MINUTES OF COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION - FEB. 15, 1972

Present: I. Berger, Chairman
        M. Chang, N. Eagle, D. Frank, N. Gore, R. Gorman, A. Hirschfield,
        W. Hynes, S. Kronfled, A. Lessard, J. Ryan, E.D. Santa Rita Jr.
        and J. Sztacho.

Dr. Berger, the Chairman, opened the meeting at 2:30 p.m. in our
new meeting room (Room 20) at the Fordham Center. He announced that the
next meeting (on Feb. 29) will be scheduled in the same room at the
same time. The March meetings will be on the 7th and the 21st.

The minutes of the last meeting were approved with the following
correction of a typographical error. On the first line of paragraph 2,
the word "oppressing" should read "opposing".

The Chairman then announced that he had been asked by the
Communicator and Newsletter on the subject of student evaluation. Also,
the Innovation Center is interested in getting some community service
component into the courses taught at the College, said Dr. Berger.

Prof. Hirschfield replied that the N.Y. State Society of C.P.A.
has set up the Community Tax Inc. (a non-profit organization) where
our students may volunteer to help prepare income tax returns for any
one with an income below $6,000.

The subject of student evaluation was next discussed. Dr. Berger
reviewed the history of the directive from SUNY on the need for student
input for promotion, reappointment and tenure after Feb. 1, 1972, and
how a Committee was subsequently set up by President Colston. Prof.
Hirschfield read a letter dated Feb. 10 from the President regarding an
Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Evaluation consisting of 5 faculty members
and 5 students. A March 15 recommendation is requested, said Prof.
Hirschfield.

The floor was then opened for suggestions and alternatives on
the problem. Prof. Hirschfield himself thought some kind of polling of
the faculty should be taken on what questions are pertinent. Should
each department have a different questionnaire, or should the questionnaire
be universal? Then, there is the problem of how student evaluation can
be obtained for the non-instructional faculty members. Is popularity a
good criterion? Should we not distinguish between "touching effectiveness"
and "student's perception of what took place in the teaching environment"?
Is not "perception" the same as "opinion"? If "effectiveness" is to be
measured, should it not be indirectly gauged? If what we are measuring
is under our control, then anxiety may be reduced.

Finally, the conclusion of the members present seemed to indicate
that unless the faculty known to what extent the student evaluation is
to be used, members of the faculty can not say beforehand what kind of
questionnaire they want to have answered by the students.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Mabel L. Chang
Secretary
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