

## 2019-20 Report

Committee on Instruction

BMCC Academic Senate

Members: Jean Amaral, Library  
Sharon Brickman, Accounting  
Andrés Colapinto, Social Sciences, Human Services, and Criminal Justice  
Lisa Rose, Social Sciences, Human Services, and Criminal Justice  
Jennifer Longley, Teacher Education  
Jun Liang, Science  
Kibrewossen Tesfagiorgis, Science  
Michael McGee Health Education  
Nicholas Smith, Academic Literacy and Linguistics  
Rifat Salam, Social Sciences, Human Services, and Criminal Justice (sabbatical Spring 2020)

Chair: Andrés Colapinto  
Secretary: Sharon Brickman  
Representative to the Executive Committee: Andrés Colapinto

The Committee focused on three core issues this year

1. Developing guidelines for Peer Observation of E-Learning Courses
2. Developing a Student Experience Survey to propose as a replacement to the College's Student Evaluations of Teaching.
3. Addressing the challenges and opportunities presented by the transition to online teaching during the COVID-19 health emergency

### **1. Guidelines for Peer Observation of E-Learning Courses**

Continuing work that began in the 2018-2019 year (largely undertaken by an ad hoc committee formed for the purpose), the Instruction Committee finished developing guidelines for peer observation of e-learning courses. At around the same time, the new PSC-CUNY contract was approved, which included new language concerning such observations. While the procedures and regulations outlined in the contract largely resembled our own, we determined that our recommendations included some important supplementation. We revised these recommendations to highlight its supplementary, non-contractual elements. This was submitted to the Senate as a resolution and passed April 22, 2020. **(See Attachment A.)**

**Note to next year's committee:** While these recommendations were passed by the Senate, it will still be necessary to remind department chairs, and the faculty as a whole, of these guidelines (as well as the contractual requirements). The committee should coordinate with the Senate Chair to ensure that the information is distributed effectively.

## 2. Student Experience Survey

Continuing work that began in the 2018-2019 year (and, again, largely undertaken by an ad hoc committee) the Instruction Committee developed a new instrument to use for end-of-semester student feedback. While we did not form another ad hoc group, volunteers from that group continued to support the project this year. We thank Ilir Disha, Ruth Guirguis, and Keridiana Chez, James Hoff, and Chun-Yi Peng for their contributions to this project.

We were guided by a growing awareness of the problems inherent in student evaluations of the type BMCC uses, where students are asked to “rank” the performance of professors on a scale, across a range of criteria. Research has shown that these questionnaires are a) not generally conducive to the improvement of teaching, and b) prone to bias on the basis of race, ethnicity, and gender, amongst other ascriptive characteristics.

An excellent summary of such findings, and a list of institutions that have taken action to address them, is available in a statement issued by the American Sociological Association last year. (**See Attachment B.**)

The Instruction Committee hopes that BMCC can follow the example of these other institutions, and rethink the very nature and purpose of student feedback. Broad reforms are needed, and we think that CUNY should revisit its policies concerning the use of student evaluations in decisions concerning reappointment, tenure and promotion. As a first step, however, the evaluations themselves can be revised so that they are more helpful (and fair) to all professors.

With that in mind, we developed an instrument we call a “student experience survey,” rather than a “student evaluation of teaching.” (**See Attachment C.**) We believe that, among other advantages, it better directs students to reflect on their experience in the classroom (for which the professor is, of course, responsible) rather than on their impression of the professor’s personality or character, or of practices not relevant to learning.

The goal for Spring 2020 was to do some informal “beta testing” by inviting professors to use the survey for mid-semester feedback. We would then collect feedback from the professors about their and their student’s impressions of the survey. (**See Attachment D.**) After getting this feedback, we planned to ask the Senate to approve a formal pilot of these questions (revised as needed) at the end of Fall 2020, for the courses of volunteer faculty who have already received tenure.

However, when classes moved online, we decided that the time was not right for beta testing, or for bringing our pilot proposal to the Senate. We hope the committee will take up this project at the beginning of Fall 2020.

