a variety of food services and meeting space for student organizations and campus events. It also gets considerable use from organizations not affiliated with the College. Many community events, from high school functions to conferences to governmental seminars, are held in the ballroom and other conference facilities. With the expected assumption of the existing mortgage on the building by New York State, long-needed repairs and refurbishing of the interior will now be possible.
### TABLE 9-1: INVENTORY OF QUEENS COLLEGE BUILDINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING NAME</th>
<th>GROSS (SF)</th>
<th>NET (NASF)</th>
<th>YR CONST</th>
<th># FLOORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings on Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renssela Hall</td>
<td>132,793</td>
<td>67,819</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating Plant</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5193</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Oil Pump House</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Klapper Hall</td>
<td>139,182</td>
<td>94,842</td>
<td>5192</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald Gymnasium</td>
<td>164,354</td>
<td>119,474</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field House for Athletics</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Pump House</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colman Auditorium</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>21,713</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College Theatre</td>
<td>33,446</td>
<td>18,141</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rathaus Hall</td>
<td>45,600</td>
<td>24,709</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gertz Speech &amp; Hearing Center</td>
<td>7,809</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>80,86</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Hall</td>
<td>30,400</td>
<td>17,186</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Hall</td>
<td>42,400</td>
<td>33,644</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Hall Addition</td>
<td>53,500</td>
<td>38,567</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horlens Pauvermaker Hall</td>
<td>186,398</td>
<td>126,584</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot; Building</td>
<td>20,006</td>
<td>12,671</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Delany Hall</td>
<td>29,740</td>
<td>19,441</td>
<td>25,922</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura &amp; Arthur Cowin Hall</td>
<td>29,740</td>
<td>19,552</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;G&quot; Building</td>
<td>9,864</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>07,98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson Hall</td>
<td>47,480</td>
<td>29,424</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;F&quot; Building</td>
<td>37,200</td>
<td>21,610</td>
<td>37,87/54</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Rosenental Library</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>157,720</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Music</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>56,930</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;J&quot; Building</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>1,854</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-1 Building</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>5,540</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-2 Building</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>5,112</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-3 Building</td>
<td>12,840</td>
<td>9,138</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-1</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>1,803</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage</td>
<td>2,120</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Shops</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Kimly Hall</td>
<td>195,500</td>
<td>113,477</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Building</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Razan Hall</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal - Bldgs - On Campus</td>
<td>1,699,970</td>
<td>1,207,982</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings Off Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Residence</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>6,255</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissena Hall - Leased Bldg</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>20,451</td>
<td>1971/92</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>204,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horsea Harding Bldg</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>28,069</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY Law School at QC</td>
<td>153,730</td>
<td>90,475</td>
<td>72/86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caumsett Conference Center</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal-Bldgs - Off Campus</td>
<td>434,170</td>
<td>256,269</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total - All Buildings</td>
<td>2,427,140</td>
<td>1,454,985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9-2

**SNAPSHOT OF MAJOR SPACE CHANGES, 1985 - 1995**

#### MAJOR NEW BUILDINGS & RENOVATIONS (GSF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEW BLDGS</th>
<th>RENOVATED</th>
<th>ADDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Science Building (1986)</td>
<td>242,550</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Rosenthal Library (1988)</td>
<td>234,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Music Building (1991)</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Klapper Hall (1992)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>139,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delany Hall-“D” Bldg. (1991)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>601,550</td>
<td>168,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SMALL NEW BUILDINGS & ADDITIONS (GSF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Bldgs</th>
<th>Renovated</th>
<th>Additions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heating Plant Extension</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Oil Pump House on Reeves</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field House for Athletics</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation Pump House</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Building on Kissena</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core addition to Gertz Speech Ctr.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added shops for B&amp;G</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>9,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL OF NEW AND RENOVATED BLDGS** = 781,060 GSF

#### RENTED SPACES VACATED & BUILDINGS DEMOLISHED (GSF)

| Leased Electrical Industries Bldg. (Vacated in 1986-7, moved to “E” etc) | 24,000 |
| Leased Horace Harding (6 levels) (Vacated in 1994; 5th occupied to 1997) | 28,800 |
| T-4 Bldg., demolished in c.1982 (site for Rosenthal Library) | 20,000 |
| T-5 Bldg., demolished in c.1982 (site for Rosenthal Library) | 20,000 |
| "Q" Bldg., demolished in c.1981 (site of Parking Field #7) | 24,600 |
| 61st Road Houses demolition in 1985 (site of Parking Fields 15S & 15N) | 34,700 |
| **TOTAL** | 152,100 GSF |

**TOTAL OF VACATED & DEMOLISHED BLDGS** = 152,100 GSF
TABLE 9-3

ACTIVE CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN FY 1994-95

1. Renovation of "B" Building - Total renovation of a 1907 building for offices and classrooms for the BALA and CBNS Programs. Consultants will be selected in 12/94. Design scheduled to start July 1995. Estimated cost - $5.3 million. (QC 050-794)


3. Site Security Lighting, Phase IVA - Continuation of new lighting for walkways and roadways. Consultants were selected. Estimated start of design 7/95. Estimated cost $450,000. (QC 004-093)


5. Rehabilitation of Campbell Dome and Plaza - Structural repairs and roofing of large lecture hall. Consultants were selected. Estimated start of design Summer 1995. Estimated cost $420,000. (QC 002-089)

6. Roof Replacement for Rathaus and King Halls - New roofing for classroom buildings. Consultants were selected. Estimated start of design 7/95. Estimated cost $0.5 million. (QC 045-082)

6. Toilet Renovations for Physically Disabled - Modifications to toilets in 4 buildings at selected locations. Consultants were selected. Estimated start of design 7/95. Estimated cost $0.5 million. (QC 048-082)

7. Tennis Air Structure - An air inflated bubble over 6 tennis courts. The consultants were selected. Estimated start of design 7/95. Estimated cost $450,000. (QC 004-088)

8. Asbestos Abatement Program, Phase I - Asbestos abatement at selected locations in 10 buildings. Work in progress and estimated to be completed by 2/96. Total cost $1 million. (DC 92-023)

9. Exterior Rehabilitation, Windows and Roofing - New windows, facade rehabilitation and exterior doors in Remsen Hall; new roofing and exterior work in Dining Hall Addition. Work in progress and estimated to be completed by 11/95. Total cost $2.2 million. (DC 92-029)

10. Mechanical and Electrical Systems Upgrading - Upgrading of fume hoods and controls in NSB and three steam absorption chillers replacements in Dining Hall Addition Building and Colden Auditionum. Construction started 1/95 and estimated completion will be by 9/96. Estimated cost $2.5 million. (DC 92-030)

B. Powdermaker Hall

Hortense Powdermaker Hall (188,400 gross square feet) is the College's largest classroom building, containing about 38 percent of the College's classroom space. Constructed in 1962, it houses most departments in the Division of Social Sciences and the School of Education; the Social Science Computer Laboratory; and a number of administrative offices. This building is scheduled to be completely renovated. Design funds in the amount of $2.7 million have been approved; planning is expected to start in late 1995. The cost of renovation ($40 million) will be requested in FY 1997.

Because of its large size and the amount of classroom space it contains, this building cannot be completely vacated to allow for the renovation to proceed unhindered. Renovating while parts of a building are still in use is always a difficult task and will require close cooperation between the design consultants, the Queens College Campus Facilities Office, the DASNY/CUNY Construction Offices, and the deans, academic departments, and administrative offices housed in the building. Initial discussions with the deans housed in Powdermaker Hall have suggested that the following items be considered in planning for the renovation:

- Continuing the recent practice of providing private offices for faculty.
- Providing community spaces for students as done in the New Science Building and New Music Building.
- Designing all classrooms to take advantage of present and emerging technologies.
- Considering the inclusion of "educational laboratories" for teacher preparation programs.
- Gathering a list of "design errors" that have appeared in the new buildings on campus for presentation to the design consultants, in the hope that these will not be repeated.
- Providing security features for classrooms and other spaces.
- Including tactile signage and equipping designated classrooms and lecture halls with assistive listening systems for individuals who are disabled.

C. Science Facilities - Equipment Upgrades

The College's science facilities have benefitted greatly from funding through New York State's Graduate Research Initiative (GRI). These funds are for major pieces of equipment. In FY 1994, the total received was $735,000: $182,000 for Biology and Biochemistry laboratories (2 HPLC systems, cold room renovation, UV-Vis spectrophotometer, photo equipment for microscopy); $177,000 for Geology (upgraded X-ray diffractometer system, petrographic microscope, amino acid analyzer, seismometer); $126,000 for Computer Science (workstations and computer equipment); and $250,000 for Chemistry and Biochemistry (partial funding for a 400-MHz NMR). A proposal for up to $579,000 in additional GRI funds for 1995 has been made.
The GRI funding for Computer Science is just one of a number of external grants the department has received to upgrade its facilities. Additional funding from the Department of Defense and from two NSF Instructional Laboratory Initiative grants has led to the installation of an Ethernet-based network of 16 Sun SPARCstation 10's and 20's in almost all faculty offices, a student software engineering laboratory with eight Sun SPARCstation 5's, a student graphics laboratory with 12 SGI Indigo workstations, a faculty research laboratory with two multimedia Sun SPARCstation 20's, a SPARCServer 10000, three high-end SGI workstations and four NeXT workstations. In addition, the department has a 64-node Inmos parallel computer and a number of PC's and peripherals.

The teaching and research laboratories in Biology, Biochemistry and Chemistry have also been significantly enhanced by the $1.1 million grant from the Undergraduate Biological Sciences Initiative of the Howard Hughes Foundation. Equipment purchased through this grant enabled substantial curriculum revisions to be made in several introductory courses, and in Biology, led to the formulation of two new interdisciplinary laboratory methods courses in cell and molecular biology. It also provided start-up equipment for a new faculty member.

D. Science Facilities - Unmet Needs

Remsen Hall was occupied in 1950 and was the first of the "new" academic buildings at Queens College. It has four large, general-purpose lecture halls (two with a seating capacity of 240, and two with a capacity of 120), and several classrooms in addition to laboratories and offices. Before the opening of the New Science Building (NSB), Remsen housed most of Chemistry, parts of Home Economics, Geology, Psychology and one Biology laboratory. When NSB was occupied, Psychology and Geology moved out; Home Economics was consolidated in Remsen; the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry expanded and consolidated its space; and a large laboratory was renovated for the teaching of drafting. Several large vacated spaces in Remsen remain unrenovated.

There are numerous problems in Remsen. Many of the teaching and research laboratories are in very poor condition. Much of the laboratory furniture needs replacement and the ventilation system in the original laboratories does not meet current standards. The original laboratories and several others added subsequently are not air-conditioned, but are, nevertheless, used for teaching and research in the summer, an unhappy situation for faculty, staff, students and scientific instruments. There is a general deficiency throughout the building in the availability of electrical power for scientific equipment and for the number of window air conditioners that would be necessary to cool rooms with fume hoods. Remedies to these problems are talked about, but are not on the immediate horizon.

Many long-standing facilities problems within the Division of Mathematics and Natural Science were solved with the completion of the New Science Building. However, a number of problems are still outstanding:
• The Biology department is still divided between four different buildings. One of the Biology facilities, Colvin Hall (formerly E-Building) was constructed in 1927 and needs renovation badly; it has, for instance, no elevator, making the movement of equipment very problematic.

• Psychology has most of their space in NSB, but also has laboratories and faculty offices in NSF. Psychology has had growth in the number of majors in the last few years and cannot offer a sufficient number of sections of a required undergraduate laboratory course.

• The Mathematics department is located in Kiely Hall with a number of departments from the Humanities division. In this building faculty offices are located in the tower, and there are two and three faculty per office. The main departments office is located on a lower floor of the central part of the building. This arrangement reduces the collegiality so important to academic departments.

• The New Science Building was designed with little thought to the space needs of doctoral students and adjunct faculty. With the growth in the number of students pursuing doctoral work, and the addition of adjunct faculty who teach certain specialized courses, e.g. drafting, a number of departments in the division are beginning to find shortages in office space for these individuals.

E. Facilities for Students With Disabilities

Because of the guarantee of equal access and opportunity offered to qualified individuals with disabilities by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), people with disabilities look to Queens College to acquire the education and training necessary to compete in the competitive labor market. The College must continue to make its facilities more accessible to individuals with disabilities. The following is a list of modifications that would make the Queens College campus more accessible to people with disabilities:

• Installation of at least one power-assisted door opener at entrances of each building; modified elevator control panels and call buttons in Kiely Hall, Powdermaker Hall, Remsen Hall, and Fitzgerald Gymnasium; and more tactile signage marking doors and buildings.

• Construction of ramps to 6 Building; bathrooms accessible to wheelchairs in each campus building; additional curb-cuts on campus; and a ramp or lift in the pool in Fitzgerald Gymnasium.

• Resurfacing of the south side of the Quadrangle and the Powdermaker Hall/Campbell Dome plaza.

• Equipping designated classrooms and lecture halls with assistive listening systems.

• Increasing the number of handicapped parking spaces.

F. Parking Facilities and Their Allocation

Queens College is located in a part of New York City that is not well served by public transportation. There are subway lines nearby but not within walking distance; connection to the campus requires at least one bus trip. The College is located near several

---

1 This list was jointly compiled by the Office of Services for Students with Disabilities and the Committee for Disabled Students. In creating this list, both offices consulted the comprehensive, campus-wide accessibility evaluation conducted by the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association during the summer of 1992.
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major highways, and so it is easily accessible by automobile. While the College does have some parking capability, it does not have sufficient parking space for all those desiring to park on campus.

At the present time there are 1213 parking spaces in 21 different areas or parking fields controlled by the College and three areas with 190 spaces controlled by the Student Union. About 300 College spaces have been lost because of the construction program. A Parking Committee, composed of faculty and staff members, is responsible for developing parking regulations administered by the Security Department. Priority for parking is given to faculty and staff. Day and Day/Evening student parking is awarded using an elaborate priority system that takes into account the student's class standing and residence location relative to public transportation and the College. There are no restrictions placed on students purchasing Evening and Summer Session parking. New York State Motor Vehicle Handicapped Registration is required for handicapped parking. There are about 2000 legal curb parking spaces in the area bounded by the Long Island Expressway, Main Street, Jewel Avenue, and Kissena Boulevard. The roof over Parking Field 5, when converted to parking, will add about 350 additional spaces to the inventory. The total number of parking spaces will be 1563—about the same as the number that existed prior to the construction program.

G. Telephone Services

The College has gradually made the transition to its own telephone system. This has simultaneously reduced cost and improved service. Until quite recently, it was not unusual for certain of the College's buildings to have only one or two telephones per floor, located in the hall. Currently, most telephones are operating within the new 997-trunk line. By the end of 1995, the College hopes to have replaced all of the older 520-phone lines with 997-lines. Telephone registration, now in place for a number of years, has been a major improvement, dramatically reducing the time students spend registering. This Telephone Information Access System (TIAS) has been expanded to include such services as transcript requests and grade reporting.

H. Advanced Telecommunications

Computers and telecommunications networks are essential parts of the College's facilities infrastructure. They play important roles in student learning, faculty research, and college administration, including budget and financing as well as registration and related information systems. The QUASAR student information/registration system will be discussed in Chapter Ten: Students. The existing system does need enhancement and expansion to include more functions (e.g., degree audits, room allocation and utilization) and the ability to serve more users simultaneously; work is underway to achieve these goals. As noted in this chapter and in a number of others, the role of computers and telecommunications is becoming increasingly important in modernizing library systems and resources as well as providing access to materials at a lower (long-term) cost.
Budgetary limitations and the quality of electrical systems in existing facilities are both major constraints in making progress in upgrading the level of computer and telecommunications support. Financial resources are essential not only for purchasing equipment but also for providing staff support including user training. Support of the College's disabled and homebound students is particularly dependent on the quality of telecommunications facilities. The Computer and Communications Planning Committee, a subcommittee of the 1994-1999 Five-Year Planning Committee, issued a detailed report on the College's needs in these areas, and the Planning Committee has endorsed that report and made recommendations depending heavily upon it.²

A major concern from a facilities perspective is expansion of the Ethernet, a local area network, that will allow students, faculty, and administrators to be more fully integrated into the computing and telecommunications capabilities provided through the College (including e-mail and Internet and Bitnet connections). This goal is in the process of being implemented. Ideally, faculty and staff would have access from their offices; however, because a relatively low percentage of the faculty has personal computers on their desks, public facilities are particularly important to faculty as well as to students. Public access for students and faculty are provided in computer laboratories available in a variety of locations around the campus. (Some of these are managed by the Academic Computer Center; others, such as the Social Science Research Lab located in Powdermaker and the Sociology Department's facilities located in Kissena Hall, are provided by academic departments or divisions.) While these facilities have been expanding rapidly in recent years, need still outpaces availability. The installation of Ethernet connections is dependent on upgrading of electrical systems in older facilities such as Powdermaker Hall, and the College is in the process of these installations. The need for back-up electrical systems becomes increasingly important as the College depends increasingly on computers for storage of information and communications.

Other major concerns highlighted by the Five Year Planning Committee included maintenance, repair, and upgrading of existing equipment and facilities and the special needs of the Library. The Library has installed the NOTIS Integrated Library System, including CUNY+ (the CUNY on-line catalog) and other databases. It has also acquired a number of databases on CD-ROM. These technological resources need to be frequently and continuously updated. It also recommended more public work stations and accessibility to library resources through the Internet.

I. Energy Conservation

The design of the new campus buildings has taken into account new energy conservation requirements. One of the many energy-saving features has been insulated glass in windows that can open, allowing air conditioning to be minimized. Lighting

² "Queens College in the Information Age: A Report and Plan," Computer and Communications Planning Committee, Queens College, July 1, 1993.
surveys have resulted in reduction of general lighting in many areas of the College; and when the main power plant was expanded, the boilers were converted to a "dual fuel" system so that low cost natural gas is used most of the year. New York State has mandated a 20 percent reduction in energy usage by the year 2000. Towards this end, at least half of the College's square footage has been retrofitted with electronic ballasts and high-efficiency lighting fixtures. This project will continue for the next several years until replacement of inefficient devices is completed.

III. The Capital Budget Process

A. The Master Plan

The most recent Queens College Master Plan was approved in 1973. The first new building recommended in this plan, the New Science Building, was approved for design in 1974, although it ended up smaller in size than the one envisioned in the plan. New York City's fiscal crisis, the subsequent takeover of CUNY by the State of New York, the imposition of tuition, and the resultant decrease in the number of students, in combination, caused the College's Master Plan to be obsolete. Despite the lack of a Master Plan, the College has moved ahead on, and has completed, a number of important major capital projects (Section I.B.). The College expects to be given funding in FY 1996 to develop a new master plan for facilities.

B. The Capital Planning Process Today

The College does maintain a Ten-Year Plan for Capital Requests and Rehabilitation. This plan reflects the College’s long-term needs and past funding, and it is updated annually. Proposed projects are assigned a priority. When a new capital project is approved by the College administration, it is added to this plan. According to CUNY guidelines, repair and capital projects costing under about $100,000 are supposed to be funded from the College's annual operating budget. Projects costing under approximately $2,000,000 are funded, if approved by CUNY, from a separate annual CUNY capital projects/repair appropriation. Projects costing over $2,000,000 must be approved individually by the New York State Budget Office and the legislature; these are then funded by the Dormitory Authority (DASNY) through the sale of bonds. Contracting and payment for capital projects is done either by DASNY or the University. Each April, DCCM (the Department of Design, Construction and Management) of CUNY asks for a preliminary submission of its capital budget requests and provides parameters and suggestions on the extent of available funds, types of projects that can be funded, and other recommendations. Separate requests must be made for design, construction, and furniture and equipment.

C. Planning For Renovation and Rehabilitation

While CUNY will continue to fund a number of capital rehabilitation projects, the major source of new funds will be DASNY. In preparation for this, DASNY engaged a
consulting firm, Burns and Roe Industrial Services, to assess the condition of the College's buildings, identify deficiencies, and recommend a rehabilitation program. The specific objectives of this study were to establish the status of existing building systems, identify conditions adversely affecting the intended utilization of the facility, identify the probable cause of the deficiencies, determine compliance with code requirements, estimate costs to correct deficiencies, determine priorities; recommend remedial actions, plan short-term and long-term capital expenditures and create a computer data base. The study provides a detailed program for the short-term (less than five years) and for the long term (6 through 30 years) for each college building. The short-term plan provides for correction of existing serious deficiencies; the long-term plan forecasts projected routine maintenance costs, major equipment replacement costs, and miscellaneous system replacement costs after the implementation of the short-term rehabilitation program.

IV. Planning Committee's Facilities Survey Questionnaire

In the late spring of 1993, the Second Five-Year Planning Committee on Facilities sent all department and program heads an open-ended questionnaire asking them to specify their most immediate facilities needs and their longer term priorities. Twenty-four departments and programs replied. Some departments duplicated the survey questionnaire and asked their faculty members to reply individually, but most were answered by the heads. Given the option of departments and programs not to reply and the option of the heads of departments and programs to mention practically any problem with facilities, the responses represent a strong indication of the types and intensities of College facility problems at the departmental and programmatic level. The survey is not to be construed to represent a random sample of faculty opinion.

The responses revealed, often in quite useful detail, that each responding department had specific needs. There are, however, certain needs that appear to be quite general. Most departments would like an increase in the general level of maintenance and cleanliness. More than half reported problems with air conditioning, air flow, and heating. These problems were reported in the oldest (e.g., Powdermaker) and newest buildings (e.g., the New Science Building). Complaints from those in the new facilities concerned the inadequate and irregular fine-tuning of their buildings' air temperature and flow equipment. The frequency of complaints about availability of space was generally lower than about maintenance problems, focused principally on deficiencies of faculty office and departmental space, classroom space and parking.

V. Task Force Survey of Department Chairs on Facilities

The Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources sent a questionnaire concerning budgets and facilities to 34 department chairs in mid-November 1994. The questions were concerned with the impact of the budget and facilities on teaching and

---

3 The questionnaire may be found in Task Force Report Appendix A.
research. As of mid-January 1995, 28 had responded. Among the many findings on facilities were:

- Nearly thirty percent said that the availability of classrooms constrained the number of sections offered. However, more than sixty percent said that classroom sizes constrained their limits on class size.

- Twenty-five of the 28 chairs said that facilities, equipment, supplies, and other physical resources hindered effective teaching. Among the most frequently noted problems (in descending order of importance):
  - inadequate number/type of personal computers (76%)
  - inadequate or unregulated heating/air conditioning/ventilation (64%)
  - inadequate supplies of other materials (64%)
  - physical decay of buildings (56%)
  - inadequate supplies of paper (52%)
  - inadequate maintenance (48%).

- Nine of the 28 said that inadequate office space hindered teaching effectiveness. Twenty-two of the 28 said that facilities, equipment, and supplies limited effective research.

- Seventy-one percent reported that physical resource problems had gotten worse over the past five years.

VI. Survey of Students on Facilities

The Task Force on Resources included a number of questions on student perceptions of physical facilities and security on the survey administered by the Task Force on Students (see CHAPTER TEN: STUDENTS). There were 549 respondents. The major findings on facilities and security were:

- Fifty-three percent of the students report that they drive to campus.

- One-quarter of students believed that security is inadequate. Specific areas mentioned most often as lacking adequate security are parking lots and outdoors in general. Not surprisingly, the majority of responses indicate that security is inadequate during the evening hours (after 5 p.m.).

- Six percent of respondents say they have experienced a threat to safety while on campus. Of these 31, only one student reported a physical attack. Six students reported verbal attacks or other harassment, and four students reported thefts.

- A third of students think that classrooms and offices are not easy to locate.

- Two-thirds of students indicate that restroom cleanliness is either poor or fair, and 57 percent rate the cleanliness and environment of the dining facilities as poor or fair.

For the questions on which the following findings are based, there are high levels of non-response because many students never use certain facilities or buildings. The percentages for specific facilities are calculated after omitting the non-responses to individual questions.

- Just under two-thirds of students rate the computer labs and science labs as good to excellent, and three-quarters rate the special music facilities as good to excellent. Two-thirds rate the outdoor athletic facilities as good to excellent; 57 percent rated the condition of Fitzgerald Gym as good to excellent.
Rosenthal Library, the New Science Building, the New Music Building, Klapper Hall, and Delany Hall (all either recently constructed or renovated) are all highly rated by students, with about half the students reporting each of these to be in excellent condition and another 33 to 40 percent rating each to be in good condition.

Sixty percent of students responding to the question about the condition of Powdermaker Hall rated it as fair or poor. For Remsen, Colwin, the Dining Hall, and the Student Union, just about half the responding students rated these facilities as fair or poor.

Just under a quarter of students do not think that there are adequate places to study on campus.

The Library received the highest rating as a place to spend time between classes, with 53 percent of respondents saying they feel comfortable there. For both the Student Union and the Dining Hall only 27 percent reported that these are comfortable places to spend time. Eight percent said that there is no place on campus that is comfortable.

In summing up these findings:

1. Security does not seem to be a large problem, although it appears that there is concern about the evening hours in outdoor spaces.
2. There is very favorable reaction to the condition of the new or recently renovated facilities on campus.
3. Powdermaker Hall, which is already scheduled to be the College's next major rehabilitation project, is most frequently judged by students to be in poor condition. Similarly, the College's high priority with respect to renovating Remsen is corroborated by student opinion.
4. There is clearly a need to increase the places on campus in which students can comfortably spend time between classes.
5. The cleanliness of restrooms and dining facilities is a function of both the way the users of these facilities treat them and the way in which college staff maintain them. It is incumbent upon the College to work on both aspects to improve the College environment.

VII. Summary Analysis and Recommendations

A. Physical Facilities: Good News and Bad News

The College has seen an impressive growth in its physical plant of some 610,000 gross square feet (an increase of 44 percent since the last Middle States review)—as well as "gut" renovation of another 170,000 square feet. These new facilities not only improve the College's ability to provide instruction and carry out research, but also enhance its ability to serve the community (in particular, with the New Music Building and its LeFrak Concert Hall). The new and renovated buildings, as well as the improved landscaping and upgrading of outdoor spaces, also help make the College community proud of the campus and its achievements.
The College's two million square feet of space have a replacement value in the range of $500-600 million. The general rule of thumb suggested by plant engineering manuals is that facilities have an annual maintenance budget of 3 percent per year, suggesting the need for $15 million per year. From FY 1992 to FY 1995, the annual maintenance budget has averaged about $3.5 million in initial allocations, about one-fifth of the necessary level. Unfortunately, the College's operating budgets have not been adequately increased to take account of the need to maintain a larger physical plant. Indeed, the continuing pattern of reductions in building, maintenance, custodial and grounds staff and in OTPS and TS funds has resulted in reduced maintenance for all buildings. The College pays a high price for the reductions in daily maintenance and deferral of more significant maintenance needs--first, as faculty, staff and students attempt to work and learn in deteriorating and poorly-maintained spaces; and, second, down the road as the University will eventually have to deal with problems that have become more costly to address.

B. Recommendations

While the College does not have a current Academic Facilities Master Plan, it expects to receive funding to develop one in FY 1996. This new Master Plan must be developed in conjunction with the College's strategic planning. This plan should concentrate on those academic programs and support services that have not benefited from the construction and renovation program of the last thirteen years as well as on the needs of initiatives identified in the College's strategic plan.

- The plan should anticipate college classroom and office needs on time scales of five and fifteen years based on current growth estimates. Is the current classroom space adequate? Is there a proper mixture of classroom sizes? What are the needs of administrative support groups such as Buildings and Grounds?

- The plan should investigate specialized facilities that will, in combination, enhance the academic program and enable professional conferences to be held at the College.

- A part of the plan should allow the College to dream, to consider technologies and required facilities that might be appropriate for the year 2025.

Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a new Academic Facilities Master Plan. <9-1>

Since 1986 the College has added about 780,000 square feet (gross) of new or renovated space. During this time period the full-time staffing level of the Building and Grounds Department, including custodian services, has decreased by 17%. This reduction in maintenance, while saving money in the short term, will, if allowed to continue, degrade the physical facilities and ultimately decrease the quality of life at the College and have an
adverse impact on all academic programs. Some way must be found to reverse this trend. One difficulty with shortages in OTPS funding for maintenance is that the College is not able to purchase supplies in bulk, significantly raising their cost.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should improve maintenance of its facilities. <9-2>

The entire fabric of college life (from educational to social) is shaped by the presence of students even when they are not in class. The results of the survey indicate that the Library was the most comfortable place on campus to spend time. While this is a terrific reflection on the Library, it points to a need to provide more space for students to congregate comfortably.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should determine how to increase the amount of space on campus where students feel comfortable to congregate. <9-3>

The sorry state of the facilities in the Colden Center complex also call for attention. As members of the community use this facility on a regular basis, its appearance is an important part of the public image of the College.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should refurbish Colden Center and the Queens College Theatre. <9-4>

Even without any increase in funding (which remains essential), the College can do other things to improve maintenance. Currently, Building and Grounds personnel are housed in many places, leading to a lack of effective supervision. Centralization would help. Unfortunately, this needed improvement will likely require capital funds for reconfiguring existing buildings or adding to the physical plant. However,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should plan for construction of a central maintenance shop so that the productivity of the maintenance staff can be increased. <9-5>

And finally, as Characteristics of Excellence notes, "An institution that cultivates a sense of community responsibility for the physical facilities as a part of the total learning environment can add greatly to institutional morale." For anyone spending time on the Queens College campus, it is clear that the too many people who use this campus contribute to its poor appearance. There is graffiti in bathrooms and litter in classrooms and public spaces. This makes the job of the limited maintenance staff even harder and destroys the quality of the learning environment. Students, faculty, and staff—and campus organizations—must all be a part of keeping the campus clean. To that end, the President should take leadership in a campus-wide campaign to promote respect for the cleanliness of the campus. Part of that campaign should be a requirement that all clubs and organizations that distribute information be responsible for the paper distributed. There must be clear guidelines for posting of materials. There must be a public relations effort on campus to
create awareness among the students, as individuals, that they bear responsibility for not
defacing bathrooms or littering buildings or the campus. Ways of enforcing these new
policies must be developed.

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should promote campus cleanliness and community responsibility.  <9-6>

VIII. Summary List of Recommendations on Physical Facilities

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should develop a new Academic Facilities Master Plan.  <9-1>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should improve maintenance of its facilities.  <9-2>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should determine how to increase the amount of space on campus where students feel comfortable to congregate.  <9-3>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should refurbish Colden Center and the Queens College Theatre.  <9-4>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should plan for construction of a central maintenance shop so that the productivity of the maintenance staff can be increased.  <9-5>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should promote campus cleanliness and community responsibility.  <9-6>
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I. Student Characteristics

A. Summary Data for the College

The Queens College urban-commuter student population reflects the diversity of the borough of Queens. The 1990 United States Census has identified the borough as the most ethnically diverse county in the nation. Approximately 120 countries are represented and more than 60 languages spoken by students at the College. Data on racial/ethnic diversity are shown in Table 10-1.

TABLE 10-1: RACIAL/ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, FALL 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Undergraduate (%)</th>
<th>Graduate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Immigrants or children of immigrants make up approximately 45% of the undergraduate student population. Among undergraduates, Asian enrollments have increased 5.8% since 1984, and 11% since 1980. Hispanic/Latino student enrollments have risen 4.3% since 1984 and 7.6% since 1980. African-American enrollment has been steady. The current 56% white undergraduate student enrollment is expected to decrease to less than 50% within the next five years. There has also been an increase in the number of students from the Eastern Bloc countries, the former Soviet Union, Greece, India, and Pakistan. Among the master's students, there has been greatest growth in the Asian and Hispanic/Latino groups.

Enrollment of African-American students over the last decade has varied between 8 and 11% of the population although African-Americans comprise about 25% of the borough. This makes Queens College the unit with the lowest number of African-American students among its regular student and SEEK student populations on any CUNY campus. Why this is so is not readily apparent, although the presence of York College, another senior college, in nearby Jamaica is likely a significant factor. In 1993, York's student body was 62.9% African-American. A number of recruitment strategies have been used to attempt to increase this population, including the recent establishment of a scholarship program for African-American students, funded by the Queens College Foundation. None,
There has been an increase in the number of students age 26 years and older, reflecting a national trend in higher education. The age distribution of students in fall 1993 is shown in Table 10-2. Both academic departments and special programs, such as Adult Collegiate Education (ACE) and the Labor, Education, and Advancement Project (LEAP), have scheduled classes in the evenings and weekends and at union facilities to accommodate the educational objectives of this growing student population. In addition, there has been a substantial increase in the number of students with disabilities. Such diversity, accompanied by severe fiscal constraints, has created unique challenges for the College as it attempts to provide a high quality liberal arts education.

**TABLE 10-2: AGE DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS, FALL 1993**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Undergraduate (%)</th>
<th>Graduate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 or under</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-25</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-40</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Women comprise 60% of the undergraduate students and 72% of the graduate students. The percent of full time undergraduates has decreased from 68% in fall 1984 to 61% in fall 1993. Over 90% of the fall 1993 graduate students attended part time.

Although the annual tuition of $2450 may appear to be low compared to that of the State University or private institutions, it is a burden for the majority of students, who are in the lower-middle to lower income ranges. In order to pay for educational expenses and to support their families or themselves, more than 80% of our students work over 20 hours per week. Many full-time students also work full time. Financial aid assistance is received by approximately 50% of the registered undergraduate students. Necessary employment and personal demands have influenced the length of time that many students need to complete the bachelor's degree. The norm is five years or more for most students.

All students commute to the college as there are no dormitory facilities. Most students (76%) reside in the borough of Queens, a proportion which is essentially

---

1 Data from fall 1993.
2 See section IV, Undergraduate Retention.
unchanged from 1985 when 78% were Queens residents. Approximately 9% reside in the other boroughs of New York City, 11% come from Nassau and Suffolk counties. Transportation time considerations and work schedules influence the capabilities of the students to take full advantage of the College's academic and co-curricular opportunities.

**B. Enrollment Trends**

The College's overall enrollment has increased by 2161 students since 1985-86 to a total of 17,841 in 1994-95. Figure 10-1 presents the enrollment trends for undergraduate and graduate students over this period. Transfer students and ACE students account for the recent increases in Queens' enrollment.

**C. University Analysis of the "CUNY Student of the Future"**

In March 1995, the University released a major study, *Immigration/Migration and the CUNY Student of the Future*, that analyzes the recent trends in immigration from foreign countries and migration from Puerto Rico and attempts to predict the characteristics and educational needs of the CUNY student body in the year 2000. Quoting from the Executive Summary of this 158 page report:

The changes in first-time freshmen at CUNY over the 1980-1990 decade are striking, and, not surprisingly, parallel many changes in the New York City population. The most important of these changes, both for CUNY and for New York City, resulting from the huge inflow of immigrants during the decade which greatly increased the proportion of the foreign-born New York City population. While limitations in the University's admissions records make it impossible to determine directly the change in the percentage of foreign-born students at CUNY during the 1980's, it is clear that the proportion who were not US citizens rose substantially, indicating that CUNY, too, has experienced an increase in immigrant students during these years.

The change in the racial/ethnic distribution of CUNY students is clearly related to this immigrant flow and reflects corresponding changes in the New York City population, with non-Hispanic white students declining as a proportion of the whole, non-Hispanic Black students maintaining a roughly constant proportion of the student body, and the proportions of Hispanic and Asian students rising significantly.

Most notably, recent immigration has altered the distribution of the country of origin of both the New York City population and of our students. More students in 1990 than in 1980 mention the countries of Asia and Central and South America in describing their backgrounds, and fewer mention Puerto Rico and the countries of Western Europe and Africa. . . . Finally the varied settlement patterns of immigrants across the boroughs of New York City will mean that the exact way in which immigration affects individual CUNY institutions differs from college to college.

---

3 In 1985, 88% of students came from other boroughs and 8% from Nassau and Suffolk counties.

4 A major portion of this report was prepared by Linda N. Edwards, Professor of Economics at Queens College, during the year she spent as a Faculty Fellow in the University's Office of Academic Affairs.

5 Migrants from Puerto Rico are included because, as non-native speakers of English, they face many of the same educational issues as immigrants from foreign countries.
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The report cites statistics from the fall 1992 freshmen class as showing that 36.8% of Queens students are born outside the US or in Puerto Rico, with other senior colleges varying from a low of 16.2% at the College of Staten Island to a high of 60.4% at City College. Regions of origin most often identified by the 1992 Queens freshmen were: Asia, > 30% of all foreign born; Eastern Europe, South and Central America, Caribbean Other Than Puerto Rico and the Dominican Republic, each 10-19% of all foreign born; Middle East, 5-9.9% of all foreign born.

Perhaps the most striking prediction in the entire analysis is that, for the University as a whole, more than half of the CUNY first-time freshmen in the year 2000 will have been born outside of the United States or in Puerto Rico. Further complicating the picture, while all immigration is likely to increase, the rate of growth will be different for different country of origin groups, and Queens will have to deal with the differential patterns occurring in the borough.

Using the University’s 1990 first-time freshmen cohort, the report assessed how current foreign-born/Puerto Rican-born students differ from current US-born students. Again quoting from the report’s Executive Summary:

A basic fact, of course, is that foreign-born and Puerto Rican students are highly heterogeneous, varying in their academic as well as socio-economic backgrounds, their degree of cultural assimilation, and their mastery of English. Still, some generalizations can be made. Foreign-born students are older than their native-born counterparts, their parents have lower levels of educational attainment, they are more likely to have a General Equivalency Diploma, they have more difficulty reading and writing in English, and they are somewhat more proficient in mathematics. On the other hand, the degree aspirations of foreign-born and Puerto Rican-born students are very much the same as those of US-born students. In addition, foreign-born and Puerto Rican-born students are more likely than their native-born counterparts to make use of the various support services offered by the colleges.

By the year 2000, New York City population will again have a proportion of foreign-born that matches the highs of the early decades of this century; it should approach double that of the 1960’s when only 18.2% of New York City’s residents were foreign-born. Queens and all CUNY colleges will have to respond to the changing needs and demands of this new wave of immigrants/migrants. The faculty and staff will need to understand the magnitude of the immigration/migration phenomenon and ask what curriculum assumptions need to be reviewed, whether the types of support services are appropriate, and whether there are sufficient staff to meet the expected increase in demand.

D. Fall 1994 Survey of Queens College First-Time Freshmen

In fall 1994, for the first time in decades, the College participated in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program’s survey of first-time freshmen conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute of the University of California, Los Angeles. Surveys were distributed and filled out in sections of English 110 and SEEK 101; these sections of English Composition are predominantly, though not exclusively, freshmen. Because of the manner in which the survey forms were distributed, certain groups of
freshmen would not have been polled, e.g. students in College English as a Second Language classes.  

In all, 469 students responded. Selected features of this sample will be described, especially when the Queens group differs substantially from students from all four year public colleges in the survey. Table 10-3 presents data on a variety of attributes: student's racial and linguistic background; parental income and education; country of birth of student and parents; and student's citizenship, political view and religions identification.

**TABLE 10-3: FRESHMAN SURVEY, FALL 1994**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Queens (%)</th>
<th>4yr Public Colleges (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racial Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>74.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American/Chicano</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Latino</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Parental Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of $60,000 or More</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of less than $10,000</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neither Parent Born in U.S.</strong></td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Born in U.S.</strong></td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student is a U.S. Citizen</strong></td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student is Non-Native Speaker of English</strong></td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6 The distribution plan will be revised in subsequent years and will attempt to include all first-time freshmen. However, with the significant sample of respondents, there is reason to believe that the current findings represent perceptions of students who are relatively new to the College.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Queens (%)</th>
<th>4 yr Public Colleges (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students' Religious Preference (selected)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Orthodox</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: Student Identifies as Born Again Christian</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Father's Education (selected)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not graduate from high school</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother's Education (selected)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not graduate from high school</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student's Political View</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far left/liberal</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle of the road</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative/far right</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, this sample is only 46% white, as opposed to 56% for all Queens undergraduates and 75% white in all four year public colleges in the survey. Parental income of Queens students is significantly lower than that of students from public colleges.
as a whole. The Queens group is much more likely to have the student and both parents born outside the US and to have the student be a non-native speaker of English, reinforcing the data obtained by the University for 1990 and 1992 first-time freshmen.

