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I. Introduction

The findings in this chapter are based on the results of questionnaires that were sent to all administrators listed on the College's organizational charts in 1986, 1990, and 1994, and to all departmental chairs who served in other than an acting capacity from 1986 to 1994. Of the 122 surveys sent, only 32 were returned. The small sample size may not be truly representative of the group which the Task Force hoped to gain information from. The Task Force also drew from the knowledge of its members, many of whom have served or are serving in a variety of administrative and leadership roles.

Organizational changes since 1986 must be interpreted within the context of the reduced staffing that has significantly affected operations within Queens College. Offices have been combined, and others eliminated, with functions reassigned to other positions within the College in ways that may or may not represent the most functional structuring of the College. Areas that require further review are identified, with the knowledge that budgets may affect the extent to which change can be made. The Task Force noted that there were many favorable comments about the responsiveness of the Queens College administration as a whole and of specific individuals. A full account of these responses may be found in material appended to the final report issued by the Task Force on Organization and Administration.

II. Changes in Overall Organization and Administrative Structure

The 1986 organizational chart1 (Figure 13-1) named 37 positions excluding the Academic Senate, Alumni Office and Student Activities Corporation. However, two positions—Associate Dean of Teacher Education and Assistant Dean of the School of General Studies—were not included on the 1986 chart, and five other positions included on the 1994-95 chart existed in 1986 but were not shown on the 1986 chart. With these individuals, the College administration was composed of 44 persons. The 1994 organizational chart (Figure 13-2) lists 49 positions excluding the Executive Secretary to the President, the Executive Assistant to the Provost, and the Executive Director of the Student Services Corporation. Of these 49 positions, four are vacant as of May 19952, leaving a total of 45 filled positions on the 1994 chart. With these adjustments, the net increase in positions between 1986 and 1994 is one (44 to 45). Significant changes are noted in Table 13-1.

---

1 Chart taken from 1986 Self-Study, p.119.

2 VP Institutional Relations, Associate Dean of Special Programs, Director of the Godwin-Ternbach Museum and Business Manager.
### TABLE 13-1: COMPARISON OF ORGANIZATIONAL CHARTS—1986 & 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1986 Chart</th>
<th>1994 Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Provost—Academic Administrative Services</td>
<td>Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Graduate Studies and Research</td>
<td>Position eliminated Assistant to Provost for Graduate Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of the School of General Studies</td>
<td>Position eliminated Assistant Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Dean of SGS</td>
<td>Dean of School of Education Position eliminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Teacher Education</td>
<td>Dean of Experimental Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>Assistant to Provost for Academic Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President Student Affairs</td>
<td>Vice President of Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President External Affairs</td>
<td>Vice President of Institutional Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Vice President/Executive Asst.</td>
<td>Deputy to President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vice President of College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Vice President of Public Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of Affirmative Action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers mask what occurred over the course of a decade: there are substantive changes to note. First, at the vice presidential level, a new Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems was added and the titles of some positions upgraded. Most Assistant Vice President titles on the 1986 chart are now Vice Presidents and the Vice President/Provost is now a Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs/Provost. Some vice presidential titles have been modified, e.g., Finance & Business to Administration; and External Affairs to Institutional Relations.

The new position of Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems was created in response to a recommendation in the previous Middle States report that there be more extensive planning at Queens College. This position and the accompanying planning advisory committees set up by the President were seen by some on the Task Force as bypassing faculty governance in the area of college-wide planning. However, it should be noted that there was little or no objection or comment from the faculty when this position and the advisory committees were created.
The Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems is also responsible for the new QUASAR system (the student information management system), and for the Library, Academic Computer Center, and Administrative Computer Center, which were formerly under the Provost's office. Several respondents felt that assigning these four major offices to the Vice President for College Affairs, Planning and Information Systems was a positive development because it addressed the campus's need to coordinate its disparate information systems and processes.

Regarding the upgrade of assistant vice presidents to full vice president titles, several Task Force members believed that there was a resulting change in the culture of how decisions were made concerning the major directions the College would take. From the academic perspective, the new arrangement had deans giving input to the Provost who was one among the group of vice presidents advising the President in decision-making. Some Task Force members felt that the deans did not have the opportunity to articulate the needs of their units as directly within the higher administration as they once did.\(^3\)

Second, there appears to be an increase in the number of titles below the Vice President level now included on the 1994 organizational chart, though there have also been some deletions. New titles with new functions include: Dean for Experimental Programs, Director of Affirmative Action, Director of the Louis Armstrong House and Archives, Director of Special Events, Director of the Godwin-Ternbach Museum, and QUASAR Implementation Manager.

Third, some positions already existed at Queens College (some under different titles) but are now designated at the Director or Executive Director level. These include the Director of Telecommunication Services, Director of Security, Director of Campus Distribution Center, Director of Research and Sponsored Programs, Executive Director of Admissions, Marketing, and Scholarship Services, and Executive Director of Continuing Education. (It should be noted that some of these titles are not on the tax levy budget.)

Similarly, when the position of Dean of Graduate Studies and Research was eliminated, the position of the Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies was created by transferring and expanding the responsibilities of the Dean's Executive Assistant. The Director of Special Programs has been at the Associate Dean level; the deanship is currently vacant and an Acting Director is in place. The position of Business Manager (currently vacant) is now included on the organizational chart. Although these positions may have existed before but had not been included on the 1986 organizational chart, the most current chart includes more positions reporting to the Vice Presidents.

Fourth, two dean-level positions, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research and Dean

\(^3\) In January 1995, Acting President Curtis held a Presidential retreat in which Vice Presidents, Deans, the Director of Affirmative Action, and Special Counsel discussed issues concerning the status and future directions in their areas of responsibility.
of the School of General Studies, were eliminated and some of the responsibilities for those positions shifted elsewhere. Issues surrounding these positions will be discussed in the next section. The Dean of the CUNY Law School at Queens College is not listed on the 1994 organizational chart because the Law School is no longer under the administrative supervision of Queens College; the Dean reports directly to the Chancellor of the University. Finally, the Academic Senate is not listed on the 1994 chart. Presumably this change was made because the Academic Senate is a governance body as opposed to an administrative unit. (For funding purposes, it is administered now by the Provost.)