**Note to next year’s committee:** Our recommendation is that the committee run a ‘beta test’ of the survey questions, as initially planned, with volunteer faculty mid-semester in Fall 2020. At the same time, the committee should start working with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Analytics (which administers end-of-year student surveys) to start planning for a possible pilot at the end of the semester, or at the end of Spring 2020. The pilot should first be approved

by the Senate body. We recommend that participants in this pilot be volunteers who have already been granted tenure.

### 3. Challenges and Opportunities in Shift to Online Teaching

After campus was closed in response to the COVID-19 outbreak, and instruction moved online, we directed our attention to some issues that arose in this unusual context.

1. College policies concerning possible conversion of in-person classes to online classes in Fall 2020:
  - a. During the semester, the College developed and communicated new policies concerning the conversion of in-person classes to online classes, in the event of a continued campus closure in Fall 2020. The committee determined that some aspects of this policy could be clarified or modified, in order to give faculty sufficient flexibility to respond to emergent challenges, whether these be technological, personal, or pedagogical. Our recommendations were approved by the Senate (May 13, 2020). Interim President Karrin Wilks communicated to the chair of this Committee that she and Provost Erwin Wong agreed to the recommended policy. **See Attachment E** for our recommendations and rationale.
  - b. **Notes for next year’s committee:** It will be important to ensure that faculty and chairs aware of the policy recommendations that the Senate approved, and the Administration agreed to adopt. This may mean following up before the beginning of the semester, once we know that all classes will, indeed, be moved to an online format.
2. Trauma informed pedagogy
  - a. The current crisis creates both a need and an opportunity for faculty to learn more about teaching students who are experiencing the effects of trauma. While a sensitivity to these issues is especially warranted at this moment, a “**trauma-informed pedagogy**” can improve teaching and learning even when we return to “normal” conditions. The committee began work on this issue—with explicit support of Interim President Wilks—that we hope will continue next year. This included:
    - i. A CETLS Community Care and & Share on this topic, led by Marguerite Rivas (5/7)
    - ii. Planning for summer faculty workshops sponsored by the BMCC Learning Academy
    - iii. The collection of resources that can be made available to all faculty and/or synthesized as a list of best practices.
    - iv. Ongoing conversations with the Student Affairs Committee and other College organizations.
    - v. Agreement from the E-Learning office to embed trauma informed pedagogy into their summer 2020 faculty cohort program for faculty who are designing e-Learning courses

- vi. Resources will be made available to faculty on BMCC's website
  - b. **Note for next year's committee:** We hope that the committee agrees to continue this important work, continuing to bring the dialog about trauma-informed pedagogy to a variety of faculty spaces.
3. Faculty Development Resources for synchronous online teaching.
- a. The Committee recognizes the remarkable efforts of the E-Learning Office to prepare faculty for a sudden switch to online instruction. We also recognized a greater need for faculty development resources pertaining to synchronous online teaching. E-Learning "training" has traditionally focused on asynchronous instruction; but during the pandemic, much instruction has been, and will likely continue to be, offered in a synchronous online format. Communication platforms could be established among faculty to share best practices under this new form of teaching, regarding use of technology, class organization, time management, students engagement etc.
  - b. **Notes for next year's committee:** It is recommended the Instruction Committee keep abreast of (or investigate) the college's policies and recommendations regarding synchronous learning, as well as emerging research on synchronous on-line teaching.

This report is respectfully submitted by the Chair of the Instruction Committee 2018-2019,

Andrés Colapinto

## Attachment A

Proposed Guidelines for Observation of Online Classes

Instruction Committee of the Academic Senate, BMCC Passed by Senate body April 22 2020

The newest PSC-CUNY contract now includes language concerning peer observation of online courses. (See Article 18.2 (b) in the [Memorandum of Agreement](#).) The intent is to “replicate as closely as possible the longstanding teaching observation practices” that have existed in previous contracts. The Instruction Committee at BMCC had been independently developing its own guidelines, and finalized them just as the contract was approved. Some of these repeat what is now in the contract, but some are new.

Below are the Instruction Committee’s proposed guidelines. Those recommendations that repeat what is contractually required are listed first, followed by those which go beyond the contract language. Note that the contract has additional guidelines which are not included here, particularly those concerning hybrid courses, and whether they should be observed online or in person.