Substantial differences in religious preference and political views are shown between the Queens and national samples; there are many fewer Queens students identifying as "born-again Christians" and many more identifying themselves politically as far left/liberal. Overall, the parents of Queens students have not attained as high a level of education compared to parents of students in the national sample; however, the percent with graduate degrees is almost the same.

When asked their probable major, more Queens students plan to major in the biological sciences, pre-med/pre-dent/pre-vet, and computer science, and fewer are interested in engineering and the physical sciences, compared to the national sample. Queens students have higher aspirations for post-baccalaureate study: 78.9% vs. 68.9% in the national sample. More Queens students than national sample students cited the following reasons as very important in deciding to go to college: parents wanted me to go (46.5% vs. 36.5%); improve reading and study skills (54.0% vs. 42.1%); and prepare for graduate or professional school (64.7% vs. 54.7%). While there were eighteen statements where the two groups tended to have remarkably similar views, Queens students differed by more than ten percentage points from the national sample in agreeing or strongly agreeing with the following statements:

- taxes should be raised to reduce the deficit (13.9% Queens vs. 25.2% national)
- abortion should be legal (69.8% vs. 59.4%)
- federal government should do more to control handguns (90.9% vs. 80.5%)
- a national health care plan is needed (83.0% vs. 71.0%)

As the College continues to administer the survey in following years, longitudinal data can be accumulated. It will also be important to standardize the population of students studied, something which was not as carefully controlled this year as it should have been.

II. Student Information Systems

Since the last Middle States review, the College has made significant strides in improving its information systems and services to students. During spring 1992, the College made the long-awaited major transition from what was basically a manual record keeping system to an integrated student information management system that includes a telephone registration component. This system, known as QUASAR (the QUEens Access System for Advising and Registration), is based on City University's Student Information Management database. It has significantly enhanced the College's ability to serve the growing informational needs of the campus and its students with a more convenient, flexible and accessible registration system, easier and more decentralized access to academic records for advising purposes, and more accurate and timely response to student inquiries.
regarding information in the College's records. In addition to providing the flexibility of registering students either by touch-tone phone or through on-line terminals in administrative and academic offices, this system also enables students to withdraw from courses, add and drop courses, select pass/no credit options, and access their grades. In spring 1995, the City University's restructured student data base was brought into production. This permits the College to enhance the system and work with CUNY in expanding its scope and sophistication.

In the three years since this transition, the City University has purchased two external modules which, when fully implemented, will make the system even more effective in serving the College community. The first module, called PACE, is currently being used by the College's Undergraduate Degree Audit Unit as a first step in the degree certification process for general education requirements. Some academic departments are using the PACE module on a pilot basis for "major" certification for June 1995 candidates for graduation. The Department of Accounting and Information Systems has served as a trial site for this process for the February 1995 graduating class. It is anticipated that when this module is fully functional, it will enable the College to provide students routinely with an audit of degree requirements met to date and still unmet. The Registrar's Office is working with Peer Advisers to ensure that the student degree audit output document is a user-friendly and helpful advising tool.

In a continuing effort to find cost-efficient electronic solutions for jobs that once necessitated many hours of manual labor, the City University has acquired the Schedule 25/25E module, which is a class and event scheduler. Still in the developmental stage and planned for a phased-in implementation, this module allocates a semester's classroom space based on specific criteria (i.e. number of seats, access for the disabled, etc.) and can also be used to assign space for one-time-only academic/non-academic events. In addition, the College is currently working to develop touch-screen access work stations so that students can obtain important information in their records through a convenient medium, especially during hours when college offices are not available for public service.

To enhance access to information regarding campus services and events, the Queens College Information Center has provided the college community and visitors with telephone and in-person service Monday through Friday. The Center is unique in that it is run largely by students in the Business and Liberal Arts Program (BALA) who volunteer to staff the center as a junior year project. Those students who successfully complete the project are then eligible to register for a special senior BALA course called "Corporate Communications." This course has been taught by the College President or by a member of the Corporate Advisory Board. Supplemental support for the Information Center pays for part-time college assistants to assure consistent coverage. The day-to-day operations are supervised by the Admissions Office.

While much has been accomplished in recent years, there are still many things to be done. This includes adopting new technology to facilitate delivery of information to the student body, and further development of the existing QUASAR and PACE systems.
Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should continue the development of information systems and methods of access to information in the student data base to improve advising and information services to students. <10-1>

### III. Recruitment and Admissions

#### A. Undergraduate Matriculants

Matriculated undergraduates are admitted either as freshman or as transfer students. Presently, freshmen are admitted on one of the following University-wide criteria: a high school average in academic subjects of at least 80%; a rank in class of at least the 66th percentile; a high school equivalency test score (GED) of at least 300; or a combined recentered SAT score of 1020 or higher. Transfer students are admitted on the basis of a grade point average: students with 6-11 credits need at least a 2.50 GPA; those with 12-23 credits need a 2.25 GPA; and those with 24 or more credits need a 2.00 GPA.

Administrators at the University Admissions Processing Center (UAPC) estimate that only 22% of the City’s high school seniors graduate with an 80 average or better. This represents the main pool from which students are recruited into the senior colleges of CUNY, including Queens. Queens College undergraduate recruiters visit around 50 high schools each recruitment season. Students who fill out a UAPC application indicate in a rank order (1-4) which units they would like to attend.

Throughout the 1970's and 1980's, there was an increase in negative perceptions of Queens College as an open admissions institution, thereby reducing the attractiveness of the College to prospective students and their families. In order to make the academic strengths of Queens College more visible to the public, former President Kenny actively supported a program to improve the public image of the College. This began soon after her arrival in 1985 and involved advertising in the media, a new logo, a redesign of the College catalogue, new recruitment brochures, and a new letterhead. The college's advertising campaign was targeted toward the diverse pool of academically strong, achievement-oriented students. The recruitment program emphasized the wide variety of academic programs of the College, the credentials of its faculty, the combination of the urban and suburban setting of the College, the diversity of the student body, and the campus life. A major intent of the advertisement campaign was to increase the College's attractiveness to Nassau and Suffolk residents.

During 1985-1990, a comprehensive reorganization of the Undergraduate Admissions Office was undertaken and what had been separate units (Pre-Admissions, Admissions and Graduate Admissions) were reorganized under a new Executive Director of Admission, Marketing, and Scholarship Services who was charged with creating a unified program to recruit and admit students. The merged Pre-Admissions and Admissions offices
were relocated to a central location in Kiely Hall. The undergraduate office consists of 6 professional staff and 8 CUNY Office Assistants. The Graduate Office, still in Powdermaker Hall, consists of 2 professional staff and 2 CUNY Office Assistants. It is scheduled to move to Kiely Hall in the next year or so. Issues related to graduate admissions will be discussed below in section III.B.

The SEEK (Search for Education, Elevation, and Knowledge) program, working in collaboration with the Office of Admissions, has had its own recruitment program for several years. It includes community visits, the publication of a brochure and other efforts to attract students who meet the criteria of being educationally- and economically-disadvantaged. Future recruitment in SEEK is limited as the University is restricting SEEK enrollments to the figure budgeted by New York State. ACE and LEAP also work collaboratively with the Office of Admissions to recruit students. This has included advertising in the continuing education brochure, Horizon; other efforts to attract mature (over 25 years of age) and highly motivated adults; and, in the case of LEAP, working closely with labor unions who are interested in having their workers pursue college degrees.

B. Graduate Matriculants

Prospective graduate students submit all the required documents to the Graduate Admissions Office. The staff verifies the application contents, logs them in, maintains a stand-alone database on applications, and sends the completed applications to the appropriate academic departments for review. The respective academic departments render a decision and students are notified by the Graduate Admissions Office. Currently, there is no formal, on-going recruitment of graduate students due to budget constraints. The Graduate Admissions Office processed 4600 applications for spring 1994 and 9730 for fall 1993.

C. Enrollment Conversion

The rate of conversion from "accepted" to "registered" is an important measure in being able to predict enrollments. About 50% of accepted freshmen actually enroll in the college. There is some variation by ethnicity in the percent of admitted students who actually enroll: a larger percent of admitted Hispanics enroll, followed by Asians, Blacks, and Whites respectively. Almost 70% of accepted transfer students enroll in the college. Here too, there is some variation by ethnicity in the percent of admitted transfer student who actually enroll. Blacks, followed by Hispanics, are more likely to enroll as transfer students than other ethnic groups.

In light of these enrollment patterns and the heightened pressures on the College to maintain and increase enrollments to achieve tuition targets set by the University as described in CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES, the College must devise new ways to manage its recruitment and admissions processes. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should adopt a comprehensive enrollment management strategy and should expand its capabilities to collect and analyze information on the characteristics of accepted and enrolled students. <10-2>

D. Non-Degree Students

Unlike matriculated students, non-degree students apply directly to the College. Since 1986, the Academic Senate has made substantial changes in the admission criteria for non-degree students. These include an increase in the minimum score on the GED from 250 to 300 and a requirement that students not meeting admission standards must have been out of school for at least three years before they may be considered for admission. The advent of the QUASAR student system has made it possible to implement the Academic Senate policy limiting non-degree students to 11 credits per semester; this resulted in a significant drop in the number of full time non-degree students. Current non-degree enrollments for fall 1994 totaled 1008 students and include two special categories: 213 students from Townsend Harris High School and 458 senior citizens.

E. Trends in Assessment Test Scores

University-wide assessment tests in writing, reading and mathematics are given to all entering students and used for placement. Students must pass the tests before they take their 61st credit. From 1986 to 1993, the native English-speaking matriculated freshman cohort had similar pass rates in math and reading, and a slight increase in the pass rate in writing. Native English-speaking non-degree students had improvements in the pass rates on all three tests. From 1991 to 1993, pass rates for non-degree students were higher than those of freshmen. Over the same period, the non-native English-speaking matriculated freshman cohort maintained the same pass rates in reading and mathematics and showed improvement in writing. Non-native English-speaking non-degree students had similar pass rates in mathematics (except for a lower rate in 1993) and increases in reading and writing. A new reading test, first administered in fall 1994, includes testing procedures more reflective of college reading than previously. This has resulted in a noteworthy decrease in the pass rates in reading for all cohorts.

The College has experienced a substantial increase in the number of students for whom English is a second language. Not unexpectedly, pass rates for such students are substantially lower in writing and reading. Enrollments in courses in the College English as a Second Language (CESL) sequence have risen 155% since the 1986-87 academic year; this underestimates demand since some students who have been placed in CESL courses have been unable to find seats available. As noted in an earlier section in this chapter, currently CUNY projects that over 50% of students in the year 2000 will be foreign-born, increasing the demand on the College's services for non-native speakers of English. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should prepare for increases in the number of students for whom English is a second language. <10-3>

IV. Undergraduate Retention

A. Retention and Graduation Rates

Data on retention and graduation rates for classes entering the College since 1986 have been analyzed and compared to data from the CUNY senior colleges as a whole. There has been a consistent rise in retention in the years 1989-1992 compared to 1986-1988 for regularly admitted first-time full time freshmen. Queens students were retained for the first year at the same rate as University freshmen collectively. Retention of Queens students in subsequent years tracks a few percentage points below that of the University as a whole. By the fourth semester, approximately 70% remain enrolled, and by the sixth semester, the percent is 61%.

Where the College exceeds University averages is in graduation rate. The Queens four year graduation rate of about 14% is five percentage points higher than University averages. It rises to 34% at five years and 42% at six years, and continues to exceed University averages of 27% and 36% respectively at these later time points.

B. Re-entry Rates

In fall 1994, 922 students re-entered the College after a lapse of at least one semester’s registration. This situation reflects Queens’ significant “stop-out” population, i.e., those students who, although in good academic standing, fail to maintain continuous registration at the College. As noted in the following section, the College has recently taken a number of proactive steps designed to improve student success and retention. However, there has not been a systematic study done since 1986 on why students leave the College. Work in this area is long overdue and should be accorded high priority. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Retention Coordinator and the Office of Institutional Research should undertake a study of the reasons students cite for “stopping out” or dropping out of the College in preparation for a concerted effort by all campus constituencies toward improving the College’s retention and graduation rates. <10-4>

C. Strategies to Improve Student Success - Retention and Graduation

Retention of registered students involves strategies aimed at students who leave, or are at risk of leaving, for reasons other than academic standing, and at those who are having substantial difficulty academically. The College is concerned with the needs of both
groups of students and has devised methods to address the needs identified.

In 1992, the College received special funding from the University's Freshman Year Initiative to launch a coordinated program for first semester freshmen, which has been described previously in CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS. One of the major aims of this program was to improve retention of freshmen by creating closely knit academic communities to counter what can appear to freshmen to be a huge, impersonal institution. This program has expanded to serve a very substantial proportion of new freshmen, with support from the College, the University and the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE). Preliminary evidence indicates that the program is succeeding, and response from students and faculty has been very positive.

Other proactive measures include the hiring in summer 1994 of two new professionals, the Director of Academic Advising and the Retention Coordinator. The Director of Academic Advising, reporting to the Provost, has taken over responsibility for the required freshman advising and registration sessions, and is now in the process of redesigning these programs and expanding academic advising and program planning services for continuing students who have not decided upon a major.

The Retention Coordinator reports to the Dean of Students, and is charged with expanding activities geared to orienting freshmen to student life and with related outreach activities to help retain students who may or may not be experiencing academic difficulty. Beginning in 1993, the College began a process aimed at minimizing "stop-outs." This involves sending a letter to students in good academic standing who fail to register for the next semester. In addition, students still unregistered after early registration are contacted by phone and are asked whether any special interventions would be helpful.

Retention efforts are also geared to students in academic difficulty. Current practice is that students placed on academic probation receive a letter from the Office of Counseling and Advisement strongly urging them to come in for an interview at the beginning of the next semester. Of about 800 students placed on probation, between 150-200 will fail to register for the next semester. Of the remaining 600, between 150 and 200 will come in for the interview, which attempts to determine what problems are contributing to the poor academic performance and to work with the student to overcome those problems.

V. Academic Advising

Since the previous Middle States review, there has been increased attention given to student advising at Queens College. The College's own planning processes have identified this as a top priority, and resources have been allocated to expand and improve advising services. As noted in the previous section, progress in this effort is evident in the introduction of the Freshman Year Initiative and its Learning Communities; the implementation of the new student information management system, QUASAR; the establishment of the new Office of Academic Advising; and the appointment of the
Coordinator of Retention Programs.

A. Office of Academic Advising

This newly created office handles advising and program planning assistance for all incoming freshmen.\(^7\) The goal is to make the initial registration process easier by providing freshmen with a centralized point from which they will receive their test scores, college bulletin, course schedules, etc. Once they have this information, the Office provides group information sessions and a one-on-one faculty-freshman registration conference. Academic advisors are available in the evening to assist new and continuing evening students. In the future, the Office will focus on improving second semester advising for freshmen, institute advising programs for incoming transfer students and offer pre-major advising. The Office also expects to support academic departments who wish to reconfigure their advising program for majors.

B. The Freshman Year Initiative / Freshman Learning Communities

There is a substantial advising component in the College's Freshman Year Initiative (FYI) program. The FYI Director works closely with the Director of Academic Advising to recruit and provide initial advising services to freshmen. The structure of the Learning Communities, where the faculty meet to discuss curricula and student progress, provides for individualized attention to the needs of students. The presence of teaching assistants in the English composition and math sections allows for peer mentoring.

C. Counseling and Advisement Center

Peer advisors and professional staff in the Counseling and Advisement Center offer pre-major advisement, personal counseling and counseling on academic probation issues. As is often the case, students' academic problems are caused or compounded by problems that have to do with personal circumstances. The Counseling and Advisement Center is, therefore, in a unique position to assist students to come to grips with issues of both a personal and an academic nature. Peer advisors bring to the program enormous energy and rich diversity. They provide information about College requirements and standards and review student transcripts to help determine their progress toward degree requirements. They help students determine whether they should see a member of the professional staff for in-depth counseling. Peer advisors go through an extensive training program that acquaints them with College policy and procedures and provides them with an understanding of group process and advising strategies.

\(^7\) The Office of Academic Advising works with the Office for International Students and the College English as a Second Language program for students in these programs. SEEK students are counseled separately.
D. Coordinator of Retention Programs

As noted above, the newly appointed Coordinator of Retention Programs provides advising services for "at risk" students and those on academic probation. The Coordinator works closely with the Director of Academic Advising, staff in the Counseling and Advisement Center and the Director of Student Activities to assure the integration of existing services for students.

E. Minority Students Advisement Office

The Minority Students Advisement Office acts as an advocate for minority students and works in collaboration with academic, administrative and support units to ensure effective outreach and support of their needs. It provides general academic, pre-registration and pre-professional advisement to minority students, advises minority students about undergraduate and graduate training and scholarships, and assists students through the application and interviewing processes. The Director serves as advisor to minority pre-professional clubs and works with deans and department chairs to discuss ways of improving and extending the advisement offered by departments.

F. Career Development Center

The Career Development Center offers a broad range of services: assisting students in meeting their career development needs from entry to graduation and beyond, providing students with advisement and counseling on how to choose their academic major based on their career objectives, advising and assisting students in the career decision-making process, assisting students in financing their education through part-time and full-time work experience, providing advice to students on how their experience can be developed to enrich their future career goals, and providing advice and information on how to organize their credential files for graduate school and for employment purposes. The Office has assisted with over 8000 annual student contacts. Group advising experiences include free hour workshops and workshops conducted for students in the Learning Communities of the Freshman Year Initiative.

The Career Development Center works closely with the Student Association and with student clubs to sponsor programs focusing on major and career choice. A recent example is the Career/Major Forum held in October 1994 designed especially for freshmen and sophomores with questions about declaring a major.

G. Academic Departments and Programs

All academic departments offer some form of advising for majors, although what is offered varies markedly in quantity, emphasis and approach. Interviews with some department chairs revealed that students receive advising from departments with regard to transfer credit evaluation, issues relating to the academic major, LASAR requirements,
filing for graduation, information on graduate schools and some career information.

Few department chairs, however, are satisfied with the degree to which advising responsibilities are integrated into the duties of their faculty. On the contrary, many departments report that they rely overwhelmingly on the goodwill of the faculty. Constraints in providing the desired level of academic advising include the lack of sufficient number of faculty available to meet with students, poor motivation or lack of information on the part of some students to seek advising, and the absence of recognition for faculty who participate in student advising.

Many departments produce extensively documented handbooks for their majors, amplifying on the material in the College Bulletin. There is widespread agreement that this practice should continue. The Director of Academic Advising has been interviewing all department chairs during the spring 1995 semester, and will be working with departments to improve communication with, and advising of, majors. The Administrative Computer Center has just completed a programming project which will provide each department with a comprehensive profile of all declared majors each semester; this information should prove useful to departments as they devise ways to improve advising services to their students.

The Department of Psychology has had a long-standing program of peer-advancing for their students. Building upon the training provided by the College's Peer Advisement program, Psychology Peer Advisors are available regularly in the department office to assist students on a drop-in basis.

BALA and Journalism faculty and administrators do intensive advising of students to assist in the selection of majors, preparation for internships and practice for interviews and public-speaking opportunities. In Journalism, the publication of Queens World provides a setting for advising as students resolve real-world ethical issues involved in making editorial decisions. In BALA, advising also occurs through faculty sponsorship of BALA Enterprises, a student-run business; the Corporate Corridor, a student-produced newsletter; and the BALA Club.

H. Search For Education, Elevation and Knowledge (SEEK)

The SEEK program is staffed with counselors who advise students about college degree requirements including LASAR, basic skills, and college majors; conduct the mandatory Student Life Workshops; review student course selection each semester; complete individual reviews of progress; and conduct freshman and transfer student orientation including course scheduling and registration procedures. The teaching faculty in SEEK also offer advice to students based on their interest in subject areas and refer them to "counseling" and/or to area departments for further information.
I. ACE and LEAP

The ACE program believes strongly in the importance of professional advising for the retention and success of adults in college. Four part time counselors offer advising services during the day; evening hours are available by appointment. Advisors work with students on understanding program requirements, untangling College policy questions, articulating ACE requirements with general College requirements, and offering assistance with selection of a major.

Advising is also a major component of LEAP, and is designed to assist the adult student in setting and meeting educational goals, in learning to negotiate the College environment, and in gaining control of their lives in general. This is accomplished through orientation workshops, mailings, and individualized advising.

J. Pre-professional Advising

The Health Professions Advisory Office is run by a faculty member who also serves as the Chair of the Health Professions Advisory Committee. The Chair and members of the Committee advise students who are seeking careers in the various health professions. One of the major responsibilities of the Office is to prepare letters of recommendation for these professional schools. This task involves working with student transcripts, interviewing students and presenting a total picture of the students to the professional schools. The Chair also assists students in applying for scholarships, including the University's Salk Scholarships. These highly sought after awards are given to students who have done a substantial research project and have been accepted into medical school. Of the eight monied awards given University-wide in spring 1995, two were Queens College students. The Pre-Law Office is also run by a faculty member who offers advising and information on when students should take the LSAT, how to prepare for the test, selection of an academic major, which schools to apply to, and how to prepare the essay for admission to law school.

K. Office of Honors and Scholarships

The College, under the auspices of the Office of Honors and Scholarships, is in the initial phase of developing a general honors program in an effort to attract and retain outstanding students. The fall 1994 group of students is composed of the 23 freshman Queens College Scholars, who receive four-year scholarships based on their high school credentials, letters of recommendation, and an essay (the latter two of which are not a part of the usual admissions requirements). The Queens College Scholars Program is more than ten years old. Prior to the 1994-95 academic year, scholarship support was the only element of the program. In the spring of 1994, the incoming scholars were given special advising and the opportunity to enroll in special courses designated for scholars. During the

8 There are approximately 40 Queens College Scholars in their sophomore, junior and senior years.
course of the academic year, the freshman scholars (and in some instances the sophomore scholars) have participated in a luncheon-seminar series to help them get to know more about the College's specific honors programs and to help them with academic planning. The Office of Honors and Scholarships also assists the College's students in applying for major national fellowships and scholarships and assists the Committee on Honors and Awards in identifying students for College-wide graduation honors.

Current plans for 1995-96 include a one-credit seminar for freshman scholars; the theme will be contemporary issues and will draw on the College’s outstanding faculty. In addition, special sections of LASAR courses will be designated for Queens College Scholars; freshmen, sophomores, and possibly juniors will have the opportunity to enroll. The number of entering scholars is being expanded in fall 1995, with the expectation that 25 or more students will be awarded the opportunity to participate in the Queens College Scholars Program. As courses and program elements are developed for the Queens College Scholars, the plan is to expand the honors program to other students who are identified as academically outstanding during the course of their studies at the College and to admit outstanding transfer students.

L. Analysis and Recommendations

It is evident that the College offers a wide array of advisement services to students. Many faculty members show a strong desire and willingness to assist their students. However, there is still a lack of coordination of advising services and insufficient support of departmental advising. For academic advising to have any solid and sustained value, departments need to set up specific timetables, designate faculty to handle advising, and publicize the availability of advising to students. New faculty orientation sessions should include information and training for advising duties. Another issue which needs to be addressed is the widespread perception that advising, unlike teaching or research, is not rewarded in any significant manner. Solutions should be sought to remedy this persistent obstacle to greater faculty involvement in student advising. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should forge ahead on the first recommendation of the 1995-1999 Planning Committee to "improve the advisement of students," and should begin implementation of the specific means suggested in the report. <10-5>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should seek greater institutional recognition for the faculty role in student advising, and should build recognition of advising responsibilities more directly into the faculty reward system. <10-6>
VI. International Students

The November 23, 1994, issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education reported that the United States had enrolled a record 449,750 foreign students in 1993-94. That year Queens College had 900 international students and ranked 13th in undergraduate/master's institutions in foreign student enrollment. The 1994-95 figure is approximately 1,000 international students representing 73 counties with most coming from China, Taiwan, Korea, Hong Kong, and Israel.

The International Student Services Office was established in 1987. At that time it was staffed with three professional level employees (director, associate director, foreign student advisor) and one secretary. Subsequent staff losses and a hiring freeze have left the Office staffed by one full-time director and one full-time secretary. As of November, 8000 student contacts had been made in 1994 with staff. Clearly this office is understaffed and unable to meet all of the needs of international students.

The International Student Affairs Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Senate dealing with the problems and concerns of international students. It is composed of four elected faculty, four elected students and three ex-officio members representing the Office of the Registrar, the International Student Services Office, and the English as a Second Language Program. In the past four years, this Committee dealt with a number of important issues, such as timing of academic dismissal, the time that international transfer students have to pass the CUNY assessment test in writing, and development of a mentoring program. The International Mentoring Program was established by the International Student Affairs Committee in fall 1994. It has been lauded as an innovative program by Acting President Curtis and described in the Quad (the College's student newspaper) as a marked success. The initial group consisted of 15 mentors (faculty and administrator volunteers) and 17 mentees. Results of questionnaires to mentors and mentees indicate that the overwhelming majority of participants felt extremely positive about the program and wished it continued. With the help of the International Student Services Office, this program will be expanded to include international student peer advisors.

Eight individual interviews and one group interview were conducted with international students by the Task Force on Students. Out of these discussions, the following problems emerged: students have difficulty learning English and developing friendships; they need better orientation to the use of facilities on campus (e.g., the Library); and they need more opportunities to learn about the resources that are available to international students.

---

9 International students are those on foreign (J1) visas. Foreign-born students who are permanent US residents or citizens are not included in this designation.
Suggestions for improvement included: institution of a follow-up "orientation" meeting during the second semester; a library tour designed specifically for international students; a tour of campus buildings and facilities; better publicity for existing services and programs such as the International Student Mentoring Program, the International Student Affairs Committee and the Writing Skills Workshop. A fully-staffed International Student Services Office would allow the director to concentrate on program development for international students while other staff could provide advisement and process legal paperwork. English language skills remain the greatest barrier to academic success for many international students. Expanded course availability in the College English as a Second Language curriculum and services in the Writing Skills Workshop would be extremely valuable for these students.

There are over 30 registered clubs on campus that cater primarily to students of certain ethnicities. These serve both students on foreign visas and permanent residents. Some examples include the Caribbean Student Association, Ikaros Greek Orthodox Club, and the Pakistan Club.

VII. Students With Disabilities

The Office of Special Services serves students with disabilities, providing them with support, counseling, and advising on personal, vocational, and academic levels. A decade ago, the Office of Special Services (then known as SEEDS--Services to Enrich the Education of Disabled Students) served approximately 150 students with disabilities. Most had physical disabilities; students with learning disabilities were typically referred to other resources since SEEDS lacked the staff and expertise to accommodate them properly. Under Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act, the College was required to provide equal access and opportunity for students with disabilities to all programs and facilities offered by the College. The College has made some progress towards this end, including initiating projects that make the campus more architecturally accessible to students with disabilities. The College also supported the creation of a Homebound Program for students whose disabilities prevent them from attending on-campus classes and activities. The enactment of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 extended Section 504's mandate of equal access and opportunity to previously unprotected and underserved individuals with disabilities.

Currently there are 380 students registered with the Office of Special Services who have a range of disabilities. The largest growing subpopulation is those with significant deficits in learning. In the 1994-1995 fiscal year, the Office of Special Services acquired grant funding to hire a Learning Disabilities Specialist who is qualified to administer and interpret on-site diagnostic cognitive assessments. To serve students with learning difficulties, individualized tutoring sessions are set up, on-going academic monitoring is performed and workshops ranging in topic from study strategies to stress-reducing techniques are offered. There are plans to enhance faculty awareness of hidden disabilities so that professors will be better equipped to accommodate and refer such students. In order
to achieve this, there will be departmental orientations that address specific issues, which will supplement the session on students with disabilities which has already been incorporated into the new faculty orientation program.

The physical access to the campus for people with disabilities has been improved through the construction and renovation of campus buildings (i.e., the New Science Building, Rosenthal Library, Klapper Hall, and the Music Building). Only two campus buildings ("G" and "I" Buildings) are presently inaccessible to people with disabilities. In addition, as a response to the ADA's more stringent requirements for programmatic access, the College has made significant progress in ensuring that all programs and curricula are accessible to students with disabilities.

The Homebound Program continues to grow. The number of applicants has risen by 90% over the last 10 years. The program has been unable fully to meet this growing demand because of the limited number of classrooms equipped with homebound technology and the inability of the College to continue to devote a full-time line to fund the coordination of the program. Technology continues to hinder the program's ability to simulate the classroom environment as effectively as desired; however, the two-way speaker systems have definitely improved. The Homebound coordinators are working on promoting a social network for homebound students so that they can feel a part of the mainstream as much as possible. A dialogue with LEAP has taken place so that vocational interests of homebound students can be provided for and realistic goals set and met. Homebound students are currently discouraged from taking courses that require much visual input as resources are limited. However, it is a long-term goal of the program for all students to have equal access and opportunity to all aspects of campus life, academic and social as well. Limited resources also curtail the availability of services such as tutoring, diagnostic assessments, and in-person counseling for homebound students.

The quality of services provided to students with disabilities needs to be monitored on a continual basis. The almost 100% turnover in the staff of the Office of Special Services in recent years may account for the lack of monitoring of the quality of services, but specific guidelines and techniques need to be implemented in order to facilitate the ongoing collection of data.

The Office of Special Services has a cooperative relationship with the Committee for Disabled Students, a student-run organization that fosters the independence and social well-being of students with disabilities. It prepares and encourages students to be in the mainstream of both campus and community. One primary enhancer of this goal is Sensitivity Day, a day where able-bodied people (students, staff, and faculty) assume a pseudo-disability for the day. This is a very effective way of teaching sensitivity. However, this event is held only once every two years and more has to be done to promote sensitivity and awareness among the campus community. The Committee assists the Office of Special Services in the provision of support services by providing funding from student funds to underwrite the costs of tutorial services for students with disabilities.
The Office of Special Services is also striving to develop cooperative relationships with the various departments of the College. Currently the Office has a working relationship with the Testing Center, the Career Development Center, the Office of Counseling and Advisement Center, and the Human Resources Office. More communication needs to take place with academic departments, which most directly affect the quality of students' collegiate experience.

VIII. Student Governance

There are five student governments on campus, each serving a specific constituency: Day, Evening, SEEK, Graduate and ACE. These Governments/Associations operate under constitutions adopted by the respective governments and are represented in the Academic Senate of the College. Under existing procedures, all student senators are elected in direct general elections, but student government officers are elected by diverse procedures. For the Day Student Association (SA), the President and Vice President are elected through direct elections. For SEEK Student Association, the top four vote-getters in the direct elections for SEEK senators become, in order, the President, Vice-President, Treasurer, and Secretary of the SEEK Student Association. In the Graduate Student Association (GSA), students elect delegates to the Graduate Student Congress (GSC). Members of the GSC represent academic discipline-based graduate clubs with the number of seats per club weighted according to a formula. The GSC in turn elects the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer of GSA. In the Evening Student Association (ESA), students vote to elect a 9-member assembly, which in turn elects its President, Vice President, Treasurer, and Chairperson. In the ACE Student Association, the President, Vice President, Treasurer, and four other members of the Executive Board are elected by ACE students present at a general membership meeting from a list prepared by a nominating committee.

The constitutions (and therefore the structure of student governance) have remained largely unchanged in the past decade, despite other transformations on campus. One indicator of the relative effectiveness of these structures might be found in the percent of eligible students voting in student elections over the past five years. Of those eligible in a given category, the percent voting has been consistent within categories, but low:

- For SA: between 19.7% and 24.7%
- For SEEK: between 16% and 24.0%
- For ESA: between 5.3% and 10.4%
- For ACE: between 5.0% and 8.6%
- For GSA: between 2.6% and 4.1%.

The 1985 Self Study was critical of the lack of diversity of representation, especially in SA. Since then, there has been dramatic progress, with two of the last three presidents of SA being African-American women, and the current vice president a Latino student. Overall, a visible, concrete, and successful effort was made by the Day Student Association to attract a broad ethnic/racial spectrum of students to its ranks. On the other hand, there is
scant chance for an effective opposition to compete successfully with the political organization, United People (UP), in power. In the last ten years, only twice did an opposition candidate for president get more than 20% of the vote, and only once was the election close. In the last elections, there was no opposition at all. Still, the process remains open and the Day Student Association has successfully addressed the problems identified by the last self study, becoming a more inclusive and effective organization.

The issue of participation and inclusiveness can also be assessed by reviewing the number of individuals who shared the top two positions (President/Vice President) in the five governments over the past ten years. Between 1985 and 1994, there were 20 students who held the SA presidency and vice presidency, i.e., no student held office more than once. In SEEK, there were 18 students over the same time frame; ACE and ESA each had 14 students; and in GSA, only five students held the two positions over the ten year time span. ACE has a two consecutive-term limit for the President. ESA and GSA have no term limits. In GSA, the same individual has been president for nine out of the past ten years; the other year he was vice-president. Not surprisingly, there is a correlation between top leadership turnover, the method of electing leaders, and interest in voting.

Clearly, some of the constitutions of student organizations are anachronistic and in dire need of revision. The GSA constitution establishes a cumbersome system in which students are effectively removed from the selection of the top leadership. It is not surprising that leadership is self-perpetuating and participation minimal. The ESA constitution, although less cumbersome, is also anachronistic and entails indirect elections. Although ACE has direct elections, the composition of the student body (largely working students) reduces for most students the opportunities to participate in elections.

Another issue that may require attention concerns the relationship between academic performance and substantial involvement in top student government positions. The Day and ACE Student Associations’ constitutions require "good standing" or a 2.5 index, respectively, for participation in student government. This in itself may not be enough when one notes, for instance, that although Day Student presidents are elected in their senior year, four of the last nine (not including the current one) have yet to graduate.

RECOMMENDATION: Student governments should undertake a thorough review of their constitutions and academic eligibility standards.
<10-7>

RECOMMENDATION: The governments representing evening, graduate and ACE students should revise their constitutions to provide for direct elections of president and vice president and for term limits for officers. <10-8>

IX. Student Activities / Student Life

Since the last self study, the number of students attending Queens College has
increased from approximately 15,800 to nearly 18,000, reversing the previous trend of declining enrollments. During the same period, the number of student clubs and organizations has continued to decrease. There are 108 registered clubs and organizations in 1995 as opposed to 150 in 1985. Of these 108 entities, 43 are academic clubs, 37 ethnic/religious clubs, and the remaining 32 social, political and general organizations. Although reliable statistics are not available, conventional wisdom among student activities professionals is that the decline in the number of organizations and their activities may be related to the growth in work schedules for most if not all of the College’s students.

There are some noteworthy changes since the last self study:

- In 1985 there were four weekly student newspapers: two general (Newsheet, Phoenix) and two ethnic (Spectrum, Ha-Ot). None of the four is any longer in existence, nor are some others published briefly since then. In their place there is one general weekly (The Quad) and one multicultural, inter-ethnic monthly (Queens World) published by students in the Journalism program.

- There have been sustained efforts by the College administration and the student associations to stress multicultural events and endeavors. Students participate in the President’s Advisory Committee on Multiculturalism. They have also originated many activities and committees on their own.

- The previous funding entity, the Student Activities Corporation (SAC) was replaced in 1992 by two boards, the College Association, which allocates funds generated by student fees, and the Auxiliary Enterprise Association, which manages and allocates funds generated by the Bookstore, Cafeteria, and the Game Room. This brings the Queens College structure in line with other units of the City University. The new boards, unlike SAC, no longer have a student majority. SAC administrative functions have been contracted out to the Student Union, and thus the administrative overhead has been reduced.

- The Student Union, under new management, has achieved some of the most significant changes in the past decade. By contracting out the food services, a perennial deficit of some $30,000 each year was replaced with $40,000 in revenue. Major, long-delayed renovations in the physical plant have been undertaken, improving the environment for student activities, as well as the revenue-generating capacity of the building. Finally, as a result of the combined efforts of the student associations and of the administrations of the Student Union and the College, the heavy financial burden of bond-repayment will be taken over by the State, thus freeing more funds for plant improvement and student life.

- The Student Activities Office has continued to provide guidance and information on issues ranging from the establishment of new clubs to the rules governing student activities and events, and has become an integral part of every aspect of student
activities on campus.

The Student Activities Office, the Office of the Dean of Students and the Student Union prepare and regularly update informational materials to assist student organizations in their activities and generally to promote an active student life. They have conducted a series of Leadership Development weekends and workshops with student government and club officers to provide them with a better understanding of their role in college life.

Despite some unsettled periods (including disturbances after tuition increases, changes in funding structures, and the impact of budgetary restraints), the student activities record at Queens College has been mainly positive. The Day Student Association has successfully addressed the criticism of the last self study. Generally there has been a cooperative, productive student-administration relationship. The administration and the student leadership have collaborated on a number of important projects, one of which resulted in the creation of a student-run profit-making corporation--BALA Enterprises; another led to the publication of the second student paper, Queens World. Finally, this past year, SA, in conjunction with various ethnic/religious clubs, organized a very successful Multicultural Festival that stressed the diversity of cultures and inter-group harmony. Such positive endeavors should be commended and encouraged.

X. Athletics and Recreation Programs

The instructional program in physical activity and wellness is conducted by the Department of Health and Physical Education and the athletic programs are conducted by the Athletic Office through the Vice President for Student Services and Programs. Both share the same facilities. Intramural competitive sport activities in five different sports are scheduled for men's, women's, and co-ed teams. Approximately 700 students participate annually. Recreational activities are either scheduled or available on a "drop-in" basis. Approximately 265 persons participate on a daily basis. Annual events, as the Turkey Run and the Biathlon, are also conducted. The gymnasium and other physical activity facilities are open and supervised seven days and several evenings a week for the College community. A Community Recreation Program, for which fees are charged, includes a variety of classes as well as use of the facilities at specified hours. The recreation programs have enjoyed a steady growth as efforts have been made to increase the number of activities and to maximize the use of available facility space. At the present time, the facility usage by the Department of Health and Physical Education and the Athletic Programs is at maximum.

All varsity intercollegiate athletic teams compete in NCAA Division II. The intercollegiate athletic program is committed to the academic success of the athletes and provides them with academic advising and tracks their academic progress. The graduation rate of the athletes as a group exceeds that of the general college population.
A unique feature of the administration of the athletic programs is the existence of the Committee on Athletic Policies and the Sports Allocation Board whose functions are to monitor, consult, advise, and recommend changes where necessary on matters related to intercollegiate athletics. Both entities include students, administrators, and faculty. This arrangement, whereby students take part in the governance of the programs and have input into the utilization of student fees, is a long-standing tradition at the College.

As institutional support has decreased continually, fund raising efforts have increased, by necessity. At the present time, approximately 70 per cent of financial support for the athletic programs comes from programmatic revenue generated by the Sports Academy (Summer Sports Camp), the continuing education programs for children and adults, community recreation programs, rentals, concessions, tournaments, and gate receipts. The remaining funding comes from students fees, tax-levy funds, and miscellaneous sources.

XI. Survey of Student Perceptions on Services

As noted in CHAPTER NINE: PHYSICAL RESOURCES, the Task Force on Students undertook a survey of undergraduate students in spring 1995 to determine some general information and to sample perceptions about student services and facilities.10 From 11 classes across all divisions of the College and at different levels, 549 responses were obtained. Over 80% of the respondents were full time students. Over half had accumulated 60 or more credits. Two thirds of respondents said Queens College was their first choice; only ten percent said it was a third or fourth choice. The top three responses on their reasons for coming to Queens were low cost (70%), live close by (59%) and academic program quality (48%). Students responding work an average of 20.2 hours per week.

In terms of service provided by campus offices, students reported yes to “courteous” and yes to “knowledgeable” as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>% Yes, Courteous</th>
<th>% Yes, Knowledgeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Center</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department office</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bursar</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 The survey itself, the data obtained from the 549 respondents and a summary report prepared by Professor Dean Savage, Department of Sociology may be found appended to the Report of the Task Force on Students.
Clearly there is room for improvement for some of the major student services offices on campus. The low rates of "courteous" for Financial Aid and the Bursar, particularly when compared to the ratings for "knowledgeable," are cause for concern.

