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I. Background Information on Revenue Sources

A. Budget Overview

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

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

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

---

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dollars (in thousands)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Funding</td>
<td>$66,309</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Foundation</td>
<td>$6161</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College Foundation</td>
<td>$4473</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Revenues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colden Center</td>
<td>$911</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development Center</td>
<td>$324</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic and Recreation Fund(^a)</td>
<td>$1180</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Unlimited Education</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Services Funds</td>
<td>$4282</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary Enterprises Association</td>
<td>$428</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships and Donations</td>
<td>$217</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services Corporation</td>
<td>$2562</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens College Association</td>
<td>$562</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for Disabled Students</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income Fund Reimbursables (IFR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Education</td>
<td>$2531</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>$1100</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech and Hearing Center</td>
<td>$48</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Preparatory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies in Music</td>
<td>$197</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,705</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current dollars</th>
<th>Annual trends for current dollars</th>
<th>Constant (1985) dollars</th>
<th>Annual trends for constant dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985-86</td>
<td>$57,881,350</td>
<td></td>
<td>$57,881,350</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-87</td>
<td>$62,527,020</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
<td>$60,516,536</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987-88</td>
<td>$60,029,740</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
<td>$61,472,638</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>$69,767,570</td>
<td>5.63%</td>
<td>$61,622,424</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$73,531,840</td>
<td>5.51%</td>
<td>$61,650,746</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$72,061,700</td>
<td>-2.11%</td>
<td>$57,304,932</td>
<td>-7.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$68,880,200</td>
<td>-4.44%</td>
<td>$51,220,630</td>
<td>-9.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>$62,881,700</td>
<td>-6.71%</td>
<td>$45,880,233</td>
<td>-11.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>$66,308,400</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>$46,416,580</td>
<td>1.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>$60,585,000</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>$47,045,787</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**STATE FUNDING OF QUEENS COLLEGE**  
**FY 1985-86 THROUGH FY 1994-95**
increases are important in bolstering morale!). When the budget figures are adjusted for inflation, the changes from peak funding go from nearly -15 percent to -26 percent, and the recent increases since FY 1993 are significantly lower (+3.2 percent in real terms compared to +9.5 percent in current dollar terms).

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

The initial allocation of tax levy funds to the College for FY 1995 was $68,885,500; with adjustments for special line items, the annual budget for FY 1995 was $71,211,700. However, the new Governor of New York State, George Pataki, requested that the City University reduce its budget during the current fiscal year by $1.5 million, nearly two percent of the University's state funding; Queens' "share" of that reduction was over $1 million. The University requested a revised financial plan from the College to ascertain how the budget would be reduced between March and June 1995. The budget in College's revised financial plan totaled $70,301,800.

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

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

---

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

The Governor's budget request for FY 1996 reduced state appropriations to the
University by $158 million and called for a tuition increase of $1000. 7 If this had held, the
Queens College budget would have been cut between $5 million and $17 million. The
lower amount reflects the College's share of the base cut; the higher would have obtained if
the Trustees did not approve the tuition increase upon which the Governor's budget was
predicated. All estimates assumed that there will not be adverse effects on enrollment — an
unlikely event to be sure. The Governor's budget also eliminated central funding ($15.1
million) of the SEEK program.

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

B. Tuition and Tuition Revenues

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

---

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

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

**ANNUAL TUITION, FALL 1979 - PRESENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>GRADUATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N.Y. STATE RESIDENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PER CREDIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS OF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '76</td>
<td>$354.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '82</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '83</td>
<td>$46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '84</td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING '89</td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPRING '91</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '91</td>
<td>$77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUING FALL '92</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALL '92 1st TIME</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Tuition waivers are granted by the University for senior citizens, high school students, employees, and cooperative teachers. (There is also a partial waiver for foreign students without financial resources implemented in 1989 "because of a disproportionate increase in non-resident tuition."\(^6\)) The State does provide a line in its budget for these waivers, and the City University has added to this allocation from its own budget flexibility (meaning that it is "taken off the top" before CUNY units receive their individual allocations). CUNY reduced its allocation for tuition reimbursement to colleges in FY 1995 below the FY 1994 level and plans further reductions in future years. In addition, it is requiring colleges that have historically overspent their tuition waiver reimbursements "to unallocate funds within their budgets as a safeguard against such practices."\(^7\) Tuition waivers have been particularly important to the College because of its large number of senior citizen students and because of its programmatic links with Townsend Harris High

