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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 1,256 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 11-1: CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL TIME FACULTY - APRIL 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Avg Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Amer</td>
<td>Rican</td>
<td>Amer</td>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disting Prof</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
<td>9.1 (50-10%)</td>
<td>9 (90%)</td>
<td>1 (10%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>280 (43%)</td>
<td>241-39 (88-14%)</td>
<td>246 (88%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Prof</td>
<td>180 (27%)</td>
<td>57-83 (54-66%)</td>
<td>156 (87%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst Prof</td>
<td>116 (18%)</td>
<td>58-58 (50-59%)</td>
<td>59 (59%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inst-II</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>0.1 (0.100%)</td>
<td>1 (100%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>13 (2%)</td>
<td>4.9 (31-69%)</td>
<td>8 (69%)</td>
<td>2 (15%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>58 (9%)</td>
<td>31-27 (55-47%)</td>
<td>38 (60%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>440-217 (67-33%)</td>
<td>517 (75%)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Numbers in parentheses refer to Queens faculty on Queens lines plus Queens faculty on Graduate Center lines.
2. 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 Bitman, 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
II. Institutional Policies and Procedures Governing Faculty Employment, Re-appointment, 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 initiated 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 of 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\(^6\) 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

\(^6\) Data on teaching load, class size and related statistics may be found in the Queens College Fact Book, 1995.
faculty lines.

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 service 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. Nominations 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 Pitdown... 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. Faculty research 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 Bittner 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 metal 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 totaling $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

---

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
restitution 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 tenure

---

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-I>

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-II>

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-III>

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. <11-13>

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>