The Task Force on Organization and Administration felt that the President would be well advised to review the need for the vice presidential positions specified in the 1994 organizational chart and the reporting structure within the College to determine whether particular offices should report to different Vice Presidents or other administrators given the new realities as to how those offices function. Two offices mentioned specifically were Financial Aid and the Registrar. In view of the fact that a new president has been appointed and that administrative reductions may have to be made to meet cutbacks in State support:

**RECOMMENDATION:** The President should review the entire organizational structure of the College. <13-1>

III. Analysis of Three Deanships

A. Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

Respondents cited the loss of this position more than any other change. The Dean resigned in 1989; a search was held and several candidates identified. In response to a directive from the CUNY Central Administration to cut the Executive Compensation Plan by 20% in two years, the President left the deanship vacant and removed several other administrative titles from the Plan. Initially, the President intended that the deanship would be filled when the financial pressures eased. It became clear within a year or two that the financial condition instead had worsened. The position was eliminated to comply with the Chancellor’s instructions to reduce executive positions further.

The academic functions of the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research were assigned to the four academic deans. Each dean assumed responsibility for the entire undergraduate and graduate curriculum, staffing, and scholastic standards for departments within their purview. The Executive Assistant to the Graduate Studies Dean became Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies, reporting initially to the Provost, and most recently to the

---

4 One positive outcome of this curricular integration is the development of a new interdisciplinary Masters degree in Social Science under the leadership of the Dean of Social Sciences. Without this new MA, several departments were grappling with the likelihood of elimination of their master’s programs because of insufficient enrollment.
Associate Provost. She oversees the Graduate Studies Office and works with the academic deans in implementing Queens College policy having to do with graduate status. There was general agreement by respondents and by Task Force members that this is a very lean and highly effective operation. However, several respondents and Task Force members were concerned that the Assistant to the Provost could not advocate effectively for the academic interests of graduate programs. It was their perception that a dean with faculty standing is needed to serve as a voice for the graduate program, to articulate its mission, to plan for the future, and to negotiate faculty and program matters with the Graduate Center.

It is difficult to judge to what extent the elimination of the deanship has contributed to a perceived decline in graduate programs. Queens College has suffered so greatly in its financial resources in the interim that such perceived declines may be attributed more to substantial fiscal losses than to the loss of the graduate dean and reassignment of functions elsewhere. The Associate Provost reports that the Graduate Office is currently undergoing program review. She and the Provost are working to identify actual deficiencies in the present status of the Graduate Office and will address them accordingly.

Respondents were also concerned with the reassignment of research responsibilities formerly overseen by the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research. Some respondents and Task Force members lamented the elimination of the "faculty-in-residence" program—a competitive program in which faculty members were given course release(s) to work on research projects. The program funded many more faculty members, albeit to a lesser extent, than the current Presidential Research Awards program. Funds available to the Dean for the "faculty-in-residence" program have been re-assigned to the Dean's Council (Deans of Arts and Humanities, Education, Mathematics and Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences) and have been used for a variety of research-support purposes.

The Dean of Graduate Studies and Research also supervised the Office of Grants and Contracts, now the Office for Research and Sponsored Programs and reporting to the Provost. Task Force members noted the highly effective operations of the Research Office but they also felt that an academic leader was needed to identify promising grant opportunities, to help in the conceptual development of proposals, and to advocate on behalf of faculty members and their proposals.

In short, respondents mentioned the Dean of Graduate Studies and Research most frequently when reflecting upon administrative changes since 1986. The functions of the Dean have been assigned to the academic deans, the Assistant to the Provost for Graduate Studies, and the Director of Research and Sponsored Programs. In spite of the reassignments, several respondents and Task Force members felt that the administration should restore the position of Dean of Graduate Studies and Research.

**B. Dean of the School of General Studies**

Similarly, the retirement of the Dean of the School of General Studies occurred at a
time of severe financial pressure to reduce the Executive Compensation Plan. The question became what to do in the short and long term with respect to the School of General Studies (SGS) and many other functions, particularly community outreach activities, that its Dean had carefully developed over the years. SGS had come to mean the office which looked out for evening and non-traditional students, as well as for ethnic and area studies programs. While it was viewed as essential that services for these student groups and interdisciplinary programs be preserved, the actual differentiation of Queens College faculty and curriculum into day and evening divisions had not existed for decades, leaving open the possibility of eliminating this "school" and its dean as long as the other ongoing functions were reassigned and maintained. This was accomplished by appointing the Associate Dean of SGS as Assistant Provost with specific responsibilities for evening student services, coordination of evening offerings, ethnic/area studies, Worker Education and Adult Collegiate Education (ACE). This move brought the Provost's Office into a more direct connection to the interdisciplinary ethnic/area studies programs and other student services. According to the Associate Provost, this enabled the Provost's Office to work directly with the academic deans to ensure that evening and non-traditional students received appropriate programming and services. However, it should be noted that some informants and Task Force members believe that the needs of evening students are not being represented adequately by this arrangement. They feel that a Dean, independent of the Provost's Office, can better advocate for and monitor the needs of evening students.

C. Dean of Experimental Programs

To initiate and operate innovative programs that do not fit comfortably within the structured academic domains of the College's departmental and divisional structure, former President Kenny established a unit for "experimental programs" to be headed by a dean. The Dean also had a mandate to raise non-tax levy money for program operations and to communicate the curricular innovations to students, faculty, administrators, boards, funding agencies and potential donors. This mandate was in response to the 1985 Middle States Evaluation Team's recommendation that the College establish connections with advisory boards and other new sources of support. All programs in the Office of the Dean for Experimental Programs initially had connections with an external board or agency:\footnote{In 1993, three programs that have no external board were transferred into the Office of the Dean of Experimental Programs; they are Cooperative Education, Women's Studies and Study Abroad.}

Business and Liberal Arts (BALA) with the Corporate Advisory Board, Journalism with the Journalism Advisory Board, Undergraduate Minority Program funded by the Mellon Foundation,\footnote{This program prepares minority undergraduates for admission to Ph.D. programs; other colleges receiving funding through this program include Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Wesleyan. The Foundation has judged the Queens program the most successful in the nation because of the program's design and its record of placing the highest percentage (63%) of Mellon graduates in funded, full-time Ph.D. programs.} Collaborative with Queens High Schools in Journalism and History funded by NEH, Summer Journalism Workshop for Minority Students funded by Dow Jones/NY Times, and scholarships and programmatic support funded by the Mitsui Foundation. In
the seven years of her tenure, the Dean has been responsible for raising over $1.3 million and for assisting the President and Vice President for Institutional Relations in their fund-raising activities.