Both the Observer and Observee should be made aware of these guidelines.

### **Proposed BMCC E-Learning Observation Guidelines**

*Contractually required guidelines (Not exhaustive: see [MOA](#) for complete guidelines)*

1. Online course observations should be as close as possible in structure to in-class observations.
2. As per contractual obligations, (i) the Observer will be allocated a 48-hour (maximum) window of time to observe the lesson, and (ii) should not observe course activity that occurred more than 7 days prior to the observation.
3. As per contractual obligations, the Observer must be enrolled in student/guest access. The Observer’s access to the class will be closed (unenrolled) by the Observee after the mutually decided upon 48-hour (maximum) window.
4. The observee should inform the students enrolled in the online class of the observer’s presence in the class prior to the observation.

*Additional recommendations of the Instruction Committee*

5. The same reporting form departments use for in-class peer observations should also be used for online class evaluations.
6. Absent specific instructions from a chairperson, program coordinator, or other designee, the Observer and the Observee should mutually agree on (i) which type of class should be observed, traditional face-to-face course OR online course, and (ii) should agree on the time of observation. If the observation is of an online class, the Observer must be trained in online teaching.
7. The Observer’s primary responsibility is to provide feedback regarding teaching and learning for a particular lesson, rather than overall course design.
8. In the case that significant interactions between the Observee and students are not visible to the Observer through student/guest access, the Observee may choose to make this activity available to the Observer in some other way. This could mean meeting in person to review the material, emailing PDFs or screenshots, etc.



Most faculty in North America are evaluated, in part, on their teaching effectiveness. This is typically measured with student evaluations of teaching (SETs), instruments that ask students to rate instructors on a series of mostly closed-ended items. Because these instruments are cheap, easy to implement, and provide a simple way to gather information, they are the most common method used to evaluate faculty teaching for hiring, tenure, promotion, contract renewal, and merit raises.

Despite the ubiquity of SETs, a growing body of evidence suggests that their use in personnel decisions is problematic. SETs are weakly related to other measures of teaching effectiveness and student learning (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; Uttl, White, and Gonzalez 2017); they are used in statistically problematic ways (e.g., categorical measures are treated as interval, response rates are ignored, small differences are given undue weight, and distributions are not reported) (Boysen 2015; Stark and Freishtat 2014); and they can be influenced by course characteristics like time of day, subject, class size, and whether the course is required, all of which are unrelated to teaching effectiveness.

In addition, in both observational studies and experiments, SETs have been found to be biased against women and people of color (for recent reviews of the literature, see Basow and Martin 2012 and Spooen, Brockx, and Mortelmans 2015). For example, students rate women instructors lower than they rate men, even when they exhibit the same teaching behaviors (Boring, Ottoboni, and Stark 2016; MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt 2015), and students use stereotypically gendered language in how they evaluate their instructors (Mitchell and Martin 2018). The instrument design can also affect gender bias in evaluations; in an article in *American Sociological Review*, Rivera and Tilcsik (2019) find that the range of the rating scale

(e.g., a 6-point scale versus a 10-point scale) can affect how women are evaluated relative to men in male-dominated fields. Further, Black and Asian faculty members are evaluated less positively than White faculty (Bavishi, Madera, and Hebl 2010; Reid 2010; Smith and Hawkins 2011), especially by students who are White men. Faculty ethnicity and gender also mediate how students rate instructor characteristics like leniency and warmth (Anderson and Smith 2005).

A scholarly consensus has emerged that using SETs as the primary measure of teaching effectiveness in faculty review processes can systematically disadvantage faculty from marginalized groups. This can be especially consequential for contingent faculty for whom a small difference in average scores can mean the difference between contract renewal and dismissal.

Given these limitations, the American Sociological Association, in collaboration with the scholarly societies listed below, encourages institutions to use evidence-based best practices for collecting and using student feedback about teaching (Barre 2015; Dennin et al. 2017; Linse 2017; Stark and Freishtat 2014). These include:

1. Questions on SETs should focus on student experiences, and the instruments should be framed as an opportunity for student feedback, rather than an opportunity for formal ratings of teaching effectiveness. For example, two universities – Augsburg University and University of North Carolina Asheville – recently revised and renamed their instruments to the “University Course Survey” and the “Student Feedback on Instruction Form,” respectively, to emphasize that student feedback, while important, is not an evaluation of teaching effectiveness.