Students expressed very high levels of satisfaction with the College Bulletin, the registration guide and departmental literature. Satisfaction with the Freshman and Transfer Student Handbooks was much more mixed, with 34-53% of students answering "did not read." On use of campus services, the percent using frequently or using some are: Library (94%), Registrar (91%), Financial Aid (60%), Academic Advising (49%), Student Life/Activities (42%), Career Development (35%), Personal Counseling (24%), and Special Services (17%). Service offices with the highest percent of students answering "unaware of service" include Special Services (27%), Personal Counseling (14%), Career Development (13%), and Student Life/Activities (11%).

Eighty-eight percent said they know the courses necessary for graduation. However, the results show that substantial numbers of students desire further advising in selecting courses (63% need a lot or some), for career guidance by faculty (58%), for fulfilling LASAR (51%), in selecting a major (46%), and for transferring credit (43%). In terms of participation in campus activities, the data show low levels in the following areas: voted in last student government election (28%), high or medium involvement in student life/activity (25%), and officer or member of committee or organization (18%).

The data indicate reasons to be proud of many aspects of student services and reasons to seek to improve service. The complete results of the survey are being made available to each of the student service offices involved and to the Office of Institutional Research so that appropriate follow-up activities may be planned. The format of the data will allow offices to do additional subset analysis to learn more about the perceptions of specific groups of students.

XII. Summary List of Recommendations on Students

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should continue the development of information systems and methods of access to information in the student database to improve advising and information services to students. <10-1>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should adopt a comprehensive enrollment management strategy and should expand its capabilities to collect and analyze information on the characteristics of accepted and enrolled students. <10-2>

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should prepare for increases in the number of students for whom English is a second language. <10-3>
RECOMMENDATION: The Retention Coordinator and the Office of Institutional Research should undertake a study of the reasons students cite for "stopping out" or dropping out of the College in preparation for a concerted effort by all campus constituencies toward improving the College's retention and graduation rates. <10-4>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should forge ahead on the first recommendation of the 1995-1999 Planning Committee to "improve the advisement of students," and should begin implementation of the specific means suggested in the report. <10-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should seek greater institutional recognition for the faculty role in student advising, and should build recognition of advising responsibilities more directly into the faculty reward system. <10-6>

RECOMMENDATION: Student governments should undertake a thorough review of their constitutions and academic eligibility standards. <10-7>

RECOMMENDATION: The governments representing evening, graduate and ACE students should revise their constitutions to provide for direct elections of president and vice president and for term limits for officers. <10-8>
CHAPTER ELEVEN

FACULTY
CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY

I. Faculty Characteristics

A. Numbers and Ages

Consideration of any aspect of the faculty of Queens College is complicated by the fact that at any given time, there are faculty who "belong" at Queens College, but are temporarily appointed on CUNY Graduate Center lines. Thus, the data presented in Table 11-1 presents information on the 615 faculty on Queens lines and the 42 faculty on Graduate Center lines.

The number of full-time faculty members at Queens College is just over half of what it was two decades ago (from 1256 in 1974 to 657 in spring 1995). Drops in student enrollments and budget crises dating from the late 1970's precipitated substantial cuts in faculty lines. In 1990-91, there were 663 faculty on Queens lines plus 49 faculty on Graduate Center lines for a total of 712 full-time faculty. The Early Retirement Incentives of 1991 and 1992 hastened the loss of faculty in recent years. In 1991 Queens College ranked number one among the CUNY campuses in number of retirees (103), and in 1992 Queens (with 38 retirees) was second only to City College. Without the loss of faculty through retirement, budget cuts in those years would have likely resulted in retrenchment. The average age of the current faculty by rank is shown in Table 11-1.

Of those who currently teach at Queens College, fully 40 percent are part-time adjuncts. The great majority (74%) of the adjuncts hold the rank of adjunct lecturer. The remainder are in the ranks of adjunct professor (3 percent), adjunct associate professor (5 percent), or adjunct assistant professor (18 percent). Approximately 50% of the adjuncts are in their 30's and 40's, and the average age overall is 43. About 10 percent of adjuncts are over the age of 60.

B. Educational Background, Rank and Reputation

The vast majority of current full-time faculty members are highly educated (approximately 90 percent hold doctoral degrees) and tenured (84 percent). The number

---

1 Placement of Queens faculty on Graduate Center lines is part of the allocation system whereby the Graduate Center "pays back" Queens College for the doctoral teaching performed by Queens faculty.

2 Faculty refers to persons on professorial lines (Assistant, Associate and Full Professor) and in titles of Lecturer, Instructor and Instructor II.

3 These figures are on a "headcount" basis, and do not represent the proportion of teaching done by adjuncts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Gender&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Avg Age</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Puerto</td>
<td>Amer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Amer</td>
<td>Amer</td>
<td>Rican</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disting Prof</td>
<td>10 (23%)</td>
<td>9-1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(50-100%)</td>
<td>(51-100%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>280 (43%)</td>
<td>241-19</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(239-221)</td>
<td>(239-221)</td>
<td>(88%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>180 (29%)</td>
<td>97-83</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(145+15)</td>
<td>(54-66%)</td>
<td>(87%)</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>116 (18%)</td>
<td>58-58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(110+6)</td>
<td>(50-80%)</td>
<td>(55%)</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst-II</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1-1.9)</td>
<td>(0-1)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>13 (2%)</td>
<td>4-9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13+0)</td>
<td>(3.6-9%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>58 (5%)</td>
<td>31-27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(58+0)</td>
<td>(52-47%)</td>
<td>(66%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>440-217</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> - Numbers in parentheses refer to Queens faculty on Queens lines plus Queens faculty on Graduate Center lines.

<sup>2</sup> - Number and percent of men vs. women.
and percent of faculty by rank is shown in Table 11.1. Ten years ago, the percent tenured was slightly lower at 81%. The distribution of faculty across the ranks is also quite similar now to what it was in 1984 when there were 40% professors, 29% associate professors, 19% assistant professors, 4% instructors and 8% lecturers.

On the one hand, the senior status of most faculty may be said to contribute to the institution’s stability, and to lend coherence and continuity to its programs, course offerings and governance. On the other hand, Queens College might also be said to have a top-heavy faculty rooted in increasingly thinner soil.

Ten professors hold the rank of Distinguished Professor, an honor accorded by the University in recognition of exceptional achievement in scholarship or creative endeavors:

Paul Avrich, historian of Russian anarchy
Robert Bittman, membrane biochemist
Morris Dickstein, literary critic and cultural historian of modern America
Azriel Genack, physicist of random processes
Fred Kaplan, authority on Charles Dickens’ life and work
Thea Musgrave, contemporary opera composer
Gregory Rabassa, translator of Latin American literature
Charles Schachter, music theorist with specialty in Schenkerian analysis
Zvi Yavetz, scholar of Roman, social and political history
Yevgeny Yevtushenko, Russian poet.

Two hundred seventy Queens faculty are also members of the doctoral faculty at the CUNY Graduate Center. With the centrally appointed doctoral faculty, they teach, supervise student dissertations, serve on thesis committees and contribute to the governance of the doctoral programs and the Graduate Center itself.

C. Gender and Ethnic Diversity

Table 11-1 also shows data on faculty gender and ethnicity by rank. Administrative charges to diversify the faculty throughout CUNY have fostered some demographic shifts on the Queens Campus in recent years. Though men still occupy two-thirds of the full-time faculty positions, 55% of all new hires in the five-year period from 1988-93 were women. Tenure statistics also still show substantial differentiation by gender: 71 percent of the tenured full-time faculty is male, as opposed to 29 percent female. Gender distribution is equal (exactly 50-50) among this year’s part-time faculty.

Between 1988 and 1993, almost half the new hires at Queens (47 percent) were non-white. Twenty-three percent were Asian/Pacific Islander, 15 percent were Black, and 9 percent were Hispanic. The full-time faculty remains predominantly White, 7.5 percent Black, 5 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 5 percent Hispanic, and less than one percent American Indian/Alaska Native. Eighty-eight percent of full-time White faculty members
have tenure. With substantial proportions of faculty from under-represented groups still in the assistant professor rank, the number who are tenured is much lower than for Whites: 64.5 percent of Black faculty members, 58 percent of Hispanics, and 51.5 percent of Asian/Pacific Islanders. No American Indian/Alaska Natives currently have tenure at Queens.

D. Regional Diversity

The full-time faculty at Queens College continues to be largely drawn from the northeast; 71 percent received their highest degree from an institution in this region, and fully 42 percent received their highest degrees from an institution in New York City—Columbia and New York University in particular. Fourteen percent of the full-time faculty's highest degrees came from Midwestern institutions, five percent from northern California/Pacific Northwest, two percent from the Southwest, and two percent from the Southeast. Six percent hold their highest degree from an institution in a foreign country; the majority of these foreign degrees came from England and Canada, but countries including Australia, France, Germany, Holland, and the former USSR also are represented. The pattern of hiring from the northeast, and especially from New York City institutions, seems to be changing. In 1993, only 24% of the new faculty received terminal degrees from institutions in New York City (Columbia, 5); in 1994, it was 27% (Columbia, 2; CUNY Graduate Center, 1).

E. A Commuter Faculty

The full time faculty at Queens live throughout the greater metropolitan area. While the majority live in New York City and the neighboring New York State counties of Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester and Rockland, 19 live in New Jersey, 16 in Connecticut and 12 in upstate New York (more than 50 miles from the College). In addition, 2 have permanent residences in Pennsylvania, 1 in Vermont, 1 in Rhode Island and 1 in Washington, DC.

Many faculty have lengthy commutes (some better measured in hours on the road rather than in miles). The length of faculty commutes means that some who live at greater distances are less likely to come to campus on days when they do not teach, reducing their opportunities to interact with colleagues and students, to serve on committees and to play a role in the life of the campus. It should be stressed that some faculty are on campus daily, and some of these have lengthy commutes. However, proximity of faculty homes to the campus, or lack thereof, is certainly an important factor in the extent to which faculty interact. Faculty do make good use of the resources of the greater metropolitan area. While some may not do much research on campus, they take advantage of the presence of great libraries and academic and cultural institutions near to their homes.

This broad dispersion also undercuts opportunities for faculty to socialize and to become better acquainted at both the professional and personal levels. To be sure, contacts
on a social level do occur and are valued. Nevertheless, the fact that faculty may each have over an hour's commute to the College and may live in opposite directions from the College certainly reduces the likelihood of their having regular interactions off campus. One positive benefit of the Freshman Year Initiative program has been that faculty from different departments and divisions have gotten to know each other on a more informal basis. Many faculty have noted that this has been most welcome.

II. Institutional Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Employment, Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

A. Faculty Recruitment and Selection; Quality Control on Appointments

1. Obtaining Authorization to Search

The department chair requests a position from the divisional dean based upon the need to staff courses and/or carry on research important to the department. After consulting with each department in the division, the dean draws up a search plan that is presented to the Provost and President. Upon recommendation of the dean and the Provost, the President issues an "Authorization to Search" form to permit the department to develop a search plan, which then must be approved by the College Director of Affirmative Action (CDAA); it is not an authorization to hire. If the search plan is approved, the University must approve the CUNY posting notice, and then the search can begin. To ensure the successful completion of searches, deans sometimes petition the Provost to authorize more searches than the likely number of faculty lines that will be filled; this is called a line pool.

2. Faculty Diversity Program

Beginning in 1988, a Faculty Diversity Program was developed in which each year the President assigns a few lines for highly-qualified diversity positions. The College places an ad for diversity candidates; departments then screen resumes submitted in response to the College's ad and those obtained through their own outreach efforts. Departments then recommend candidates to the dean who may recommend candidates to the Provost and President. The program has resulted in attracting and hiring a substantial number of minority candidates and has contributed to (though by no means is the sole source of) the increase in the hiring of minority faculty (see I.C. above). Although this program was designed to increase the percentage of faculty from under-represented groups, some faculty have been frustrated by the perceived lack of specificity about how the President makes these hiring decisions. With the small number of lines tentatively identified each year as diversity lines, there has been strong competition among departments. The frustration among faculty, then, may be largely attributed to breakdowns in communication regarding the reasons for denials.
3. Procedures for Recruitment, Screening and Hiring

Department chairs follow College guidelines that govern the search process. Special attention is given to adherence to federal and University rules on affirmative action/equal opportunity in advertisements and recruitment procedures. The College Director of Affirmative Action (CDAA) must approve the department's search plan, advertising text, and candidate pool to ensure compliance with pertinent regulations. The search plan must include the intended placement of advertising in appropriate publications, recruitment efforts at conventions, and personal contacts to be used to reach under-represented groups, and the names of search committee members, if different from the department's Personnel and Budget Committee (P & B). University approval is now required for the advertising text as well. Although it is appropriate for the University to monitor a College's affirmative action practices, University approval can delay the placement of advertising copy by weeks, which can be a significant setback in the recruitment effort. Depending upon the time of year, an additional month's delay can make a crucial difference in the ability of a department to advertise its position successfully. To date, the College has not been particularly successful in attempting to deregulate the current University system.

The departmental committee interviews candidates from a certified pool and selects a finalist, who must be affirmed by the department's P & B Committee. The department chair completes the Faculty Data Form, which must be signed by the CDAA; all materials are then sent to the dean for review. Recommendations for appointment are made to the Provost, and from the Provost to the President. The department is then given an authorization to hire.

When more searches have been authorized in a division than there are available lines, choices are made from among the candidates put forward by the departments. The Provost subsequently informs the dean that he/she may allow the department to make an offer to the candidate. The major problem that some chairs and faculty have with this process is that, even after a department searches for and chooses a candidate, the candidate may not be offered a position. This is perceived to lessen the credibility of the College among the wider academic community, and it has been demoralizing for departments and divisions that invested great professional effort and expense in the recruitment process. Some have wondered whether this is an ethical procedure. It is certainly hard on the morale of departments that are turned down. On the other hand, it has been the administration's experience that not every authorized search finds a qualified candidate. Therefore, authorization of more searches than the number of anticipated hires permits assurance that the desired number of new hires overall can be achieved. Furthermore, deans have repeatedly argued to be able to recruit for more lines than can be hired—to be able to choose among the candidates recommended and to hire the very best available. This is an annual dilemma facing departments, deans and the academic administration—for which there is no easy, or uniformly accepted, answer.
4. Problems in Attracting Candidates

It is sometimes difficult to attract candidates to the College. Among the reasons reported is that the cost of living and housing in New York is too high. In addition, for an institution that places such a high priority on scholarly research, the comparatively heavy teaching load, the lack of doctoral programs in certain areas, the lack of secretarial support for general faculty activities, and the limitations in research facilities on campus are drawbacks.

Previous rounds of budget cuts have seriously eroded assistance available to faculty in carrying out their teaching duties. For example, funds for readers in large social sciences classes have been reduced substantially, though not eliminated. The Psychology Department has had to discontinue its practice of hiring laboratory assistants who worked alongside the faculty in labor-intensive laboratory courses. For individuals participating heavily in the doctoral programs of the CUNY Graduate School, teaching credit for dissertation advisement is not uniformly part of Queens College practice. And, finally, the severe cuts in library holdings will surely make the College less attractive to top quality candidates.

B. Reappointment, Non-reappointment, Tenure and Promotion

1. Reappointment of Non-Tenured Faculty

The probationary period before re-appointment with tenure is five years. Reappointments prior to tenure are made on an annual basis. During that time the faculty member's activities with respect to teaching, research or creative activity, and service are examined critically so that proper guidance can be provided. Each non-tenured faculty member must be observed in the classroom at least once each semester and must participate in an annual conference with the department chair. To insure that the chair's evaluations and guidance are sufficiently detailed to be useful to the faculty member, and to protect the institution from potential charges of insufficient guidance, the Provost meets with each divisional dean to review the annual conference summary for all untenured faculty beyond the first reappointment. When the summaries are deemed lacking, the chair must bring additional information to the tenure candidate's attention prior to its being added to the individual's personal file. Recently, the President has begun to incorporate more explicit statements about the candidate's progress and the College's expectations in the annual letter of reappointment. Departments are guaranteed return of a line if they take early action not to reappoint faculty on the basis of performance prior to the end of the probationary period. The Task Force on Faculty supported this practice.

---

4 Senior colleges within CUNY, Queens included, have previously explored the possibility of lengthening the probationary period to the more standard six years—to no avail.
2. Granting Tenure

The departmental P & B determines whether a faculty member should be recommended for a sixth-year appointment with tenure. The criteria for tenure are outlined in the Statement of the Board of Trustees on Academic Personnel Practice in the City University of New York (September 22, 1975). This document states that the primary criteria are: teaching effectiveness and scholarship and professional growth. Supplementary considerations are service to the institution and service to the public. The guidelines state that teaching and scholarship are equally important, and together they are more important than service, which, nevertheless, may also be considered.

Procedures for applying for tenure are provided by the Office of the Provost and are outlined in the document "Procedures and Criteria for Faculty Tenure Decisions." A change made several years ago in the process is that the chair or designated member of the department P & B may solicit at least four external evaluations to be placed in a separate, confidential file, to be transmitted with the candidate's other materials. These letters from external reviewers are different from letters of support, which are solicited by the candidate. It should be noted that, although the College P & B has strongly endorsed this practice, there is no legal requirement for external evaluation of a candidate's scholarly or creative work. It should also be noted that "If a department does not solicit letters from external reviewers for one of its candidates, it may not solicit letters for any of its candidates." The Task Force on Faculty endorsed this approach.

Guidelines are given for the composition of the curriculum vitae. A recent optional addition to these guidelines is a statement from the candidate. Here the candidate has the opportunity to provide additional information about his/her professional career and the future direction of scholarship and/or creative activities.

If the department does not recommend tenure, the chair must inform the candidate immediately, and the candidate may appeal the decision by writing to the division dean. If the departmental P & B does recommend tenure, it must write a detailed evaluation report supporting the candidate. This report must be written by a member of the P & B other than the chair and must be initialed by all members of the committee. Guidelines for this report highlight discussions about teaching effectiveness, scholarly and/or artistic production, service relevant to professional and faculty roles, and general comments, where any special circumstances can be described.

Candidates' dossiers and departmental evaluations are forwarded to the College P & B Committee for consideration by its Committee of Six (see CHAPTER TWELVE: GOVERNANCE for details on committee structure and functions). Concurrently, evaluations of lecturers recommended for a certificate of continuous appointment (CCE) are forwarded to the College P & B Committee. The Committee of Six

---

5 This document will be available for inspection by the Evaluation Team.
is convened and chaired by the Provost, a non-voting member. The divisional deans are invited to present the case for candidates from their divisions and make recommendations early on in the Committee's deliberations. The Committee votes after reviewing all supporting materials for each candidate.

All positive and negative recommendations for tenure or CCE from the Committee of Six are forwarded to the College P & B, which votes on each case. All recommendations made by the College P & B are forwarded to the College President for his or her independent consideration, and he/she, in turn, submits the name and curriculum vitae of each individual he/she wishes to recommend for reappointment with tenure or CCE to the Board of Trustees for final approval. In those cases in which faculty members have not received a recommendation for reappointment with tenure or CCE from the College P & B, they may make a written appeal to the College President. The President reviews all appeals and may meet with the Provost, the academic deans, and the Committee of Six for further input prior to rendering a decision.

3. Promotion

In most regards, the procedures followed for promotion are comparable to those for reappointment with tenure. Promotion decisions are made during the spring term. The number of years in rank, or at the College, are not considerations in and of themselves. While the same material that led to tenure may be considered for promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to full Professor must involve new work, usually within the last five years.

C. The Valuing of Teaching, Research and Service

Paralleling a trend in many academic institutions, in recent years there has been a perception by many that the emphasis on scholarly publications for the awarding of tenure or promotion has grown. Some faculty have felt increasingly frustrated by an undervaluing of teaching effectiveness and service (both to students and the College and University) in the tenure/promotion process, and new faculty are, at times, faced with conflicting signals about how they should spend their time. Issues facing the faculty are how teaching is evaluated and whether teaching effectiveness alone can stand as the primary qualification for tenure or promotion in cases where there is little or no evidence of scholarly or creative activity. In response to a recommendation in the First Five-Year Plan, a President's Advisory Committee on Teaching and Service was created. The Committee consisted of 12 faculty members who submitted a detailed report in May 1992. The findings were as follows:

1) The Committee found a widespread and justified perception on campus that teaching and service are undervalued in the official reward system, which relies too exclusively on published research.

2) The College should permit more flexibility to individual faculty members in choosing their relative degree of specialization among the three academic activities.
3) If we are to adequately reward teaching and service, the College administration must create mechanisms that will enable performance in these areas to be considered at the same level of detail and accuracy as research activity. Within the report, documents were designed to serve as possible mechanisms for evaluation. They were: The Teaching Dossier, Departmental Form for Evaluating Teaching Through Student Comments, Peer Observation Reports, Sample Alumni/Alumnae Questionnaire, The Service Dossier.

4) The encouragement of good teaching and service requires activities beyond the formal evaluation and reward system.

This report was circulated to the department chairs in March 1993 and two open forums on teaching, service, and research were held. There was concern expressed both about the disparities that exist among departments regarding expectations for service and the disparities that exist regarding teaching loads, especially when some departments have labs and others involve supervision of students in the field. Some people were leery of the problems involved in evaluating teaching. Most felt that candidates should have a greater chance to represent themselves, and possibly even be interviewed at the divisional level or by the Committee of Six. Overall, the faculty present at these hearings largely supported the recommendations of the report.

Some faculty members were disappointed that until November 1994 no action had been taken regarding this important report, though the Executive Committee of the College P & B had, indeed, been discussing aspects of it. In November 1994, however, there was a retreat for the voting members of the College P & B (department chairs) and the academic administration; members of the President's Advisory Committee for Teaching and Service were invited to present their recommendations and engage in open discussion with the chairs. Afterwards, the department chairs and administration spent the afternoon discussing the issues further. They all agreed that the perception that teaching does not count in tenure and promotion decisions is faulty. That is, teaching is, indeed, valued. The problem is that better ways are needed to evaluate teaching and to document the fruits of that evaluation. All agreed that it would be unacceptable to change University policies to accept teaching as a sole basis for the award of tenure or promotion and that present criteria should be retained. As an outcome of this retreat the Provost will look at other universities to find more effective techniques for evaluating teaching.

At its monthly meeting in February 1995, the College P & B voted in support of the following statement affirming the valuing of teaching for tenure and promotion and setting up expectations concerning departmental roles and responsibilities in the evaluation of teaching:

RESOLUTION ON THE ROLE OF TEACHING IN PERSONNEL DECISIONS

1. The quality of teaching must be accorded significance in personnel decisions (appointments, reappointments, tenure, and promotion).
2. Teaching may be defined broadly; it should not be restricted to classroom instruction and attendant interactions with students only (e.g., development of new courses and curricular revision are within its scope).

3. It is the obligation of each department to develop methods to assess the quality of teaching of its faculty, including, but not limited to, peer review and student evaluation. The criteria for assessment may differ in accordance with the mission and character of each department and the assignments of the candidate.

4. Forms E, F, and G and materials submitted in support thereof shall contain information relevant to the quality of the candidate’s teaching.

Later in spring 1995, the Provost met with a group of chairs to discuss possible methods of implementation. Plans are underway to involve departments in developing their own methods of evaluation of teaching beginning in fall 1995.

III. Faculty Workload - Teaching Responsibilities

A. Teaching Load

The contractual teaching load at senior colleges of the City University is 21 contact hours per year for professorial faculty, and 27 hours for lecturers and instructors; it is negotiated between the faculty union, the Professional Staff Congress, and the City University. There have been no substantive changes to the teaching load in successive contracts dating back to 1984. The language of the contract describes limits of teaching load and is silent about any of the other accepted faculty responsibilities which are more fully articulated in the University's Bylaws.

In the past decade, the teaching load of the Queens College faculty, expressed in courses per semester, has remained the same. Full-time faculty of professorial rank at Queens College are expected to teach three courses per semester (usually nine contact hours per week), for a total of six courses for the academic year. Instructors and Lecturers are responsible for four courses per semester (twelve contact hours per week). Average contact hours are somewhat higher in certain departments, particularly in language acquisition, science laboratories, and the School of Music.

The collective workload statistics for the faculty show somewhat lower totals because of release time granted for administrative and, occasionally, research activities. For 1993-94, the average teaching load for Queens faculty was 16.7 contact hours per year, compared to a University wide average for senior colleges of 18.3. The percent of teaching done by full time faculty declined rather abruptly in fall 1992 and continues at just under 60%. Between fall 1987 and fall 1991, the percent of teaching done by full time faculty varied from 63.3% to 66.1%. Most of the drop can be attributed to the loss of full time data.

Data on teaching load, class size and related statistics may be found in the Queens College Fact Book. 1995.
While the workload responsibilities of the faculty are given in terms of contact hours, the University funds the adjunct and summer session budgets on student full time equivalents (FTE's). This approach is now being applied to the calculation of full time faculty needed for the purposes of Base Level Equity re-allocations (see CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES). There are many courses in which the contact hours exceed the credits earned. While discipline-specific ratios correct for some of the hour/credit disparity, there is still a discontinuity between how faculty workloads are figured and how faculty teaching productivity is measured.

B. Institutional Support for Teaching Activities

One of the major advantages of teaching at Queens College is that the faculty encounter few impediments to testing a new idea in teaching or research. There are many cases in which new courses were introduced as experimental programs into the curriculum without the prolonged process of formal approval of the university. In these cases the approval of the Chair of the department is sufficient, and the course may run up to three semesters to establish its worth. There is also support for team teaching within the department and across different departments.

Queens College continues to take great pride in the very high calibre of its teaching faculty and in the consistently high quality of its instructional programs. In addition to the credentials and composition of its faculty, as summarized above, the College's instructional program is augmented by a highly sophisticated support services structure that includes the Benjamin Rosenthal Library, the Academic Computer Center, the Academic Skills and Resource Center, and the Center for Instructional Media Support. For a description of these academic support services beyond the scope of this section, refer to CHAPTER SIX: ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES. Another very important support service for faculty is the Grants Office, discussed elsewhere in this chapter and in CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES. Finally, there is the Reprographics Office, which supports large scale duplicating needs.

C. Awards for Teaching Excellence and Innovation

The College's commitment to teaching is reflected in three different award programs which recognize demonstrated excellence in teaching, the potential for teaching innovation and the development of departmental diversity initiatives.

1. President's Award for Excellence in Teaching

This award was established in 1990. The aim is to recognize excellence in teaching throughout the College. Nominees are taken from any department and from individual students. Three awards were given each year from 1990 through 1993 and four...
were awarded in 1994. The amount of each award is $5000, given as a direct award to the faculty member.

2. President's Mini-Grant for Innovative Teaching

Since 1990, the President has awarded small grants to subsidize experimentation and innovation in teaching. Nine grants are awarded each year. The amount of an individual award varies, with a total of $25,000 awarded per year. These awards are used primarily for the purchase of supplies and materials.

3. Mini-grant for Departmental Diversity Initiatives

Building upon the success of a two-year Ford Foundation-funded project, former President Kenny began the President's Mini-grants for Departmental Diversity Initiatives in 1994. The aim of these was to support departmentally based projects that would promote attention to multicultural diversity. Two grants were awarded in 1994, for a total of $11,000.

IV. Research and Scholarship

A. Faculty Achievements

Research, scholarship and creative activity are important aspects of faculty life at Queens College. These activities allow faculty to be a part of a larger community of scholars and artists in their disciplines. In addition, much of the research and scholarly activity of College faculty is accessible to and influences the broader public discussion and debate. Noteworthy examples include Andrew Beveridge's work on census data for the New York Times, Andrew Hacker's book Two Nations, Black and White, Separate, Hostile, Unequal and Frank Spencer's book Bilddown... A Scientific Forgery. Paul Fardy's PATH program (Physical Activity and Teenage Health) will receive the 1995 Award for the Outstanding Program in the United States from the American College of Sports Medicine. And Maureen Connor has a one-woman show at the P.P.O.W. Gallery and has just received a 1995 Guggenheim Fellowship.

The College subscribes to the belief that faculty who engage in scholarly research are likely to be better teachers. Students are able to study with faculty who are active participants in the research of their fields, thus enhancing the content of the curriculum. Undergraduates serving as research assistants learn valuable skills and develop an understanding of the substance and structure of research.

Faculty research is supported by external funding, primarily from the federal government. In FY 1993, the College attracted $2.9 million in external funding to support 58 research projects. In FY 1994, the total increased to $3,633,573, again supporting 58
awards. External funding is important not only because it allows faculty and students to engage in research, but because it provides overhead funds that accrue to the educational activities of the College more generally.

Faculty in the Division of Mathematics and Natural Sciences brought in over 37% of the total research dollars awarded in FY 1994, led by the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry with $878,144. Among the divisional leaders were the Departments of Biology ($654,887) and Physics ($570,918), and the Center for the Biology of Natural Systems ($599,670). Collectively, faculty in the departments in the School of Education were awarded 13 grants for a total of $985,400.

Several Queens faculty members are recipients of three separate concurrent research grants. Professor Harry Gafney of the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry holds grants from the National Science Foundation, the Army Research Office and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research for his work on photodisposition in glass. Also in the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Distinguished Professor Robert Bittman has an award from the National Institutes of Health and two sub-grants, one from the University of Alberta and the other from the University of Manitoba, for his work on membranes. Physics Professor Fred Cadieu won grants from the Raytheon Corporation, the Army Research Office and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research for work on thin magnetic and metallic films for microwave circuits. In Biology, Associate Professor Zahra Zakeri received funding from the Council on Tobacco Research and the National Institutes of Health; NIH awarded her both a research grant and a Research Career Development Award for her work in the area of programmed cell death.

Besides external funding, faculty research and creative activities are also supported by the University under the PSC-CUNY Faculty Research Award Program stipulated in the PSC-CUNY contract. In FY 1995, 86 Queens faculty members received PSC-CUNY awards totalling $441,000. These grants provide an important means of supporting students as research assistants.

More information on grant and contract activity of the faculty may be found in CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES in the Annual Reports of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.

B. Released Time

As pressure has mounted on the budget, there has been a tightening of the overall workload policies at Queens. In spring 1992, new guidelines for the granting of release
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7 Faculty research grants accounted for 59% of the $6.2 million of the total grants and contracts awarded in FY 1994; see CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES.

8 Copies of the Annual Reports of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs for the fiscal years 1987 through 1994 will be available for inspection by the Evaluation Team.
time to faculty who perform administrative tasks were promulgated, and a department-by-
department review of administrative releases was conducted by the Office of the Provost. 
However, rumors about the practices in different divisions and departments continue to 
abound. The Provost, the deans and the Director of Institutional Research are examining 
the entire process by which faculty workload data are gathered and reported. A revised 
system is anticipated for the 1995-96 academic year.

Some departments and individual faculty members participate heavily in the doctoral 
programs of the Graduate School of the City University of New York, and others, not at 
all. For those who do, there is no uniform Queens College practice concerning teaching 
credit for supervising doctoral dissertations. Some faculty members supervise as many as a 
dozen or more doctoral students during a single semester. In the past faculty were given a 
formula for requesting released time from a three-credit course based upon the number of 
doctoral students enrolled in dissertation supervision. In recent years that practice has not 
been maintained as budget cuts have placed additional constraints on departments and the 
position of Dean of Graduate Studies and Research (whose office coordinated the record 
keeping) was eliminated. While some departmental chairs still grant such release time, a 
fair and uniform policy governing such issues is needed.

C. Support for Faculty Research and Improvement

1. Fellowship Leaves

Fellowship leaves of absence, or "sabbaticals," are available every seven 
years to faculty. In the past, faculty could choose between a full year at half pay or a half 
year at full pay. Past fiscal difficulties in the University resulted in a significant reduction 
in half-year full-pay sabbaticals. At Queens, the College P & B instituted a practice of 
reviewing all requests for such leaves and established guidelines for the award of full pay 
leaves, giving preference to chairs and other faculty who have performed at least four years 
of intensive administrative work. The College P & B is clearly on record supporting the 
restoration of half-year full-pay leaves for all faculty who are eligible. However, as the 
College now has to support all such leaves from its operating budget, the likelihood of 
expanding opportunities beyond those available now is very low. Full-year half-pay leaves 
have not been affected, and have been consistently encouraged.

2. Travel Funds

Travel funds ranging from $200 to $600 to attend professional conferences 
are available to faculty once a year. Usually the faculty member must be a speaker or 
otherwise involved with the conference to be able to receive the support. Many faculty 
have complained that the financial limitations make it impossible to attend international 
conferences. Some funds for travel come from a contractual obligation to provide for travel 
by the instructional staff. Deans have often supplemented travel funds from their tax levy 
budgets and from non-tax levy sources, e.g., grant overhead returns and private donations.
3. The PSC-CUNY Faculty Research Award Program

Awards from this program are designed to enhance scholarly and creative activities in the University, especially among junior faculty. A major vehicle for the University's encouragement and support of faculty research, these awards are supported by an annual State budget line of $2.8 million. The awards are competitive; University review panels in disciplinary areas rank proposals; many rely heavily on external reviewers. See CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES, for additional detail on the program and on awards to Queens faculty.

4. The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the Development Office

Colloquially known as the Grants Office, the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs is the campus branch of the CUNY Research Foundation. It provides assistance to faculty who seek to apply for funds from outside the College, primarily from Federal, State or local government sources. It also coordinates the submission of proposals to the PSC-CUNY Faculty Research Award Program. Where needed, assistance with proposal writing is also available. The Office publishes a monthly newsletter alerting faculty to grant and contract opportunities and deadline dates and maintains databases and resources to help identify prospects. It has a staff of six and is supported from the indirect costs of grants returned to the College by the CUNY Research Foundation.

Opportunities for support of faculty research from private foundations, corporations and private giving are the responsibility of the Development Office. Two recent additions to the staff, the Director of Corporate and Foundation Relations, and the Director of Research, have expanded the support available to faculty. New workshops for faculty on grant application strategies have been offered, and additional workshops are planned.

5. President's Research Award

Former President Kenny established the President's Research Award in 1986, funded by annual allocations from the Queens College Foundation. Five or six awards are given each year for a semester's release from all teaching duties to enable the faculty to devote a concentrated period of time to their research or creative activity. Departments are provided with $5000 to compensate for the released time. There is an excellent record of productivity from the faculty who have won these awards.

There are faculty who would prefer to see a return to the earlier Faculty-in-Residence program, which allowed faculty one course of released time for research and creative work. This program was phased out with the advent of the President's Research Award and the practice of granting released time to new faculty in their first year. Other funds that supported the Faculty-in-Residence program have been
allocated to the Dean's Council for funding a variety of research support activities.

6. Start-up Funds and Released Time for New Faculty

When new faculty are hired, the department chair may request funding to help establish the faculty member's research agenda. This ranges from specially-equipped computers to substantial laboratory equipment and renovations, depending on budget availability and the needs of the new faculty member. Funding has come from a variety of College sources, tax levy and non-tax levy budgets, divisional deans and the Provost, and recently from funds awarded by the University's Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs through the Academic Program Planning process.

For the past several years, the Provost has provided departments with replacement adjunct funds for two courses for each new faculty member in their first year of teaching. The reduced teaching load enables them to establish their research programs or advance their creative activities early, recognizing the pressures to produce a substantial body of work in the short time to tenure. Some departments have split the award, with one release in the first year and the second in the third year. The Provost has expressed an interest in preserving the program and its scheduling flexibility while exploring whether the program might be expanded to include some additional released time for all untenured faculty in their third year of appointment. Whether the current financial situation will permit this is not known at this time.

V. Faculty Service

The extent to which faculty members serve the institution and the wider academic community to which they belong is considered an important indicator of collegiality and professional awareness. As such, service is an expected ongoing feature of faculty members' professional activities. In recognition of this fact, the "service" record is ostensibly factored into both tenure and promotion decisions—along with teaching and scholarly activity.

A. Service to the College

Service is ordinarily defined as an official non-teaching activity conducted at either the departmental, divisional, or college level. The kinds of activities involved range from the intense administrative activities of a departmental chair to serving on an ad hoc department or college committee, the life-span of which is limited to a single semester with a minimum expenditure of time and effort.

---

9 See Report of the President's Advisory Committee on Teaching and Service, May 1992, p. 12.
1. Departmental Service

Department chairs at Queens College are elected by the faculty for a three-year term. In undertaking the administrative responsibility of a department, the chair is given a reduced teaching load, which, depending on department size, involves a release from one or two courses per semester. However, there is general understanding that the duties of a chair go beyond the hours involved in the reduction in teaching load. In addition to being responsible for the day-to-day running of a department, the duties of a chair involve (among other things) preparing annual reports and annual faculty evaluations, overseeing the preparation of promotion and tenure papers, and stewarding the affairs of the department at the divisional and college level.

There is wide variation among departments in the intensity of service requirements and expectations based on a number of variables, including department size, established departmental policies, and the extent to which a chair delegates responsibility. In some departments, service duties are clearly defined and distributed on a strict rotation schedule, while others have less formal arrangements.

All departments possess personnel and budget committees (P & B's). Membership is generally determined by election by the department’s full time faculty for a three-year term. The number of standing committees varies from department to department; most have separate curriculum committees and others as appropriate. Departmental committees other than the P & B may be elected or appointed by the chair.

Other departmentally-based service activities not involving formal committee assignments include regular student advising. Although this crucial task is currently under review by the College's administration and several pilot schemes are underway, difficulties remain, especially with coordinating the individual efforts of the faculty and those of their respective departments, divisions, and the college-at-large (see 1993 Five-Year Planning Committee on Faculty, pp. 24-25). The newly hired Director of Academic Advising has met with each department chair to determine how she can help systematize and improve departmental advising of majors. As a first step, workshops for departmental support staff will be offered, as they are at the front line answering questions students have. Furthermore, at present, there is a general perception that advising is a grossly underrated service. It needs to be integrated into the total academic experience and should involve all faculty, from the time of their appointment to their retirement. There is also the question of definition: that is, it may be preferable to consider academic advising an element of teaching, to be valued and evaluated as part of a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.

Service activities are generally recorded in the chair’s Annual Evaluation Report. Nevertheless, there has been no general practice of documenting the extent or quality of committee service, departmental or college-wide (see below). The Report of the President’s Advisory Committee on Teaching and Service (May 1992) recommended that an effort be made to preserve in all faculty personnel files detailed records of these duties.
The Task Force on Faculty concurred that such records would be of immense value in evaluating service performance in both tenure and promotion cases.

2. College-wide Service

Service on college-wide committees is expected as well, particularly for faculty who have received tenure. Faculty involvement in college-wide committees is determined by experience, possession of specialized skills or knowledge, and willingness to serve. As a consequence, not all faculty achieve the same level of activity in this category. Nevertheless, one way in which all faculty could become more involved in college-wide activities is through participation in the affairs of the Academic Senate, either as departmental or divisional delegates. Currently, however, there is no formal mechanism in place that ensures the service of all full-time faculty on the Senate or its committees. In some departments, the selection of delegates to the Academic Senate is on a rotational schedule, while in others, such service slots are filled on a volunteer basis, which can lead to the exploitation of junior faculty or a biased use of service-oriented faculty. Ideally, all faculty should be involved in this kind of service.

B. Service Outside the College

It is also recognized that valuable service to the College can be rendered either directly or indirectly through a faculty member’s external professional activity. For example, holding office in a professional body, local or national, not only brings credit to the individual, but also to the College. Other kinds of professional activity include editorial work on professional journals and serving as a reviewer for a government or private funding agency. Also, it should be acknowledged that less traditional ways of rendering external service to the College are compatible with the College’s mission and the accepted responsibilities of faculty. Examples include the promotion of academic programs through lecturing in high schools, or contributing to the wider dissemination of knowledge through a public lecture series. Given the inherent variation in the amounts of time and effort involved in these kinds of service, it is incumbent on individual departments to provide accounts of such service compared to other service categories.

