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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 Caucus 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 fall 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 EXI 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:** Department 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.
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>20</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>1008</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 insure 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.g.
on these matters.

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, Gittlesons 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 ensure 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 nonvoting ex officio member of the College P & B and 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>