Members of the Task Force felt strongly that this position shifted the locus of support for innovation from the faculty and departments to its office. Even the dean feels that "experimental programs" does not appropriately reflect the interdisciplinary, externally-funded nature of most of the Office's programs. Faculty members felt that significant resources were diverted for these experimental programs during a time when individual departments and programs had to make adjustments to smaller budgets; they may not have known the extent to which external funding has been obtained to support the new initiatives. The creation of this office coupled with the elimination of two other deanships was perceived as a message that support for innovation and change had shifted from the faculty and the academic area to the presidential level. If, however, this deanship was created to assist faculty in planning for experimental programs, the question was raised as to how faculty members get access to this office and, more importantly, to the process of planning for change. Improved communication may be part of the answer. The challenge for the Dean is to balance ongoing innovation and fund-raising with the administration of existing programs.

**D. Summary on Deanships**

Several Task Force members as well as survey respondents felt strongly that the Deans of Graduate Studies and Research and of the School of General Studies should be restored. While restoration may be impossible, it is appropriate that a review of the functioning of all deans' positions take place. Therefore,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Provost should review the structure and function of all deanships. <13-2>

**IV. Analysis of Other Administrative Positions**

**A. Vice President of Student Services and Dean of Students**

The major concern about the structure of this Vice President's position was whether there was a duplication of duties between it and the Dean of Students. Several members of the Task Force discussed examples from other colleges in which the Dean of Students was the individual assigned all functions dealing with students—namely, admissions, retention, scholastic standards, counseling, and student activities. As to the Dean of Students position, questions arose over the desirability of the current reporting structure, whereby the Dean formally reports to the Vice President for Student Services and maintains a "dotted line" reporting to the Provost in his capacity as Chair of the Department of Student Personnel and as a member of the group of deans who meet monthly with the Provost.
B. Affirmative Action Officer

The Affirmative Action Officer position has matured from part-time status to full-time as of fall 1994. Until 1990, a faculty member was assigned on a part-time basis to attend to affirmative action matters in the area of hiring. The faculty member worked closely with the Labor Designee/Legal Advisor to the President. After 1990, the Affirmative Action Office was headed by a Director who also served as Executive Assistant to the President. In fall 1994, the Affirmative Action Officer became a full-time position (acting) reporting to the President. In addition to her duties with respect to hiring and record keeping, the Affirmative Action Officer also chairs the campus-wide Affirmative Action Committee and the Presidential Advisory Council on Multiculturalism, which are composed of faculty and administrators. The upgrade of this position to full-time is consistent with practice at the major senior colleges in the CUNY system.

V. General Comments about College Organization and Administration

A. Knowledge About Administration

The remarks of respondents and of Task Force members indicated that decisions about changes in the administrative structure of Queens College have been made at the level of Vice President and above. Only one respondent indicated that he/she was involved in making a decision concerning a major administrative change. It is not surprising to find that most informants were unaware of administrative changes unless the decisions affected them directly. In fact, the Task Force members who are chairs of departments had only a moderate degree of awareness of the scope of administrative offices and their current incumbents. These Task Force members stated repeatedly throughout the meetings that they did not know about new directions taken in certain initiatives. For example, all knew about the University’s College Preparatory Initiative (CPI), but the former chair of History did not know that the CPI requirement for American history was to come on line in 1997 and therefore may affect the courses offerings in that department. Task Force members were also generally unaware of the details of ad hoc committees set up under severe budgetary pressure in order to address quickly issues such as library resource allocation.

These perceptions did lead to the realization that greater communication of administrative structure and actions should be fostered. The organizational chart as well as other important administrative information should be clearly presented to chairs and faculty. Perhaps this information could be included in the data book currently being developed in the Provost’s Office. Discussion in the Steering Committee led to the recommendation that the organizational charts should be included in the College phonebooks.

Regarding other means of communication, various suggestions came up. The further use of EYI, the College’s biweekly faculty-staff newsletter, is felt to be desirable. As the College becomes more “on line,” the use of electronic bulletin boards may have benefits for the timely dissemination of information and exchange of ideas. The need for an
annual report was discussed, as was the need for revision of the faculty handbook. In terms of positive developments, the institution of orientation programs for new faculty and new department chairs was noted. The consensus from the questionnaires and discussions is there still are substantial gaps in the knowledge of College administrative functioning among those who hold leadership positions at the College. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should create a better system of communication and sharing of information among members of the administration, department chairs, and faculty. <13-3>

B. Assignment and Supervision of Office Support Staff

In late spring 1991, new guidelines were issued concerning the allocation of secretaries; they were based on the recommendations of a committee composed of faculty members and administrators. This new allocation system was developed in response to major budget reductions that made it difficult to assign secretaries to departments based on past practice. Within one year, the College experienced difficulties in funding even this reduced allocation system. The Director of Human Resources moved some full time secretaries from one department to another to fill major gaps in service. Although this method of assignment quickly responded to need, it also led to a situation where chairs and deans felt that they had limited say in the selection of departmental secretaries.

Task Force members who have been or are currently serving as chairs and deans stated that they were concerned about the split in authority and responsibility over the secretaries assigned to academic offices. It has been made clear that the Director of Human Resources has ultimate authority and responsibility for all matters concerning the assignment and evaluation of office support staff at Queens College. Yet, the secretaries function within the specific contexts of individual departments. Recently, office administrative and clerical staff have been assigned to departments without any, or at most minor, input from the Chair. The Chair (or designee) should at least be able to interview prospective candidates. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should review the procedures by which office support staff are allocated to and selected by departments. <13-4>

C. Function of Ad Hoc Committees

Members of the Task Force discussed the various committees and boards that the President created since the last Middle States Association Self Study. Currently ad hoc committees function to implement presidential initiatives in several areas. The Presidential Advisory Council on Multiculturalism addresses the need to create a campus responding to the growing diversity of students. The Council is composed of faculty, staff,
lministrators, and students. The President also created the Five Year Planning Committee in response to the 1986 Middle States Report. With financial support from the Queens College Foundation, former President Kenny established the President's Research Award, the President's Award for Excellence in Teaching, and the Mini-grant Programs for innovative Teaching and for Departmental Diversity. The President appoints faculty members to serve on the selection committees for these awards.