C. The Valuing of Service

At this juncture, while service is a recognized and expected feature of the faculty role at Queens College, it remains a poorly defined category. Recognizing the difficulties involved in establishing comparative standards whereby service is ranked, it is contended that there should be at least a minimum service requirement that involves some of the elements outlined above. It is also recommended that detailed records of service be maintained. Furthermore, service should be scrutinized not only for the purposes of

---

and promotion, but as an ongoing requirement from hiring to retirement.

Although service is considered important, it is widely held by the faculty that service should not be regarded as having an equivalent status with teaching and scholarly activity, particularly when it comes to making tenure and promotion decisions. This is consistent with the CUNY Bylaws in which teaching and research (and other forms of scholarly productivity) are considered the primary criteria for tenure and promotion; service is considered to be secondary.

VI. Secretarial Assistance and Related Administrative Support

Lack of adequate secretarial support may be the single most vexing problem for most faculty members at Queens College as they try to fulfill their roles in teaching, research and service. It has negative effects on faculty productivity, communication with students and colleagues, and morale. Because faculty have to perform their own secretarial functions, some set up their offices at home, where they find it is more efficient to work. Although this tendency may facilitate desirable scholarly activity, it can contribute to greater isolation for individual faculty members, and a lack of commitment to being on campus for events other than one's own classes. This situation can lead to a lack of a sense of community on campus, for both faculty and students. The Task Force on Faculty found that the need for assistance for faculty is particularly acute in the following areas: taking phone messages, and making appointments for students and others (a voice mail system would go a long way toward improving this situation); typing syllabi or exams; preparing forms and reports; and photocopying and filing.

VII. Faculty Participation in Policy and Program Formation and in Governance

A. Structures for Participation

The organizational nature of Queens College is such that there are three distinct, and often intertwining, routes for faculty participation in policy and governance. The first route is through the Academic Senate, which has significant responsibility in the areas of curriculum and scholastic standards. Here, the faculty, along with the students, have an important and direct voice in the running of the college. Faculty members of the Senate are elected at the departmental level or through their respective divisions. The second major route is available to those elected to be departmental chairs or members of departmental P & B Committees. Both chairs and P & B members are elected for three-year terms and many are highly active in college policy and governance issues. (There is the potential for overlap between these routes, as chairs and P & B members can also be members of the Academic Senate.) A third way for faculty to participate in policy and governance is through the many committees appointed by the administration, the Academic Senate, departments, etc. This route provides all faculty with exposure to the administrative workings of the college and the opportunity to be heard on a wide range of topics related to
policy and governance.

There are also means for faculty participation in University-wide governance. The University Faculty Senate meets monthly during the academic year and has a number of standing committees. The faculty is also represented on the University's Board of Trustees, with the Chair of the University Faculty Senate serving ex officio. Faculty also serve on a wide variety of ad hoc committees and task forces convened by the University administration to advise them on issues such as articulation, English as a Second Language, remediation and assessment. For additional detail, see CHAPTER TWELVE: GOVERNANCE.

B. Faculty Contributions to the Planning Process

During the interval since the last visit of the Middle States Association, the College has gone through a series of planning sessions, and faculty have been prominent leaders and participants in these activities. Although many of these plans cannot be implemented fully because of the continuing budgetary crisis at the University level, the process itself has been a valuable learning experience. There are now more faculty on the campus with a thorough knowledge of how the system works and how the processes of change can be engaged. One unfortunate result of so much effort is the perception that planning documents simply sit, unimplemented, on shelves because of budget cuts or bureaucratic inertia. Administrators and current faculty committees engaging in activities based on planning documents should make it a priority to disseminate that information widely to the rest of the faculty. Yearly reports of progress on the recommendations of the five year plans have been published in FYI, the faculty-staff newsletter. To the extent that there are still perceptions of inaction, other means of communication should be considered. For additional detail, see CHAPTER SIXTEEN: PLANNING.

C. Tenure and Promotion

Throughout most of the history of Queens College, positive recommendations of the Committee of Six on tenure and promotion have been affirmed by the College P & B and by the College President. This long-standing academic peer-review policy is highly valued by the faculty, because it provides stability, integrity, and credibility to established policy in guiding faculty members preparing themselves for tenure and promotion evaluation. Some have expressed concern that the departmental chairs have too much input in the tenure and promotion process, because they vote at the departmental, divisional, and College P & B levels. Others note that most votes are positive in any case. It is not clear what alternative procedures one might use if there were to be a change, but perhaps alternatives should be studied.

D. Central Control Issues

Since the last Middle States review, the issues surrounding central control by the
CUNY Chancellor have become major policy and governance themes at the College. There has been a widespread perception by faculty and students that attempts by the Chancellor to centralize power come at the expense of the quality of education at Queens College. There is a perception that lack of support for some of the Chancellor's proposals by Queens College faculty and/or administration has resulted in fiscal punishment of Queens College and reward of other colleges in the CUNY system. As noted in CHAPTER EIGHT, FINANCIAL RESOURCES, the University has removed faculty lines from Queens College through an initiative known as Base Level Equity, with the faculty lines going to other colleges with higher part-time to full-time teaching ratios. This was particularly hard for Queens to bear because the College has made painful financial sacrifices over the years to maintain a high proportion of full-time faculty on its staff rather than rely too heavily on adjunct teaching. Quality of education is difficult enough to maintain during a period of severe budget cuts; many are frustrated as they perceive it to be eroded further by the larger university system.

E. The Role of Collective Bargaining

The long experience with the faculty union contract has effectively removed many of the most difficult problems that can divide faculty and administration at the college level. The collective bargaining agreement provides an alternative route for faculty to pursue in the case of grievances or protests against application of a particular policy or procedure. Most important is the air of mutual cooperation between the administration of the College and the union where attempts are made to head off problems before they become crises. The system seems to work very well.

VIII. Recommendations and Commendations

There is ample evidence that the present faculty are a caring and dedicated group of people who continue to teach with enthusiasm, to conduct research and scholarly activity at a productive rate, and to serve the wider academic community with dedication. One example cited by the Task Force on Faculty was the faculty's production of a detailed report in May 1994 concerning the role of faculty teaching and service. This report resulted in a retreat for the faculty who wrote the report, the faculty chairs, and the academic administration. There was lengthy, animated debate; collectively, the chairs reaffirmed that teaching and service were, indeed, important components of faculty responsibility, but that these components of the faculty role should not eliminate the element of scholarship in granting tenure and promotion. The College P & B later voted on a motion requiring departments to devise their own mechanisms for evaluation of faculty with respect to teaching, in recognition that there are different kinds of teaching in different disciplines and at different levels (see II.C.). As coordination of these activities will be necessary,

---

11 The Task Force on Faculty noted that support for this statement was evident during its frequent meetings during fall 1994.
RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should insure that the format of the tenure and promotion papers allows for a full presentation of the candidate's teaching performance. <11-1>

Support is expressed for the various award programs for teaching and research. It is hoped that the new president will continue such initiatives as the President's Award for Excellence in Teaching, the Mini-grants for Teaching Innovation, and the President's Research Award. Innovation and experimentation in teaching is also facilitated by the relative ease with which the faculty can introduce experimental courses at Queens College before formal approval is required. This practice is to be commended.

Concerning faculty service to the institution and to the wider academic community, it is felt that more detailed records of faculty service are desirable in all faculty personnel files that, along with information on teaching and research, should be used during tenure and promotion decisions. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: Departmental chairpersons should insure that annual reviews fully document faculty members' service to the department, the College and the University, and their contributions to their profession. <11-2>

Concerning the tenure and promotion process, it was noted that throughout most of Queens College history, positive tenure and promotion recommendations of the Committee of Six have been regularly accepted by the College President, in recognition of the generally thorough review done by faculty committees. The Task Force on Faculty found broad support for maintaining this tradition as it was perceived by faculty to provide stability, integrity, and credibility to established policy in guiding faculty members preparing themselves for tenure and promotion evaluation. Therefore, while respecting the President's Bylaw responsibility to come to an independent judgment with regard to candidates' qualifications for tenure and promotion,

RECOMMENDATION: The President is urged to give great weight to the recommendations concerning tenure and promotion made by the Committee of Six and the College P & B Committee, and the College P & B Committee is urged to continue to work with the President to refine and improve the review process involved in tenure and promotion decisions. <11-3>

Concerning faculty characteristics, the Queens College faculty is recognized as being of high quality, with 90% holding the doctorate. During the past 20 years, the number of full-time faculty members has shrunk by 50 percent. Today only 60% of classes are taught by full-time faculty, and there is concern about becoming increasingly a faculty of adjuncts. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should try to preserve the faculty lines it has now, and should resist an over-reliance on adjuncts. <11-4>

The College also needs to address some of the problems it faces in filling available faculty lines. Under increasing control by CUNY, the search process now has so many administrative levels of scrutiny that it is increasingly difficult to get advertisement copy into the print media in time to meet publication deadlines for late fall or early spring, to schedule interviews, and to offer a strong candidate a position according to timelines that are competitive with other colleges and universities.

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should make every effort to streamline College and University processes involved in faculty hiring. <11-5>

In the eyes of some, the faculty hiring process is further hampered by a Queens College practice whereby more searches are authorized than there are available positions, forcing competition among searches and demoralizing and embarrassing departments and search committees when they do produce top candidates who are not, in the end, offered the advertised position by the College. The Task Force on Faculty recommended that the College stop the practice of advertising for more positions than it is likely to be able to fill. It also felt that it was important that the College re-examine the searching and hiring procedures, aiming to work out a more streamlined set of procedures that still fulfill affirmative action principles. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost and the Deans should review the practice of approving searches for which there may not be available lines, taking into account the negative experiences of some departments that have completed successful searches but have failed to obtain authorization to hire. <11-6>

The Task Force on Faculty supported the practice of purchasing equipment and supplies for new faculty and enabling them to establish their research programs quickly through released time during their first year. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should continue to support new faculty through the provision of start-up funds and released time. <11-7>

In an era of increasing budgetary pressures, work-load is another important aspect of faculty life in need of attention. However one understands the differences in the assumptions made in the PSC-CUNY contract, by the CUNY Central Administration, and by long-standing practice at Queens College, the bases used for determining workload should be carefully examined by all. With continuing pressure from the University that
Queens faculty teach the full 21 hours per academic year agreed to in the Contract, rather than the 18 in standard practice at Queens College, it becomes increasingly important for administrators to communicate clearly about released time granted to faculty so that perceptions of fairness can be maintained. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Provost, in consultation with deans and chairpersons, should undertake a thorough review of the process by which faculty workload is determined and accounted for, and should develop a system for award of released time that obviates past perceptions of inequity. <11-8>

Concerning faculty diversity, the active recruitment of female and diversity applicants should be continued. Clarification of procedures for filling a line under the Queens College Faculty Diversity Program is needed. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College should continue to diversify its faculty with respect to race, ethnicity and gender. The Provost should clarify for departments the policies and practices involved with diversity appointments. <11-9>

Faculty contributions to the organizational plan of the College are numerous. Nevertheless, faculty serving on College planning committees sometimes have the impression that their work has gone unnoticed when they submit a report and fail to see any action resulting from the recommendations contained in the report. Often inaction is a result of further budget cuts. But there are times when action is taken, and the faculty are unaware of it. The faculty-staff newsletter is a suitable outlet for such information; such coverage is likely to be a significant morale booster. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** All College administrators who implement recommendations based on official College planning documents should announce the outcomes of the recommendations to the College community in a timely manner. <11-10>

Not surprisingly, institutional support for faculty teaching, research and service at Queens College over the past 10 years has suffered under devastating budget cuts. Lack of adequate administrative support services and cutbacks of student assistants for large lecture courses and laboratory courses seriously impair faculty performance in all three of these areas. The Task Force on Faculty noted that funds are returned to the College by the Research Foundation from the indirect costs associated with research grants, and suggested that these funds might be used to provide additional secretarial assistance for faculty. Other re-allocations of funds are also possible. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should form a task force to improve staff support for faculty roles in teaching, research and service. <11-11>

Other College-wide instructional support services at Queens College have also been adversely affected by severe budgetary constraints. These include the Benjamin Rosenthal Library, the Academic Computer Center, the Academic Skills Center, and the Center for Instructional Media Support. Nevertheless, the directors and staff members of these central instructional services have clearly maintained a commitment to providing the best possible service under the circumstances. Their leadership in the face of the demoralizing and incapacitating fiscal problems of recent years is to be highly commended. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should make every effort to sustain and improve the level of funding for College-wide instructional support services: the Benjamin Rosenthal Library, the Academic Computer Center, the Academic Skills Center and the Center for Instructional Media Support. <11-12>

IX. Summary List of Recommendations on Faculty

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should insure that the format of the tenure and promotion papers allows for a full presentation of the candidate’s teaching performance. <11-1>

RECOMMENDATION: Departmental chairpersons should insure that annual reviews fully document faculty members’ service to the department, the College and the University, and their contributions to their profession. <11-2>

RECOMMENDATION: The President is urged to give great weight to the recommendations concerning tenure and promotion made by the Committee of Six and the College P & B Committee, and the College P & B Committee is urged to continue to work with the President to refine and improve the review process involved in tenure and promotion decisions. <11-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should try to preserve the faculty lines it has now, and should resist an over-reliance on adjuncts. <11-4>
RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should make every effort to streamline College and University processes involved in faculty hiring. <11-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost and the Deans should review the practice of approving searches for which there may not be available lines, taking into account the negative experiences of some departments that have completed successful searches but have failed to obtain authorization to hire. <11-6>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should continue to support new faculty through the provision of start-up funds and released time. <11-7>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost, in consultation with deans and chairpersons, should undertake a thorough review of the process by which faculty workload is determined and accounted for, and should develop a system for award of released time that obviates past perceptions of inequity. <11-8>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should continue to diversify its faculty with respect to race, ethnicity and gender. The Provost should clarify for departments the policies and practices involved with diversity appointments. <11-9>

RECOMMENDATION: All College administrators who implement recommendations based on official College planning documents should announce the outcomes of the recommendations to the College community in a timely manner. <11-10>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should form a task force to improve staff support for faculty roles in teaching, research and service. <11-11>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should make every effort to sustain and improve the level of funding for College-wide instructional support services: the Benjamin Rosenthal Library, the Academic Computer Center, the Academic Skills Center and the Center for Instructional Media Support. <11-12>
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I. College and University Governance Structures

Queens College functions in an environment of shared governance. The internal governance structure encourages participation in college affairs, fosters commitment and collegiality, and allows for discussion of divergent ideas. Queens College is governed by the Bylaws of the CUNY Board of Trustees, the Charter and Bylaws of the Queens College Academic Senate, procedural motions of the College P & B and the contractual agreements between the University and various bargaining units. College governance plans must be approved by the Board of Trustees. The administrative organization of Queens College will be discussed in CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION. References to the College administration in this chapter will focus on its relationship to governance bodies.

The President is the chief educational and administrative officer of the College with a broad range of responsibilities specified in the Board of Trustees Bylaws. During the period covered by this Self Study, the President tended to play a particularly active role by establishing several presidential committees. It is the responsibility of the President to exercise strong leadership and authority, but the extent to which the President encourages communication, collaboration and cooperation between strong governance units is a contributing factor to how successfully the College fulfills its mission and goals.

As recognized by the Middle States Evaluation Team in 1986, the faculty of Queens College play an active role in the governance of the institution. Curricular issues, recommendations on tenure and promotion, institutional priorities and budgetary matters are subjects of faculty deliberation and involvement. Although the nature of that involvement and the particular areas of special concern may have shifted somewhat during the last decade, the degree to which faculty influence the governance of the College remains a distinctive characteristic of the institution and has doubtless done much to maintain a sense of collegiality and commitment in a time of growing fiscal hardship and increasingly centralized decision-making by CUNY administration. The aim of this chapter is to outline the nature of the faculty role in governance, with particular attention to changes that have occurred since the last Middle States review.

II. Departmental Governance

Chairs of academic departments are elected by vote of all members of the

---

1 See CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

2 For a description and discussion about student governance issues, see CHAPTER TEN: STUDENTS.
instructional staff of the department who hold faculty rank. The normal term of service is
three years, and there is no limit to the number of terms a chair may serve. There is no
additional remuneration for chairs of academic departments, although they are allowed
reduced teaching loads. Also elected to three-year terms are four full-time faculty to
constitute, with the chair, the Departmental Personnel and Budget Committee (P & B).

The chair has primary responsibility for scheduling courses and assigning teaching
responsibilities to faculty, managing the department's budgets, supervising non-teaching
staff, providing annual evaluations of all faculty, assigning office space, making committee
assignments, and chairing meetings of the department and of its P & B Committee. Some
of these responsibilities may be delegated to an assistant/deputy chair or other appointee,
although ultimate responsibility resides with the chair. In addition, the chair serves as the
department's liaison with the divisional Dean of Faculty and with the College administration
as a whole. The chair serves ex officio as a member of the Divisional Caucus and the
College Personnel and Budget Committee.

It is the responsibility of the Departmental P & B Committee to make
recommendations on behalf of the department regarding appointment of new faculty,
reappointment of non-tenured faculty, tenure and promotion. Mandated teaching
observations are carried out by faculty assigned by the Committee. Major decisions
regarding budgetary matters are normally made in consultation with the P & B.

Internal governance structures tend to vary from department to department.
Generally an elected or appointed Curriculum Committee makes recommendations to
the department as a whole regarding proposed curricular changes or alterations in the
requirements for a major or minor; departmental proposals are subject to approval by the
appropriate Academic Senate curriculum committee and the Academic Senate at large. In
some departments, student representation on departmental curriculum committees is
encouraged. Departments with graduate degree programs normally establish a Graduate
Committee, headed by the Graduate Program Advisor. A departmental Honors and Awards
Committee normally makes recommendations regarding departmental honors and prizes.

III. Divisional Caucus and Screening Committees

The Divisional Caucus is made up of the chairs of every department in the division.
The Caucus normally meets monthly during the academic year. In addition, the chairs
assemble as a Divisional Screening Committee once per term to evaluate divisional
candidates for tenure (in fall) and promotion (in spring). Meetings of the Caucus are
chaired either by an elected chair or by the divisional Dean of Faculty. In recent years
divisional Deans have made a practice of attending caucus sessions and have traditionally

3 There have been three exceptions: Chairs of the Departments of Student Personnel, the Library, and Special
Programs (SEEK) are, respectively, the Dean of Students, the Chief Librarian, and an Associate Dean serving as
Director of SEEK. All are appointed by the President upon the recommendation of search committees.
overseen the balloting at Divisional Screening Committees.

A principal function of the Divisional Caucus is to serve as the conduit for input from the Division to the College P & B and to the administration. Divisional Deans and members of standing committees of the College P & B also use the forum provided by the Caucus to keep chairs informed of important issues. The Caucus nominates divisional representatives to the standing committees of the College P & B at its first fall meeting and recruits volunteers to serve on select advisory committees as the need arises.

The Divisional Screening Committees receive and consider recommendations for reappointment with tenure and for promotion from departmental P & B's. Papers submitted without affirmative recommendation of the departmental P & B are also considered when requested by the candidate. In all cases, the candidate's personal file and supporting materials are made available to members prior to the meeting. The Screening Committee meets in closed session, where candidates' credentials receive a thorough examination and discussion. Members then express a preference vote by secret ballot and a tally of the results is forwarded to the College P & B for its deliberations and those of its subcommittee, the Committee of Six.

IV. The College P & B Committee

Voting membership of the College Personnel and Budget Committee is composed, as per CUNY Board of Trustees Bylaws, of the chairs of all academic departments and the Provost. Sessions are chaired by the President. Several non-voting invitees normally attend P & B meetings, including Vice Presidents, Deans, the Registrar, the Chair of the Academic Senate and the head of the College's chapter of the Professional Staff Congress. Meetings are normally held monthly during the academic year, but may be called at any time under special circumstances.

As defined in the CUNY Bylaws, the principal functions of the College P & B are to review and make recommendations to the President concerning all proposed appointments to the instructional staff, reappointments with tenure or Certificate of Continuous Employment, and promotions; and to review and make recommendations regarding the "annual tentative budget" prepared by the President for submission to the Chancellor. In addition to these mandated functions, the Committee has served to represent faculty interests and concerns on a range of issues, communicating both with the College administration and University governance bodies.

Until recently, the College P & B has played a more significant role in personnel matters than in the budgetary area. In part this has been due to its own choice of priorities, but it has also been determined by the complexities of the budgetary process within CUNY and a perceived reluctance of the Administration to encourage greater faculty involvement in financial planning. Recent developments point to a greater attention to budgetary matters, as will be indicated below.
As noted earlier, meetings of the College P & B are chaired by the President, assisted by the Provost. The President is thus able to report on matters of interest or concern directly to the assembled chairs on a regular basis and hear their views. Others are invited to raise issues or report on departmental developments. The Executive Committee of the P & B apprises the body of its deliberations and frequently introduces motions for consideration. Thus, an important function of the P & B is to serve as a medium of communication between the administration and the faculty as a whole, since the members of the P & B are in a position to report matters of interest directly to their departments. How effectively this is done is a matter of some concern. Detailed minutes provide a record of actions and discussion and are routinely circulated to all chairs, though not to the faculty at large.

The College P & B has proven an effective forum for communication of faculty concerns to the administration and a workable, if at times unwieldy, means of effecting change. It is a cornerstone of faculty governance at the College, and the openness and freedom of exchange that characterize its sessions have doubtless contributed much to the strong sense of collegiality among its members.

A. Standing Committees of the College P & B

1. The Executive Committee

The Executive Committee consists of three members and one alternate from each of the three academic divisions of the College (Arts and Humanities, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, the last including the School of Education). Members and alternates are nominated by the respective Divisional Caucuses and elected by the P & B at its first meeting of each academic year. The Committee elects its own chair and vice chair from among its members. The Committee meets monthly during the academic year, but special meetings to deal with particular problems or issues are frequent. The Chair of the Executive Committee attends the monthly meetings of the President’s Cabinet and serves as a liaison between the Committee and the Administration and between the P & B and the leadership of the Academic Senate.

Issues may be brought to the attention of the Executive Committee from a variety of sources, including the Administration, the Academic Senate, the P & B, individual faculty members and governance bodies at other CUNY campuses. The range of matters dealt with in recent years has been broad, including evaluation of the role of teaching as a criterion for promotion and tenure, the establishment of a means for increasing faculty input into the budget process, criteria for systematic program review within CUNY, and relations between the College faculty and the central CUNY administration. Traditionally, the Executive Committee has been the faculty body charged with recommending to the President candidates for appointment as University Distinguished Professor, reviewing nominations submitted by academic departments. It has customarily interviewed candidates for President of the College as part of the search process, making its
recommendation to the Board of Trustees' Presidential Search Committee.

No formal method of communicating recommendations of the Executive Committee has been established, other than through its monthly report at the meeting of the College P & B. As a result, the College community at large is normally dependent on the departmental chairs and administrators present at P & B meetings for information. It is not surprising that there is a lack of understanding on the part of some faculty regarding the Executive Committee's role in campus governance.

2. The Committee of Six

The Committee of Six is the standing committee charged with making recommendations to the College P & B regarding reappointment with tenure and promotion. It consists of two chairs from each academic division, nominated annually by the Divisional Caucuses and elected by the P & B at its first meeting in the fall. The Committee is chaired by the Provost, who oversees deliberations but does not participate in voting. Members review the candidates' academic records, the reports of the departmental P & B and the departmental chair, and the numerical ranking provided by the appropriate Divisional Screening Committee. The Committee meets with the three divisional Deans and the Dean of the School of Education for additional input. All candidates' personal files and supporting materials are available throughout the review process. Scrutiny and review are thorough. Candidates' materials are examined for at least a week before the Committee convenes and deliberations normally require a full week. Members who are chairs of departments with candidates under review traditionally absent themselves from deliberations for a period of time prior to the final vote to assure full and open discussion. A positive recommendation to the College P & B requires four affirmative votes.

The rigor and objectivity of the review process has made the positive recommendation of the Committee of Six a crucial factor in determining promotion and tenure at the College. The Committee's recommendations are normally upheld by the College P & B, and only on rare occasions has an affirmative recommendation of the P & B not been approved by the President. Faculty members and administrators who have come to Queens College from institutions with different methods of promotion and tenure review have often expressed admiration for the effectiveness of the Committee of Six. Upon her arrival, President Kenny expressed reservations about the unusually large role played by chairs in the promotion and tenure process, and urged consideration of an alternative method involving senior faculty chosen by the President. The College P & B reaffirmed its confidence in the existing system, while taking steps to improve its processes by providing clearer guidelines for the documentation of candidates' qualifications and accomplishments. In due course, President Kenny came to be supportive of the Committee of Six and its recommendations.
3. The Budget Committee

In May 1994, the College P & B established a standing committee to formulate input to the administration on budgetary issues, to create structures for systematic on-going review of the College's budget and to formulate procedures by which the P & B could have input to the budget planning process. The Committee consists of two chairs or former chairs from each of the three academic divisions, nominated by the respective Divisional Caucuses and elected by the P & B at its first meeting in the fall. In the brief period since its formation, the Budget Committee has begun to have an impact. The current administration has shown a willingness to involve the Committee in the establishment of budgetary priorities and has kept it informed of developments affecting the College's current and projected fiscal status. A strong and effective Budget Committee will go far toward improving the faculty's contribution to financial decision-making.

4. Other Committees of the College P & B

Each year at its first full meeting, the College P & B elects a chair from each division to serve on a subcommittee charged with reviewing College Laboratory technicians who have been recommended by their departments for reappointment with tenure. The CLT Review Committee is chaired by the Dean of Mathematics and Natural Sciences. Its recommendations are submitted to the full College P & B for approval.

With restrictions placed by the University on the number of half-year, full-pay fellowship leaves, individual colleges were required to develop internal guidelines to determine eligibility for such leaves. The College P & B adopted criteria for eligibility and established an ad-hoc committee to review applications. The Committee consists of one senior faculty member and one alternate from each division who are neither chairs nor members of the administration. Members and alternates serve staggered three-year terms. The Committee's recommendations are submitted to the College P & B for approval.

B. Improvement of Communication

Communication—or the perceived lack of it—remains a central issue for the College P & B. This is true at the level of the P & B, Academic Senate, PSC and the President, as well as between the P & B and the academic departments. The role of the Chair of the P & B has changed somewhat over the last decade, as former President Kenny chose not to continue the practice of meeting regularly with the Chairs of the Executive Committee and Academic Senate, together with the representative of the Professional Staff Congress. These so-called "troika" meetings were perceived as effective under President Saul Cohen and the early years of President Kenny's administration, providing an opportunity for more effective exchange of ideas than the sessions of the President's Cabinet, which were largely informational. The leadership of the Executive Committee, the Senate and the union were forced to develop their own channels of communication with her and with each other. The College's current leadership has given indication of a return to more regular consultation.
with all bodies. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The President should re-institute regular meetings between leaders of the three principal governance bodies to insure timely means of communication. <12-1>

If the President does not wish to convene a regular meeting with the three governance leaders, they should make provision to do so on their own.

A matter of ongoing concern is the unevenness of communication between the College P & B and the faculty and College community. Department Chairs use different methods of relaying discussions and decisions of the College P & B to their departments, some holding frequent departmental meetings, others using intradepartmental memos or word of mouth. As a result the level of awareness of current developments differs widely from department to department. The same may be said regarding the deliberations of the Executive Committee of the P & B. Some Divisional Caucuses schedule regular reports from their representatives to the Executive Committee, but this is far from a universal practice and it is frequently the case that faculty whose Chairs are not members of the Executive Committee are poorly informed about its doings. The situation calls for steps to improve communication. The College's informational newsletter FYI could be utilized as a vehicle for reaching a wider audience on matters of general concern. Perhaps the P & B or the Executive Committee could circulate bulletins directly to all departments regarding issues of current concern. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** Depertment chairs should find new methods to improve communication and information sharing with all members of their departments, faculty and staff alike. <12-2>

V. Academic Senate

A. Structure and Function

The Academic Senate of Queens College is the governance body on campus recognized by the CUNY Board of Trustees for the "formulation of policy relating to the admission and retention of students, curriculum, granting of degrees, campus life, and the nomination of academic (full) deans," as well as "the educational affairs customarily cared for by a college faculty." This function is carried out through a meeting of the full Senate once a month during the academic year, with a possible "continuation meeting" if business cannot be completed at a single meeting. The Senate also has a variety of committees that operate as necessary during the year, making reports at the regular Senate meetings. Most Senate committees (as stated in its Charter) have an equal number of students and faculty. Recommendations of the Senate must be approved by the Board of Trustees. They are forwarded to the Board by the President of the College, who may transmit such proposals with or without his or her approval.
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The Academic Senate of Queens College was created in 1970, replacing the Faculty Council. Currently it has a membership designed to give representation to all constituents in the academic divisions of the College and the student body (Table 12-1).

**TABLE 12-1: COMPOSITION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

- **Faculty members (60)**
  - 34 (1 from each department)
  - 6 from the Arts Division at large
  - 6 from the Social Sciences Division at large
  - 6 from the Math and Natural Sciences Division at large
  - 8 College-wide at large

- **Student members (30)**
  - 17 Day Session Senators
    - 8 At large
    - 3 Freshman/ lower sophomore
    - 3 Upper sophomore/lower junior
    - 3 Upper junior/senior
  - 6 Evening Session Senators
  - 2 SEEK Program Senators
  - 2 ACE Program Senators
  - 3 Graduate Division Senators

Meetings of the Senate are also open to all members of the Queens College community who are given the right to speak on the floor but not to make motions. Committee membership of the Senate is open to any member of the instructional staff, and all students who have a cumulative index of at least 2.0 and are not on probation. Senate committees are required to report to the Senate at least once a year.

The Academic Senate was noted by past Middle States evaluators as an integral part of a governance model where faculty “govern the College to an extent almost unknown in American institutions of higher education.” They further commented that this is “not necessarily wrong,” and that the College “has built and maintained high quality educational programs with this model.” There has been general agreement on campus with the evaluators that the current model of governance through the Academic Senate is, on the whole, effective and functional, having maintained the integrity not only of the educational programs at Queens College, but of its administration and environment, as well. However, on the basis of numerous interviews conducted in preparation for this Self Study, there is also a strong sense that there are problems that should be addressed and room for

---

4 Ex-officio (non-voting) members include the College President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Divisional Deans, Dean of Students, Chief Librarian, Registrar, Professional Staff Congress Chair, and the Student Government Presidents.
improvement.

It has been noted that, although the College is currently undergoing a self study and academic departments are being reviewed regularly, the Academic Senate itself has never undergone such a self study. The effectiveness of the Senate and its committees has never been assessed. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should review its Charter, Bylaws and Policy Book and undertake a complete self study with regard to its composition, policies and practices. <12-3>

B. Representation on and of the Senate

During the course of deliberations for this Self Study, and in the Senate itself, the issue of the proportionate representation of various constituencies as laid out in the Charter has been questioned as how effectively it reflects the current College community. In addition, the categorization of students (i.e., "day," "evening," etc.) has been questioned as being an anachronism.

First is the issue of representation. Table 12-2 shows enrollment and voting statistics in the election of student senators for the 1993-94 academic year. If one compares the percent of each constituency in the overall student body to the percent representation on the Senate, the numbers are reasonable except for the evening division (with 9% of the students having 20% representation on the Senate) and graduate division (21% of the students having only 10% representation). If one compares this representation to the number of students actually turning out to vote, in the graduate case, only 2% of the students voted for their representatives. If one considers only those students who voted, then 76% of the voters (the day students) have a 57% representation on the Senate, and 3% of the voters (graduates) have a 10% representation on the Senate. It would not be practical, of course, to gear Senate representation to something as volatile as voting percentages, but the matter clearly deserves the attention of the Senate's Governance Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Senators</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Voters</th>
<th>% of Voters</th>
<th>% of enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day matric</td>
<td>8863</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve matric</td>
<td>1681</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE matric</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK matric</td>
<td>1005</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAD matric</td>
<td>3374</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recent demise of the administrative unit referred to as the "School of General Studies" or SGS, more colloquially referred to as the "Evening Division," has been a cause of concern to some. The background concerning its elimination may be found in CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION. The population of evening students used to be clearly defined: They were enrolled in SGS, generally attended classes at night, majored in one of the departments that offered a full evening program, had their own Dean, and were given some privileges such as early registration for classes in their major offered in the evening. This was in a time past, where "traditional" students were full-time, attended classes in the day and graduated in four years. Evening students worked the "traditional" nine-to-five jobs, and came to school in the evening.

The situation has changed dramatically. Now, most students are "non-traditional," working any combination of mornings, afternoons, evenings, certain days, etc., and they select course schedules that complement their other priorities. Currently, evening students become "evening students" by simply asking the Registrar to list them as such; the same goes for "day" students, and a switch in status may be accomplished at any time and repeatedly. The notion of the "traditional" day and evening student, both sociologically and administratively, has vanished.

The Senate needs to react to this phenomenon and consider adjusting its representation accordingly. The current inconsistency could be resolved by encouraging the administration to return to the previous model (an unlikely event in light of the budget picture and the reality of student patterns of course-taking), or by folding student representation into one group. It was also observed that while ACE and the Evening Division have separate representation, all ACE students are considered evening students. In addition, it was surprising for the Task Force on Governance to learn that graduate students enrolled at the CUNY Graduate Center (Ph.D. programs) may have representation on the Senate. This privilege is offered not only when they are taking graduate courses at Queens College, but also when they are taking undergraduate courses.

The student membership of the Academic Senate is also strongly influenced by the politics of the Student Government. However, Senate committee membership is more broad-based, drawing from a wider pool within the student community. There was less certainty as to whether the cultural diversity of the Senate mirrored that of the student body. This may be related to the small numbers of students who actually participate in elections. There was a consensus that the Senate should examine how accurately its current membership reflects the student body in general and its diversity in particular. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Academic Senate should review its scheme of proportional representation. 12-4

During the deliberations of the Task Force on Governance, it was noted that the Chair of the Academic Senate either serves ex-officio or is a regularly invited guest at other College meetings (e.g. the President's Cabinet and the College P & B). However, the Chair of the
Executive Committee of the College P & B does not serve ex-officio on the Academic Senate. In light of recent cooperation between these two bodies and in the spirit of communication,

RECOMMENDATION: *The Academic Senate should consider adding the Chair of the Executive Committee of the College P & B to its list of ex officio members.* <12-5>

C. Committees of the Academic Senate

There are 14 standing committees of the Academic Senate, 1 special committee (Governance), and 2 college committees (Athletic Policy and Honors and Awards). All of them, except for the College Committee on Honors and Awards, have equal representation of students and faculty, as mandated by the Senate’s Charter. The activity of these committees varies widely, reflecting differing responsibilities. Those responsible for curriculum meet frequently and make reports at virtually every Senate meeting. Others meet infrequently to carry out required duties.

Many on campus are currently greatly concerned by continuing problems in filling the seats on these committees and by poor attendance at committee meetings. There are numerous vacancies in both the faculty and student positions on many committees, diluting the force of faculty and student representation in such an important body as the Academic Senate. It is not clear why this is true, though apathy and time constraints seem two obvious possibilities. There is a general consensus among the faculty that the Academic Senate itself is not a place of great excitement, and that a small portion of individuals monopolize the discussion. It is difficult to get both faculty and students to see through this perception and get them to realize that the business of the Senate, and of its Standing Committees, is indeed important. Assuming that the Senate undertakes a self study, part of that process will undoubtedly be devoted to an examination of committee functioning. In any event, and as soon as possible,

RECOMMENDATION: *The Academic Senate should raise the awareness on campus of its role and that of its committees, and encourage a broader participation of students and faculty.* <12-6>

Attendance at committee meetings, while generally poor, is worse for the student representatives. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: *The College faculty and administration and the student governments should actively encourage student participation on Academic Senate committees.* <12-7>

Many Senate committees are never or rarely heard from, which diminishes the visibility of the Senate. The Charter requires that a committee report to the Senate once a year; however, the Senate has not been enforcing this rule. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should ensure that all committees report to it at least once a year. <12-8>

One of the most important functions of the Academic Senate is in the area of curriculum development. The Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees serve as conduits between departments wishing to modify their curricula and the Academic Senate (via the Executive Committee). Approved proposals are sent on to the Board of Trustees for approval and, in some cases, to the New York State Department of Education. The Curriculum Committees consider the proposals for academic soundness (content, hours and credits), for conflict or duplication with other departments, and for compliance with College and University policies. The Curriculum Committees are also charged with overseeing the general College requirements for graduation, as well as any changes to majors and minors within departments. This includes the College's undergraduate "Liberal Arts and Science Area Requirements" (LASAR).

In reviewing the procedures for curriculum revision (from the department to the appropriate curriculum committee to the Executive Committee to the Academic Senate), the observation was made that the divisional deans are entirely out of the loop. This was found to be detrimental as the deans should be able (and expected) to play important consultative roles on such matters as coordination and potential overlap with other programs and the prospects for staffing and funding new or revised programs. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The divisional deans should become more directly involved in curriculum development and revision, and should be kept informed of the progress of curricular proposals as they go through governance review. <12-9>

D. The Senate's Relationship to the University

A strong and important tie to the governance of the University as a whole is through the University Faculty Senate (UFS). The Chair of the Academic Senate is an ex-officio member of the UFS, and past Chairs have been faithful in attending UFS meetings, often also serving as one of the College's voting delegates. The UFS is an important body for the dissemination of University-wide information, for establishing University-wide policies, and for learning what is going on at other Colleges. In addition, the Chancellor and other University officials regularly attend UFS meetings, and are available for questions and answers, providing a singular opportunity for faculty to address members of the Chancellery.

E. The Senate's Relationship to the College P & B

While the P & B has no official relationship to the Academic Senate, nor does it overlap in its responsibilities, there have been occasions when the two bodies have joined together, in their advisory roles, to make recommendations to the Administration, or to take a position on matters both internal and external to the College. This type of cooperation must
rely on the leadership of the chairs of the Academic Senate and P & B Executive Committee. The Task Force on Governance offered strong encouragement for such cooperation and felt that regular meetings between the Senate and P & B chairs, either formal or informal, would only serve to foster better communication on campus. The Chair of the Senate is currently invited to attend the P & B meetings as a guest.

F. The Senate's Relationship to the Administration

Where the Senate is a creator of policy, the Administration is the implementer of policies. If new grading policies are introduced, the Registrar must implement them. If new course requirements are made, the Provost must be sure that there are sufficient resources to offer appropriate courses. Clearly, the making of policies without consideration of the administrative consequences would be counterproductive, and is averted by having administrators deeply involved with the Senate. As stated earlier, the President, Vice Presidents and the Registrar are among the ex officio members of the Senate. In general, and to their credit, many of them attend Senate meetings regularly, are available and willing to answer questions, and therefore have input into the Senate's deliberations.

Administrators are also ex officio members of many Senate committees, providing a conduit for information long before matters reach the floor of the Senate. A prime example is the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, where both the Provost and the Registrar are represented by designees who are among the most faithful in attending meetings. Curricular decisions, therefore, are not only made with the knowledge of the Provost and Registrar, but with their counsel and experience as well. This particular link to the Administration is key to the success of the strong role in faculty governance of the College.

The Administration is also relied on for another important role, that is for financial support of the Senate. In this respect, the history has been good. The Senate has prime office space, equipment, administrative assistance, and a student aide. In addition, released time has been provided for those who have extraordinary responsibilities (the Chair, the Executive Officer of the Scholastic Standards Committee, and the Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee). Over the last several years of budget crisis, support for the Senate has been cut, as it has been for the rest of the College. This has been passed along primarily as a reduction in released time. Everyone has been forced to do more with less; the Senate has been no exception.

G. The Senate's Relationship to the College President

The President is an ex officio, non-voting member of the Academic Senate. The University's Bylaws state that the President is to "transmit to the board the recommendations of his/her faculty council on matters of curriculum and other matters falling under faculty jurisdiction." The President, however, may offer either negative or positive recommendations

---

5 Bylaws of the Board of Trustees of the City University of New York, Section 11.4.A.5.
The Task Force on Governance attempted to assess how former President Kenny's actions affected the Academic Senate. It was felt that the President was generally supportive of all items sent to the Board of Trustees, and on occasion fought very hard on behalf of the Senate, even if she was not entirely in favor of what the Senate had decided. However, there was a general sense that the President felt that the Senate impeded her own agenda. Faculty perceived that she clearly had her own curricular agenda, and was on occasion frustrated at the ponderous pace of the Senate in supplying the necessary approval of programs she initiated. (One must admit that others have been frustrated by the pace of Senate deliberations as well.)

