BRONX COMMUNITY COLLEGE  
of The City University of New York

MINUTES OF COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTION - FEB. 13, 1972

Present: G. Berger, Chairman  
M. Chang, H. Eagle, D. Frank, N. Gore, R. Gorman, A. Hirschfield,  
W. Hynes, S. Ktenofeld, A. Lessor, J. Ryan, E.D. Santa Rics Jr.  
and J. Sztako.

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 N.Y. 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 Celston. Prof.  
Hirschfield read a letter dated Feb. 20 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 affectiveness"  
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  
a questionnaire they want to have answered by the students.

The meeting adjourned at 4 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mabel L. Chang  
Secretary
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