In addition to revitalizing the Queens College Foundation Board, which has increased the fund raising efforts of the College, former President Kenny established several additional advisory boards. The Corporate Advisory Board has had a major impact on the campus by nurturing the growth of the undergraduate Business and Liberal Arts (BALA) program. Members of the Corporate Advisory Board have supported the BALA program by teaching courses, by offering mentoring experiences for BALA students, by advising on curriculum, and by mentoring students in experiential projects such as BALA Enterprises, a private non-profit business which markets personal items with the Queens College logo. Another outgrowth of recommendations from the Corporate Advisory Board has been the establishment of the Center for the New American Workforce (CNAW). CNAW's mission is to secure funding for projects that help private and public organizations respond to workplace issues such as hiring, training, and evaluation that involve persons from diverse backgrounds. CNAW has held conferences and seminars as well as published timely information about the current workforce.

The Journalism Advisory Board has had a role similar to the Corporate Advisory Board in developing the undergraduate Journalism minor, which now enrolls 200 students. The Arts Board provides leadership in fund-raising for the arts at Queens College and advises the Dean of Arts and Humanities and departments within this division about its programs.

The President now chairs three committees that review and approve expenditures involving student activities: the Auxiliary Enterprise Association, College Association Board, and Student Union Board of Directors. For the first board, the President's role has changed from advisory to one of direction, a change that came about through a CUNY Board of Trustees decision. There has been a steady growth in the number of these external boards, and Task Force members perceive a paucity of information about them in the campus community at large. These findings generally reinforce the conclusions that led to recommendation <13-3> on the need for greater communication.

VI. Relationship of Queens College to the CUNY Central Administration

A. General Description of the CUNY Central Administration

Queens College is one of 20 colleges including the Graduate Center that comprise the City University of New York (CUNY). The formal administrative structure of CUNY has not changed greatly since Queens College's 1986 Self Study report. In order to put its
discussion into historical context, the Task Force drew heavily from that report. The CUNY Board of Trustees is responsible for setting overall policies controlling the University. The Board has 17 members, ten of whom are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the New York State Senate, five of whom are appointed by the Mayor of the City, and 2 of whom serve ex officio. The latter include the chairs of the University Student Senate (voting) and the University Faculty Senate (non-voting). The Chancellor is the chief educational and administrative officer of the University and is selected by the Board of Trustees. In turn, other members of the CUNY Administration (Deputy Chancellor and Vice Chancellors, University Deans, Directors) are selected by and serve at the discretion of the Chancellor.

The CUNY Administration is a most powerful body in that it coordinates all university-wide actions. It assembles the University budgetary requests and, subject to the constraints placed on the budgets by the City and State, allocates all lines and monies to the individual colleges. All proposed curricular changes in the colleges must be passed by the CUNY Administration before being presented to the Board of Trustees. Subject to action by the Board of Trustees, the CUNY Administration sets the basic admissions standards for the colleges and the university-wide minimal retention standards. Most undergraduate and transfer student admissions to the University are handled centrally, rather than by individual colleges.

Under the City University Bylaws, the Council of Presidents (COPS) is charged with advising the Chancellor in the development of a coordinated master plan for the University. Proposals for consideration by the Board of Trustees are primarily generated by the Chancellor and by COPS. The Chancellor is the permanent chair of COPS, which has as its members the Deputy Chancellor, the presidents of all the colleges and the Graduate School, the Dean of the CUNY Law School and the President of the affiliated Mount Sinai School of Medicine.

B. Description and Analysis of the Relationship to the Central Administration

In response to the 1986 Queens College Self Study Report and campus visit, the Middle States Evaluation Team stated:

Whether caused by the fiscal crisis, the new governance mechanism, or the nationwide trend toward stronger central management in higher education, the creation of the new Board of Trustees has been followed by the conversion of CUNY from a loosely joined confederacy into a higher education system. There is much stronger management by the CUNY central administration. Traditional lobbying of its local legislative delegation by each college has been diminished as the Chancellor has assumed principal responsibility for representation of CUNY. Budgets which once allocated virtually all resources directly to the colleges have been replaced by budgets which allocate lump sums ... to CUNY respective colleges.

Since 1986, this trend to greater centralization and the concomitant reduction in individual campus autonomy has accelerated. Some centralization efforts received praise from respondents, especially those in technical areas such as student information
management systems, the CUNY+ library cataloguing system, and facilities management and planning.

Nevertheless, comments on the whole tended to characterize the relationship as strained at best—even hostile in some instances. One respondent stated that the CUNY Administration has attempted to pit one campus against another. Another believed that CUNY should be patterned after the SUNY system in which the central office does not get involved unless there are financial or managerial difficulties at a campus. SUNY campuses are believed to be given much wider latitude and autonomy. Several respondents stressed the need to develop a better environment of cooperation between Queens College and CUNY Administration.

What has led to the uneasy relationship between Queens College and CUNY Administration? One pivotal event that all Task Force members cited was the "Goldstein Report," named for its chair, President Leon Goldstein of Kingsborough Community College. In spring 1992, Chancellor Reynolds convened a committee chaired by President Goldstein and composed of distinguished professors and college administrators, charging it with reviewing the academic programs of CUNY. Their report was issued in fall 1992 and called for a review of all academic programs at each CUNY college, with a focus on consolidation or elimination of many small programs. Faculty members at Queens College (and elsewhere) felt that they had not been consulted beforehand on such a major set of academic recommendations. The directives in the report were perceived to be a fait accompli that had to be followed. The substance of the report was widely perceived as an attack by the Chancellor on the liberal arts at CUNY and on the autonomy of individual colleges, especially those like Queens with a strong liberal arts mission. There was widespread fear that enrollments, not program quality or integrity, would be used to decide which programs remained where.

In summer 1993, an internal document from CUNY Central Administration became public, indicating that the extent to which colleges had cooperated with the thrust of the Academic Program Planning Initiative would be taken into account in the allocation of resources. Many faculty and administrators within the University interpreted this report as confirming the suspicion that academic program planning was intended to centralize academic control and consolidation of programs. The Chancellor was invited at her request to meet with the Academic Senate. Various vice chancellors met with the College P&B Committee. The meetings did not alleviate faculty concerns and were soon followed by votes of no confidence in the Chancellor in both the Academic Senate and College P&B Committee.