Where Senate approval for actions was not required, however, the President used self-appointed Presidential Committees, and, at her discretion, requested participation from members of the Academic Senate on these committees. Some of these efforts were viewed by some as redundant, and may have led to a diminishing of the importance of the Academic Senate in the eyes of some people. The President, over the years, changed many aspects of procedures for communication. As noted earlier in this chapter, she de-emphasized what was colloquially referred to as the "troika"—an informal meeting of the chairs of the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee of the College P & B, and the local chapter of the Professional Staff Congress. The frequency of the meetings of this group diminished over time from monthly to yearly to not at all.

H. Summary Findings on the Academic Senate

In summary, the Task Force on Governance finds that the governance model at Queens College with respect to the Academic Senate has worked over the last 24 years, and continues to work. There is room for improvement through self-study and modernization, through image improvement, and through increased communication with other units on campus. Student participation provides a most interesting facet to the process of college governance and, while it can cause division, is certainly to be valued.

There remains the issue of representation—of enfranchisement—of certain professional and administrative support staff in the governance of the College. Of particular concern is the fact that persons in such titles as Higher Education Officer (HEO) and College Laboratory Technician have no representation on either of the major governance bodies, the Academic Senate or the College P & B Committee. (Persons holding HEO titles are members of the President's Cabinet.) Other groups not formally represented are adjuncts and graduate assistants, Gittiesons and the classified trades.

RECOMMENDATION: The representative governance bodies on campus should review their membership structures and consider ways by which groups of staff not presently represented could be invited to participate on a voting or non-voting basis. <12-10>
VI. Bargaining Units

The Professional Staff Congress (PSC) is the union representing the faculty and professional staff at Queens College. Specifically excluded from the contract are administrators such as President, Provost, and Deans. The department chairs are covered by the PSC/CUNY contract. The PSC plays no direct role in governance at Queens College. The PSC does, however, act to insure that faculty prerogatives in governance as expressed in the PSC/CUNY contract and the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees are protected, maintained and enhanced. The PSC meets and negotiates with the Chancellor of CUNY and the President of the College at least twice a semester to protect such aspects of faculty governance as the election of department chairs by the faculty and the control of the curriculum by the Academic Senate. The PSC chapter chair sits as an unvoting ex officio member of the College P & B and the Academic Senate. The PSC also directly lobbies the Governor of the State of New York, the State Legislature, the Mayor of the City of New York, and the City Council on behalf of the interests of PSC members.

District Council 37 represents the secretarial staff at the College, commonly called the Gittleson series, including supervisory positions held among the support units of the College (i.e., Human Resources Office, academic departments, Registrar's Office, Bursar's Office, Library, Provost's Office, President's Office, etc.). The titles are unique to the City University and are broken into the following categories: CUNY Secretarial/Office Assistant, Levels I, II, III, IV, and CUNY Administrative Assistant, Levels I, II. The Gittlesons are governed by Civil Service regulations and the City University of New York. The City University develops, administers and scores qualifying entrance exams for the Secretarial/Office Assistant title, and a qualifying promotional exam for the Administrative Assistant title. The City University promulgates lists of individuals eligible for entrance level appointments and promotional titles.

The Gittleson series of titles is covered by contracts between District Council 37 of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees and CUNY. The contract requires that the Gittlesons have representation from the union. The Shop Steward insures that the contract that governs the Gittlesons is enforced. In addition, the Shop Steward is the liaison between Gittlesons and various College committees such as the Parking Committee, Retrenchment Committee and Middle States Task Force on Governance, as well other.

---

6 Faculty covered by the PSC/CUNY contract include both full-time and part-time teaching faculty. The professional staff includes the following titles: Registrar, Higher Education Officer, and College Laboratory Technician.

7 See University Bylaws, Section 9.1.

8 See Article 2.5-2.7 in the current PSC/CUNY contract.
Gittleson staff every month to insure a constant flow of information between the Administration and the Gittleson staff. Meetings between the Director of Human Resources and union representatives are held every four to six weeks.

VII. Law School and Queens College

The troubled state of governance between the College and the CUNY Law School as described in the 1986 Middle States Evaluation Team's Report was resolved at the January 29, 1990, meeting of the CUNY Board of Trustees by adoption of an interim Governance Plan for the City University School of Law for a "developmental period" ending in 1994. During the 1993-94 academic year, the Chancellor, upon appropriate consultation, including the Dean and the President, made recommendations for changes in the Plan, representing the culmination of the growth of the Law School from its opening ten years ago through its achievement of full accreditation by the American Bar Association in 1992. The Governance Plan now states that "The City University School of Law at Queens College is a unit of the City University of New York." The Law School is now a constituent and independent element of CUNY, similar to a college, and has ties to all institutions within the City University.

VIII. Summary List of Recommendations on Governance

RECOMMENDATION: The President should re-institute regular meetings between leaders of the three principal governance bodies to insure timely means of communication. <12-1>

RECOMMENDATION: Department chairs should find new methods to improve communication and information sharing with all members of their departments, faculty and staff alike. <12-2>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should review its Charter, Bylaws and Policy Book and undertake a complete self study with regard to its composition, policies and practices. <12-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should review its scheme of proportional representation. <12-4>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should consider adding the Chair of the Executive Committee of the College P & B to its list of ex officio members. <12-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should raise the awareness on campus of its role and that of its committees, and encourage a broader participation of students and faculty. <12-6>
RECOMMENDATION: The College faculty and administration and the student governments should actively encourage student participation on Academic Senate committees. <12-7>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate should insure that all committees report to it at least once a year. <12-8>

RECOMMENDATION: The divisional deans should become more directly involved in curriculum development and revision, and should be kept informed of the progress of curricular proposals as they go through governance review. <12-9>

RECOMMENDATION: The representative governance bodies on campus should review their membership structures and consider ways by which groups of staff not presently represented could be invited to participate on a voting or non-voting basis. <12-10>
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CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

I. Introduction

The findings in this chapter are based on the results of questionnaires that were sent to all administrators listed on the College's organizational charts in 1986, 1990, and 1994, and to all departmental chairs who served in other than an acting capacity from 1986 to 1994. Of the 122 surveys sent, only 32 were returned. The small sample size may not be truly representative of the group which the Task Force hoped to gain information from. The Task Force also drew from the knowledge of its members, many of whom have served or are serving in a variety of administrative and leadership roles.

Organizational changes since 1986 must be interpreted within the context of the reduced staffing that has significantly affected operations within Queens College. Offices have been combined, and others eliminated, with functions reassigned to other positions within the College in ways that may or may not represent the most functional structuring of the College. Areas that require further review are identified, with the knowledge that budgets may affect the extent to which change can be made. The Task Force noted that there were many favorable comments about the responsiveness of the Queens College administration as a whole and of specific individuals. A full account of these responses may be found in material appended to the final report issued by the Task Force on Organization and Administration.

II. Changes in Overall Organization and Administrative Structure

The 1986 organizational chart (Figure 13-1) named 37 positions excluding the Academic Senate, Alumni Office and Student Activities Corporation. However, two positions—Associate Dean of Teacher Education and Assistant Dean of the School of General Studies—were not included on the 1986 chart, and five other positions included on the 1994-95 chart existed in 1986 but were not shown on the 1986 chart. With these individuals, the College administration was composed of 44 persons. The 1994 organizational chart (Figure 13-2) lists 49 positions excluding the Executive Secretary to the President, the Executive Assistant to the Provost, and the Executive Director of the Student Services Corporation. Of these 49 positions, four are vacant as of May 1995, leaving a total of 45 filled positions on the 1994 chart. With these adjustments, the net increase in positions between 1986 and 1994 is one (44 to 45). Significant changes are noted in Table 13-1.

---

1 Chart taken from 1986 Self Study, p.119.

2 VP Institutional Relations, Associate Dean of Special Programs, Director of the Godwin-Ternbach Museum and Business Manager.
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TABLE 13-1: COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS—1986 & 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1986 Chart</th>
<th>1994 Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Provost—Academic</td>
<td>Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies and Research</td>
<td>Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of SGS</td>
<td>Assistant Provost for Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the School of General Studies</td>
<td>Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Assistant Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Teacher Education</td>
<td>Dean of School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President—Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President—External Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President/Executive Ass't.</td>
<td>Victoria President of College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to Provost for Academic Advising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Institutional Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy to President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President of Public Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Affirmative Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers mask what occurred over the course of a decade: there are substantive changes to note. First, at the vice presidential level, a new Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems was added and the titles of some positions upgraded. Most Assistant Vice President titles on the 1986 chart are now Vice Presidents and the Vice President/Provost is now a Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost. Some vice presidential titles have been modified, e.g., Finance & Business to Administration; and External Affairs to Institutional Relations.

The new position of Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems was created in response to a recommendation in the previous Middle States report that there be more extensive planning at Queens College. This position and the accompanying planning advisory committees set up by the President were seen by some on the Task Force as bypassing faculty governance in the area of college-wide planning. However, it should be noted that there was little or no objection or comment from the faculty when this position and the advisory committees were created.
The Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems is also responsible for the new QUASAR system (the student information management system), and for the Library, Academic Computer Center, and Administrative Computer Center, which were formerly under the Provost’s office. Several respondents felt that assigning these four major offices to the Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems was a positive development because it addressed the campus’s need to coordinate its disparate information systems and processes.

Regarding the upgrade of assistant vice presidents to full vice president titles, several Task Force members believed that there was a resulting change in the culture of how decisions were made concerning the major directions the College would take. From the academic perspective, the new arrangement had deans giving input to the Provost who was one among the group of vice presidents advising the President in decision-making. Some Task Force members felt that the deans did not have the opportunity to articulate the needs of their units as directly within the higher administration as they once did.  

Second, there appears to be an increase in the number of titles below the Vice President level now included on the 1994 organizational chart, though there have also been some deletions. New titles with new functions include: Dean for Experimental Programs, Director of Affirmative Action, Director of the Louis Armstrong House and Archives, Director of Special Events, Director of the Godwin-Ternbach Museum, and QUASAR Implementation Manager.

Third, some positions already existed at Queens College (some under different titles) but are now designated at the Director or Executive Director level. These include the Director of Telecommunication Services, Director of Security, Director of Campus Distribution Center, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, Executive Director of Admissions, Marketing, and Scholarship Services, and Executive Director of Continuing Education. (It should be noted that some of these titles are not on the tax levy budget.)

Similarly, when the position of Dean of Graduate Studies and Research was eliminated, the position of the Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies was created by transferring and expanding the responsibilities of the Dean’s Executive Assistant. The Director of Special Programs has been at the Associate Dean level; the deanship is currently vacant and an Acting Director is in place. The position of Business Manager (currently vacant) is now included on the organizational chart. Although these positions may have existed before but had not been included on the 1986 organizational chart, the most current chart includes more positions reporting to the Vice Presidents.

Fourth, two dean-level positions, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and Dean...
of the School of General Studies, were eliminated and some of the responsibilities for those positions shifted elsewhere. Issues surrounding these positions will be discussed in the next section. The Dean of the CUNY Law School at Queens College is not listed on the 1994 organizational chart because the Law School is no longer under the administrative supervision of Queens College; the Dean reports directly to the Chancellor of the University. Finally, the Academic Senate is not listed on the 1994 chart. Presumably this change was made because the Academic Senate is a governance body as opposed to an administrative unit. (For funding purposes, it is administered now by the Provost.)

The Task Force on Organization and Administration felt that the President would be well advised to review the need for the vice presidential positions specified in the 1994 organizational chart and the reporting structure within the College to determine whether particular offices should report to different Vice Presidents or other administrators given the new realities as to how those offices function. Two offices mentioned specifically were Financial Aid and the Registrar. In view of the fact that a new president has been appointed and that administrative reductions may have to be made to meet cutbacks in State support:

RECOMMENDATION: The President should review the entire organizational structure of the College.

III. Analysis of Three Deanships

A. Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Respondents cited the loss of this position more than any other change. The Dean resigned in 1989; a search was held and several candidates identified. In response to a directive from the CUNY Central Administration to cut the Executive Compensation Plan by 20% in two years, the President left the deanship vacant and removed several other administrative titles from the Plan. Initially, the President intended that the deanship would be filled when the financial pressures eased. It became clear within a year or two that the financial condition instead had worsened. The position was eliminated to comply with the Chancellor's instructions to reduce executive positions further.

The academic functions of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research were assigned to the four academic deans. Each dean assumed responsibility for the entire undergraduate and graduate curriculum, staffing, and scholastic standards for departments within their purview. The Executive Assistant to the Graduate Studies Dean became Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies, reporting initially to the Provost, and most recently to the

---

4 One positive outcome of this curricular integration is the development of a new interdisciplinary Masters degree in Social Science under the leadership of the Dean of Social Sciences. Without this new MA, several departments were grappling with the likelihood of elimination of their master's programs because of insufficient enrollment.
Associate Provost. She oversees the Graduate Studies Office and works with the academic deans in implementing Queens College policy having to do with graduate status. There was general agreement by respondents and by Task Force members that this is a very lean and highly effective operation. However, several respondents and Task Force members were concerned that the Assistant to the Provost could not advocate effectively for the academic interests of graduate programs. It was their perception that a dean with faculty standing is needed to serve as a voice for the graduate program, to articulate its mission, to plan for the future, and to negotiate faculty and program matters with the Graduate Center.

It is difficult to judge to what extent the elimination of the deanship has contributed to a perceived decline in graduate programs. Queens College has suffered so greatly in its financial resources in the interim that such perceived declines may be attributed more to substantial fiscal losses than to the loss of the graduate dean and reassignment of functions elsewhere. The Associate Provost reports that the Graduate Office is currently undergoing program review. She and the Provost are working to identify actual deficiencies in the present status of the Graduate Office and will address them accordingly.

Respondents were also concerned with the reassignment of research responsibilities formerly overseen by the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. Some respondents and Task Force members lamented the elimination of the "faculty-in-residence" program—a competitive program in which faculty members were given course release(s) to work on research projects. The program funded many more faculty members, albeit to a lesser extent, than the current Presidential Research Awards program. Funds available to the Dean for the "faculty-in-residence" program have been re-assigned to the Dean's Council (Deans of Arts and Humanities, Education, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences) and have been used for a variety of research-support purposes.

The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research also supervised the Office of Grants and Contracts, now the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs and reporting to the Provost. Task Force members noted the highly effective operations of the Research Office but they also felt that an academic leader was needed to identify promising grant opportunities, to help in the conceptual development of proposals, and to advocate on behalf of faculty members and their proposals.

In short, respondents mentioned the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research most frequently when reflecting upon administrative changes since 1986. The functions of the Dean have been assigned to the academic deans, the Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies, and the Director of Research and Sponsored Programs. In spite of the reassignments, several respondents and Task Force members felt that the administration should restore the position of Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

B. Dean of the School of General Studies

Similarly, the retirement of the Dean of the School of General Studies occurred at a
time of severe financial pressure to reduce the Executive Compensation Plan. The question became what to do in the short and long term with respect to the School of General Studies (SGS) and many other functions, particularly community outreach activities, that its Dean had carefully developed over the years. SGS had come to mean the office which looked out for evening and non-traditional students, as well as for ethnic and area studies programs.

While it was viewed as essential that services for these student groups and interdisciplinary programs be preserved, the actual differentiation of Queens College faculty and curriculum into day and evening divisions had not existed for decades, leaving open the possibility of eliminating this "school" and its dean as long as the other ongoing functions were reassigned and maintained. This was accomplished by appointing the Associate Dean of SGS as Assistant Provost with specific responsibilities for evening student services, coordination of evening offerings, ethnic/area studies, Worker Education and Adult Collegiate Education (ACE). This move brought the Provost's Office into a more direct connection to the interdisciplinary ethnic/area studies programs and other student services.

According to the Associate Provost, this enabled the Provost's Office to work directly with the academic deans to ensure that evening and non-traditional students received appropriate programming and services. However, it should be noted that some informants and Task Force members believe that the needs of evening students are not being represented adequately by this arrangement. They feel that a Dean, independent of the Provost's Office, can better advocate for and monitor the needs of evening students.

C. Dean of Experimental Programs

To initiate and operate innovative programs that do not fit comfortably within the structured academic domains of the College's departmental and divisional structure, former President Kenny established a unit for "experimental programs" to be headed by a dean. The Dean also had a mandate to raise non-tax levy money for program operations and to communicate the curricular innovations to students, faculty, administrators, boards, funding agencies and potential donors. This mandate was in response to the 1986 Middle States Evaluation Team's recommendation that the College establish connections with advisory boards and other new sources of support. All programs in the Office of the Dean for Experimental Programs initially had connections with an external board or agency:

- Business and Liberal Arts (BALA) with the Corporate Advisory Board,
- Journalism with the Journalism Advisory Board,
- Undergraduate Minority Program funded by the Mellon Foundation,
- Collaborative with Queens High Schools in Journalism and History funded by NEH,
- Summer Journalism Workshop for Minority Students funded by Dow Jones/NY Times,
- and scholarships and programmatic support funded by the Mitsui Foundation.

5 In 1993, three programs that have no external board were transferred into the Office of the Dean of Experimental Programs; they are Cooperative Education, Women's Studies and Study Abroad.

6 This program prepares minority undergraduates for admission to Ph.D. programs; other colleges receiving funding through this program include Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Wesleyan. The Foundation has judged the Queens program the most successful in the nation because of the program's design and its record of placing the highest percentage (63%) of Mellon graduates in funded, full time Ph.D. programs.
the seven years of her tenure, the Dean has been responsible for raising over $1.3 million and for assisting the President and Vice President for Institutional Relations in their fund-raising activities.

Members of the Task Force felt strongly that this position shifted the locus of support for innovation from the faculty and departments to its office. Even the dean feels that "experimental programs" does not appropriately reflect the interdisciplinary, externally-funded nature of most of the Office's programs. Faculty members felt that significant resources were diverted for these experimental programs during a time when individual departments and programs had to make adjustments to smaller budgets; they may not have known the extent to which external funding has been obtained to support the new initiatives. The creation of this office coupled with the elimination of two other deanships was perceived as a message that support for innovation and change had shifted from the faculty and the academic area to the presidential level. If, however, this deanship was created to assist faculty in planning for experimental programs, the question was raised as to how faculty members get access to this office and, more importantly, to the process of planning for change. Improved communication may be part of the answer. The challenge for the Dean is to balance ongoing innovation and fund-raising with the administration of existing programs.

D. Summary on Deanships

Several Task Force members as well as survey respondents felt strongly that the Deans of Graduate Studies and Research and of the School of General Studies should be restored. While restoration may be impossible, it is appropriate that a review of the functioning of all deans' positions take place. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should review the structure and function of all deanships. <13-2>

IV. Analysis of Other Administrative Positions

A. Vice President of Student Services and Dean of Students

The major concern about the structure of this Vice President's position was whether there was a duplication of duties between it and the Dean of Students. Several members of the Task Force discussed examples from other colleges in which the Dean of Students was the individual assigned all functions dealing with students—namely, admissions, retention, scholastic standards, counseling, and student activities. As to the Dean of Students position, questions arose over the desirability of the current reporting structure, whereby the Dean formally reports to the Vice President for Student Services and maintains a "dotted line" reporting to the Provost in his capacity as Chair of the Department of Student Personnel and as a member of the group of deans who meet monthly with the Provost.
B. Affirmative Action Officer

The Affirmative Action Officer position has matured from part-time status to full-time as of fall 1994. Until 1990, a faculty member was assigned on a part-time basis to attend to affirmative action matters in the area of hiring. The faculty member worked closely with the Labor Designee/Legal Advisor to the President. After 1990, the Affirmative Action Office was headed by a Director who also served as Executive Assistant to the President. In fall 1994, the Affirmative Action Officer became a full-time position (acting) reporting to the President. In addition to her duties with respect to hiring and record keeping, the Affirmative Action Officer also chairs the campus-wide Affirmative Action Committee and the Presidential Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, which are composed of faculty and administrators. The upgrade of this position to full-time is consistent with practice at the major senior colleges in the CUNY system.

V. General Comments about College Organization and Administration

A. Knowledge About Administration

The remarks of respondents and of Task Force members indicated that decisions about changes in the administrative structure of Queens College have been made at the level of Vice President and above. Only one respondent indicated that he/she was involved in making a decision concerning a major administrative change. It is not surprising to find that most informants were unaware of administrative changes unless the decisions affected them directly. In fact, the Task Force members who are chairs of departments had only a moderate degree of awareness of the scope of administrative offices and their current incumbents. These Task Force members stated repeatedly throughout the meetings that they did not know about new directions taken in certain initiatives. For example, all knew about the University's College Preparatory Initiative (CPI), but the former chair of History did not know that the CPI requirement for American history was to come on line in 1997 and therefore may affect the courses offerings in that department. Task Force members were also generally unaware of the details of ad hoc committees set up under severe budgetary pressure in order to address quickly issues such as library resource allocation.

These perceptions did lead to the realization that greater communication of administrative structure and actions should be fostered. The organizational chart as well as other important administrative information should be clearly presented to chairs and faculty. Perhaps this information could be included in the data book currently being developed in the Provost's Office. Discussion in the Steering Committee led to the recommendation that the organizational charts should be included in the College phonebooks.

Regarding other means of communication, various suggestions came up. The further use of FYI, the College's biweekly faculty-staff newsletter, is felt to be desirable. As the College becomes more "on line," the use of electronic bulletin boards may have benefits for the timely dissemination of information and exchange of ideas. The need for an
annual report was discussed, as was the need for revision of the faculty handbook. In terms of positive developments, the institution of orientation programs for new faculty and new department chairs was noted. The consensus from the questionnaires and discussions is there still are substantial gaps in the knowledge of College administrative functioning among those who hold leadership positions at the College. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College administration should create a better system of communication and sharing of information among members of the administration, department chairs, and faculty.  

**<13-3>**

**B. Assignment and Supervision of Office Support Staff**

In late spring 1991, new guidelines were issued concerning the allocation of secretaries; they were based on the recommendations of a committee composed of faculty members and administrators. This new allocation system was developed in response to major budget reductions that made it difficult to assign secretaries to departments based on past practice. Within one year, the College experienced difficulties in funding even this reduced allocation system. The Director of Human Resources moved some full time secretaries from one department to another to fill major gaps in service. Although this method of assignment quickly responded to need, it also led to a situation where chairs and deans felt that they had limited say in the selection of departmental secretaries.

Task Force members who have been or are currently serving as chairs and deans stated that they were concerned about the split in authority and responsibility over the secretaries assigned to academic offices. It has been made clear that the Director of Human Resources has ultimate authority and responsibility for all matters concerning the assignment and evaluation of office support staff at Queens College. Yet, the secretaries function within the specific contexts of individual departments. Recently, office administrative and clerical staff have been assigned to departments without any, or at most minor, input from the Chair. The Chair (or designee) should at least be able to interview prospective candidates. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The College administration should review the procedures by which office support staff are allocated to and selected by departments.  

**<13-4>**

**C. Function of Ad Hoc Committees**

Members of the Task Force discussed the various committees and boards that the President created since the last Middle States Association Self Study. Currently ad hoc committees function to implement presidential initiatives in several areas. The Presidential Advisory Council on Multiculturalism addresses the need to create a campus responding to the growing diversity of students. The Council is composed of faculty, staff,
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Administrators, and students. The President also created the Five Year Planning Committee in response to the 1986 Middle States Report. With financial support from the Queens College Foundation, former President Kenny established the President's Research Award, the President's Award for Excellence in Teaching, and the Mini-grant Programs for Innovative Teaching and for Departmental Diversity. The President appoints faculty members to serve on the selection committees for these awards.

In addition to revitalizing the Queens College Foundation Board, which has increased the fund raising efforts of the College, former President Kenny established several additional advisory boards. The Corporate Advisory Board has had a major impact on the campus by nurturing the growth of the undergraduate Business and Liberal Arts (BALA) program. Members of the Corporate Advisory Board have supported the BALA program by teaching courses, by offering mentoring experiences for BALA students, by advising on curriculum, and by mentoring students in experiential projects such as BALA Enterprises, a private non-profit business which markets personal items with the Queens College logo.

Another outgrowth of recommendations from the Corporate Advisory Board has been the establishment of the Center for the New American Workforce (CNAW). CNAW's mission is to secure funding for projects that help private and public organizations respond to workplace issues such as hiring, training, and evaluation that involve persons from diverse backgrounds. CNAW has held conferences and seminars as well as published timely information about the current workforce.

The Journalism Advisory Board has had a role similar to the Corporate Advisory Board in developing the undergraduate Journalism minor, which now enrolls 200 students. The Arts Board provides leadership in fund-raising for the arts at Queens College and advises the Dean of Arts and Humanities and departments within this division about its programs.

The President now chairs three committees that review and approve expenditures involving student activities: the Auxiliary Enterprise Association, College Association Board, and Student Union Board of Directors. For the first board, the President's role has changed from advisory to one of direction, a change that came about through a CUNY Board of Trustees decision. There has been a steady growth in the number of these external boards, and Task Force members perceive a paucity of information about them in the campus community at large. These findings generally reinforce the conclusions that led to recommendation <13-3> on the need for greater communication.

VI. Relationship of Queens College to the CUNY Central Administration

A. General Description of the CUNY Central Administration

Queens College is one of 20 colleges including the Graduate Center that comprise the City University of New York (CUNY). The formal administrative structure of CUNY has not changed greatly since Queens College's 1986 Self Study report. In order to put its
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discussion into historical context, the Task Force drew heavily from that report. The CUNY Board of Trustees is responsible for setting overall policies controlling the University. The Board has 17 members, ten of whom are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the New York State Senate, five of whom are appointed by the Mayor of the City, and 2 of whom serve ex officio. The latter include the chairs of the University Student Senate (voting) and the University Faculty Senate (non-voting). The Chancellor is the chief educational and administrative officer of the University and is selected by the Board of Trustees. In turn, other members of the CUNY Administration (Deputy Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, University Deans, Directors) are selected by and serve at the discretion of the Chancellor.

The CUNY Administration is a most powerful body in that it coordinates all university-wide actions. It assembles the University budgetary requests and, subject to the constraints placed on the budgets by the City and State, allocates all lines and monies to the individual colleges. All proposed curricular changes in the colleges must be passed by the CUNY Administration before being presented to the Board of Trustees. Subject to action by the Board of Trustees, the CUNY Administration sets the basic admissions standards for the colleges and the university-wide minimal retention standards. Most undergraduate and transfer student admissions to the University are handled centrally, rather than by individual colleges.

Under the City University Bylaws, the Council of Presidents (COPS) is charged with advising the Chancellor in the development of a coordinated master plan for the University. Proposals for consideration by the Board of Trustees are primarily generated by the Chancellor and by COPS. The Chancellor is the permanent chair of COPS, which has as its members the Deputy Chancellor, the presidents of all the colleges and the Graduate School, the Dean of the CUNY Law School and the President of the affiliated Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

B. Description and Analysis of the Relationship to the Central Administration

In response to the 1986 Queens College Self Study Report and campus visit, the Middle States Evaluating Team stated:

Whether caused by the fiscal crisis, the new governance mechanism, or the nationwide trend toward stronger central management in higher education, the creation of the new Board of Trustees has been followed by the conversion of CUNY from a loosely joined confederacy into a higher education system. There is much stronger management by the CUNY central administration. Traditional lobbying of its local legislative delegation by each college has been diminished as the Chancellor has assumed principal responsibility for representation of CUNY. Budgets which once allocated virtually all resources directly to the colleges have been replaced by budgets which allocate lump sums ... to CUNY respective colleges.

Since 1986, this trend to greater centralization and the concomitant reduction in individual campus autonomy has accelerated. Some centralization efforts received praise from respondents, especially those in technical areas such as student information.
management systems, the CUNY+ library cataloguing system, and facilities management and planning.

Nevertheless, comments on the whole tended to characterize the relationship as strained at best—even hostile in some instances. One respondent stated that the CUNY Administration has attempted to pit one campus against another. Another believed that CUNY should be patterned after the SUNY system in which the central office does not get involved unless there are financial or managerial difficulties at a campus. SUNY campuses are believed to be given much wider latitude and autonomy. Several respondents stressed the need to develop a better environment of cooperation between Queens College and CUNY Administration.

What has led to the uneasy relationship between Queens College and CUNY Administration? One pivotal event that all Task Force members cited was the “Goldstein Report,” named for its chair, President Leon Goldstein of Kingsborough Community College. In spring 1992, Chancellor Reynolds convened a committee chaired by President Goldstein and composed of distinguished professors and college administrators, charging it with reviewing the academic programs of CUNY. Their report was issued in fall 1992 and called for a review of all academic programs at each CUNY college, with a focus on consolidation or elimination of many small programs. Faculty members at Queens College (and elsewhere) felt that they had not been consulted beforehand on such a major set of academic recommendations. The directives in the report were perceived to be a fait accompli that had to be followed. The substance of the report was widely perceived as an attack by the Chancellor on the liberal arts at CUNY and on the autonomy of individual colleges, especially those like Queens with a strong liberal arts mission. There was widespread fear that enrollments, not program quality or integrity, would be used to decide which programs remained where.

In summer 1993, an internal document from CUNY Central Administration became public, indicating that the extent to which colleges had cooperated with the thrust of the Academic Program Planning Initiative would be taken into account in the allocation of resources. Many faculty and administrators within the University interpreted this report as confirming the suspicion that academic program planning was intended to centralize academic control and consolidation of programs. The Chancellor was invited at her request to meet with the Academic Senate. Various vice chancellors met with the College P&B Committee. The meetings did not alleviate faculty concerns and were soon followed by votes of no confidence in the Chancellor in both the Academic Senate and College P&B Committee.

Other recent actions have reinforced the perception of undue central control over Queens and other colleges in the system. On July 7, 1994, the Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance and Information Systems, Richard Rothbard, distributed a memo entitled "Initial Allocation of the 1994–95 Operating Budget" to senior college presidents and professional school deans. This contained the first indication of a new method of funding full-time
faculty lines among the senior colleges—a process termed "base level equity." A description of the funding formula and its impact has been presented in CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES. The reaction from Queens College and other affected faculties was predictable and strong. Objections were raised over the timing of the formula change and over the peremptory loss of autonomy of colleges to decide how they would allocate lines, whether to faculty or to support staff.

In a memorandum dated September 7, 1994, the Chancellor charged a committee of CUNY senior college presidents to review the base level equity program. This Ad Hoc Committee on Base Level Equity submitted its report to Chancellor Reynolds. In the Framework Summary section of its Report, items 5 and 6 state:

5) Even in the absence of additional funding, the reallocation of existing faculty lines may not be the only or best procedure for addressing imbalances among colleges. The same goal may be achieved, for example, by moving some funding from the non-instructional part of the budget or from central, university-wide priorities to campus-level instruction.

6) It would be a worthwhile investment in time if consideration were given to learning more about the means developed in other large university systems, both here and abroad (sic), to deploy scarce resources. Paradigms that make sense elsewhere should be considered for implementation at CUNY.

The committee also proposed short term recommendations such as creating new lines out of existing resources, reallocating lines to a pool of centrally-controlled lines, and proceeding cautiously if base level equity were to proceed in the next academic year. The Task Force cautions that Queens College must carefully analyze the potential impact of these recommendations on the College's ability to staff its programs. The Task Force feels very strongly that further reduction of staff via the current base level equity policy only exacerbates the negative climate of Queens College's relationship to CUNY Administration.

A final example of events contributing to a negative climate between the College and the Central Administration relates to the process used to select a new President for Queens College. In following the progress of the presidential search at Hunter College last year, many members of the Queens College campus community became concerned about the perceived intrusion of CUNY Administration in the search process, in particular the regular presence of the Chancellor during presidential search committee meetings and interviews with candidates. The Hunter College Senate approved a resolution asking the Board of Trustees to review its policies and requested the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs "to report on how the procedures used for presidential searches within CUNY are governed by the state laws, CUNY bylaws, and other binding regulations, with particular attention to guarantees of due process for the candidates and the role of the chancellor in the process."

Vice-Chancellor Diaz's response dated 27 September 1994 included the following statement:

---

7 The College's acting president, Stephen M. Curtis, was a member of the Chancellor's Ad Hoc Committee on Base Level Equity.
The various solutions I have reviewed seek to mandate particular procedures not required by the Guidelines. Such action is not merely beyond the purview of the Faculty Senate but is an unnecessary and unwarranted intrusion into the affairs and policies of the Board of Trustees.

In short, the CUNY Administration has in recent years implemented a more centralized planning, budgeting, and review system. Although the objectives of this trend to centralize decision-making within the University may be viewed as helping to use more effectively the CUNY system's vast resources in difficult financial times, the process by which policies are developed, implemented, and maintained has led many at the College to conclude that the relationship between Queens College and the CUNY Administration is, at best, strained and needing attention.

C. Other Aspects of the Queens College and CUNY Relationship

1. Articulation

Since the formation of CUNY in the early sixties, and especially with the growth in both the number and size of the community colleges over the past twenty years, there has been a concern about articulation of course credit between senior and community colleges. Until the mid-1980's, the arrangement was loose and, while admission was articulated, inter-college programmatic/course agreements were not structured consistently. This resulted in a strong CUNY initiative in 1985. Program committees composed of senior and community college personnel were named to develop a CUNY-wide policy. A course equivalency guide was developed to spell out course by course articulation. This guide is updated periodically; there is now an on-line version that will facilitate timely sharing of equivalency information. However, this addresses only one major concern, the articulation of individual courses, leaving the more sensitive articulation of academic programs. In 1992, this other issue began to receive more explicit attention.

Moving well beyond the course equivalencies, Queens has developed several program-to-program articulation agreements with local community colleges, expanding significantly the opportunities for community college students to plan their programs efficiently. The College's School of Education now has two separate fully articulated programs with LaGuardia and Queensborough Community Colleges. They are now recognized by New York State as "jointly registered programs" and are therefore, uninterrupted curricula from the first course taken at the community college until graduation from Queens College. They clearly state what courses at the community colleges are acceptable at Queens College to fulfill basic liberal arts and science requirements. Those courses applicable to the Elementary Education and liberal arts and science co-major or to the Secondary Education minor are also clearly identified. These programs are intended to speed up the time to graduation from Queens College by helping students to avoid course duplication. Currently, the Fine Arts program at LaGuardia Community College and the Art Department at Queens have agreed upon an articulation agreement aimed at the B.A. in Studio Art and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. The College is awaiting University and State approvals.
Current initiatives by CUNY Institutional Research include a review of the time taken by community college graduates to complete programs at the senior colleges and a consideration of a common course number system that would be used to convert courses at each college to a CUNY wide number, making easier both the electronic processing of transfer credits and the advising of transfer students.

At the crux of most debate is the issue of program length. An existing CUNY requirement that community college Associate of Arts and Associate of Science graduates be assured that no more than 64 credits will be required for the bachelor's degree has been reaffirmed. This requirement interferes with the ability of CUNY community college transfer students to complete majors in several departments and is viewed by many senior college faculty as an infringement on curricular independence and an erosion in the quality of the baccalaureate degree. Controversy also revolves around the minimum required credits for those coming to senior colleges with an Associate of Applied Science diploma as there is very little liberal arts content in these programs and usually little or no fit with a senior college major.

Respondents to the Task Force's questionnaire appeared to recognize that the College needs to improve its relationships with community colleges in discussing all issues concerning articulation such as recruitment, admission, transfer and credit evaluation. Perhaps, as one respondent stated, rather than having course by course equivalencies, Queens College should expand articulation to more program sequence equivalencies, as was done in education and is now being done in studio art. Finally, one respondent suggested making joint faculty appointments between community colleges and Queens College. The Provost and the Deans of Education and Social Sciences have already proposed joint lines to the CUNY Administration and have received approval to search for two joint appointments between Queensborough Community College and Queens College's departments of Sociology and Elementary Education. Thus, there is a recognition and commitment on the part of Queens College to addressing the issue of articulation between the College and its primary community colleges.

At the same time, CUNY appears to be taking a more assertive leadership position in developing CUNY-wide policies in articulation. The CUNY Administration has reaffirmed its commitment to all of the tenets of the 1984 policy statement, including a never previously-enforced explicit statement of senior college program length for community college graduates. The central issue concerning members of the Task Force was the extent to which faculty on individual campuses will retain autonomy in making curricular decisions. It should be noted that previous attempts to increase articulation between the community and senior colleges, such as the jointly registered programs in Education, were based on courses that Queens College faculty had already determined to be transferable. Thus, a process whereby faculty at each college retain ultimate responsibility for curricular matters must be a fundamental tenet of any future planning about articulation. In this spirit,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should expand communication and programmatic articulation with its community college partners. <13-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The University should preserve the faculty's primary role in decisions concerning curricular equivalencies. <13-6>

Several respondents commented on improving articulation between and among the senior colleges of the system. Some preliminary attempts have been made to collaborate in the sharing of faculty between Queens College and York College, the other senior college in the borough of Queens. One respondent suggested that the College should explore ways of improving the process that allows students from one CUNY campus to enroll at other campuses across the University. Students take courses elsewhere "on permit" but different registration processes and varying academic calendars can make this difficult. A CUNY B.A. degree exists, allowing students to take courses anywhere in the system. Although this route is available, faculty and students alike need to know about the availability of spaces in classes throughout the CUNY system. At this point, most articulation between senior colleges takes place on an ad hoc, personal basis. For example, the Special Education program within the School of Education is working with City College to enroll some students so that they may complete their degrees. This working relationship came about through personal contact rather than a formal system of identifying students and available courses.

Programmatic articulation also involves meetings among faculty members and administrators within a discipline or interest group. There are monthly meetings of the Deans of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Social Science, and Education as well as of the Chief Librarians throughout the CUNY system. Faculty members in certain disciplines also meet on a regular basis, Mathematics Educators, Early Childhood Education, and English as a Second Language, among others. One respondent suggested that perhaps the CUNY Administration could help fund colloquia and other professional activities across all CUNY campuses to encourage cross-campus dialogue within a discipline.

2. College Preparatory Initiative (CPI)

The dual mission of the City University—access and excellence—has always left it vulnerable to attack by those who feel that there should be higher admissions standards and those who criticize the quality of the education received in the New York public schools. In order to continue to grow in enrollments and to increase retention and graduation rates, Chancellor Reynolds developed the College Preparatory Initiative in collaboration with the current and former Chancellors of the New York City Board of Education. What developed was a list of competencies (stated in terms of courses to be passed successfully) that would improve the student's chances of success in college. As noted in CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (III.C.), the competencies are not admissions requirements; students lacking CPI units must fulfill the areas lacking by taking
college courses comparable in content. The CPI competencies were developed by unique teams of college faculty and New York high school faculty, facilitated by CUNY administrative staff—thought by many to represent an historic joint curricular effort benefiting both systems.

CPI policies exist in a context of other CUNY policy mandates that necessarily complicate the successful implementation of the CPI. For example, CPI may complicate meeting the articulation goal of assuring that community college students complete their senior college degrees within 64 credits. If students have not fulfilled their CPI requirements, senior colleges may be forced to alter their general academic requirements in order to accommodate the CPI requirements.

Another potential problem involves two specific CPI requirements: laboratory science and American history. The College's LASAR system fulfills the current CPI standard of one unit in laboratory science. When the laboratory science requirement increases to two in the 1997 CPI cycle, a second science unit will be required. Students lacking two high school units will have to complete two laboratory sciences classes at Queens, one more than is now necessary to graduate. This will increase the enrollment pressure on these laboratory science courses, thus increasing instructional costs. In the area of American History, CUNY must face the reality that more students are enrolling who were not educated in the United States. The vast majority of these students will not have had any American history course; one CPI unit in American history will be added to the competencies expected in 1999. The LASAR Social Science course menu at Queens includes two American history courses that have been heavily subscribed under the present pre-CPI environment. The History department is likely to have to increase its offering of these courses in order to accommodate these extra enrollments at a potential increase in cost. Efforts are underway to have the University assess the impact of the addition of these CPI units so that adequate financial and programmatic planning can be instituted.