---

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

\(^7\) Ibid., pp. 16-17. Reduced funding of tuition waivers is included in reductions associated with failure to meet the College's tuition revenue target, as discussed below.
School. The College has had to reduce the number of senior citizen waivers it offers due to these new constraints. The situation will be ameliorated next year as the senior citizen tuition waiver program is replaced by a system that allows senior citizens to audit courses on a space available basis. FTE's from senior citizen registrations will no longer be included in College totals.

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

C. Fees

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

---

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

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

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

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

D. The Queens College Foundation and the Office of Development

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

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

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

In addition to the annual giving campaigns, the College initiated its first capital campaign in 1992. The funds raised from this campaign will be used for endowments of chairs and scholarships, for program support, and for the purchase of laboratory equipment and other similar kinds of facilities funding. Since August 1992, $10,165,000 has been pledged to this capital campaign, with $1,437,000 received from these pledges. The initial goal of the capital campaign was $1.5 million (originally a two-year goal), and the long-

---

14 Funding of building construction and rehabilitation is the responsibility of the State Dormitory Authority.
FIGURE 8-3
QUEENS COLLEGE FOUNDATION FUND RAISING

Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Series 1</th>
<th>Series 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SERIES 1 - FUND RAISING
SERIES 2 - FUND RAISING PLUS INVESTMENT INCOME
range goal is $25 million. One of the recent major gifts to the College was $1 million donated by Samuel J. LeFrak to support music programs and scholarships, including the Hope and Pride Program of outreach to pre-college music students. Three other $1 million commitments have been made by William E. Thiele, Edwin M. Cooperman and Irving Goldstein.

In FY 1994 the Foundation spent $325,000 on operating expenses (salaries, printing, fund-raising costs). The amount raised in that year was approximately $41 million, indicating that less than eight cents of every dollar raised was applied toward expenses.

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

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

E. Research and Sponsored Programs\textsuperscript{15}

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

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

\textsuperscript{15} Much of the data in this section are taken from the Research and Sponsored Programs Office's Grants and Contracts Report 1994. Copies of the 1994 report and those of preceding years will be available for inspection by the Evaluation Team.
In 1971, the Grants and Contracts Office, which later became the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), was established at the College to facilitate attempts to obtain external funding. In FY 1985, 139 proposals were submitted; 67 awards totaling $3,401,249 were received from sources external to CUNY. In FY 1994, 149 proposals were submitted and 90 awards were received totaling $6,160,571. (This figure does not include PSC-CUNY Research Awards, discussed below.) Through March 1995, external research grants are exceeding last year's total for the same period by over $550,000. Over a ten year period, then, there was a seven percent increase in proposals submitted and a 34 percent increase in awards received. The total dollar increase was 81 percent; adjusted for inflation, the real increase was 24 percent. Additional information on external funding may be found in Figures 8-4 through 8-7.

The federal government provides the largest portion of the College's external funding for grants and contracts, 67 percent in FY 1994, and its share has been a relatively consistent part of the total over the past decade. NIH and the Department of Education are the largest sources of the College's federal research dollars. For FY 1994, 59 percent of grant and contract funding\(^{16}\) supported research; program development was the second largest category (15%) followed by community outreach (8%).

While the College's total amount of external funding for grants and contracts is well below the funding of two other CUNY units (both Hunter and City Colleges received over $25 million\(^{17}\)), it should be noted that both colleges have professional schools and units not represented at Queens that contribute heavily to their grant and contract totals. Nevertheless, Queens College and its faculty should increase the rate at which grants are sought and won. Some faculty maintain that heavy teaching loads are part of the problem, reducing time available to write grants. Greater institutional support and incentives for writing grants would help address this problem. The ORSP, the College P & B Committee and the Administration need to make conscientious efforts to determine what the obstacles are to greater productivity in raising external funds and to devising ways to overcome the obstacles identified.