Other recent actions have reinforced the perception of undue central control over Queens and other colleges in the system. On July 7, 1994, the Vice Chancellor for Budget, Finance and Information Systems, Richard Rothbard, distributed a memo entitled "Initial Allocation of the 1994-95 Operating Budget" to senior college presidents and professional school deans. This contained the first indication of a new method of funding full-time
faculty lines among the senior colleges—a process termed "base level equity." A description of the funding formula and its impact has been presented in CHAPTER EIGHT: FINANCIAL RESOURCES. The reaction from Queens College and other affected faculties was predictable and strong. Objections were raised over the timing of the formula change and over the peremptory loss of autonomy of colleges to decide how they would allocate lines, whether to faculty or to support staff.

In a memorandum dated September 7, 1994, the Chancellor charged a committee of CUNY senior college presidents to review the base level equity program. This Ad Hoc Committee on Base Level Equity submitted its report to Chancellor Reynolds. In the Framework Summary section of its Report, items 5 and 6 state:

5) Even in the absence of additional funding, the reallocation of existing faculty lines may not be the only or best procedure for addressing imbalances among colleges. The same goal may be achieved, for example, by moving some funding from the non-instructional part of the budget or from central university-wide priorities to campus-level instruction.

6) It would be a worthwhile investment in time if consideration were given to learning more about the means developed in other large university systems, both here and abroad [sic], to deploy scarce resources. Paradigms that make sense elsewhere should be considered for implementation at CUNY.

The committee also proposed short term recommendations such as creating new lines out of existing resources, reallocating lines to a pool of centrally-controlled lines, and proceeding cautiously if base level equity were to proceed in the next academic year. The Task Force cautions that Queens College must carefully analyze the potential impact of these recommendations on the College's ability to staff its programs. The Task Force feels very strongly that further reduction of staff via the current base level equity policy only exacerbates the negative climate of Queens College's relationship to CUNY Administration.

A final example of events contributing to a negative climate between the College and the Central Administration relates to the process used to select a new President for Queens College. In following the progress of the presidential search at Hunter College last year, many members of the Queens College campus community became concerned about the perceived intrusion of CUNY Administration in the search process, in particular the regular presence of the Chancellor during presidential search committee meetings and interviews with candidates. The Hunter College Senate approved a resolution asking the Board of Trustees to review its policies and requested the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs "to report on how the procedures used for presidential searches within CUNY are governed by the state laws, CUNY bylaws, and other binding regulations, with particular attention to guarantees of due process for the candidates and the role of the chancellor in the process." Vice-Chancellor Diaz's response dated 27 September 1994 included the following statement:

---

7 The College's acting president, Stephen M. Curtis, was a member of the Chancellor's Ad Hoc Committee on Base Level Equity.
The various solutions I have reviewed seek to mandate particular procedures not required by the Guidelines. Such action is not merely beyond the purview of the Faculty Senate but is an unnecessary and unwarranted intrusion into the affairs and policies of the Board of Trustees.

In short, the CUNY Administration has in recent years implemented a more centralized planning, budgeting, and review system. Although the objectives of this trend to centralize decision-making within the University may be viewed as helping to use more effectively the CUNY system's vast resources in difficult financial times, the process by which policies are developed, implemented, and maintained has led many at the College to conclude that the relationship between Queens College and the CUNY Administration is, at best, strained and needing attention.

C. Other Aspects of the Queens College and CUNY Relationship

1. Articulation

Since the formation of CUNY in the early sixties, and especially with the growth in both the number and size of the community colleges over the past twenty years, there has been a concern about articulation of course credit between senior and community colleges. Until the mid-1980's, the arrangement was loose and, while admission was articulated, inter-college programmatic/course agreements were not structured consistently. This resulted in a strong CUNY initiative in 1985. Program committees composed of senior and community college personnel were named to develop a CUNY-wide policy. A course equivalency guide was developed to spell out course by course articulation. This guide is updated periodically; there is now an on-line version that will facilitate timely sharing of equivalency information. However, this addresses only one major concern, the articulation of individual courses, leaving the more sensitive articulation of academic programs. In 1992, this other issue began to receive more explicit attention.

Moving well beyond the course equivalencies, Queens has developed several program-to-program articulation agreements with local community colleges, expanding significantly the opportunities for community college students to plan their programs efficiently. The College's School of Education now has two separate fully articulated programs with LaGuardia and Queensborough Community Colleges. They are now recognized by New York State as "jointly registered programs" and are therefore, uninterrupted curricula from the first course taken at the community college until graduation from Queens College. They clearly state what courses at the community colleges are acceptable at Queens College to fulfill basic liberal arts and science requirements. Those courses applicable to the Elementary Education and liberal arts and science co-major or to the Secondary Education minor are also clearly identified. These programs are intended to speed up the time to graduation from Queens College by helping students to avoid course duplication. Currently, the Fine Arts program at LaGuardia Community College and the Art Department at Queens have agreed upon an articulation agreement aimed at the B.A. in Studio Art and the Bachelor of Fine Arts degree. The College is awaiting University and State approvals.
Current initiatives by CUNY Institutional Research include a review of the time taken by community college graduates to complete programs at the senior colleges and a consideration of a common course number system that would be used to convert courses at each college to a CUNY wide number, making easier both the electronic processing of transfer credits and the advising of transfer students.

At the crux of most debate is the issue of program length. An existing CUNY requirement that community college Associate of Arts and Associate of Science graduates be assured that no more than 64 credits will be required for the bachelor’s degree has been reaffirmed. This requirement interferes with the ability of CUNY community college transfer students to complete majors in several departments and is viewed by many senior college faculty as an infringement on curricular independence and an erosion in the quality of the baccalaureate degree. Controversy also revolves around the minimum required credits for those coming to senior colleges with an Associate of Applied Science diploma as there is very little liberal arts content in these programs and usually little or no fit with a senior college major.

Respondents to the Task Force’s questionnaire appeared to recognize that the College needs to improve its relationships with community colleges in discussing all issues concerning articulation such as recruitment, admission, transfer and credit evaluation. Perhaps, as one respondent stated, rather than having course by course equivalencies, Queens College should expand articulation to more program sequence equivalencies, as was done in education and is now being done in studio art. Finally, one respondent suggested making joint faculty appointments between community colleges and Queens College. The Provost and the Deans of Education and Social Sciences have already proposed joint lines to the CUNY Administration and have received approval to search for two joint appointments between Queensborough Community College and Queens College’s departments of Sociology and Elementary Education. Thus, there is a recognition and commitment on the part of Queens College to addressing the issue of articulation between the College and its primary community colleges.