VI. Relationship of Queens College with the Graduate Center

All CUNY doctoral programs are housed administratively at the CUNY Graduate School and University Center, located in midtown Manhattan. Most doctoral courses are given there, with the exception of courses in the laboratory sciences, most of which are offered at the sister colleges making up the doctoral consortium. The Graduate School has some central faculty but the vast majority of doctoral teaching is done by faculty at the consortial colleges who have been elected to serve in the individual Ph.D. programs. These faculty teach doctoral courses as part of their full-time faculty teaching loads. In spite of pressures from the budget, the Queens College faculty and administration have reaffirmed support for continued participation in the doctoral programs of the Graduate Center. It is a general sense that the character and mission of the College would be compromised if there were not opportunities for the faculty to teach and mentor doctoral students. Certainly there would be significant negative impact on the laboratory science programs at Queens without the doctoral students who work in campus laboratories and teach undergraduate courses.
That said, there are difficulties in making this form of consortial doctoral education work.

Paying the colleges back for this doctoral teaching is done through a complex Allocation System administered by the Graduate School. The amount of funding due each college is computed by a formula that aggregates the actual amount of teaching contributed by that college's faculty, and allocates a number of full time faculty lines from within a fixed pool of lines dedicated for this purpose. There is widespread belief that the colleges are not fully compensated for the contributions of the faculty and that departments within a college are not supported in proportion to their contribution to the Graduate Center's teaching.

This structural arrangement has created mixed feelings among the Queens College community. Faculty, of course, want to participate in doctoral education--several respondents cited the positive contribution that such an association has made to their continued development as scholars and doctoral-level educators. Furthermore, faculty participation at the Graduate Center has also helped some Queens College departments identify excellent adjuncts for its programs with the accompanying benefit to the graduate student of gaining experience in teaching. However, the majority of comments reveal structural difficulties with Queens College's relationship to the Graduate Center:

1. The funding for doctoral teaching comes to Queens College as a whole, not to the departments whose faculty are teaching doctoral courses. Because the departments are not compensated directly for their faculty's time, they cannot replace them and thus lose courses in their undergraduate and master's programs at the College. Departments feel that because of this reimbursement arrangement, they are forced to support doctoral programs that, in some cases, have little relationship to the mission of their department.

2. While some doctoral programs in the natural sciences are housed at Queens College, the Graduate Center does not support (or at best minimally supports) them in terms of equipment, supplies, or laboratory technicians. The College budget is therefore required to support these expensive doctoral programs. It should be noted that Queens College is not funded as a doctoral institution.

3. Doctoral students who hold graduate assistantships through the auspices of Queens College are not given tuition remission by the Graduate Center, but some graduate assistants paid through the Graduate Center are.

4. Faculty who hold appointments on the doctoral faculty teach courses as part of their regular teaching load. However, there is no consistent mechanism to compensate them for service on doctoral dissertation committees. Dissertation direction is included in the formula that determines Graduate Center funding for Queens College, but individual faculty members, and therefore their departments, are not routinely given released time for this major academic effort. (See CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY.)
5. Many respondents believe that the Graduate Center reimburses Queens College for the release of its faculty far beneath their actual value and "teaching power." Until recently, the formulas for reimbursing the individual colleges for releasing faculty were not fully shared with college faculty or administration. This perception is best captured by the statement of one respondent that "the Graduate Center situation is a grand shell game with everyone losing."

6. Some chairs and deans have noted that sometimes individual faculty members arrange to teach at the Graduate Center with the Executive Officer (Graduate Center administrator who functions like a chair of the department) of the doctoral program without prior discussion with the chair of the respective department or dean at Queens College. When this situation arises, the Queens College chair frequently feels that his/her scheduling prerogative has been usurped. Regardless of the intent, the outcome is one in which some chairs and administrators at Queens College feel that they are indeed subsidizing the Graduate Center operation.

The system by which faculty lines are allocated to the campuses to compensate for doctoral instruction is being reviewed by a task force appointed by the President of the Graduate School and University Center. Chaired by the GSUC Provost, this task force includes campus presidents, provosts, chief financial officers, executive officers of CUNY doctoral programs, and representatives of the CUNY central administration. The committee is likely to recommend revisions of the allocation system to make it more responsive to the needs of the colleges. However, the perception of some chairs that their departments lose teaching power as a result of their contributions to doctoral instruction will be addressed only by clarification, or perhaps reform, of the College's practices for allocating resources internally in support of doctoral instruction. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should review, and modify if necessary, its system for recognizing departmental contributions to doctoral instruction. The system should include appropriate recognition for dissertation supervision and other contributions to the work of the Graduate Center. The details of the resource allocation models, both of the College and the Graduate Center, should be communicated clearly to chairs and to faculty. <13-7>

VII. Summary List of Recommendations on Organization and Administration

RECOMMENDATION: The President should review the entire organizational structure of the College. <13-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should review the structure and function of all deanships. <13-2>
RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should create a better system of communication and sharing of information among members of the administration, department chairs, and faculty. <13-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should review the procedures by which office support staff are allocated to and selected by departments. <13-4>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should expand communication and programmatic articulation with its community college partners. <13-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The University should preserve the faculty's primary role in decisions concerning curricular equivalencies. <13-6>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should review, and modify if necessary, its system for recognizing departmental contributions to doctoral instruction. The system should include appropriate recognition for dissertation supervision and other contributions to the work of the Graduate Center. The details of the resource allocation models, both of the College and the Graduate Center, should be communicated clearly to chairs and to faculty. <13-7>
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CHAPTER FOURTEEN: ALUMNI/AE

I. Establishment and Functioning of the Office of Alumni Affairs

The establishment of an Office of Alumni Affairs as an administrative unit, with a Director reporting to the Director of Development, occurred in 1989. Before the Office's formation, alumni matters were handled by a separately incorporated Queens College Alumni Association, a sometimes active, loosely organized operation, which was not considered a formal part of the College's administrative structure. President Shirley Strum Kenny decided that the establishment of a fully functioning Alumni Office was an important College priority. A key to the Office's success has been the identification and development of a solid base of Queens College graduates who provide support, not only in a financial sense, but also in terms of promoting the Alumni Office's activities, volunteering to participate on various working committees, etc. The large response to the College's Annual Homecoming Reunion Day (held on the campus each May) attests to the effectiveness of the Office's outreach efforts.

Prior to the early 1980's, fund-raising at the College had been a rather disjointed activity--both the Queens College Foundation (QCF) and the Alumni Association solicited contributions from alumni. In FY 1987, the responsibility for fund-raising was transferred from the Alumni Association to the QCF. The Office of Alumni Affairs is still involved in fund-raising to the extent that it coordinates cultivation activities, e.g., organizes the Homecoming reunion, contacts alumni through various mailings designed to keep graduates up to date on College developments and pertinent issues, encourages alumni to visit the campus, and fosters appreciation among graduates for their College years. Reunion class gifts are the only direct fund-raising efforts currently handled by the Alumni Affairs Office. These outreach efforts have been quite successful, and considerably more alumni have responded with contributions, both large and small. The Office also helps to identify prospective major donors for the Development Office, which then follows up on those leads. And it initiates and maintains liaisons with the QC Alumni Chapters located in cities throughout the nation.

In order to communicate more effectively and meaningfully with the College's graduates, then President Kenny authorized a revision of the alumni/ae newsletter, Queens College Report; a magazine format was adopted and retitled as Q--The Magazine of Queens College. Co-edited by the Vice President for Institutional Relations and the Director of Publications, Q has become a 32-page, award-winning magazine, and response from alumni/ae has been enthusiastic.

Queens alumni/ae are playing vital roles on the College's behalf. Two important examples come from spring 1995: many alumni/ae contacted State legislators to protest the Governor's budget for CUNY, and a dedicated cohort participated in the interviews of the
finalists for the Queens presidency. One alumnus served on the CUNY Board of Trustees Search Committee for President.

II. Issues of Concern to Alumni/ae

There are several substantive issues affecting the College's relations with its alumni/ae. The College's "open enrollment" policy of the 1970's, even though discontinued many years ago, remains an area of considerable concern to a number of alumni/ae. These individuals feel that open enrollment damaged the institution's reputation for excellence, lessening what had previously been a very positive public perception of Queens College. As a consequence of this policy and their perception of its negative impact, alumni/ae from the late 1970's and 1980's appear somewhat alienated in comparison with graduates from earlier decades. The Director believes that a possible explanation for this is that these individuals do not feel their degrees are as "valuable" as those held by alumni/ae who graduated earlier—a feeling that their older brothers' and sisters' QC degrees are worth a lot more. An additional concern regarding younger alumni/ae relates to their lack of class identification, since many of them take five, six, or more years to graduate. It should also be noted that the alumni/ae who choose to remain active, who feel a bond with the College, identify themselves as Queens College graduates, not as graduates of "The City University of New York." This is important in view of the current policies being advanced by the University's central office — efforts which many believe are aimed at consolidation and homogenization. If the image and reputation of Queens College become somehow lost in that of the City University, there is real concern that the College's relations with its alumni/ae will suffer.

An unanswered question at this time relates to the future of the College's relations with its most prestigious alumni/ae in light of the recent departure of President Kenny. It is widely perceived that many of the College's successful external relation efforts in recent years were largely the result of President Kenny's direct and personal involvement in the establishment and nurturing of the various Queens College boards: the Queens College Foundation Board, the Corporate and Journalism Advisory Boards, the Arts Board, etc. The open question is whether the individuals who serve on these boards and actively work in the College's behalf (many of them College alumni who are now national leaders in their respective fields) will remain active now that President Kenny has gone.

Acting President Curtis has devoted significant time and energy in keeping all boards fully involved in College activities and apprised of the progress in the search for a new president. He has also initiated expanded communications between board members and the campus community. An example of this is the presentation made by two QCF board members (Edwin Cooperman and Michael Mintzes, both alumni) to a Faculty Assembly at the beginning of spring 1995 semester. A challenge for the new president will be to maintain and expand upon the very strong foundation of external supporters carefully developed by former President Kenny and nurtured by Acting President Curtis.
III. Future Directions for Alumni Affairs

The Alumni Office faces difficulties when it comes to maintaining effective communication with the College's alumni/ae. The Director believes that Queens does not communicate with its graduates frequently enough. The College mailed a newsletter to its alumni/ae three times a year from 1987 to 1993. The stylish magazine, Q, which replaced the less elaborate, but more frequent newsletters, was published in fall 1993 and again in fall 1994. A newsletter was again mailed in March 1995 to fill in the gap.

The Office of Alumni Affairs is understaffed. At the present time, the Office has one full-time staff person (the Director) and one full-time secretary. Considering that there are currently over 90,000 names in the alumni database (62,000 verified good mailing addresses), the office's staff is far too small adequately to maintain communications, organize activities, and design and disseminate alumni publications—mandatory functions for any institution hoping to remain connected to (and financially supported by) its graduates.

There are a number of efforts in progress that have great potential for enhancing the College's alumni/ae relations efforts. The Harris Publishing Company has been contracted to compile an up-to-date, comprehensive, and cross-referenced Queens College alumni/ae directory. This volume will be available within a year; the company has agreed to provide the Alumni Office with copies of its questionnaire, responses and related materials—information that will provide an invaluable database for future activities. A public relations video entitled "Queens College" was recently produced for the institution (as a courtesy) by Julian Kainen and Michael Lawrence Films. This eight-minute documentary shows the exciting new developments taking place at the College, and it has already been extensively and successfully used for many purposes—recruitment and fund-raising, to name but two. Finally, the Alumni Office has recognized the important role that "feeling connected" plays in alumni/ae life. To this end, a number of "professional affiliates groups" have been formed. There is, for example, a Medical Alumni group—graduates who are now physicians have gotten together, sponsored a dinner, raised some money, and offered to mentor Queens students interested in pursuing medical careers. Similarly, there is a Lawyers' Group, and an Accountants' Group is being formed. The Development Office also recognizes the importance of encouraging alumni to identify with certain professional interests, and contributions to the College can now be earmarked for specific departments or purposes, rather than made as a general contribution to the overall alumni/ae fund.

Individual departments' involvement with their alumni/ae is highly variable. Some have long traditions of extensive contact with their alumni/ae, while others have kept no records. The need for more uniform departmental record-keeping and contact has been highlighted both by the offers of support from the Office of Alumni Affairs and by the Academic Program Review process that involves a sampling of perceptions of alumni with regard to the quality of the curriculum, advising, etc. The Home Economics Department has a long-standing commitment to keeping track of its alumni/ae. It does a survey every
two years, inquiring about the professional positions and accomplishments of their graduates and about their feelings on what was valued most and least in their major. The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry sends out a newsletter to its alumni/ae. Recently this contained solicitations for funds for undergraduate research stipends. The new program called FAST (FIPSE-Alumni Student Training) has received donations, and the first FAST Fellowships were awarded in spring 1995.

Despite limitations of staffing and budget, the College's relations with its alumni/ae have improved dramatically in recent years. This improvement can largely be attributed to the tireless efforts of the Director of Alumni Affairs, to her small but dedicated staff, and to a former president who clearly saw the vitally important role that a College's alumni/ae must play in order to ensure the institution's future growth and development. In the words of a number of successful alumni/ae who serve on advisory boards, it was President Kenny who made them once again "feel proud" to be graduates of Queens College, and it was she who convinced them of their responsibility to try to "give something back." This is a strong legacy on which to build.

In light of the successes of the recent past and the potential for future growth,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The staff and operations of the Office of Alumni Affairs should be supported at enhanced levels, and publication of the alumni magazine should be more frequent. <14-1>

**IV. Summary List of Recommendations on Alumni/ae**

**RECOMMENDATION:** The staff and operations of the Office of Alumni Affairs should be supported at enhanced levels, and publication of the alumni magazine should be more frequent. <14-1>
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CHAPTER FIFTEEN:
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS AND CHANGE

I. A Focus on Assessment

Like many other colleges in the country, Queens has been searching for ways to improve the assessment of student learning outcomes as part of the focus on assessment and quality improvement throughout the College. The Middle States Evaluation Team made it clear in 1986 that it found the College wanting with respect to systematic academic program review and the team was critical of the budget process as "not a programmatic process which considers new initiatives or examines an array of options." It recommended that the new president consider "much more overt planning" in many areas. The College has embraced these criticisms and has made great strides toward institutionalization and integration of assessment and planning processes. The most recent evidence, perhaps, is that a separate sub-committee on Outcomes Assessment was established for the Planning Committee that produced the 1994-1999 Five Year Plan. Their report was the basis on which much of this current chapter was built. Their recommendations led to the identification of outcomes assessment as one of the five top priorities for the College in the next five years.

The focus of this chapter is to describe and analyze the mechanisms now in place that help the College measure its effectiveness and judge the coherence of its efforts--its institutional integrity. Suggestions will be offered as to how the present systems of assessment can be improved. The following chapter will discuss the achievements made with respect to planning processes and point the way for further enhancements of present practice.

II. Student Learning

A. Institutional Level

In 1986, the Middle States team wrote "The aggregate of these reviews showed a College with a highly suitable curriculum in each academic area and a faculty very strongly committed to high quality teaching. Students overwhelmingly expressed a high degree of satisfaction with their courses and academic endeavors." Yet the team also found that "there are very few outcome measures by which to assess the instructional program....There is no regularly scheduled review of each academic program."

In 1995 a very different situation exists. The following sections detail progress made in academic program review and other efforts to assess program quality, and identify where there are still gaps in outcomes assessment processes. In the final section of this chapter, specific recommendations are presented to fill the gap, provide the College with a
multi-dimensional assessment process insuring that the College knows how its students and alumni fare and that the assessment data are used constructively for continuous improvement.

1. Academic Program Review

In fall 1988, the College instituted an Academic Program Review process. Initiated by the Office of the Provost and modified in 1992, the College’s first cycle of academic program reviews is close to complete. All academic departments and programs, as well as academic support units follow a common process. Administrative units also undergo comparable reviews. As described in CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, the purpose of Academic Program Review is to encourage these units to review critically all of their activities and their effectiveness vis-a-vis available current resources in relation to their individual goals and the goals of the College and CUNY. The expectation is that strengths and weaknesses will be identified and needed changes in program, organization and resources will be suggested. CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS provides more information on the process and an analysis of the program’s effectiveness and shortcomings.

The College has benefitted greatly from this investment in academic program review. In addition to the examples cited in CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, recent outcomes of the review of School of Music are instructive. After meeting with the senior administration in May 1995, the School wrote a new Statement of Mission and Goals that articulates clearly the inter-relatedness of the components of their undergraduate program. The School has also made contact with Townsend Harris High School to plan a number of joint activities in music performance.

The process could be strengthened by more systematic collection of survey data across all departments. Further, as noted in CHAPTER FIVE, the elements of follow-up, reinforcement and feedback are presently missing from the process. Implementation of the recommendations in CHAPTER FIVE regarding the Academic Program Review process should be a priority for the College.

Other programs offered by the college such as LEAP and ACE, Honors in the Western Tradition and minors such as Business and Liberal Arts (BALA) and Journalism are not currently included in this Academic Program Review process. (BALA and Journalism minors have been subject to review through their advisory boards, a process independent of the College’s Academic Program Review.) Review of all programs according to a common format is needed to assess student learning outcomes.

2. Surveys of Graduates

The Dean of Students has begun systematic surveys of students at graduation. The questionnaire asked recent graduates about their employer and intentions for future
study. For the 1993-94 graduating class, approximately 900 recent graduates responded to the first request. This survey will be repeated for the 1994-95 graduating class. To date, the Office of Development has used the information to update their files on graduates. The Dean of Students and his staff will be analyzing the data; they hope to glean information which will be useful to both academic and administrative offices. Six months after graduation, a pilot graduation and placement survey was sent to those who responded to the 1993-94 graduate survey. Surveys were sent out in February 1995 and are currently being returned by mail. The Office of Institutional Research will summarize the results and make them known to appropriate offices on campus.

3. General Education Requirements

Formal ongoing assessment of the general education requirements of the college has been lacking. The College adopted a set of general education requirements in 1980—Basic and Advanced Learning Skills and LASAR. LASAR has been evaluated once by a subcommittee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee. The Committee chose to maintain the current structure of LASAR offerings. To make these requirements, especially LASAR, meaningful to students, one needs to know what each is meant to accomplish: What areas of learning does each cover? What are the stated objectives of LASAR? Who evaluates it? What skills are meant to be built or enhanced in each area?

There is growing desire among the faculty to reexamine the concept of LASAR itself. LASAR, like other portions of the curriculum, needs to have its aims (re)stated and its accomplishments tested against those aims. A serious evaluation of LASAR would attempt to answer the following questions: Are the courses taught in a manner consistent with the reason they have been included in a LASAR category? Are they monitored for compliance with the needs of their LASAR category? It would be useful for the College to evaluate periodically the general educational requirements as departments evaluate the academic program, through a review process. At the current time, there is no ongoing evaluation process in place for LASAR requirements.

4. The Freshman Year Initiative and Freshman Survey

In fall 1993, Queens College received funding from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education (FIPSE) to expand the Freshman Year Initiative program which had been begun with University funding the year before. As part of the evaluation process, a consultant was brought in to advise the Provost's Office and the Office of Institutional Research on the design of a complete assessment plan for the project. The Office of Institutional Research is tracking student grade point averages, pass rates and rates of withdrawal for all students in the program. Surveys to elicit quantitative and qualitative information are also being used. In fall 1994, the College began participating in the Cooperative Institutional Research Freshmen Survey of UCLA and the American
Council on Education. From this, the College will have data on how Queens College students view themselves academically and socially. The College will have a national data base on freshmen as well as a Queens College data base which will be useful for designing special programs for freshmen, and following changes over time.

5. Developmental Courses

The College recognizes that a portion of the student body enters without sufficient basic skills to fulfill curricular requirements. The existence of remediation and developmental education in mathematics, reading and writing is expensive for the College, using resources that limit course offerings elsewhere. In addition to remediation, there are a number of courses in College English as a Second Language offered through the CESL program that, while not remedial, are configured in a comparably expensive way. The College's responsibility is to determine whether the outcomes from these courses are assessed and adjustments made where necessary. Currently, success is measured through pass rates of the CUNY Assessment Tests: what percent of students taking a particular remedial course pass the CUNY test. While completion of the CESL sequence has been the basic prerequisite for most "regular" college courses, there has been no "hard stop" on ESL students registering for courses for which they may not have the skills required. The educational outcome of these remedial/developmental courses can be measured best by looking regularly at success rates in subsequent courses. A study done recently by the University of all college ESL has done this and has led to some reconsideration of how ESL courses are structured. Further thought and planning in this area are underway.

6. Quality of Teaching

Systematic assessment of the quality of the student academic experience also occurs through monitoring teaching quality. The College currently measures teaching quality through the use of Course and Faculty Evaluation forms and department peer observations, as well as by recognition through Presidential Awards for Teaching Excellence. Further information on these procedures is provided below (section V).

As discussed in CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY, there has been widespread perception that quality teaching per se has not been considered a high priority in the College's faculty reward system. The College needs to work harder to assure that successful teaching is, and is seen as, a major component in the reward system. There has been significant movement on this score during 1994-95; it is to be hoped that the recent motion approved by the College P & B Committee (see CHAPTER ELEVEN) will result in improved processes for the evaluation of teaching and in the development of a new culture more supportive of achievement in teaching and student learning.

\[1\] Data from the fall 1994 survey are summarized in CHAPTER TEN: STUDENTS.
7. Institutional Research's Fact Book

The Office of Institutional Research has completed revising and expanding the College’s Fact Book. The current Five-Year Plan observed that the previous Data Book had not been widely distributed on campus, and plans are to make copies of the revised and expanded Fact Book available to academic and administrative offices all across campus. The new Fact Book will be a great resource for departments and programs undertaking an Academic Program Review, for student service personnel interested in retention rates and enrollment trends and for faculty and staff writing institutional grants.

8. Faculty Research Productivity

The Office of Institutional Research has just received the database on faculty who responded to a CUNY Faculty Research Survey. This includes the area of their scholarship or creative activity and lists publications within the past five years. Information can be extracted in various forms.

B. Departmental and Course Level

1. Student Participation in Departmental "Honors" Programs

One measure of students' learning outcomes is their participation in department "honors" programs. There are many models of honors curricula in place. However, it is not always easy to identify "honors programs" from reading the College Bulletin, since departments do not describe honors curricula uniformly. Detail about the major, including honors curricula and requirements, is usually provided in departmental handbooks for majors. Students need clarification on whether honors are given for the completion of a series of specialized courses or as a result of a capstone experience such as a senior thesis, or some combination of these.

The Task Force discussed whether the College should devise a uniform set of criteria for all honors programs in order to assure some consistency, or whether the current practice of department autonomy is sufficient. More discussion is needed. It is clear, however, that understanding the differences between a regular and an honors curriculum is essential, and honors curricula require ongoing monitoring.

2. Student-Faculty Interchange

Both formal and informal interchange of students and faculty are seen as invaluable aspects of College life that contribute to student learning. Only informal assessment currently exists in this area through the Academic Program Review process. Some questions that need to be asked include: To what extent do departments reach out to student organizations, especially major interest clubs? To what extent do faculty members speak at club meetings? Are students invited to attend presentations by guest lecturers?
Does the College administration do enough to encourage such interchange? Do departments and divisions exchange information on the success of these events? That these events are scheduled is clear; however, further information is needed to determine how people are informed about them and how widely students and faculty participate in them.

Another measure of student-faculty relations is the extent to which students work as lab assistants, tutors or teaching assistants or participate with faculty members on grant projects. This is an area where there are many exceptional models across the College. It would be useful for departments and divisions to codify information on what exists and share it with colleagues. Creative relationships between students and faculty in one department may serve as a stimulus or model to others.

Often faculty-student relationships extend beyond the confines of the College to the community. Internships serve to enhance the reality of subject matter, relating the work of the instructor/student team to the external world. While internships exist, either directly through departments, through Cooperative Education courses and placements or through focused programs such as the Business and Liberal Arts minor, there is little information available to the College community at large. The specific intent of these programs and courses, and the measurements used to evaluate their success need to be articulated and shared more widely within the campus community.

3. Departmental Curriculum

Almost all departments structure courses in some hierarchical manner. The course numbering system of the College, overhauled about ten years ago, assigns numerical ranges based on course level. A review of the Undergraduate Bulletin, however, shows clearly that a number of departments, primarily in the social sciences, have a relatively flat structure, offering access to 200-level courses without prerequisites or to 300-level courses with no more than one prerequisite. While there is no reason why all departments need be highly structured, each department's course inventory should be reviewed to determine what types of prior knowledge or levels of skill need to be accomplished before the major is fulfilled.

4. Other Department Procedures

The Task Force developed a survey of academic departments to determine what departmental and course level activities were occurring to measure student learning outcomes. Responses from over 75% of the department chairs provide the assessment data. This survey revealed that in addition to the required institutional and departmental measures (e.g., Academic Program Review, Course and Faculty Evaluations, observation of faculty), several other means are used by them to assess overall program quality. These methods include review by the departmental curriculum committee of course content, relevance and effectiveness; and review by faculty at monthly departmental meetings. Curriculum guidelines of professional associations are also employed as reference points within the
discipline. About a third of the departments require an integrative or capstone course at the end of the regular course sequence to consolidate student learning in the major, and another third of the departments require some other culminating experience, generally a senior thesis or some type of research paper or project. A clear majority of departments do not require students to take a comprehensive exam prior to graduation. Monitoring students toward completion of the major is carried out through faculty advising, but departments differ in how systematically this is done. Finally, about two-thirds of the departments collect syllabi and final exams from faculty and adjuncts on a regular basis.

Aside from Academic Program Review, most departments do not have a formal process to evaluate the success of student learning in their major. They rely on a variety of informal measures, and are often reactive, responding to problems or issues brought to them by individuals or groups. Formal procedures do exist to respond to problems and generally follow a process of submission to the curriculum committee for evaluation and then to the full faculty. It is not clear how information, when gathered, is used to improve teaching and learning.

III. Students' Ethical and Personal Development

The Mission Statement adopted by the College in 1986 clearly identifies students' ethical and personal development as an important outcome of their Queens College experience. Specifically, this refers to the extent to which students have an understanding of themselves, other individuals, and their environment, and participate in activities related to those concerns. How the College provides opportunities for students to acquire this understanding and encourages and facilitates their participation is an important component of outcomes assessment.

A. Students' Understanding of Themselves

There is no accepted measure or central record-keeping on the extent to which students are exposed to experiences that promote self-understanding, or on the extent to which students' self-understanding grows as a function of their exposure to the College. Research suggests that students' self-understanding generally does grow with exposure to college, but that it is difficult to pinpoint specific experiences associated with this growth. Therefore, attempts to measure the contribution of specific Queens College programs to students' self-understanding will probably provide little information.

In order to identify formal College activities having as an objective the enhancement

---

2 Reproduced in CHAPTER FOUR: THE MISSION AND GOALS OF QUEENS COLLEGE.

3 As a revised Mission Statement is adopted through this Self Study process, the College must plan for assessment of the goals put forth therein.

of students' self-understanding, Assistant Provost M. Hratch Zadoian, Dean of Students
Burton Backner, and LEAP Assistant Director Suzanne Paul were interviewed. Activities
meeting this description are generally found in special programs, many serving students
with special needs. These include LEAP, SEEK, and Fresh Start. Each of these programs
provide group and individual counseling, and in some cases, courses that help students to
increase their self-understanding. An example of the latter is LEAP 6 (Work, Life, and
Culture). In this course students have an opportunity to study the role of their own ethnic
group (and others) in the world of work and in society. They are also encouraged to
consider their own role in work and society.

B. Students' Understanding of Others

An index of the extent to which the College enables students to understand others is
description of formal college entities that focus on specific cultures or ethnicities.
Described below are three types of entities: academic programs in ethnic and area studies;
development of a college-wide course requirement with a multicultural emphasis; and
extracurricular activities with a multicultural component. The information provided is based
on an interview with Assistant Provost M. Hratch Zadoian, whose administrative
responsibilities include interdisciplinary and special studies. Additional information is
contained in former President Kenny's July 20, 1994, response to the Board of Trustees'
request for a description of College efforts to combat bigotry and in the 1993 Revision of
the Affirmative Action Program Plan.

1. Academic Programs

The College offers five interdisciplinary majors (Africana Studies, Byzantine and
Modern Greek Studies, East Asian Studies, Jewish Studies, and Latin American Area
Studies) and three minors (Irish Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and Italian-American
Studies) in ethnic and area studies. Each program offers several of its own courses and
"cross-references" courses from other departments. Collectively, a very large number of
Queens College courses are listed by the ethnic and area studies programs (see 1993-1995
Undergraduate Bulletin, pp. 151-158). The extent to which these courses are reaching the
student body is monitored by Mr. Zadoian's office each semester.

2. Development of a Course Requirement in Cultural Diversity

A sub-committee on curriculum of the Presidential Committee on
Multiculturalism has functioned at the College for a number of years. One of its goals was
development of a curricular requirement for all students. A proposal was submitted to the
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee several years ago that would require students to
select one course from a list of approximately six courses. The designated courses dealt
with more than one identified group and emphasized intergroup relations and/or
comparative studies. An example is Ethnic Studies 310: Six Ethnic Groups in New York
City. An alternative requirement was also submitted. Both have been discussed in
preliminary ways by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and the Academic Senate. Neither approach elicited substantial support. Definitive action is likely to be delayed pending the complete review of LASAR.

3. Extracurricular Activities

There are many college structures and organizations with an ethnic or cultural focus. These include centers for ethnic studies, such as the Asian/American Center, the Center for Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, the Center for Jewish Studies, and the John D. Calandra Italian-American Institute. There are also many official student organizations and activities (a list is appended to the Task Force's report). Clubs are encouraged to sponsor joint events, leading to a number of multicultural opportunities. The College chaplains and religious organizations sponsor many public events with multicultural and multiethnic themes.

C. Students' Understanding of Their Environment

According to the mission statement, a desired objective for students is to have enhanced understanding of their urban environment and the ecology and biology of the larger natural environment. Levels of student participation could be measured by their involvement in public-spirited activities such as College blood drives, charitable organizations, campus elections, etc. The Dean of Students and the Director of Student Activities maintain a list of student organizations (clubs) most of which are service-oriented.

One source of data on level of student participation in campus-based extracurricular activities is a student survey conducted in fall 1992 by students enrolled in a class on multicultural center design. A non-random sample of approximately 600 students was surveyed; the response rate is not indicated. In response to a question regarding involvement in campus-based co-curricular activities, 66% responded that they were not involved. Another question revealed that approximately 70% of students who responded spent 6 or fewer hours on campus when they were not in class. These data confirm the observation of Dean Backner that students at this commuter campus have (or take) little time for campus-based extracurricular activities.

A measure of the extent to which the College encourages public-spirited activities can be gleaned from descriptions of the formal awards granted to students by the College. Among college-wide undergraduate awards, 17 of 34 awards specify service as a criterion, 2 of 14 program awards require service, as do 7 of 27 departments listing awards. In addition, service is rewarded through the Belle Zeller Scholarship Trust Fund, created by the Professional Staff Congress/CUNY to encourage and recognize excellence among the students of the City University of New York. Candidates for this scholarship must have a minimum GPA of 3.75. They must also demonstrate "a strong commitment to college
and/or community services and those qualities of individual character that show their potential for leadership and future achievement." At least one Queens College student has been the recipient of this prestigious scholarship every year since 1984.

Another measure of the College's encouragement of public-spirited activities is the existence of programs such as the Big Buddy Program (Dr. Arthur Salz, Elementary and Early Childhood Education), QC Ambassadors (Admissions), and Golden Key Honor Society, in which service is a primary component. Dr. Salz, Mr. Hayes, and Dr. Backner agreed that more campus-wide documentation and recognition for such programs would be valuable.

IV. Students after Graduation

In its report, the 1986 Middle States team noted a deficiency in the College's efforts in the area of alumni relations, writing that "The College is far behind in identifying and communicating with its alumni, because of long inattention to maintaining adequate alumni records." The report noted, as well, that the alumni/ae were not being used in academic assessment: "An extensive survey of alumni undertaken recently contained virtually no questions about the educational program of the College." The 1991 Periodic Review noted a number of improvements in the area of alumni/ae relations, but no mention was made of using the alumni/ae in outcomes assessment. The 1993 Follow-Up Report to the Periodic Review, however, commented on one action of the College to redress this situation: "All academic program reviews require a survey of alumni perceptions about: the quality of their education in the major department and how it has served them in their post-graduation careers; the intellectual atmosphere within the department; how well students feel welcomed into the departmental community." In addition, "Many departments sample their alumni so as to include populations that have been out of college for varying amounts of time. This permits them to identify trends in departmental offerings and practices." The 1993 Planning Committee on Outcomes Assessment recommended an alumni/ae survey assessing the benefits of a Queens College education, a recommendation endorsed in the 1994-99 Five-Year Plan (item 47). In response to these reports, Queens College has attempted to incorporate alumni/ae assessment more fully into its measure of institutional effectiveness.

A. Institutional Level

The Alumni Office keeps names, addresses, phone numbers, and where possible, business addresses. Previous questionnaires elicited some basic information. A revised questionnaire will be sent out to all alumni/ae in the near future by an outside firm. The results of this second survey will be published in a directory, which will include occupational and geographical cross-listings. This survey will result in a resource of outstanding value. However, it is still more rudimentary than the one envisioned by the Planning Committee. For important reunions, the Alumni Office prepares booklets, which contain brief essays by class members on their experiences after college. These booklets are a rich source of information but have not been systematically analyzed or used by the
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College. The Alumni Office also publishes the Queens College Report, which includes alumni/ae notes, as well as occasional extensive profiles of notable alumni/ae. These publications provide good material, which is not being systematically used. Also, the Director of Alumni Affairs collects books written by alumni/ae.

The College invites distinguished alumni/ae to serve on four advisory boards: Queens College Foundation, Arts, Corporate, and Journalism. Their participation can be thought of as part of a systematic effort of assessment. The Pre-Health Professions Advisor keeps files on acceptances to medical school. These files are not computerized, however, and students are not tracked beyond admission. As noted earlier, the Dean of Students Office has begun to survey graduating seniors. These data will be shared with the Offices of Development and Alumni Affairs and will be used to guide programmatic planning for academic programs and student activities.

B. Departmental

As part of the Academic Program Review process, departments have recently conducted alumni/ae surveys. Alumni/ae, as well as students and faculty, are asked to fill out the ETS Standardized Questionnaire on Perceptions of the Department. Departments then assess answers to questions in a number of categories, e.g., Environment for Learning, Quality of Teaching, Faculty Concern for Students, Curriculum, Departmental Procedures, Available Resources, Employment Assistance, and Program Purpose. Alumni/ae are also asked to report on their career choices, providing a sketch of career possibilities of the major. This report includes much excellent information, and departments have been able to gain valuable knowledge about themselves. Unlike the survey recommended by the Planning Committee, however, this is a periodic project, not an ongoing one built into the program. Furthermore, it concentrates almost purely on attitudes towards the department and does not, except in the item on career choice, address a basic question envisioned by the Planning Committee: what kind of graduates, as workers, as citizens, and as people, is the College turning out?

C. Research Findings of Professor Dean Savage

Professor Dean Savage, Sociology, has conducted extensive independent research on Queens College alumni/ae, specifically a longitudinal survey of seniors of the class of 1989. This survey, "Queens College and Beyond," and its "Follow-Up Study" are appended to the Task Force's report. The results include valuable information on what jobs graduates took, how they found their jobs, how long it took, how hard it was, how much they earned in their first post-graduation job, whether they pursued further education, where and in what fields they did so, what kinds of skills they need in their jobs and how well the College trained them in these needed skills. The surveys also asked questions about graduates' opinions of the College and the education they received there, how they liked their majors and whether they would major in the same department again. These excellent surveys could serve as models for future, on-going alumni/ae questionnaires. It should be noted that they
cover two out of the three general areas envisioned for such future surveys: graduate study and employment, and attitudes towards the College. Except for three questions on the first study about religious and political beliefs and one multi-part question on the "Follow-Up Study" about social awareness and social attitudes, they do not include questions about citizenship and cultural participation.

Professor Savage has also searched the National Research Council's Doctorate Records File to compile a list of alumni/ae who have earned doctorates and prepared tables based upon his findings. His data testify to the College's success in preparing its graduates to succeed in graduate school. Overall, the College ranks 35th in the number of its graduates who go on to receive the Ph.D. In certain fields, the College record is particularly good, ranking fifth in the number of graduates who have earned Ph.D.'s in foreign languages and in psychology, eighteenth in sociology and anthropology and 24th in education. Yet the College ranks 103rd in graduates earning life science doctorates. More work needs to be done to discern some of the reasons behind the differences among disciplines.

Using various sources such as Dissertation Abstracts and faculty listings in college catalogs, he has compiled a list of the names, majors, years of graduation, graduate schools, and present positions and institutions of alumni/ae who have earned doctorates or who hold academic positions. He estimates that he has thus far located half of the 3500 alumni/ae who have earned doctorates. He has compiled lists for individual departments and sent them to those departments. Some results and his discussion of this research are appended to the Task Force's report. This is exceptionally good material that can be of great use to the College both in the Middle States review and in the future.

V. Faculty Development and Achievement

Faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, creative activity and service enhances the intellectual and psychological climate of the college. There are a number of systematic, formal procedures in place at the College to evaluate faculty accomplishments. A review of processes currently used to promote faculty mentoring and development is indicative of support for faculty. Also of importance is to consider the prevailing recognition/reward system with a view toward recommending change, when desirable.

A. Teaching Evaluation Procedures

A range of processes and procedures for the systematic assessment of teaching practices is currently in effect, including those mandated by the PSC-CUNY Contract and the College's Academic Senate. For a fuller description and discussion, see CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY. For most departments, no standardized observation report form

\[\text{Data source: Doctorate Record Files, National Research Council. Undergraduate degrees earned between 1979 and 1988.}\]
exists. Usually the chair, in consultation with the departmental P&B Committee, assigns the faculty observer and determines the time and date of the observation. The observee is notified and requested to supply course syllabi and other supporting teaching materials to the observer prior to the visit. Subsequent to the observation, the observer prepares a report that the chair and observee both receive. In case of disagreement, the observee may contest it in writing and/or during a special conference, if he/she so desires. After a faculty member receives tenure, no requirement exists for class observation. A chair can, however, recommend that a tenured faculty member request class observation prior to commencing the promotion process.

Courses and faculty members undergo student evaluation using a form constructed by the Academic Senate. It is scheduled to be administered every third semester for the entire faculty, and it is now being done each semester for untenured full-time faculty. Administered by the Office of Institutional Research, the questionnaire consists of an objective and a subjective section. Findings of the objective component are organized and summarized by department and by course, including the name of the instructor, in a separate booklet distributed to the campus community through the Bookstore. Copies are also available in the Benjamin Rosenthal Library and in departmental offices. Some departments have developed their own evaluation instruments as an addition to the uniform Academic Senate questionnaire. Their regular use assures the availability of student input on a more frequent basis.

B. Procedures to Evaluate Scholarship and Creative Activity

Departments collect this information regularly from non-tenured faculty and from faculty members below the full professor rank as part of the tenure/promotion process and they assemble it as part of the Academic Program Review process. Data from the questionnaire indicate that about half of the departments maintain lists of individual faculty publications, grant applications, oral presentations, and/or other professional activities (other than vitae). The faculty-staff newsletter, FYI, periodic newsletters from the Dean of the Arts and Humanities, the Dean of the School of Education, and from the Graduate School of Library and Information Studies chronicle some of the activities of some of the faculty. As noted earlier, the Office of Institutional Research now has access to the University database on faculty research interests and recent publications. While this is a useful resource, it is not comprehensive since participation was optional. At present, no system is in place to collect and analyze information from the entire faculty regarding scholarly and creative achievement.