ORSP assists the Research Foundation in administering the College's participation in the PSC-CUNY Faculty Research Awards Program, a competitive program mandated by the PSC-CUNY contract and funded by the University.\(^{18}\) In FY 1996 the University budgeted $2.8 million for these awards. The bulk of this funding goes to support research assistance, supplies and certain equipment. For FY 1996, of the 120 Queens faculty members who applied for grants, 105 (88%) won awards totaling $436,758, averaging

\(^{16}\) Grant and contract funding in both the CUNY Research Foundation and the Queens College Foundation.


\(^{18}\) The Professional Staff Congress (PSC) is the bargaining unit for faculty and other instructional staff.
FIGURE 8-5
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS AWARDED BY SOURCE

<table>
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<th>Millions</th>
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- **FISCAL YEAR 1985**
- **FISCAL YEAR 1994**

TOTAL 1985: $3,401,255
TOTAL 1994: $6,160,571
FIGURES 8-6
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS AWARDED BY SOURCE

FISCAL YEAR 1985
PRIVATE $539,234
CITY $160,000
STATE $182,370
FEDERAL $2,519,651

FISCAL YEAR 1994
PRIVATE $699,677
CITY $856,454
STATE $473,293
FEDERAL $4,132,247
FIGURE 8-7
FEDERAL GRANTS AND CONTRACTS BY MAJOR AGENCIES

FISCAL YEAR 1985
$2,519,645

FISCAL YEAR 1994
$4,132,247
$4160 per grant (range $2000-$7635). The College’s new faculty members have had an exceptionally good success rate in winning awards.

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

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

F. Financial Aid

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

---

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

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

**TABLE 8-3**

**FINANCIAL AID TO QUEENS COLLEGE STUDENTS**

| TOTAL AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL AID RECEIVED, BY PROGRAM (THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS) |
|------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|                  | 89-90         | 90-91         | 91-92         | 92-93         | 93-94         |
| TAP              | 3,135         | 3,430         | 5,225         | 6,784         | 7,310         |
| PELL             | 3,930         | 4,173         | 5,864         | 6,465         | 6,839         |
| GSL*             | 3,411         | 3,921         | 4,277         | 3,219         | 5,297         |
| CUSTA            | 53            | 62            | 72            | 123           | 112           |
| APTS             | 127           | 249           | 280           | 314           | 327           |
| SEEK             | 383           | 653           | 613           | 718           | 794           |
| PERKINS LOAN     | 660           | 420           | 388           | 379           | 537           |
| SEOG             | 306           | 152           | 171           | 219           | 228           |
| CWS              | 177           | 192           | 473           | 215           | 372           |

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>93-94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAP</td>
<td>4,014</td>
<td>4,227</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>4,794</td>
<td>5,415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELL</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,990</td>
<td>4,680</td>
<td>5,181</td>
<td>5,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSL*</td>
<td>1,279</td>
<td>1,339</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>1,226</td>
<td>1,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTA</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APTS</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEK</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERKINS LOAN</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOG</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

II. The Budget Process and Financial Controls

A. The State and University Budget Process

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

---

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

22 For example, the CUNY model has one category for health sciences and biology. Because many of the health science courses taught elsewhere in the University are done in very large lecture-only sections (as in the nursing programs), the ratio applied to Queens’ biology sections is too high. As discussed below, the College employs its own Adjunct Model which uses more detailed discipline-specific CUNY-wide ratios that are closer to College practice. The College model recognizes, for example, that its biology sections are more appropriately compared to sections of physics or chemistry here and elsewhere in the University.
funding has declined, the practice of under-funding the adjunct model means that the
adjunct budget and summer funding fall short of actual College needs. The colleges are
presented with their technical budgets, which they review and return with their written
budget requests including new programmatic initiatives under the University's procedure of
Academic Program Planning instituted in FY 1994. A college may find some, all, or none
of these requests incorporated into its allocation from CUNY. Some initiatives may be
incorporated into the initial budget allocation; others may be added during the course of the
fiscal year.