At the same time, CUNY appears to be taking a more assertive leadership position in developing CUNY-wide policies in articulation. The CUNY Administration has reaffirmed its commitment to all of the tenets of the 1984 policy statement, including a never previously-enforced explicit statement of senior college program length for community college graduates. The central issue concerning members of the Task Force was the extent to which faculty on individual campuses will retain autonomy in making curricular decisions. It should be noted that previous attempts to increase articulation between the community and senior colleges, such as the jointly registered programs in Education, were based on courses that Queens College faculty had already determined to be transferable. Thus, a process whereby faculty at each college retain ultimate responsibility for curricular matters must be a fundamental tenet of any future planning about articulation. In this spirit,
RECOMMENDATION: The College should expand communication and 
programmatic articulation with its community college 
partners. <13-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The University should preserve the faculty's primary role in 
decisions concerning curricular equivalencies. <13-6>

Several respondents commented on improving articulation between and 
among the senior colleges of the system. Some preliminary attempts have been made to 
collaborate in the sharing of faculty between Queens College and York College, the other 
senior college in the borough of Queens. One respondent suggested that the College should 
explore ways of improving the process that allows students from one CUNY campus to 
 enroll at other campuses across the University. Students take courses elsewhere "on 
permit" but different registration processes and varying academic calendars can make this 
difficult. A CUNY B.A. degree exists, allowing students to take courses anywhere in the 
system. Although this route is available, faculty and students alike need to know about the 
availability of spaces in classes throughout the CUNY system. At this point, most 
articulation between senior colleges takes place on an ad hoc, personal basis. For example, 
the Special Education program within the School of Education is working with City College 
to enroll some students so that they may complete their degrees. This working relationship 
came about through personal contact rather than a formal system of identifying students and 
available courses.

Programmatic articulation also involves meetings among faculty members 
and administrators within a discipline or interest group. There are monthly meetings of the 
Deans of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Social Science, and Education as well as of the 
Chief Librarians throughout the CUNY system. Faculty members in certain disciplines also 
meet on a regular basis, Mathematics Educators, Early Childhood Education, and English 
as a Second Language, among others. One respondent suggested that perhaps the CUNY 
Administration could help fund colloquia and other professional activities across all CUNY 
campuses to encourage cross-campus dialogue within a discipline.

2. College Preparatory Initiative (CPI)

The dual mission of the City University—access and excellence—has always 
left it vulnerable to attack by those who feel that there should be higher admissions 
standards and those who criticize the quality of the education received in the New York 
public schools. In order to continue to grow in enrollments and to increase retention and 
graduation rates, Chancellor Reynolds developed the College Preparatory Initiative in 
collaboration with the current and former Chancellors of the New York City Board of 
Education. What developed was a list of competencies (stated in terms of courses to be 
passed successfully) that would improve the student's chances of success in college. As 
noted in CHAPTER FIVE: ACADEMIC PROGRAMS (III.C.), the competencies are not 
admissions requirements; students lacking CPI units must fulfill the areas lacking by taking
college courses comparable in content. The CPI competencies were developed by unique teams of college faculty and New York high school faculty, facilitated by CUNY administrative staff—thought by many to represent an historic joint curricular effort benefitting both systems.

CPI policies exist in a context of other CUNY policy mandates that necessarily complicate the successful implementation of the CPI. For example, CPI may complicate meeting the articulation goal of assuring that community college students complete their senior college degrees within 64 credits. If students have not fulfilled their CPI requirements, senior colleges may be forced to alter their general academic requirements in order to accommodate the CPI requirements.

Another potential problem involves two specific CPI requirements: laboratory science and American history. The College’s LASAR system fulfills the current CPI standard of one unit in laboratory science. When the laboratory science requirement increases to two in the 1997 CPI cycle, a second science unit will be required. Students lacking two high school units will have to complete two laboratory sciences classes at Queens, one more than is now necessary to graduate. This will increase the enrollment pressure on these laboratory science courses, thus increasing instructional costs. In the area of American History, CUNY must face the reality that more students are enrolling who were not educated in the United States. The vast majority of these students will not have had any American history course; one CPI unit in American history will be added to the competencies expected in 1999. The LASAR Social Science course menu at Queens includes two American history courses that have been heavily subscribed under the present pre-CPI environment. The History department is likely to have to increase its offering of these courses in order to accommodate these extra enrollments at a potential increase in cost. Efforts are underway to have the University assess the impact of the addition of these CPI units so that adequate financial and programmatic planning can be instituted.

VI. Relationship of Queens College with the Graduate Center

All CUNY doctoral programs are housed administratively at the CUNY Graduate School and University Center, located in midtown Manhattan. Most doctoral courses are given there, with the exception of courses in the laboratory sciences, most of which are offered at the sister colleges making up the doctoral consortium. The Graduate School has some central faculty but the vast majority of doctoral teaching is done by faculty at the consortial colleges who have been elected to serve in the individual Ph.D. programs. These faculty teach doctoral courses as part of their full-time faculty teaching loads. In spite of pressures from the budget, the Queens College faculty and administration have reaffirmed support for continued participation in the doctoral programs of the Graduate Center. It is a general sense that the character and mission of the College would be compromised if there were not opportunities for the faculty to teach and mentor doctoral students. Certainly there would be significant negative impact on the laboratory science programs at Queens without the doctoral students who work in campus laboratories and teach undergraduate courses.
That said, there are difficulties in making this form of consortial doctoral education work.

Paying the colleges back for this doctoral teaching is done through a complex Allocation System administered by the Graduate School. The amount of funding due each college is computed by a formula that aggregates the actual amount of teaching contributed by that college's faculty, and allocates a number of full time faculty lines from within a fixed pool of lines dedicated for this purpose. There is widespread belief that the colleges are not fully compensated for the contributions of the faculty and that departments within a college are not supported in proportion to their contribution to the Graduate Center's teaching.