The type of measurable activities in which faculty engage varies greatly but clearly each enhances and enriches their roles as teachers. The number of grants, either PSC-CUNY or external ones, applied for and received demonstrate an active and ongoing research agenda. Even if funding is not obtained, the time and effort required for preparing and submitting a proposal are valuable factors in assessment. The Office of Research & Sponsored Programs in its periodic newsletter Grants Bulletin publicizes the availability of
funding and application deadlines from a wide range of national and local agencies, including PSC-CUNY. Award recipients are also announced. In an annual publication, annual statistics on the distribution of funding received by individuals and the College as a whole are presented. CUNY also regularly announces grant recipients, as does the Clarion, the PSC-CUNY newsletter.

C. Service Evaluation Procedures

A widespread perception prevails on campus about the undervaluing of service in the College’s reward system. The only aspect of service identified in the Faculty section of the Guidelines for Academic Program Review is participation on College committees. The 1992 Report of the President’s Advisory Committee on Teaching and Service is the first official document where formal recognition has been given to this aspect of academic responsibility, and recommendations have been offered to improve the system. In furtherance of these recommendations, the Provost held a retreat for the College P&B in November 1994. The group analyzed the current system and examined available options with a view toward identifying possible avenues for change. A fuller description of faculty roles in service may be found in CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY.

D. Institutional Reward System

The College’s foremost reward for faculty is the granting of tenure and promotion. The review process consists of several layers and is detailed in CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY. The amount of care, time, effort and quality control involved in these processes is staggering. The process is deeply rooted and protected by the faculty who want to have a major share in the decision making to assure that high standards and the reputation of the institution are maintained.

Distinguished professorships are considered a promotion for full professors who are judged deserving of this honor because of their achievements and reputation in their field. These awards are few and while they are renewed annually, they carry no term limit. Departmental candidates’ dossiers are forwarded to the Executive Committee of the College P & B which reviews and evaluates them, invites reviews from outside experts and makes recommendations to the President. The decision to submit one or more names (or not to submit any candidates) to the Chancellor and the CUNY Board of Trustees is made by the President.

As has been noted earlier, former President Kenny created several awards to recognize outstanding teachers and to encourage research. These include the annual President’s Award for Excellence in Teaching, several annual mini-grants for innovative teaching and the annual President’s Award for Research. Each of these carries a stipend.

---

6 Currently the College has ten Distinguished Professors whose names and areas of expertise are given in CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY.
and each has been presented on ceremonial occasions. A substantial number of institutional awards is now in place to recognize teaching and research, two of the three prongs of academic activities of faculty. It is hoped that service, the third prong, will eventually also be recognized.

E. Faculty Development and Mentoring

Administration and faculty agree that mentoring and development of new and junior faculty have received attention during the last several years. Newly hired full-time faculty have recently received released time from their teaching assignments during the first year at the College in order to aid them in the development of their short and long-term research agendas. Funding for this effort originates from the Provost's Office. It is believed that this practice helps departmental recruitment efforts and promotes research and publication after hiring. A series of new faculty orientation meetings organized by the Provost's Office affords a chance for new faculty to meet each other and a wide range of administrative and academic support staff. They are briefed by the Provost about the College's expectations with regard to teaching, scholarship and service, and about the processes involved in the tenure and promotion decisions. Other sessions are devoted to teaching and to issues having to do with student conduct.

Traditionally, department chairs and/or senior faculty bear the primary responsibility for the advising and mentoring of junior faculty. This is usually taken seriously since the future of the individual and the department are intertwined. Recently a more formal program has been established whereby the Provost's Office ensures that each new faculty member is assigned a mentor. Mentors and mentees are invited to various welcoming events, and mentors are given opportunities to meet and discuss the mentoring process. The Affirmative Action Committee, which developed the original mentoring plan, is now involved in the longitudinal assessment of the new faculty orientation program, including its mentoring component.

Interdisciplinary faculty interaction on campus is fostered both by the institution and by the faculty. The Freshman Year Initiative and the Asian/American Center, for example, are products of joint faculty/administration initiatives. The long-standing gathering of the Monday Lunch Club of the Social Sciences Division has been organized through faculty efforts.

As the technology revolution occurs, the Academic Computer Center has increasingly involved itself in professional development and in-service training for both faculty and staff. Under institutional sponsorship, it has developed mini-courses for staff in basic computer literacy. Faculty development also began on this level, but has in time been expanded to include Internet, e-mail and other now basic technology related activities. Both formal and informal grant writing workshops have been offered recently by the staff of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the Development Office. This is part of an institutional effort to encourage faculty to obtain external funding in light of decreasing
internal funds. Everyone recognizes the present and future value of faculty development and mentoring and the College's significant progress in these areas.

VI. Administrative and Staff Contributions to Institutional Effectiveness

A. Administration

Administrators facilitate the effective operation of the College through their leadership. An important new assessment procedure has been established for administrative effectiveness: a process for regular review of administrative offices in 1988 comparable to the Academic Program Review. A number of offices have been through the process, although it is not yet clear how these evaluative findings have been used for improvement.

The assessment of academic administrators (e.g., Provost, Chief Librarian and Deans) follows policies developed by the Academic Senate. The President is evaluated every 5 years by the CUNY Board of Trustees. Other administrators (e.g., Higher Education Officers and Registrars) are evaluated annually by the person to whom they report. Department chairs are elected by department members. There are no formal evaluations of their leadership. The College provides occasional retreats for chairs in order to assist them in administering a department.

B. Staff

The Office of Human Resources monitors the evaluations of all classified staff, including clerical and buildings and grounds personnel. Provisional staff are supposed to be evaluated every 3 months; more realistically, all staff are evaluated once a year on their work performance. The evaluation is done by the supervisor of the staff member (e.g., department chair or unit head). The Director of Human Resources indicated that when a staff member is performing poorly, she works with them individually.

Several years ago, the staff was identified as needing improvement in working with students in general and specifically in working with students from diverse backgrounds. In response, the Office of Human Resources sponsored a training program for all staff, "Connections." This is a "customer service"-oriented program geared toward the college campus; it includes vignettes to analyze. Included in the five sessions is "Valuing Diversity," which deals with multicultural issues. This training addressed the need to improve sensitivity to others on campus, particularly those new to New York and unfamiliar with American higher education. Another training program provided by Human Resources was "Telephone Techniques." It is a generic program to improve interactions on the telephone. While there is perception that staff sensitivity and cooperation have improved across the campus, there have been no formal procedures to assess success of these programs or to evaluate staff behavior. Staff sensitivity is an important part of college climate, and might be included in assessment in that area. These sessions have had a
positive effect in another regard—getting staff together in small groups from different offices, giving them opportunities to get [better] acquainted and to become appreciative of the roles played by others on campus.

VII. Quality of Campus Life

There have been a number of occasional efforts that include partial assessment of campus climate. These include the original "Queens College and Beyond" survey of 2,500 seniors in 1989, a representative sample of 400 undergraduates done in 1988 to measure undergraduate employment and spending patterns, and a 600 person survey done by Latin American Area Studies in 1993 on diversity on campus. Furthermore, in 1989, the Office of Institutional Research for CUNY conducted a survey of Undergraduate Experience at all CUNY campuses; this survey is scheduled to be repeated next year. On the departmental level, many departments have conducted surveys of current students and recent graduates as part of the Academic Program Review process; aggregate data from the departmental use of Educational Testing Service's PSAS questionnaires are now available, and can be updated as more departments complete their reviews.

Although research on outcomes indicates that the most effective predictors of outcomes are student input attributes, there is still a strong case to be made for improving the campus environment in which students learn. A lack of involvement in one’s education is a major cause of attrition, perhaps the most important one on commuter campuses like Queens. One of the principal aims of efforts to improve education and reduce attrition should be to create a campus climate that is engaging and welcoming, one to which more students will want to commit themselves. The underlying assumption here is that education is more effective when students invest more effort and are more integrated into campus life. Graduation rates are also higher under these conditions. There is strong support in the literature for both claims.

What works? The literature makes some pretty clear suggestions: good teaching (which needs to be emphasized and rewarded), informal faculty-student interaction outside of class, provision of spaces where students come to feel at home (this is especially important on commuter campuses, especially during the first two years), student participation in extracurricular activities, living on or near campus, attending a private college, strong orientation and advisement programs, on-campus employment (such as work-study), student involvement in research, and supportive and welcoming organizational and interpersonal climate of individual departments.

It is not possible to change some things—Queens College is going to remain a public college and a commuter campus—but others offer possibilities for improvement. Some have

---

8 Ibid.
already been recognized, and in some instances programs are already under way. The College is placing more emphasis on good teaching, and there are important initiatives in place to increase freshman integration and faculty-mentored student research, to cite two examples. These two projects, funded by separate FIPSE grants, are conducting evaluation studies as part of the grants.

An outcomes assessment committee’s contribution might be to specify the dimensions of campus climate—the relevant ones are those believed to enhance integration, improve commitment to education, and increase graduation rates—and propose ways of measuring changes over time. To evaluate the results, it is important to decide whether to make comparisons across campuses, which would imply using measures employed in ongoing major national studies, or simply establish a baseline and track changes over time locally. Doing both is possible, and would only require that some measures that are already used in larger studies (such as the National Educational Longitudinal Study currently underway) are included.

VIII. Summary and Recommendations

Since the last Middle States review, Queens College has made considerable progress in its acquisition of data from outcomes assessment and other measures of institutional effectiveness. The Academic Program Review process has been cited repeatedly by department chairs and others interviewed as the primary systematic means of assessing the extent and quality of the student learning experience. The review process for administrative offices and units has also contributed to the evaluation of institutional effectiveness. Other formal measures discussed above (Course and Faculty Evaluation Forms, the Cooperative Institutional Research Freshmen Survey, the "Queens College and Beyond" survey, the Alumni Office questionnaire, the ETS standardized questionnaires, and mandated teaching evaluation procedures) are sources of important data. These measures emanate from a variety of campus sites including the Office of Institutional Research, the Academic Senate, and the Alumni Office. In addition, a very wide array of informal processes and procedures and proxy-measures provide further data on the extent to which Queens College achieves the goals and objectives set forth in its mission statement. The procedures in place are clearly multidimensional as is recommended in Framework for Outcomes Assessment.

Now with several years of experience in formal academic program review, there is the opportunity to evaluate the program itself. As noted above, the program is well accepted and has resulted in many significant changes in curriculum and departmental practices. There are, however, ways to expand and improve the process. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Program Review process should be amended to include interim progress reports following the completion of each major review. <15-I>

and
RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Program Review process should be broadened to cover any academic unit offering courses. <15-2>

While there is clear evidence of continuing improvement in the systematic collection of information, there are three major issues that need to be addressed to strengthen College efforts to evaluate institutional effectiveness. These are a) analyzing and expanding the use to which assessment findings are put, b) the assignment of responsibility of the evaluation of effectiveness, and c) the need for additional procedures for the collection of information.

A. Use of Assessment Findings

It is stated in Characteristics of Excellence that "An institution should be able to demonstrate that the information obtained is used as a basis for ongoing self-renewal." Framework for Outcomes Assessment describes assessment as one part of a feedback loop that links outcome results with actions. The dissemination of assessment data to the College community needs to be broadened, and a closer look needs to be taken at how to establish better links between assessment and intervention. Thus,

RECOMMENDATION: The President and senior administration should strengthen the association between assessment, planning and implementation, and should make assessment data more generally known within the campus community. <15-3>

Assessment requires a strong commitment to institutional research. In recent years, the Office of Institutional Research has been extremely short on staff and other resources. If the College is to make significant advances in its assessment and planning, it must invest more in institutional research. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The administration should review the resources available to the Office of Institutional Research and should develop a plan to expand its capacity to support institutional assessment and planning. <15-4>

B. Assignment of Responsibility

The Task Force's difficulty in gathering information for this report reveals a second issue of concern. There is no person coordinating the efforts to evaluate institutional effectiveness, which results in duplication and/or overlap, lack of coverage of some information, and often haphazard, irregular administration of measures. It is difficult to know where to go to retrieve these data. It seems imperative that a central person or group be placed "in charge" of planning and coordinating the efforts to facilitate assessment. Many offices and persons would be involved in carrying out the plan including chairs, deans, the Provost's Office, the Alumni Affairs Office, the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of Grants and Sponsored Research, faculty, and students, but leadership in this
enterprise is required. Thus,

RECOMMENDATION: The President should vest responsibility for coordinating the College's efforts in outcomes assessment and review of institutional effectiveness in an individual. <15-5>

C. Additional Assessment Procedures

Additional assessment procedures to enhance current data collection are needed. The following elements represent possible components of a general plan for outcomes assessment.

1. Longitudinal Survey

It is important to obtain college-wide data on students in a systematic and organized manner. Information on students is currently collected by several offices, but there is limited coordination of the research activities and no longitudinal perspective. The centerpiece of the proposed plan is the use of a national longitudinal survey (e.g., the National Educational Longitudinal Survey [NELS] or the Beginning Post-secondary Student Longitudinal Study [BPS]) to be administered to a sample of students every two years. The College can also incorporate additional questions on student ethical and personal development and/or campus climate in a survey of this type.

A distinct advantage of using a longitudinal study is that the College will be sampling all students, not only those who stay until graduation. This will provide data not currently collected on stop-outs and drop-outs as well as those who graduate. If resources permit, the College should consider use of a survey and data files since these provide extensive longitudinal information on students and graduates. This survey would not replace the CIRP survey for freshmen currently being administered.

2. Graduating Student Survey

In addition to the longitudinal survey, it is recommended that a multiple choice Exit or Senior Survey be given to all graduating students at the time they receive their diploma card to gather quantitative data on the nature of their experiences at the College and their degree of satisfaction. [This would build upon the recent efforts by the Dean of Students to sample the opinion of graduating seniors and recent graduates.] The survey might include questions about courses they would recommend, future plans (e.g., graduate or professional school) and highest degree to which they aspire. Also important is information about the nature of their courses and their academic experience (in how many courses did they write papers and/or essay exams, do field research, do library research, make oral presentations, do laboratory work, produce creative or artistic works?). Among other possible questions: In what departments beside your major did you take courses at the 300 (advanced) level?
3. Essays

Qualitative data provide another means of assessing institutional effectiveness (Characteristics of Excellence). A sample of about 100 seniors, either a sub-sample of the longitudinal study or others, should be asked to write descriptive essays reflecting on either their learning experience at the College or what influence the College has had on their personal development. A core of faculty would review the student essays to assess how well the College is meeting its mission. Student reflections will provide qualitative data that can be studied further and discussed by the faculty.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should adopt an integrated, multi-dimensional program of student outcomes assessment including elements such as longitudinal surveys, surveys of graduating seniors and student essays. <15-6>

4. Additional Approaches

More systematic data collection and analysis in the following areas should be considered. For the Academic Program Review process:

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost, deans and departments should work together to establish additional procedures for the assessment of program quality and outcomes. <15-7>

For the benefit of informing students about their options and attracting superior students to the College:

RECOMMENDATION: The College should maintain an inventory of honors programs to be included in official College publications and recruiting material. <15-8>

Students' general intellectual skills can be assessed upon entry to the College through the General Intellectual Skills test (ETS) or another general educational test developed by The College. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate, in undertaking periodic review of the LASAR general educational requirements, should develop a strategy that will assess course offerings in relation to the general intellectual skills students will learn. <15-9>

The absence of a Dean for Graduate Studies has resulted in lack of assessment procedures for Graduate Programs other than the Academic Review Process. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should include measures of its effectiveness with graduate students when planning outcomes assessment. <15-10>

Awareness of diversity is strong among the numerous courses, programs, and activities that bring heterogeneous groups together on campus. The sharing of that information is not what it might be. The valuable information contained in former President Kenny's report to the Board of Trustees is the kind of document that could have helped to increase participation in multicultural activities had it been more widely available.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should collect data on level of student participation in the impressive array of activities available to learn about cultures and ethnicities that differ from their own. <15-11>

Other aspects of the College's Mission Statement need to be looked at and analyzed systematically. For example, the 1986 Mission Statement speaks of aims to expand students' self-understanding and understanding of their environment. No attempts have been made to assess such goals. As a revised Mission Statement is adopted through this Self Study.

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a process whereby the goals for student development and attainment of its Mission Statement are assessed. <15-12>

There is a substantial resource of existing material related to alumni/ae—the aggregate data from questionnaires used in departmental self-studies, the results of the two surveys conducted by the Alumni Office, the reunion booklets, the Queens College Reports, and the results of the several Savage surveys. Yet regular surveys of alumni/ae that include a significant number of questions on the academic programs of the College are not current practice. The College also has no standardized way to assess how its graduates meet its own mission-based goals, such as citizenship and cultural participation. The usefulness of essays written by alumni/ae at intervals of about twenty years is suggested by the rich and informative narratives in the reunion booklets. An essay would complement the short-answer and multiple-choice responses of a more routine survey by providing more detailed, more complex, and more reflective answers; by providing information and assessments that go beyond the questionnaire or that are unpredictable; providing a source of quotations and anecdotes that might be useful in a variety of ways; and in general providing a sense of the full person behind the statistics.

RECOMMENDATION: Existing material on alumni/ae achievements and experience should be collected and systematically studied; expanded alumni/ae surveys should be administered at regular intervals to assist in assessment of the goals set by the College and its
departments; and alumni/ae should be asked to write about the value and effects of their Queens experience at ten year intervals. <15-13>

RECOMMENDATION: Departments should be encouraged to undertake their own initiatives to maintain records on alumni/ae and keep in contact with them. <15-14>

Recommendations on issues relating to teaching and faculty are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should develop and publicize descriptive and evaluative information about the types of institutional support for faculty development and mentoring. <15-15>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should broaden the scope of teaching assessment measures by recognizing the importance of innovation in teaching techniques and methodology, new course development, and increased application of technology and media. <15-16>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should give serious consideration to the introduction of the teaching dossier as a mechanism for documenting and evaluating teaching. <15-17>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a systematic centralized information system for documenting faculty achievements in research, scholarship and creative activity as is recommended in the College's 1994-1999 Five Year Plan. <15-18>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should increase the recognition given to "service" in faculty evaluation by broadening the scope of service assessment to measure faculty participation in leadership roles within professional organizations; representation of the institution on external committees, task forces, and commissions; and work with government agencies, business and industry. The College should seriously consider the introduction of a service dossier. <15-19>

Additional recommendations on training of staff and administrators:

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a systematic mechanism to assess perceptions concerning the quality of service by staff, with special attention to assessing perceptions of students. <15-20>
RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop programs to improve the training and performance of department chairs and administrators and should evaluate the effectiveness of the training through interview and performance measures. <15-21>

XIV. Summary List of Recommendations on Institutional Effectiveness and Change

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Program Review process should be amended to include interim progress reports following the completion of each major review. <15-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Program Review process should be broadened to cover any academic unit offering courses. <15-2>

RECOMMENDATION: The President and senior administration should strengthen the association between assessment, planning and implementation, and should make assessment data more generally known within the campus community. <15-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The administration should review the resources available to the Office of Institutional Research and should develop a plan to expand its capacity to support institutional assessment and planning. <15-4>

RECOMMENDATION: The President should vest responsibility for coordinating the College's efforts in outcomes assessment and review of institutional effectiveness in an individual. <15-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should adopt an integrated, multi-dimensional program of student outcomes assessment including elements such as longitudinal surveys, surveys of graduating seniors and student essays. <15-6>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost, deans and departments should work together to establish additional procedures for the assessment of program quality and outcomes. <15-7>
RECOMMENDATION: The College should maintain an inventory of honors programs to be included in official College publications and recruiting material. <15-8>

RECOMMENDATION: The Academic Senate, in undertaking periodic review of the LASAR general educational requirements, should develop a strategy that will assess course offerings in relation to the general intellectual skills students will learn. <15-9>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should include measures of its effectiveness with graduate students when planning outcomes assessment. <15-10>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should collect data on level of student participation in the impressive array of activities available to learn about cultures and ethnicities that differ from their own. <15-11>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a process whereby the goals for student development and attainment of its Mission Statement are assessed. <15-12>

RECOMMENDATION: Existing material on alumni/ae achievements and experience should be collected and systematically studied; expanded alumni/ae surveys should be administered at regular intervals to assist in assessment of the goals set by the College and its departments; and alumni/ae should be asked to write about the value and effects of their Queens experience at ten year intervals. <15-13>

RECOMMENDATION: Departments should be encouraged to undertake their own initiatives to maintain records on alumni/ae and keep in contact with them. <15-14>

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should develop and publicize descriptive and evaluative information about the types of institutional support for faculty development and mentoring. <15-15>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should broaden the scope of teaching assessment measures by recognizing the importance of innovation in teaching techniques and methodology, new course development, and increased application of technology and media. <15-16>
RECOMMENDATION: The College should give serious consideration to the introduction of the teaching dossier as a mechanism for documenting and evaluating teaching. <15-17>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a systematic centralized information system for documenting faculty achievements in research, scholarship and creative activity as is recommended in the College's 1994-1999 Five Year Plan. <15-18>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should increase the recognition given to "service" in faculty evaluation by broadening the scope of service assessment to measure faculty participation in leadership roles within professional organizations; representation of the institution on external committees, task forces, and commissions; and work with government agencies, business and industry. The College should seriously consider the introduction of a service dossier. <15-19>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop a systematic mechanism to assess perceptions concerning the quality of service by staff, with special attention to assessing perceptions of students. <15-20>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should develop programs to improve the training and performance of department chairs and administrators and should evaluate the effectiveness of the training through interview and performance measures. <15-21>
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I. A Retrospective on Planning at Queens College

Queens College has always engaged in a variety of forms of institutional planning. However, the current, formalized system—centered on the elaboration of five-year plans that make explicit College-wide priorities for action—is relatively new. In large part, it responds to recommendations made by the Middle States Association Evaluation Team in fall 1986 that called for "more overt and careful institutional planning" (Adamany Report, p. 18). In response to that call and soon after assuming the presidency, former President Kenny set up Planning Committees on Recruitment, Admissions, and Retention (October 1986), and then, on January 27, 1987, issued a memo on long-range planning to the College community; that memo began the process by which the current planning structure was put in place. The history of instituting that structure is traceable in the documents that have been exchanged between the College and the Middle States Association reviewers in the ensuing years.2

Following President Kenny's memo of January 1987, ten committees3 were set up to consider various areas of concern to the College as a whole. Some were singled out during the last Middle States Association evaluation as in need of particular attention. Each committee did its work during the spring 1987 semester and prepared a report, presented in 1988 to the President and campus as a whole as "The Reports of the Planning Committees." Comments and proposals were at that point solicited from the whole College community. The College Planning Committee, appointed in March 1988 by President Kenny, then worked with the previous Committees' reports to identify priorities for implementation over the course of the next five years; it submitted its final report, "Recommendations of the College Planning Committee," in October 1988. This report was also then subject to campus-wide scrutiny and suggestions, and the course of its implementation during the years 1988-1993 charted annually in the College's faculty and staff newsletter, EXI.

This planning cycle was coordinated by a new Acting Vice President for Planning. Subsequently the position became permanent with expanded duties as Vice President for

---

3 These ten Planning Committees were: Academic Program and Support Services Review, Affirmative Action, Campus Communications, Computing & Management Systems, Continuing Education & Non-Credit Programs, Curricular Development, Facilities, Faculty Development, Graduate Studies, and Non-Traditional Students.
Campus Affairs, Planning and Information Systems. An analysis of the position as it exists currently may be found in CHAPTER THIRTEEN: ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION.

For the most part, the second planning cycle followed the form of the first. One innovation, however, was the setting up, at the beginning of the second cycle, of a Pre-Planning Committee composed of students, faculty, and administrators, and charged with reviewing progress in implementing the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan and with identifying particular areas of concern to be considered as part of the new planning cycle (see Pre-Planning Committee for the Five-Year Plan, Final Report). By contrast, all pre-planning work for the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan was carried out by a committee composed of the College President and vice presidents.

The Pre-Planning Committee came to its proposals following an extensive interviewing and surveying process. As part of that process, members of the campus community were asked for "recommendations for problem identification committees." Though the five Planning Committees actually appointed by President Kenny in 1993 differed somewhat in emphases from those identified as most urgent by the Pre-Planning Committee, the pre-planning work certainly gave the President and planners a strong indication of which areas a variety of members of the College community found most in need of attention in the work of the 1994-1999 planning cycle.

The five committees—Planning Committees on Faculty, Students, Facilities, Computers and Communications, and Outcomes Assessment—met extensively and submitted their reports in 1993-1994. These were discussed in open forums in fall 1993. A 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan Planning Committee then considered those recommendations and the campus response to them in preparing the Recommendations of the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan (June 1994). These were discussed in open forums in October 1994 and ratified by the Academic Senate. They are currently in their first year of implementation.

In 1993, the University initiated a new planning process, called Academic Program Planning. Prior to that time, campus academic planning interfaced with the central administration primarily through statements of academic goals that accompanied budget planning documents. With the initiation of the Academic Program Planning process, a regular dialogue began between the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the College on matters of academic priorities. Funds are set aside centrally to support Academic Program Planning initiatives and are distributed annually in response to proposals submitted by the campuses. Review of these proposals provides an opportunity for a discussion of campus and university priorities. These discussions also occur at intervals throughout the year. Additional details on Academic Program Planning will appear later in this chapter (section V).
II. **The Successes of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan**

The 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan made 37 recommendations; 33 (89%) have been successfully implemented and have significantly improved life at the College. Review of academic programs and administrative offices have been instituted on a regular, rotating basis. Major new technological systems have been installed on campus, most notably the QUASAR system that has changed completely (and much for the better) the College's systems for course scheduling, student registration, and student record-keeping. In association with the broader CUNY library system, new on-line catalogs and databases have made information retrieval at the College's Rosenthal Library easier and more efficient. The overall campus need for access to computing facilities and new technologies was recognized in the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan (and the recommendations of the 1994-1999 Plan pushed the College even further toward improving such access). Awards for teaching excellence and mini-grants for innovative teaching projects have been instituted in order to emphasize the College's continuing commitment to excellence in instruction. Orientations and a mentoring system for new faculty have been set up to help in the sometimes difficult process of entry into the College community. Significant attention has been paid to increasing the racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of the College's faculty and toward furthering multicultural programs and sensitivity throughout the College. And emphasis has been put on addressing the needs of evening students—to assure that they have access to a variety of offerings and are able to complete their programs of study within a reasonable amount of time.

III. **The Failures of the First Five-Year Plan**

Despite the many successes of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan, there are several areas in which implementation has been incomplete or unsuccessful. Most of these are linked in one way or another to the College's continuing budgetary problems. Thus, for instance, though recommendation #35 of the 1988-1993 Plan proposed the allocation of "greater resources . . . for [library] acquisitions, library services and for extending library hours," in fact, due to a decrease in available OTPS funds and a 13% annual increase in the cost of periodicals and monographs, there has been an overall decrease in new acquisitions of printed material. Similarly, budgetary constraints have impeded the implementation of recommendation #32 of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan, which proposed that "priority . . . be given to the improvement of cleaning services and general maintenance of classrooms and other campus facilities." And while recommendation #17 of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan called for the reduction of the "excessive size of classes in graduate courses relative to state norms for each discipline," there has been "an overall increase, not a decrease in average class size" due to "drastic budget reductions affecting both full-time and part-time instructional personnel" (EYI October 1993).

Certain proposals from the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan—for instance, the call, in recommendation #4, "to encourage reading, writing, and oral communication across the curriculum"—have been worked on by the College but are not yet fully instituted. All such
partially implemented recommendations, as well as those whose implementation was
prevented by budgetary constraints, were reconsidered by the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan
Committee, and many of these were reiterated as College priorities in the 1994-1999 Five-
Year Plan even as somewhat different strategies for their implementation were proposed.

IV. The 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan

Given the general success of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan, the various Committees
involved in the next round of planning were able to direct their attention away from areas
like Academic Program Review, where significant progress had already been made, toward
remaining areas of urgent need like student advising and outcomes assessment. Such areas,
though they received some attention during the College’s previous round of planning, in
1993 still remained of significant concern to the campus community at large. The success
of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan in addressing a variety of crucial issues along with the
simultaneous identification of new concerns to the College partly explains the narrowing of
the initial set of Planning Committees from ten in the initial cycle to five in the following
cycle. The creation of a Committee on Outcomes Assessment recognized an issue largely
unaddressed by the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan.

The 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan Committee, reviewing the implementation of the
1988-1993 Five-Year Plan, the new recommendations of the Committees on Faculty,
Students, Facilities, Computers and Communications, and Outcomes Assessment, and the
campus response to those recommendations, was, in its recommendations, able to target
five major goals around which all its more specific proposals were organized (see
Recommendations of the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan, p. 4). The Committee felt that,
particularly given the promise of continued budgetary constraint, strongly targeting
particular goals, rather than trying to address every issue of possible concern to the campus,
would be the most effective way to proceed. The main areas of concern it identified--
 improving student advising, furthering quality teaching and research, making computer and
information technology widely available on campus, implementing a comprehensive plan
for maintenance and replacement of facilities and equipment, and instituting meaningful
outcomes assessment at the College--were certainly common concerns across the campus, as
comments in the open forums of October 1994 made clear. Thus, for instance, in those
forums there was much discussion on general issues of student advising, as well as the
Committee’s specific recommendations for its improvement (recommendations #1-12),
showing that many on campus had already thought hard about the problems of providing
adequate advising services to the population of commuter students that the College serves.
The kind of open, thoughtful, and creative discussion of advising that obtained in the open
forums is encouraging for the prospect of implementing a new, more comprehensive and
well articulated student academic advising system at the College over the course of the next
five years, the goal at which the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan’s recommendations on advising
aim.
In the first year of implementation of the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan, it is of course too early to assess how successful the Plan might be in guiding the College. But given the achievements of earlier planning work in helping to chart general directions of movement, and in instituting particular changes like systematic Academic Program Review on campus, one might predict continued success for the system of institutional planning developed and deployed at the College in recent years.

V. Academic Program Planning

In spring 1992, Chancellor W. Ann Reynolds appointed an Advisory Committee on Academic Program Planning. The report of that committee, which was released in December 1992, contained a number of controversial recommendations which were never formally implemented. The report did, however, lead to a Board of Trustees resolution in June 1993 which set in motion the current Academic Program Planning process. The Board resolution called for "continuation, and where needed, initiation or intensification, of campus-based planning, program review, and program development activities...", affirmed "the importance of inter-college collaboration in offering academic programs," and stated that campuses should "regularly review their bulletins and related publications to ensure that all listed programs and courses are actually available to students, with reasonable frequency and according to the terms indicated."

At Queens, the five-year planning and program review processes were already well established. Indeed, the College's program review process was described as exemplary by the Office of Academic Affairs. The College's first Academic Program Planning report, in October 1993, detailed the results of the first five years of program reviews, described seven planning initiatives that were underway or under consideration, and listed several inter-campus initiatives that were either in place or under development.

In the early fall of 1993, the annual financial planning meeting, which in the past had focused totally on budget issues, included a discussion of academic planning and was attended by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Queens College Provost. In November 1993, the College received an allocation of $352,000 in response to its request for funds to support academic planning initiatives. These funds included support for two new faculty hires in interdisciplinary programs (Business and the Liberal Arts, and Journalism) and two new hires in advisement, as well as one-time funds for addressing a shortfall in the library journals budget. Requests for funding for faculty hires in Japanese and Korean and to address shortfalls in the graduate assistant and adjunct budgets were not funded.

The next formal Academic Program Planning report was submitted in May 1994. This report described the use of the funds allocated in the previous November, articulated the College's academic priorities for 1994-95 (faculty hiring, continued expansion of advisement, graduate assistantships, library resources, and computer access), described collaborative efforts with other CUNY colleges, updated the status of academic program
reviews, and described progress on our audit of bulletin listings. The report included also a request for funds to support academic priorities in 1994-95. This report was followed in August by a response from the Vice Chancellor which included detailed information about the College’s 1994-95 Academic Program Planning allocation: $350,000 to support four faculty positions (Accounting, Japanese, Korean, Teaching English as a Second Language), two advising positions, and one-time funds for computer access.

The most recent formal interaction on Academic Program Planning occurred in November 1994 when Vice Chancellor Freeland and University Dean Anne Martin visited the College to meet with President Curtis and Provost Thorpe. In addition to a review of the current status of academic program planning initiatives at the College, this meeting focused on different philosophies regarding prioritization and resource allocation: to what extent should some programs be designated as centers of excellence with concomitant infusion of resources and to what extent should there be an emphasis on maintenance of an excellent broadly-based liberal arts curriculum. Clearly, considering the current fiscal outlook, this issue will become even more central in the coming months and years. As the College considers how to implement deep cuts in its budget, its priorities must be crystal clear. The decisions made now will determine the course of the College for many years to come.

Thus, unlike the time of the last Middle States Association review, Queens College has an ongoing, active, and public institutional planning process. It has had considerable success in engaging the whole campus community—students, faculty, staff and administration—in the consideration of campus needs and problems and in setting priorities for effective action in addressing those needs and problems.

VI. Recommendations and Commendations

There is a general sense on campus that institutional planning has been a positive force for Queens College. Many of the recommendations of the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan have received strong support across the campus, from students, faculty, staff and administration. And there is a sense—suggested in the tone and content of the recent public forums and in the endorsement of the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan by the Academic Senate—that the new set of planning recommendations will receive similar support.

There are various important attributes of the current planning process at Queens College that have furthered the success of that process and that should, therefore, be cultivated in future planning efforts. As Queens College currently approaches planning, there is a very wide range of campus input. The various levels of committees—pre-planning, planning groups assigned to particular issues (e.g., faculty, students, facilities, outcomes assessment), and a final Planning Committee to set overall priorities—guarantee that many individuals and constituencies are involved in the overall process. In the first cycle of planning, over 100 individuals served on official committees; in the second cycle, the number was approximately 80. Such wide representation ensures that planning takes
into account a broad range of views and experiences from across the College community. In addition, public forums, interviewing of concerned individuals, and the active solicitation of written suggestions (as, for instance, by the Pre-Planning Committee) have allowed for others at the College not directly involved in planning work to share their views with the committees. Such a structure should be preserved in future planning work.

Even greater campus participation might be hoped for, however, during the periods between the actual planning work, that is, when the plans are in the process of being implemented. There is a certain tendency once a Five-Year Plan has been published and publicly discussed for attention to shift away from it. Though those charged with the implementation of the Plans--largely College administrators--have in fact been assiduous in their attention to the Plans' recommendations, those recommendations tend to fade into the background for those not so actively involved in the process of implementation. One possible way of addressing this situation would be to hold a public forum each semester during which progress in implementation of the Plan would be reported to the whole College community. This would make it possible to follow more closely the progress (and impediments) in implementing specific recommendations and to gather campus-wide feedback about that progress. Most members of the Task Force on Planning, however, felt that more frequent public forums are not necessarily the best way to proceed in extending campus involvement with the planning process, since previous forums are not usually attended by as broad a cross-section of the campus as one might wish. While somewhat more frequent forums might be held, the consensus of the Task Force is that it would be more productive to track the planning process and implementation in published material made widely available on campus. Thus, the kind of assessment of implementation that was made for the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan in the campus publication FYI might be extended to other print media--for instance, student newspapers--and ultimately to electronic media (thus, an on-line bulletin board might be frequently updated with information on implementation of the Five-Year Plan). Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should expand efforts to communicate with the Queens College community regarding implementation of the recommendations of the Five Year Plans. Reports should include explanation of progress toward and impediments to achievement of the goals set forth and should provide for regular discussion and re-assessment of the recommendations. <16-1>

The planning process has been, in the view of the Task Force on Planning, quite successful in bringing imaginative, creative, and practical proposals to the attention of the College community and its various constituent populations. In many areas--minority hiring and retention, student advising, academic program assessment and curricular development, to name but a few--the Five-Year Plans have helped set the broadest agendas of the College. The 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan is particularly significant in presenting a new vision of comprehensive student advising; in making meaningful outcomes assessment a
crucial goal; in proposing a coordinated plan for implementing and maintaining technological innovations on campus; in pushing teaching and research in directions that will involve cross-disciplinary work and connections between the College and the surrounding community; and in recognizing the importance of maintaining the integrity of the College's physical facilities.

As the recommendations in all of these areas also make clear, the planning process has focused attention not just on identifying large or abstract problems and needs that the College must address but also on providing real, practical suggestions for how to approach those problems and needs. For instance, the advising proposals in the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan do not just present the general sense that student advising needs to be improved, but outline quite specific suggestions for how the College should proceed in seeking that improvement. Already—in the public forums and in the Academic Senate discussion of the Plan—some of these proposals (for instance, recommendation #4 that a credit-bearing orientation course for freshmen be instituted on an experimental basis) have generated considerable controversy. The Task Force on Planning believes that such controversy is healthy in focusing attention on the real need for advising reform and in generating thoughtful and practical ideas for how to implement such reform, even when those ideas would revise or replace certain specific recommendations of the Planning Committees.

In making their recommendations, the Planning Committees have consistently taken into account the feasibility of their proposals—what resistance particular recommendations might meet from constituent populations on campus, what budgetary restraints might potentially block implementation. Such perceived obstacles do not necessarily stand in the way of proposals that are felt to be particularly important; thus, even though the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan Committee was aware that money might not be available for full implementation of its proposals on computing technologies, it ultimately decided that pushing for the expansion of such technologies on campus was so crucial a goal that the Plan should outline an ideal situation with respect to such technologies—where Queens College really should be five years from now in access to computing and communications facilities—even if in the end the College might find itself somewhat short of that ideal. At the same time, however, the Committee was careful to make clear its priorities for implementation, so that, should the budget make necessary the putting aside of certain recommendations, those most crucial to the health of the campus would be funded first.

Despite the Planning Committees' acute awareness of practical restraints to ideal plans, and despite their weighing of the ideal against the practical in forwarding recommendations to the College, the articulation of the planning process with the particularly crucial factor of the budget remains less than ideal. In large part, this reflects the complex and always difficult budget process that Queens College participates in as a part of CUNY, funded largely by a state government that does not generally provide budgets in a fashion that would permit long-range planning and subject to budget decisions, at both the state and CUNY levels, that are beyond its control. The 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan Committee did consider "the question of the budget" explicitly in its plan.
(Recommendations of the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan pp. 2-3), but this served mostly to remind the College community of the budgetary obstacles to effective planning and to urge the College "to continue advocating its interests with state and city funding sources." In the interest of integrating the recommendations of five-year plans with annual budgeting,

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should increase its efforts to meld long range planning and annual budgeting, while resisting a tendency strictly to limit horizons and vision according to budget. <16-2>

For the institutional planning work done in preparation of the Five-Year Plans, it would be very useful if the College were able to provide at least rough five-year projections of future budgets as well as current budget figures for those programs, operations, and facilities whose futures are under consideration by the various Planning Committees. As the planning process currently works, Committees generally have only rough ideas of such budgetary information and plans are thus not linked to a firm sense of the resources that might be available during the course of the next five years. Of course, given the complexity and changeability of the budget process at Queens College, even the provision of such figures and projections would not give planners a fully reliable idea of what real budgets would look like. But the more tangible evidence of the College's current and future fiscal situation that the Committees might have, the more realistic and useful would be their planning work. In the absence of such evidence, the Task Force on Planning fears that recommendations from the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan that were not implemented for lack of adequate funding and that have been reiterated in the Second Five-Year Plan will remain wished-for by the College but unrealized.