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

While Queens College appears as a line-item in the Governor's Budget, the Central
Office of the City University is given flexibility for allocating the entire CUNY budget, and
it is able to retain portions of the line-item allocations to each of its units for subsequent
distribution according to University priorities. In addition to line-items for each of the
CUNY units, the University receives appropriations for a large number of programmatic
items, many of which are to be distributed to CUNY units as "lump sums" according to
University formulas, contractual commitments, and discretionary priorities. The State's
line item for Queens College in the FY 1995 Executive Budget was $73.3 million, more
than the College's initial allocation from the University (including lump sum distributions)
of $68,885,500. During the course of the budget year, the College can usually expect to
receive additional allocations that somewhat increase the total tax-levy operating budget. 3

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

3 In a number of years, the June (end of year) budget figures have exceeded allocations. For example, the
allocation for FY 1993 was $62,881,700. The June 1993 figure was $63,734,625 (Queens College Budget
data).
the College's SEEK program.\textsuperscript{24}

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

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

B. The College's Internal Budget Process

When the College receives its budget from the Central Office, the budget is broken down into five basic categories, Personal Services Regular (PSR), Other than Personal Services (OTPS), Temporary Services (TS), adjuncts and Summer. However, with the approval of the University Budget Office, the College may reallocate among categories. The College's initial financial plan for FY 1995 allocates the budget as indicated in Table 8-4. Nearly 84 percent of the budget this fiscal year was originally allocated to Personal Services Regular and another 4 percent to regular (non-summer) adjunct teaching, leaving just 12 percent ($8.4 million) for all other operating needs. PSR has taken an increasing share of the budget over time (up from 79 percent in FY 1992), with the burden being most

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


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 92</th>
<th>FY 93</th>
<th>FY 94</th>
<th>FY 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Services Regular</td>
<td>$54,298,055</td>
<td>$51,310,256</td>
<td>$54,431,342</td>
<td>$57,603,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Regular</td>
<td>$2,246,190</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
<td>$2,229,609</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Services</td>
<td>$3,330,394</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>$2,675,594</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTPS</td>
<td>$7,585,254</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
<td>$5,225,850</td>
<td>8.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Session</td>
<td>$1,215,800</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>$1,240,400</td>
<td>1.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$69,880,209</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$62,281,700</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

D. Allocations to Interdisciplinary Programs

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

E. Budget Summaries and Financial Audits

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

SOURCE: Provided by Vice President for Administration, Queens College from report prepared by CUNY Accounting Office.
expenditures ($18.3 million in fringe benefits on wages and salaries of $60.9 million in FY 1994),\textsuperscript{34} are managed by the University. In addition, the University directly pays certain rent and utility costs. Because funds from the Queens College Foundation ($4.473 million) and from the Research Foundation ($6.156 million) are not included, it is not appropriate to compare the IPEDS data to data aggregated from other (public) institutions. Inclusion of these funds would dramatically increase entries for governmental grants and contracts and for private grants, contracts, and gifts. On the expenditures side of the ledger, expenditures on research would increase significantly. IPEDS data from FY 1989 through FY 1994 have been used to construct Figure 8-8, which indicates the declining contribution of state appropriations and the rising contribution of tuition and fees to support the College.\textsuperscript{35}

F. Financial Management and Controls

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

\begin{itemize}
    \item The Bursar's lock box system with Chemical Bank allows students to pay their tuition bills by check or credit cards by direct mail to the College's lock box with Chemical Bank. About 45 percent of the students now use this method.
    \item The College's purchasing and accounts payable system allows the College's departments to prepare their purchase requisitions on their computer and forward the requisition with a floppy disc or on-line to Purchasing and Accounts Payable directly. The system allows the preparation of bid documents and purchase orders in accordance with State of New York guidelines. A monthly report is prepared providing the budgeted amount, transfers, encumbrances, vouchers expended, and the budget balance available. Purchase requisitions are encumbered when received and adjusted when a purchase order is issued.
    \item Recording and billing of postage and telephone usage has changed. Departmental budgets were established, and departments are held accountable to stay within their allocations. Adjustments are made to tax levy OTPS budgets at the beginning of the new fiscal year for over- and under-spending in the previous year. The College plans to institute a similar system for central receiving of supplies that are currently not departmentally budgeted.
\end{itemize}