This structural arrangement has created mixed feelings among the Queens College community. Faculty, of course, want to participate in doctoral education—several respondents cited the positive contribution that such an association has made to their continued development as scholars and doctoral-level educators. Furthermore, faculty participation at the Graduate Center has also helped some Queens College departments identify excellent adjuncts for its programs with the accompanying benefit to the graduate student of gaining experience in teaching. However, the majority of comments reveal structural difficulties with Queens College's relationship to the Graduate Center:

1. The funding for doctoral teaching comes to Queens College as a whole, not to the departments whose faculty are teaching doctoral courses. Because the departments are not compensated directly for their faculty's time, they cannot replace them and thus lose courses in their undergraduate and master's programs at the College. Departments feel that because of this reimbursement arrangement, they are forced to support doctoral programs that, in some cases, have little relationship to the mission of their department.

2. While some doctoral programs in the natural sciences are housed at Queens College, the Graduate Center does not support (or at best minimally supports) them in terms of equipment, supplies, or laboratory technicians. The College budget is therefore required to support these expensive doctoral programs. It should be noted that Queens College is not funded as a doctoral institution.

3. Doctoral students who hold graduate assistantships through the auspices of Queens College are not given tuition remission by the Graduate Center, but some graduate assistants paid through the Graduate Center are.

4. Faculty who hold appointments on the doctoral faculty teach courses as part of their regular teaching load. However, there is no consistent mechanism to compensate them for service on doctoral dissertation committees. Dissertation direction is included in the formula that determines Graduate Center funding for Queens College, but individual faculty members, and therefore their departments, are not routinely given released time for this major academic effort. (See CHAPTER ELEVEN: FACULTY.)
5. Many respondents believe that the Graduate Center reimburses Queens College for the release of its faculty far beneath their actual value and "teaching power." Until recently, the formulas for reimbursing the individual colleges for releasing faculty were not fully shared with college faculty or administration. This perception is best captured by the statement of one respondent that "the Grad[uate] Center situation is a grand shell game with everyone losing."

6. Some chairs and deans have noted that oftentimes individual faculty members arrange to teach at the Graduate Center with the Executive Officer (Graduate Center administrator who functions like a chair of the department) of the doctoral program without prior discussion with the chair of the respective department or dean at Queens College. When this situation arises, the Queens College chair frequently feels that his/her scheduling prerogative has been usurped. Regardless of the intent, the outcome is one in which some chairs and administrators at Queens College feel that they are indeed subsidizing the Graduate Center operation.

The system by which faculty lines are allocated to the campuses to compensate for doctoral instruction is being reviewed by a task force appointed by the President of the Graduate School and University Center. Chaired by the GSUC Provost, this task force includes campus presidents, provosts, chief financial officers, executive officers of CUNY doctoral programs, and representatives of the CUNY central administration. The committee is likely to recommend revisions of the allocation system to make it more responsive to the needs of the colleges. However, the perception of some chairs that their departments lose teaching power as a result of their contributions to doctoral instruction will be addressed only by clarification, or perhaps reform, of the College's practices for allocating resources internally in support of doctoral instruction. Therefore,

RECOMMENDATION: The College should review, and modify if necessary, its system for recognizing departmental contributions to doctoral instruction. The system should include appropriate recognition for dissertation supervision and other contributions to the work of the Graduate Center. The details of the resource allocation models, both of the College and the Graduate Center, should be communicated clearly to chairs and to faculty.  

VII. Summary List of Recommendations on Organization and Administration

RECOMMENDATION: The President should review the entire organizational structure of the College.  

RECOMMENDATION: The Provost should review the structure and function of all deanships.
RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should create a better system of communication and sharing of information among members of the administration, department chairs, and faculty. <13-3>

RECOMMENDATION: The College administration should review the procedures by which office support staff are allocated to and selected by departments. <13-4>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should expand communication and programmatic articulation with its community college partners. <13-5>

RECOMMENDATION: The University should preserve the faculty's primary role in decisions concerning curricular equivalencies. <13-6>

RECOMMENDATION: The College should review, and modify if necessary, its system for recognizing departmental contributions to doctoral instruction. The system should include appropriate recognition for dissertation supervision and other contributions to the work of the Graduate Center. The details of the resource allocation models, both of the College and the Graduate Center, should be communicated clearly to chairs and to faculty. <13-7>
CHAPTER FORTYTHREE

ALUMNI/AE
CHAPTER FOURTEEN: ALUMNI/AE

I. Establishment and Functioning of the Office of Alumni Affairs

The establishment of an Office of Alumni Affairs as an administrative unit, with a Director reporting to the Director of Development, occurred in 1989. Before the Office’s formation, alumni matters were handled by a separately incorporated Queens College Alumni Association, a sometimes active, loosely organized operation, which was not considered a formal part of the College’s administrative structure. President Shirley Strum Kenny decided that the establishment of a fully functioning Alumni Office was an important College priority. A key to the Office’s success has been the identification and development of a solid base of Queens College graduates who provide support, not only in a financial sense, but also in terms of promoting the Alumni Office’s activities, volunteering to participate on various working committees, etc. The large response to the College’s Annual Homecoming Reunion Day (held on the campus each May) attests to the effectiveness of the Office’s outreach efforts.

Prior to the early 1980’s, fund-raising at the College had been a rather disjointed activity—both the Queens College Foundation (QCF) and the Alumni Association solicited contributions from alumni. In FY 1987, the responsibility for fund-raising was transferred from the Alumni Association to the QCF. The Office of Alumni Affairs is still involved in fund-raising to the extent that it coordinates cultivation activities, e.g., organizes the Homecoming reunion, contacts alumni through various mailings designed to keep graduates up to date on College developments and pertinent issues, encourages alumni to visit the campus, and fosters appreciation among graduates for their College years. Reunion class gifts are the only direct fund-raising efforts currently handled by the Alumni Affairs Office.

These outreach efforts have been quite successful, and considerably more alumni have responded with contributions, both large and small. The Office also helps to identify prospective major donors for the Development Office, which then follows up on those leads. And it initiates and maintains liaisons with the QC Alumni Chapters located in cities throughout the nation.

In order to communicate more effectively and meaningfully with the College’s graduates, then President Kenny authorized a revision of the alumni/ae newsletter, Queens College Report; a magazine format was adopted and retitled as Q—The Magazine of Queens College. Co-edited by the Vice President for Institutional Relations and the Director of Publications, Q has become a 32-page, award-winning magazine, and response from alumni/ae has been enthusiastic.