It should be noted, in the consideration of budgetary concerns, that, during her tenure at the College, former President Kenny regularly used funds from her "reserve" accounts to support initiatives spelled out in the Five-Year Plan. Such strong presidential support for the planning process is crucial, and the Task Force hopes that it will be continued by future administrations. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should increase the availability of budgetary information to the Planning Committees and continue its strong support for College-wide planning efforts. <16-3>

It is clear that, over the course of the past eight years, institutional planning has become a valued and useful process at Queens College, and there is every reason to believe that, in something very much like its current form, it will continue to help guide the College. There is some evidence, however, that it needs to be even more firmly institutionalized than it has yet been. Despite the large numbers of people who have been involved in the past two formal cycles of planning work, there are those on campus, particularly students, but also faculty and staff, who still have only the vaguest idea of how
the College goes about planning for its future. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should endeavor to involve the whole campus community in the planning process. <16-4>

In addition, the transition from the 1988-1993 Five-Year Plan to the 1994-1999 Plan was somewhat rougher than it might have been. Ideally the 1994-1999 Plan should have picked up immediately where the preceding one left off. Instead, largely because of the difficult logistics of marshalling all the student, faculty, staff and administration participation needed to make the planning process work effectively, and because of the somewhat slower than anticipated progress of the planning work itself, the College finds itself with a year's gap between these two Five-Year Plans. One way of preventing such gaps in the future would be to begin the "pre-planning" process even earlier than was done for the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan. Ultimately it was felt that the formal preparation for a new plan need not begin until the beginning of the fourth year of implementation of the current plan--as was the case in making the transition from the 1988-1993 to the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan. But the timetable for planning does need to be spelled out, and adhered to, more rigorously than was the case in setting the 1994-1999 Five-Year Plan in motion. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The President should establish and maintain a strict timetable for the next cycle of institutional planning. <16-5>

In developing the timetable, the President may wish to consider the following suggestions:

1) During the fall semester of the fourth year of an ongoing planning cycle, a Pre-Planning Committee should do its work.

2) During the spring semester of that fourth year, Planning Committees assigned to specific areas should meet and make their recommendations.

3) During the fall semester of the fifth year, public hearings on the Planning Committees' recommendations should be held, and a final Planning Committee, to draft the overall Five-Year Plan, set up.

4) During the spring semester of the fifth year, the Planning Committee should meet and forward its prioritized recommendations to the President.

Setting out, and holding to, such a rigorous timetable would help ensure that the planning process that has clearly been of so much value to Queens College would continue to operate efficiently and thus provide optimal benefits to the campus community at large.
VII. Summary List of Recommendations on Planning

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should expand efforts to communicate with the Queens College community regarding implementation of the recommendations of the Five Year Plans. Reports should include explanation of progress toward and impediments to achievement of the goals set forth and should provide for regular discussion and re-assessment of the recommendations. <16-1>

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should increase its efforts to meld long range planning and annual budgeting, while resisting a tendency strictly to limit horizons and vision according to budget. <16-2>

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should increase the availability of budgetary information to the Planning Committees and continue its strong support for College-wide planning efforts. <16-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should endeavor to involve the whole campus community in the planning process. <16-4>

RECOMMENDATION: The President should establish and maintain a strict timetable for the next cycle of institutional planning. <16-5>
APPENDIX A: DEVELOPMENT OF THE SELF STUDY

I. Initial Planning

The planning for the Self Study began under former President Shirley Strum Kenny and Provost John A. Thorpe early in fall 1993. A decision was reached to undertake a Comprehensive Self Study with a focus on student outcomes assessment. The expectation was that development of a comprehensive self study would allow all components of the College community to participate in a thorough and searching reassessment of mission and goals, a description and analysis of what the College does well and where it fails to live up to its own expectations, efforts to integrate outcomes assessment and other measures of institutional effectiveness more fully into the College's existing review and planning processes, and development of a set of priorities for the future and recommendations for change.

In November 1993, Middle States Association liaison Dr. Arturo Iriarte visited Queens College to discuss preliminary planning for the self study and evaluation team visit. He met with the President, the Provost, the Assistant to the Provost, the Planning Committee, the PSC Collective Bargaining Group, the Executive Committee of the College Personnel and Budget Committee, the Vice Presidents, the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the Deans and the leaders of the Student Governments. In December 1993, Professors Allan Ludman and Elizabeth S. Boylan attended the Commission on Higher Education's workshop for institutions in the pre-design phase.

In September 1994, Dr. Kenny became President of SUNY at Stony Brook, and Dr. Stephen M. Curtis was appointed Acting President of Queens College. A search for a permanent successor to President Kenny concluded in May with the appointment of Dr. Allen L. Sessoms. Acting President Curtis and Provost Thorpe determined that the Self Study should proceed as planned, believing that the proposed timing of the visit—fall 1995, shortly after the arrival of Dr. Sessoms—will serve the College and the new president well. Coincidentally, the last visit by a Middle States Evaluation Team occurred during the first semester of Shirley Kenny's presidency.

II. Appointment of the Steering Committee and Organization of Task Forces

Planning for appointments to the Steering Committee and its task forces occurred during the spring 1994 semester. Working from the Characteristics of Excellence, nine broad areas for self study were identified. Calls for nominees and volunteers to staff these nine task forces went out in spring 1994 to faculty, staff and students. From the responses, the Provost appointed the members of the Steering Committee and the chairs of the nine task forces. In consultation with the task force chairs, the Provost subsequently appointed almost 100 members to the nine task forces.
For the Planning Task Force, it was decided to use the entire membership of the Planning Committee which had just completed the College's Five Year Plan for 1994-1999. Its primary role in the current Self Study was to complete an evaluation of the College's planning process and to make recommendations on how to strengthen the process on the basis of their own recent experience. In other instances, individuals who had served on recent planning sub-committees were asked to continue on task forces working on the same or a related area, in an effort to maintain continuity in the evaluation/planning process and to make best use of expertise already developed and the investigation and analysis already accomplished. This was particularly true for the Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Change. The chair and several members of her task force had just completed work on the Outcomes Assessment sub-committee for the 1994-1999 Five Year Plan. They were able to build on their knowledge base, perform an even greater inventory of current practice, and develop a detailed set of recommendations for assessment of student learning and operational effectiveness.

III. Operation of the Steering Committee

The Steering Committee began to meet in March 1994, discussing the staffing of task forces, the need for a detailed charge to each task force, and the outline for a self study design. In September, the Committee completed selection of task force members, agreed upon a time line for submission of documents, reviewed potential sources of information, and discussed the proposed outline and format of the task force reports.

Efforts were begun to keep the entire College community informed about the purpose of the self study process and about the progress being made. Several issues of EYJ, the faculty/staff newsletter, featured articles about the self study process and the work of the task forces, and posed questions for members of the College community to consider during this time of reflection and assessment. In October 1994, President Curtis highlighted the self study process in the Faculty Assembly. The Steering Committee chair met with the new editors of the student newspapers, The QUAD and Queens World, to develop regular means of communication with student readers and the local community. Both subsequently published articles on the self study process.

In December 1994, three members of the Steering Committee attended the Commission's workshop for institutions developing a self study. Later that month, the full Self Study Design was submitted to the Commission, and with minor revisions, approved. Also during December, Dr. Iriarte met with Acting President Curtis, Provost Thorpe, Steering Committee chairperson Boylan and members of the Executive Committee of the Queens College Foundation Board to insure that there was a common understanding about the purpose of the self study and external evaluation, and agreement on time-frame.

From the end of January 1995 to the end of March 1995, the Steering Committee met nine times before approving the release of a draft report. Five campus hearings occurred in early May. Following the hearings, a second draft was prepared for review by
the Steering Committee. Upon further revision in late May, the Steering Committee approved the Self Study.

In late March, Dr. Ruth Leventhal was named chair of the Evaluation Team. Dr. Leventhal visited Queens College on May 1, 1995 to review preparations for the site visit. The date of the site visit was set for October 15-18, 1995.

IV. Operation of Task Forces

A. Mission, Goals and Institutional Integrity

1. Charge to the Task Force

The major job of the Task Force is to develop a forceful statement which accurately and concisely describes the basic mission of the College. To place this statement in historical context, some preliminary study is needed. This study should carefully review the Mission Statement of the 1985; the 1986 Evaluation of the Middle States Association; and the Mission Statement in the Periodic Review Report of 1991. After a thorough discussion of these documents, the Task Force should consider the extent to which the basic mission remains unchanged. In assessing the central elements of the mission, consideration will be given to several factors: the financial crisis of the 1980's and 1990's; the changes in student population; and the new initiatives undertaken by the college in curricular development, e.g. world studies, high school-college collaboration, the Business and Liberal Arts program, and the minor in Journalism.

A statement of the mission will be drawn up after a thorough discussion of the above issues as well as any others suggested by members of the Task Force. The final report should include a comparative analysis of the 1994 mission with the description of the 1988 mission. Before writing a final draft, the mission statement will be reviewed by administrators, chairs, faculty, student leaders and alumni. Every attempt will be made to receive input from all interested parties.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force met eight times between October and December 1994. Various draft mission statements were prepared and considered by members of the Task Force in order to produce a coherent vision that could then be formulated into a single statement. The discussions were lively, incisive and (many reported) interesting; student representatives made notably valuable contributions to the discussion, in particular in encouraging the Task Force to formulate a general yet distinctive statement on the education offered by Queens College.

The old adage proved true: it is far more difficult to write a short statement than a long one. The Chair had prepared a working document listing three crucial areas of
concern: educational mission, faculty, and community. It quickly became clear from the discussion that the nature of the liberal arts education offered to the College's diverse student body would be difficult to formulate succinctly. Discussion of draft statements on educational mission made it clear that there was a disagreement of emphasis, if not of substance, within the Task Force. A substantial portion of the Task Force insisted that any mission statement should emphasize the distinctive and unique nature of a Queens College education, that Queens is not simply offering a standard liberal arts education, but a liberal arts education enriched by a vast array of curricular options tailored especially for our multi-generational and multi-ethnic student population. Other members, however, were concerned that an emphasis on the special nature of our offerings would de-emphasize the importance of the College's commitment to a liberal arts education. It was ultimately resolved that these points could be balanced in a mission statement by placing equal emphasis on both points.

B. Educational Programs

1. Charge to the Task Force

The aim is to produce a documented description and analysis of the college's educational programs. "Analysis" here means discussion of problems as well as strengths, with recommendations for solutions to the problems and timetables for the solutions. "Educational programs" means all of the college's instructional efforts, curricular and extracurricular, undergraduate and graduate, day and evening, on campus and off, credit and non-credit, together with all the related matters of library, academic support services, and learning resources.

The Task Force expects to consider: (a) consistency of programs with the college's mission; (b) effectiveness of programs and soundness of existing arrangements for curriculum innovation, program review, quality control, and data collection; (c) adequacy of both day and evening course offerings, services, enrichment activities, and library resources; (d) soundness of course requirements, both general requirements and programmatic ones; (e) prospects for recently inaugurated programs and adequacy of related library resources; (f) feasibility of further curricular innovations despite budget constraints; (g) library support of the educational mission and curricula of the college, quality of the collections and their relevance to the educational mission, availability of the access to materials on and off campus, efforts concerning college-wide information technology; (h) adequacy of support services in instructional media, academic advising, academic computing, students' English language development, and skills development; (i) extent to which the college is meeting its responsibilities in respect to nontraditional students; and (j) scope and quality of the college's non-credit programs aimed at community needs, and other community outreach activities.

The Task Force will review: existing college planning documents; polls of students, faculty, and alumni conducted for recent departmental self-studies and reviews;
students' evaluations of courses and faculty; data on departmental enrollments, majors, and
degrees conferred; data pertaining to skills of entering students and to retention and attrition
of students; and data on use of the library and of learning resources in general.

Task Force members will confer with faculty and administrators who have
expertise in particular areas of importance. The Task Force will interview department
chairs, divisional deans, department advisors of MA programs, directors of programs in
area and ethnic studies, the Assistant Provost for Interdisciplinary and Special Studies, the
Dean for Experimental Programs, the Director of Academic Advising, the chairs of the
Academic Senate’s committees on curriculum and on scholastic standards (undergraduate
and graduate), the Director of the Academic Computer Center, pre-professional advisors in
law, medicine, and teaching, the Director of the Cooperative Education Program, the
Director of Alumni Affairs, and the Director of the Environmental Teaching and Research
Center. Throughout its deliberations, the Task Force will seek to take account of views of
all interested parties. Students, faculty, alumni, and administrators will be encouraged, by
means both formal and informal, to share with the Task Force their thoughts concerning the
educational programs of the college.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force as a whole usually met once a week during fall 1994.
Smaller working groups into which the Task Force was divided for examination of
particular issues met many additional times. Many authorities from within the College were
interviewed, some by the Task Force as a whole, but most by the working groups.
Questionnaires (attached to the Task Force report) were prepared to serve as a basis for
discussion in interviews and to generate written responses for consideration by the Task
Force. One questionnaire was distributed by deans to departmental chairs and faculty;
another was distributed by Task Force working groups to directors and staff of centers and
programs collateral to departmental curricula. Reports of interviews, written responses to
questionnaires, and working group assessments of particular matters were prepared by the
groups, distributed to the entire Task Force membership, discussed at general meetings, and
incorporated by the chair into a draft report. After discussion and revision, it was approved
by consensus as the final report of the Task Force.

C. Financial and Physical Resources

1. Charge to the Task Force

The charge of the Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources is to
describe the financial and physical facilities of the college, how they have changed since the
last Middle State review, to assess the effectiveness of the budgetary and capital planning
processes of the College, and to make recommendations based on that assessment. The
basic operating premise of the Task Force is that the role of the College’s resources is to
facilitate its educational programs (as broadly defined by the Task Force on Educational
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Programs and Resources), that is, to foster the environment in which teaching, learning, research, and other supportive activities can take place and, ideally, thrive. As noted in Characteristics of Excellence, the College's financial resources should be sufficient "to assure the quality and continuity of... programs and services." Similarly, the physical facilities "should meet the needs of the institution's programs and functions."

The report of the Task Force on Resources is directed at understanding the nature of the College's resource constraints and how they have affected its educational programs. It is to focus not only on outcomes but also on processes. In a period of fiscal constraint, how well do the financial and facilities planning processes work and how do members of the College community feel about the fairness of resource allocations? The Task Force will not estimate the specific budgetary needs of individual departments, programs, or administrative offices in the College; nor will it evaluate the administrative efficiency of budget and facilities staff. Rather the Task Force will attempt to identify the general budgetary constraints and institutional inefficiencies that affect departments and programs in general.

Specifically, the Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources will:

- Describe the composition and allocation of the College's financial resources and the state of the physical plant, including: current levels and sources of funds; significant additions or deletions over the last ten years; current and projected operating budgets; procedures by which funds are allocated to the College; procedures by which funds are allocated within the College; current inventory of the physical plant, indicating recent changes; inventory of projects in process and those in planning; current maintenance levels and recent trends; the relationship between financial planning and physical facilities planning.

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the budget and the budgetary process.
  - How well do total resources meet the College's needs based on its mission and goals?
  - How flexible are resources?
  - Do internal budgetary processes promote an efficient and equitable distribution of the College's resources?
  - What are the categories of unmet budgetary needs and what are the estimated shortfalls in each category?
  - What plans does the College currently have for addressing unmet needs?
  - What plans does the College have for improving resources in light of program plans for the next few years?
  - In what other ways can the College better allocate its existing resources among competing needs (departments and categories of spending)?

- Evaluate the effectiveness of the process of planning and maintaining facilities.
  - How well do the College's physical facilities meet its needs based on its
mission and goals? What are the College's unmet facilities needs?
> How adequate is the maintenance of facilities? What are the unmet maintenance needs?
> What plans does the College have to deal with inadequacies in physical facilities and their maintenance?
> What additional recommendations can the Task Force make for improving physical facilities and maintenance?

The Task Force will take into consideration the recently completed Report of the 5-Year Planning Committee on Facilities, but shall be free to form independent conclusions about the College's needs. With respect to the analysis of both financial and physical resources, the Task Force's evaluation of allocations and/or needs must take into account a wide range of perspectives from across the campus community (students, faculty, departments, programs, support services), and the Task Force's membership will be broadly constituted with representatives from the administration, all academic divisions, and the student body.

2. Process and Procedures

This task force was constituted to provide broad representation and particular experience with the College's finances and facilities. The inclusion of administrators as Task Force members has strengthened the Task Force's ability to carry out its charge. Much of the discussion in Task Force meetings involved presentations and "interviewing" of members who bear administrative responsibilities for finances and facilities. Student members were selected who had particular interests and experience with the kinds of issues considered by the Task Force. Three subcommittees were formed: on the tax-levy budget, non-tax-levy funding sources, and facilities.

In addition to reliance on extant administrative data, the Task Force collected data by interviewing the Provost, four academic deans, the Vice President for Administration, the Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems, and a number of other administrators. Department chairs were also surveyed about the impact of financial and facilities constraints on academic programs and about perceptions of the effectiveness and fairness of the budgetary process. Students were surveyed concerning facilities as part of the larger questionnaire developed by the Task Force on Students.

1 The faculty members included a sociologist with strength in survey research and a physicist who has previously served as the College's director of facilities; these faculty members had also both served as departmental chairs. The representative of the arts division previously served as division dean for 11 years and, prior to that, as chair of the Department of Romance Languages. The Task Force Chair is a professor of economics with budgeting and administrative experience.
D. Students

1. Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force will:

(a) describe the current student population in terms of place of residence, age, gender, economic status, ethnicity, and credit load;

(b) describe each college entity that provides services for the students as to its name, purpose, structure, and program description; the availability and accessibility of the services; information distribution; the use of the service; record keeping and assessment procedures; and planning; and

(c) evaluate the effectiveness of the services by analyzing the relationship between the service provided and the mission and goals of the college; the flexibility of the services to meet changing student needs; the student demand as compared to the availability of services; college plans to equalize the demand and availability; identification of the needed services; and college plans to meet additional needs.

2. Process and Procedures

At an initial meeting of the Task Force, its charge was discussed, sub-committees selected, materials distributed, and future meetings organized. College entities providing services, opportunities, and activities for students were organized into specific groupings that then served as the focal point for each sub-committee. Subsequently, the entire Task Force met to share progress reports and discussed those reports. A questionnaire to sample student opinion was developed and distributed. The data were analyzed by Professor Dean Savage, Sociology, and his student assistants.

E. Faculty

1. Charge to the Task Force

A description and subsequent analysis will be undertaken of the following aspects of faculty life: characteristics of the faculty—their distribution with respect to discipline, rank, age, gender, ethnicity, etc.; institutional policies and procedures governing faculty employment, promotion, and retention; faculty service in the institution and to the wider academic community; faculty responsibilities and institutional support for faculty performance; faculty participation in policy and program formation and in governance of the institution; quality of instruction and institutional support for instructional quality; and opportunity for innovation and experimentation in teaching and research and institutional support for such innovation.
The analysis will focus on the extent to which the faculty are meeting the College's expectations in the areas of teaching, scholarship or creative activity, and service, and on the extent to which the College is supporting faculty work and development in these three areas. Progress towards diversifying the faculty and meeting Affirmative Action goals will be documented and analyzed.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force on Faculty met for two hours every two weeks during the fall 1994 semester. It discussed the issues of greatest concern to members and distinguished the various aspects of faculty life that would be considered further. Information on each of these aspects was gathered and analyzed, and recommendations formulated. Each member took responsibility for writing one section of the Task Force's final report. The Task Force on Faculty interviewed the Associate Provost, the deans, the Director of Institutional Research, department chairs, program directors, faculty, and students.

F. Governance

1. Charge to the Task Force

The charge to the Task Force on Governance was to: describe the legally constituted bodies that enable the College to fulfill its mission and goals; describe the roles of the Board of Trustees, CUNY Administration and the Chancellor in College Governance; describe the roles of Queens College President, Provost and Deans in College Governance; describe and evaluate the governance roles of faculty, i.e., department personnel and budget committees, department curriculum committees, divisional screening committees, College Personnel and Budget (P & B) Committee, and relevant sub-committees and/or ad hoc committees; describe and evaluate the governance roles of the Academic Senate (Senate membership and representation, Senate committees and their duties, and the role of Search and Review Committees); describe and evaluate the governance roles of the University Faculty Senate as it applies to Queens College; describe and evaluate the roles of bargaining units in governance (bargaining unit for faculty and non-instructional professionals, the Professional Staff Congress, and the bargaining unit for full and part-time administrative staff - District Council 37); describe and evaluate the relationship between governance bodies, i.e., collaboration and cooperation between CUNY administration and campus governance, and collaboration and cooperation between the College P & B, Academic Senate, students, and non-instructional professional staff; describe the current relationship between the CUNY Law School and Queens College; and identify areas in need of improvement.

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force on Governance held eleven meetings during the fall 1994 semester. The Task Force was divided into sub-committees based upon the different issues
raised in its charge. Five sessions were devoted to interviewing the Provost and Associate Provost and three other current or former administrators. Three current or former governance leaders were interviewed by sub-committees. The list of questions for the interviews was made available to interviewees before they came before the Task Force. Task Force sub-committees were charged with writing relevant parts of the document.

G. Organization and Administration

1. Charge to the Task Force

The charge to the Task Force on Organization and Administration was to:

(a) review the description of the formal organization and administrative structure of the College and its relationship to the City University of New York;
(b) describe recent documents that affect the relationship between administration and faculty within the College and between the College and the City University of New York, and evaluate their impact on the College;
(c) solicit opinions from administrators, chairs, and faculty members concerning their perceptions about the ways in which the administrative structure functions, and analyze discrepancies among the perceptions; and
(d) develop evaluative statements concerning the extent to which the administrative structure meets the needs of the College, and make recommendations as to how improvements could be made.

To accomplish the solicitation of opinions noted in item (c) above, the Task Force used the following four questions: 1. What has changed in the administration? 2. Why was it changed? 3. Was the change effective? 4. What else needs to be changed?

2. Process and Procedures

The Task Force was composed of six faculty members, one of whom serves as the Dean of Education, and one administrator, the Senior Registrar. Among the six faculty members, there were representatives of all four major academic divisions of the College and the Library. At initial meetings, basic information about the Middle States self study process, a draft of the Task Force’s charge and the College’s organizational chart and statistical profile were distributed. The Task Force then began discussions about how to solicit opinions from the campus community, and settled on four questions (cited above in the charge) which were to guide its data gathering and analyses.

---

2Two of the six currently serve as chair of departments, and two others have served as chairs within the past ten years. One present chair has also previously served as Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. One former chair presently chairs the Academic Senate and has served as Dean of Mathematics and Natural Sciences. Among the chairs and former chairs, several have been members of important subcommittees of the College Personnel and Budget Committee—the Executive Committee and the Committee of Six, the latter responsible for recommendations on tenure and promotion.
Appendix A

Questionnaires were sent to all administrators listed on the College's organizational charts in 1986, 1990, and 1994 and to all departmental chairs who served in other than an acting capacity from 1986 to 1994. Of the 122 surveys sent, only 32 were returned. The responses were evaluated and members agreed upon which issues to highlight in the Task Force Report. In the course of the Task Force's deliberations, certain issues additional to those stated in questionnaire responses were also raised. It was decided that these issues should be included in the Report given the extensive experience that Task Force members had had in the administration of the College; such issues are labeled accordingly.

H. Institutional Effectiveness and Change

1. Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force on Institutional Effectiveness and Change is charged with describing and analyzing procedures used by Queens College for evaluation of its educational effectiveness, the assignment of responsibility for this evaluation of educational effectiveness, the use to which its findings are put, and the need for additional procedures for collection of outcomes information. In accordance with this general charge, the Task Force will collect and analyze information on current College procedures and processes to assess:

(a) the quality of the student academic experience during college, that is, the extent to which students have mastered the knowledge, skills and abilities that are incorporated in the mission statement;
(b) student ethical and personal development during college, that is, the extent to which students have an understanding of themselves, other individuals and their environment and participate in activities related to those concerns;
(c) students after college, that is, the extent to which graduates have been prepared to perform as intelligent citizens after they leave the institution;
(d) faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, creative activity and service, that is, the extent to which faculty participation enhances the intellectual and psychological climate of the college;
(e) administration and staff contribution to the College, that is, the extent to which the administration provides leadership, and the administration and staff facilitate the effective operation of the College; and
(f) the quality of campus life, that is, the extent to which there is a climate conducive to student learning and socialization and hospitable to the multicultural, multilingual and multilingual community of the college.

Questiannaires were not sent to administrators or department chairs who were no longer employed by the College.
The information collected in these six areas will answer the following questions: What procedures and processes are used by the institution and who is responsible for instituting them? What procedures and processes are used by departments and who is responsible for instituting them? What procedures and processes are used in the classroom and who is responsible for instituting them? To what use are evaluative findings put? On the basis of the evaluation of existing assessment processes, the Task Force will develop recommendations as to what additional procedures and processes are still needed to assess student academic experience; student ethical and personal development; graduate performance; faculty achievement in teaching, scholarship, creative activity and service; administration and staff contribution; and the quality of campus life. It will develop recommendations concerning who should be responsible for instituting additional procedures and processes evaluating institutional effectiveness, and describe and analyze the projected use of these additional evaluative procedures.

2. Process and Procedures

The task force members held weekly meetings throughout the fall 1994 semester. Numerous documents and materials were distributed to task force members and a variety of people were interviewed. A systematic review of each of the six areas identified in the charge was undertaken to determine what procedures/processes of outcomes assessment were currently in place and who was responsible for them. Each member of the task force selected one of the six areas in the charge and investigated the following: what is the College now doing in this area, who is doing it, and what else needs to be done? The student academic experience was addressed first and required the greatest amount of time. Attention was paid to both quantitative and qualitative assessment methods as is suggested in Characteristics of Excellence. Information needed from departments was listed as each area was reviewed; these data were collected through a questionnaire compiled in late November and distributed to department chairs (see Appendix A of Task Force report). Each task force member was asked to follow-up with department chairs to insure a good response rate. Numerous sources of information were used to gather data including books, articles, reports, and surveys. A faculty member made a presentation to the Task Force on the National Educational Longitudinal Survey 1988. A complete listing of resources can be found in Appendix A of the Task Force report.

I. Planning

1. Charge to the Task Force

The Task Force on Planning established the following aims:

1. To present a coherent and comprehensive plan for the College, to be implemented over the course of the next five years (1994-99). This plan should particularly address the following issues, recognized in previous planning work as of special urgency for the College: student advisement; outcomes assessment; curricular development; faculty
hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, and development; the place of graduate education at
the College; implementation of new computer and communications technologies; library
services; and renovation and maintenance of the physical plant.

2. To assess the College's current planning mechanisms, examining how
effective the establishment and realization of planning objectives has been. In this
assessment, the Task Force should be particularly concerned to evaluate how the planning
process at the College is linked to resource allocation—that is, how an ideal sense of where
the College should move in the future is tempered by an awareness of the necessary
limitations to planning imposed by budgetary considerations.

2. Process and Procedures

The Planning Task Force met weekly during the spring 1994 semester, as it
drafted the College's Five-Year Plan for 1994-1999, presented to former President Kenny
in June 1994. During the spring meetings, even as it did the actual work of planning for
the next five years, the Task Force began to assess the College's overall process of
institutional planning, discussing, for instance, the relative merits of a five-year plan that
would try to address all the College's needs and a plan, more limited in scope, that would
instead target the College's most urgent problems.

During the fall 1994 semester, the Task Force met less frequently, primarily
to gather response from the larger College community to the "Recommendations,
distributed across the campus at the start of the 1994-1995 academic year. Two extensive
public hearings were held on October 12 and 13, at which time the Task Force heard
responses—objections, agreements, further recommendations—to its Plan and answered
questions provoked by that Plan. The Task Force met again several times late in the fall
semester to draft and revise its final report.

The Task Force included student representatives, from both graduate and
undergraduate programs and from both day and evening sessions (one student is also an
elected member of the student government); faculty from the College's three divisions, the
School of Education, and the Library; representatives of the College Deans and of the
Executive Committees of the College-wide Personnel and Budget Committee and Academic
Senate; and several of those administrators (Vice Presidents and the Provost) responsible for
implementing most of the Planning Committee's recommendations. Meetings in December
1994 gave Task Force members the opportunity to respond to the draft report, and a fully
revised version was then prepared based upon suggestions for revision. The revised report
was approved by the full Task Force in December 1994.
The Planning Committee on Academic Program and Support Services Review was appointed by
President Shirley Strum Kenny in 1987, in response to concerns expressed by the 1986 Middle States
Association visiting team over the lack of formal academic program review. The Planning Committee
proposed a review program consisting of an intensive departmental review and a review by a selected
external panel. The recommendations of this Planning Committee, endorsed by the College Planning
Committee, formed the basis of the process which was initiated by the Office of the Provost in the
1989-90 academic year. Some of the procedures have been modified for the reviews initiated in 1992
and beyond in response to new policies being promulgated by the University.

The self-study is designed to encourage members of a department to analyze its curriculum in relation
to the goals of the department, the College and the University; to investigate the effectiveness of its
curriculum in relation to the desired outcomes (as perceived by students, alumni, and faculty
members); to review various procedures to determine strengths and weaknesses; to consider needed
changes; to evaluate the effects of current levels of resources on the ongoing programs; and to
suggest needed changes in program, department organization, and resources. A self-study that is
exclusively laudatory or damning is likely to be less useful to the department and the College, than
one which tries to describe as accurately as possible the current status and needs of specific units.
Following the department's self-study, a panel of external reviewers (two or three depending on the
program's size and structure), will visit the campus for two days to meet with members of the
department, administrators and students.

The model of internal self-study, followed by external review, parallels the accreditation process used
by the Middle States Association. They describe the purposes of the two elements as follows:

The self-study allows an institution to analyze "its functions, appraise its educational effectiveness, review
its on-going planning procedures, and discover means by which its work can be strengthened." The primary
function of an evaluation visit by a team of experienced academic colleagues from other institutions "is to
study an institution's analysis of its own work and to give the institution the views of competent outsiders
on the validity of that self-analysis...It is a healthy sign when their work can be predominantly
Corroboration of an institution's own findings, a cause for serious concern when they identify major
problems undetected by the institution."

The departmental review should be conducted in a manner consistent with these stated purposes.
A. THE INTERNAL DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW AND REPORT

It is recommended that the department chairperson appoint a departmental review committee to prepare the self-study report. Reports from other institutions and accrediting agencies indicate that the generation of the report will be facilitated if a small core of full-time, tenured, senior faculty are involved in the data gathering and writing of the report. Obviously, as broad a representation of the faculty, students, staff, and alumni as possible should be included in the data pool.

The Provost’s Office and the Office of Institutional Research are prepared to meet with department P&B’s and review committees to assist them in any way needed. The Office of Institutional Research will provide a historical record of FTE’s produced; students graduating with degrees from the department; the number of full-time faculty, instructional staff, and support staff assigned to a department. Department’s requiring additional information should request it from the Office’s Director, Dr. Margaret McAuliffe, 997-5788. Representatives from the department will meet with the Provost, Associate Provost and Dean prior to initiating the review process to review the guidelines, expectations and timetable.

The Self-Study is a report developed by the department’s faculty. The major purpose of the internal review is to provide an analysis of the current status of the department and a projection of where the department aspires to be in the next five years or so. As such, the review should project needed changes, the resources necessary to make the changes, and the plans to obtain needed resources.

A recommended format and topics to be covered are indicated below and are designed to assist the department in developing a comprehensive self-study report. While departments are free to organize the information as appropriate for their discipline, it is expected that the major elements will be covered in the self-study report. Departments should check with the Provost’s Office if they wish to deviate significantly from this format.

The Self-Study Report will be presented to the Dean, the Provost and the President, and to members of the external review panel. New CUNY guidelines require that a copy be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. The Self-Study Report is considered a privileged document, that is, the College administration will not release it to others; the department is free to share the report as it chooses.
Self-Study Topics

Mission

- A statement of the department's sense of itself and its relation to the mission of the College and the University.

Resources

- A statement of the current state of the resources (human, physical and fiscal) which are available to carry out the department's goals and objectives, and an evaluation of prospects for the future.

- An analysis of the department's sources of funding, both tax-levy and non tax-levy support, including grants awarded to individual faculty members. Means for encouraging faculty to obtain external support for instructional and research purposes should be described.

- An analysis of the scope and adequacy of centralized facilities such as the library, film library, computer hardware and software, and learning resource centers to support the instructional and research needs of the department's programs.

Faculty

- A description of the current faculty:
  - their number,
  - teaching and research specializations,
  - publications,
  - extra-departmental teaching in the College and Graduate Center,
  - participation in College committees.

- The composition and quality of the faculty should be analyzed with respect to:
  - breadth of preparation,
  - range of graduate schools attended,
  - affirmative action goals,
  - age distribution,
  - participation in the governance of the College.

Tabular presentation of this information is encouraged. Appendices should contain current
curriculum vitae of all faculty and any evaluations of the department by professionals which are on public record.

- A description of recent faculty recruitment activities, including the search process and selection criteria.

- A description of departmental procedures for the evaluation of faculty (and staff, as appropriate) for re-appointment, tenure and promotion.

- A description of the department’s efforts to facilitate faculty development, both in teaching and research.

- A description of the means by which adjunct faculty are recruited, selected, supervised and evaluated.

The Curriculum and Enrollments

- A presentation and analysis of the history of enrollments for the past ten years, based on data provided by the Office of Institutional Research. This should include data both on the number of majors (plus minors if applicable) and graduates, and on FTE student enrollments.

- An outline of the contribution of the department to the liberal arts and sciences goals of the Division and the College, both generally, as well as specifically for those courses qualifying as LASAR requirements. Include a description of how LASAR courses are reviewed in order to insure that the goals of LASAR are being met.

- An outline of the majors program with course descriptions appended, including a description of the typical path(s) of majors, gathered from transcripts as well as from current students. Comparisons should be drawn between the College's major and those offered by other reference colleges, both within and outside of CUNY. The requirements for the major should be analyzed with respect to the expectation that students should study more advanced and cumulatively integrated subject matter as they progress toward graduation, and with respect to the diversity of talents and ways of learning in the student body.

- The quality of advisement of majors and the frequency of student-faculty contact outside of class should be evaluated.

- Projections for the growth (or reduction) in the number of majors, and for new or revised direction in the major field, should be presented.

- An analysis of the relationship between specialized and pre-professional programs and the department's major, particularly those subject to certification by external agencies.
• A description of the role and relationship of the department to the College's School of General Studies and Summer Session, including a review of the process by which SGS and summer offerings are monitored.

• An analysis of the participation of non-majors in the department's courses, including a description of the typical paths of non-majors as they use the department's offerings.

• A description of the contribution of the department to other majors, interdisciplinary courses and programs, MA programs, Ph.D. programs, etc. The administrative, financial and academic roles played by departmental faculty in the programs of the CUNY Graduate School should be explained.

• A description of the range of "special programs" offered to matriculants, non-matriculants, and students with "special" needs. This includes, but is not limited to, remedial and developmental programs for academically disadvantaged students, and to programs for the physically challenged.

• A description of the means by which the department applies assessment mechanisms which assure the quality and viability of its programs and courses.

Students

• A summary and analysis of the career choices and perceptions of a random sample of recent graduates from the major, derived from the ETS standardized questionnaire and supplemented, as the department sees fit, by additional mail or telephone interviews.

• A summary and analysis of perceptions of current undergraduate majors based on the ETS standardized questionnaire, with additional discussions/focus groups as desired.

Critical Analysis and Priorities for the Future

• A description and analysis of the department's strengths and problems, proposed changes, and unsolved problems on which an external review panel might provide counsel, as viewed by the department's staff. Special attention should be given to issues regarding faculty recruitment and retention, especially with regard to women and minorities.

• A plan for the future direction of the department, consistent with the mission and future direction of the College. See the attached document for the statement of the mission of the College.
B. THE SELECTION OF THE EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Given the multiple purposes of Queens College academic programs, the external review personnel must be recruited from several pools of expertise. Visitors based in the discipline under review should have relevant experience in at least one of the following areas:

a) liberal arts and sciences programs at the highest levels of quality;
b) academic research at the highest levels of quality;
c) large scale (preferably public) college education at the highest levels of quality.

The department will furnish the Dean with names of those individuals who fulfill the various expertise functions listed above, along with pertinent biographical information about the potential reviewers (e.g. current position, area of specialization, relevant administrative experience, where and when the Ph.D. was granted, other distinguishing academic credentials). Additional names will be sought by the Dean from other knowledgeable persons. The Dean will obtain approval from the President and Provost regarding persons to make up the pool of reviewers. The Dean will formalize all arrangements with members of the review panel. Appropriate honoraria will be offered to the chairperson and members of the review panel.

C. GUIDELINES FOR THE SITE VISIT

The departmental Self-Study Report will be sent to the review panel members by the Dean at least two weeks in advance of the visit. The site visit will typically involve two full days on campus, consisting of interviews and the drafting of the final report. The Dean, in consultation with members of the Department, will establish a schedule for the visit. Minimally, it will include:

- a charge to the reviewers by the President and meeting with the Dean and Provost;
- a tour of facilities;
- examination of additional material, e.g. course syllabi, sample examinations and student work, scholarly or creative works of the faculty, etc.;
- meeting with the Chairperson and P&B Committee;
- individual meetings with all full time faculty;
- meetings with adjunct personnel, graduate students and staff;
- meetings with students, and if possible, recent graduates;
- attending classes;
- an exit interview with the President, Provost and Dean.
The focus of the panel during the site visit should be on rounding out their information about the department under review; evaluating the department's performance relative to teaching, research and support; identifying problems and issues for discussion in the curriculum, teaching or research efforts of the department; and making suggestions wherever appropriate. The Dean will make arrangements with the review team concerning submission of their final report. It is expected that it will be submitted within two weeks of the site visit.

D. DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER'S REPORT

As soon as the Dean receives the Report, he/she will distribute it to the department, the President and Provost. The department will then examine the report for accuracy, and analyze its recommendations. It is expected that it will serve as a basis for broad discussion within the department. The department will develop a written response to the Report, correcting factual errors or misperceptions if any, and offering a plan to incorporate the suggestions made by the reviewers into the department's action agenda for the next 5-7 years. The goals articulated by the department for itself should be as explicit as possible. The department's written response should be developed as quickly as possible, no later than one month after receiving the reviewer's report.

E. MEETING WITH THE COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION

When the department's response is complete, the Dean will set up a meeting of the department's P&B with the President, Provost and Dean attending. The focus of the meeting will be the reviewer's report and the department's response. The goal of the meeting is to establish a set of goals for the department for the next 5-7 years, and to work out a timetable to effect agreed upon change. The Provost will summarize the goals and timetable in a document called an Academic Plan, which will be given to the department, and which will accompany the department's Self-Study Report, the reviewers' report and the department's response to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.
QUEENS COLLEGE OF CUNY
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW
TIMETABLE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CHECKLIST

Late spring - Selection of departments for review during next academic year.

Late spring - September
- Organizational meetings with departments, Divisional Dean, Provost, Associate Provost and Director of Institutional Research to go over objectives and to outline the process.

September - December
- Writing of Self-Study by departments.

September - October
- Survey of faculty, student and alumni perceptions.

December 1
- Deans develop list of potential external reviewers with department, and submit list to Provost for final selection by President. Each name should be accompanied by brief statement of qualifications and affiliation.

December 15
- Department submits Self-Study to Dean and Provost for review. Dean works with Department on editing as needed, and checks that Self-Study contains current statistical information on department's FTE's, graduates, etc. When approved by Dean and Provost, site visit is scheduled. Self-Study is mailed to reviewers by Dean. If incomplete, Self-Study returned to the department for further work.

December - January
- President and Provost approve list of potential external reviewers and identify reviewers to chair site visit team. Dean begins scheduling of site visits for departments whose Self-Studies were approved.

Late February - late March
- Site visits coordinated by Dean. Dean responsible for travel plans, hotel accommodations and other local arrangements. Schedule of meetings to be arranged by Dean and to include:
  ----President's charge to reviewers, attended by Provost, Associate Provost and Dean;
  ----tour of appropriate physical facilities;
  ----meetings with chairman and P&B; with individual faculty; with support staff; with students (graduate and undergraduate) with alumni;
  ----auditing of selected classes;
--- time for reviewers' discussion and writing;
--- exit interview with President, Provost, Associate Provost, and Dean.

Prior to site visit

Dean is responsible for insuring that President, Provost and Associate Provost have complete, final versions of the Self-Study including all appendices, a site visit schedule and brief biographies on the reviewers.

Within two weeks of site visit and no later than April 15th

Report of site visit team due in Dean's Office. Dean to distribute report to Department, President, Provost and Associate Provost. Department (all full time faculty) reviews report and develops brief response statement, to be forwarded to President, Provost, Associate Provost and Dean within one month of receipt of the reviewers' report.

No later than mid-May

Meeting of department's Personnel and Budget Committee with President, Provost, Associate Provost and Dean to discuss Self-Study, site visit report, department's response statement, and future directions of the department.