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>(A) Tuition &amp; Fees</th>
<th>(B) State Appropriations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988-89</td>
<td>$22,926,000</td>
<td>$72,585,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-90</td>
<td>$27,364,000</td>
<td>$74,789,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>$29,138,000</td>
<td>$70,718,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>$37,402,000</td>
<td>$62,071,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>$41,861,000</td>
<td>$58,246,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>$43,824,000</td>
<td>$53,457,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% change from 1988-89 to 1993-94:

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

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

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

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

III. Task Force Survey of Department Chairs on Budget

The Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources sent a questionnaire\(^{36}\) concerning budgets and facilities to 34 department chairs in mid-November 1994. The questions were concerned with the impact of the budget and facilities on teaching and research and on the chair’s views on budgetary and planning processes. As of mid-January 1995, 28 of 34 had responded. Among the many findings were these on budget:

> Chairs had highly varied views on whether they would prefer to be able to allocate more funds to adjuncts vs. OTPS/TS.

> One-third of the chairs (9 of 28) reported that they did not receive a departmental allocation of OTPS/TS funds. Of the 19 who did, eleven said they were not allowed to decide how much to allocate for OTPS versus TS.

---

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

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

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

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

IV. Summary Analysis

A. Declining State Support

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

B. The Burden on Students

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

C. Impact on the College's Educational Mission

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

E. The Pressure of the Tuition Target

Meanwhile, the University continues to set increasing enrollment and tuition revenue targets for the College, with financial penalties for not reaching these targets. Yet, the basic determination of the budget is not tied to the level of enrollments. This puts the College between “a rock and a hard place,” with a strong incentive to meet the tuition target, yet with the consequence of putting increasing burdens on a shrinking full-time faculty and providing students with fewer and larger classes. (In FY 1995 the College also had to absorb six lines that had previously been funded by the Graduate Center, putting additional pressure on the personal services budget.)
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COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN FULL-TIME FACULTY AND FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENTS 1985-1994

[Graph showing changes in FTE students and full-time faculty from 1985-86 to 1994-95]
F. Base Level Equity

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

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

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

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

H. Budgeting and Planning

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

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

---

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

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

I. Perceptions of the College’s Budget Process

The survey of department chairs conducted by the Task Force on Financial and Physical Resources revealed two somewhat disconcerting findings: first, that a majority of chairs feel they do not receive adequate information about how the College allocates funds to their division; 12 out of 28 felt that it was not clear how resources were allocated within their divisions; eight of the 28 felt that their departments were not fairly treated, even recognizing the severity of budget constraints.35 One important rule for maintaining morale in difficult times is to let people know what is happening, and reduce uncertainty, while making them feel they are being treated fairly. Of course, one problem with the notion of fair treatment when resources are shrinking is that it often encourages across-the-board cuts rather than hard decisions about what the institution’s priorities should be.

J. Increases in External Funding and Alumni/ae Support

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

K. How Does the Future Look?

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

---

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

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

V. Recommendations

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

B. Recommendations That Can Be Implemented by the College

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Among the directions that must be considered:

\begin{itemize}
  \item > Restructuring with more very large classes to allow for maintenance of a sufficient inventory of smaller classes. Restructuring of the curriculum so that fewer--but more intensive or comprehensive courses--are required to complete a degree.

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

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

\footnote{The Physics Department has set a good example for this with its coordination of its Master's curriculum with Hunter and Lehman Colleges.}
the College to expand the educational boundaries of the campus.\footnote{The College is currently participating in a University-wide initiative to expand the use of technology funded by a $150 million bond issue. While distance learning was one option the College could have undertaken, it chose to promote faculty development through training in an open systems multi-media laboratory relying on high-speed connectivity with the Internet. However, distance learning remains an important technological enhancement that the College should pursue. The University did have an earlier (not very successful) experiment with distance learning in the 1970's; fortunately, the technologies have improved significantly since then.}

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

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

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

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

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

Recent trends in giving to departments have indicated that alumni are willing to help the College provide for students of the future the first-class education that they received here in the past. Departments must think about the ways in which this alumni support can be tapped so that donors can feel that they are making concrete contributions to improving the College. Therefore,
RECOMMENDATION: Departments should work with the Office of Development to increase communications with alumni/ae and to develop projects that will encourage their financial support. <8-14>

VI. Summary List of Recommendations on Financial Resources

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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