Queens alumni/ae are playing vital roles on the College’s behalf. Two important examples come from spring 1995: many alumni/ae contacted State legislators to protest the Governor’s budget for CUNY, and a dedicated cohort participated in the interviews of the
finalists for the Queens presidency. One alumnus served on the CUNY Board of Trustees Search Committee for President.

II. Issues of Concern to Alumni/ae

There are several substantive issues affecting the College's relations with its alumni/ae. The College's "open enrollment" policy of the 1970's, even though discontinued many years ago, remains an area of considerable concern to a number of alumni/ae. These individuals feel that open enrollment damaged the institution's reputation for excellence, lessening what had previously been a very positive public perception of Queens College. As a consequence of this policy and their perception of its negative impact, alumni/ae from the late 1970's and 1980's appear somewhat alienated in comparison with graduates from earlier decades. The Director believes that a possible explanation for this is that these individuals do not feel their degrees are as "valuable" as those held by alumni/ae who graduated earlier—a feeling that their older brothers' and sisters' QC degrees are worth a lot more. An additional concern regarding younger alumni/ae relates to their lack of class identification, since many of them take five, six, or more years to graduate. It should also be noted that the alumni/ae who choose to remain active, who feel a bond with the College, identify themselves as Queens College graduates, not as graduates of "The City University of New York." This is important in view of the current policies being advanced by the University's central office--efforts which many believe are aimed at consolidation and homogenization. If the image and reputation of Queens College become somehow lost in that of the City University, there is real concern that the College's relations with its alumni/ae will suffer.

An unanswered question at this time relates to the future of the College's relations with its most prestigious alumni/ae in light of the recent departure of President Kenny. It is widely perceived that many of the College's successful external relation efforts in recent years were largely the result of President Kenny's direct and personal involvement in the establishment and nurturing of the various Queens College boards: the Queens College Foundation Board, the Corporate and Journalism Advisory Boards, the Arts Board, etc. The open question is whether the individuals who serve on these boards and actively work in the College's behalf (many of them College alumni who are now national leaders in their respective fields) will remain active now that President Kenny has gone.

Acting President Curtis has devoted significant time and energy in keeping all boards fully involved in College activities and apprised of the progress in the search for a new president. He has also initiated expanded communications between board members and the campus community. An example of this is the presentation made by two QCF board members (Edwin Cooperman and Michael Minikes, both alumni) to a Faculty Assembly at the beginning of spring 1995 semester. A challenge for the new president will be to maintain and expand upon the very strong foundation of external supporters carefully developed by former President Kenny and nurtured by Acting President Curtis.
III. Future Directions for Alumni Affairs

The Alumni Office faces difficulties when it comes to maintaining effective communication with the College’s alumni/ae. The Director believes that Queens does not communicate with its graduates frequently enough. The College mailed a newsletter to its alumni/ae three times a year from 1987 to 1993. The stylish magazine, Q, which replaced the less elaborate, but more frequent newsletters, was published in fall 1993 and again in fall 1994. A newsletter was again mailed in March 1995 to fill in the gap.

The Office of Alumni Affairs is understaffed. At the present time, the Office has one full-time staff person (the Director) and one full-time secretary. Considering that there are currently over 90,000 names in the alumni database (62,000 verified good mailing addresses), the office’s staff is far too small adequately to maintain communications, organize activities, and design and disseminate alumni publications—mandatory functions for any institution hoping to remain connected to (and financially supported by) its graduates.

There are a number of efforts in progress that have great potential for enhancing the College’s alumni/ae relations efforts. The Harris Publishing Company has been contracted to compile an up-to-date, comprehensive, and cross-referenced Queens College alumni/ae directory. This volume will be available within a year; the company has agreed to provide the Alumni Office with copies of its questionnaire, responses and related materials—information that will provide an invaluable database for future activities. A public relations video entitled “Queens College” was recently produced for the institution (as a courtesy) by Julian Krainen and Michael Lawrence Films. This eight-minute documentary shows the exciting new developments taking place at the College, and it has already been extensively and successfully used for many purposes—recruitment and fund-raising, to name but two. Finally, the Alumni Office has recognized the important role that “feeling connected” plays in alumni/ae life. To this end, a number of “professional affiliates groups” have been formed. There is, for example, a Medical Alumni group—graduates who are now physicians have gotten together, sponsored a dinner, raised some money, and offered to mentor Queens students interested in pursuing medical careers. Similarly, there is a Lawyers’ Group, and an Accountants’ Group is being formed. The Development Office also recognizes the importance of encouraging alumni to identify with certain professional interests, and contributions to the College can now be earmarked for specific departments or purposes, rather than made as a general contribution to the overall alumni/ae fund.

Individual departments’ involvement with their alumni/ae is highly variable. Some have long traditions of extensive contact with their alumni/ae, while others have kept no records. The need for more uniform departmental record-keeping and contact has been highlighted both by the offers of support from the Office of Alumni Affairs and by the Academic Program Review process that involves a sampling of perceptions of alumni with regard to the quality of the curriculum, advising, etc. The Home Economics Department has a long-standing commitment to keeping track of its alumni/ae. It does a survey every
two years, inquiring about the professional positions and accomplishments of their graduates and about their feelings on what was valued most and least in their major. The Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry sends out a newsletter to its alumni/ae. Recently this contained solicitations for funds for undergraduate research stipends. The new program called FAST (FIPSE-Alumni Student Training) has received donations, and the first FAST Fellowships were awarded in spring 1995.

Despite limitations of staffing and budget, the College's relations with its alumni/ae have improved dramatically in recent years. This improvement can largely be attributed to the tireless efforts of the Director of Alumni Affairs, to her small but dedicated staff, and to a former president who clearly saw the vitally important role that a College's alumni/ae must play in order to ensure the institution's future growth and development. In the words of a number of successful alumni/ae who serve on advisory boards, it was President Kenny who made them once again "feel proud" to be graduates of Queens College, and it was she who convinced them of their responsibility to try to "give something back." This is a strong legacy on which to build.

In light of the successes of the recent past and the potential for future growth,

**RECOMMENDATION:** The staff and operations of the Office of Alumni Affairs should be supported at enhanced levels, and publication of the alumni magazine should be more frequent. <14-1>

---

**IV. Summary List of Recommendations on Alumni/ae**

**RECOMMENDATION:** The staff and operations of the Office of Alumni Affairs should be supported at enhanced levels, and publication of the alumni magazine should be more frequent. <14-1>