2. SETs should not be used as the only evidence of teaching effectiveness. Rather, when they are used, they should be part of a holistic assessment that includes peer observations, reviews of teaching materials, and instructor self-reflections. This holistic approach has been in wide use at teaching-focused institutions for many years and is becoming more common at research institutions as well. For example:

- University of Oregon has undertaken a multi-year process to develop a holistic framework for assessing teaching effectiveness, including peer review, self-reflection, and student feedback. Extensive research and resources are available on the Office of the Provost [website](#), including guidance on how to interpret SETs
- University of Southern California has instituted peer review of teaching for faculty evaluation. Their [Center for Excellence in Teaching](#) provides resources for how to use peer review effectively and addresses common concerns.
- University of California Irvine requires faculty to submit two types of evidence to document teaching effectiveness. In addition to SETs, faculty can submit a reflective teaching statement, peer evaluations of teaching, and other evidence like a [Teaching Practices Inventory](#), developed by physicist Carl Weiman.
- University of Nebraska Lincoln has articulated [best practices for faculty evaluation](#) that state, in part, “it is recommended that student evaluation scores should not be given undue weight in faculty evaluations, since these scores are easily manipulated and reflect many attitudes that extend beyond the successful accomplishment of the faculty member’s teaching duties.”
- The University of Michigan’s Center for Research on Teaching and Learning recommends that student ratings should

never be used in isolation and should be part of a broader assessment of teaching effectiveness. They have developed [resources](#) that include a summary of research findings on SETs, a handout for students on how to make their feedback most helpful to instructors, and best practices for using SETs in personnel decisions.

- Ryerson University has gone even further and is no longer using SETs for tenure or promotion decisions (Farr 2018). Instead, Ryerson asks faculty to compile a teaching dossier that includes a statement of teaching philosophy, evidence of curricular engagement, and self-reflections.
3. SETs should not be used to compare individual faculty members to each other or to a department average. As part of a holistic assessment, they can appropriately be used to document patterns in an instructor’s feedback over time.
  4. If quantitative scores are reported, they should include distributions, sample sizes, and response rates for each question on the instrument (Stark and Freishtat 2014). This provides an interpretative context for the scores (e.g., items with low response rates should be given little weight).
  5. Evaluators (e.g., chairs, deans, hiring committees, tenure and promotion committees) should be trained in how to interpret and use SETs as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness (see Linse 2017 for specific guidance).

Gathering student feedback on their experiences in the classroom is an important part of student-centered teaching. This feedback can help instructors to refine their pedagogies and improve student learning in their courses. However, student feedback should not be used alone as a measure of teaching quality. If it is used in faculty evaluation processes, it should be considered as part of a holistic assessment of teaching effectiveness.

**Attachment C**  
**BMCC Student Experience Survey**  
**Mid-Semester**

This survey will help your instructor better understand your experience in this course.

It is specific to the instructor of this particular portion of the course (lecture, lab, discussion, recitation, etc.). Please focus your feedback on the specific portion of the learning experience over which they have control.

This survey is anonymous, and your answers cannot be traced back to you.

**Teaching and Learning Elements:**

For each of the following teaching and learning elements, please indicate whether it has been **beneficial** to your learning, **neutral**, or **needs improvement** to help your learning. In the next section you will be asked to indicate which one was the MOST helpful to your learning, and which one is the MOST in need of improvement.

The way I am welcomed and included in this class:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The level of challenge in this course:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The degree to which the course includes active learning (e.g., in-class activities, hands-on activities, or field trips, etc.):

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The opportunities for student interaction in this class:

- Are beneficial to my learning
- Neither add nor detract from my learning
- Need improvement to help my learning



## Attachment C

The course readings or other materials used:

- Are beneficial to my learning
- Neither add nor detract from my learning
- Need improvement to help my learning

The assignments or projects in this course:

- Are beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Need improvement to help my learning

The variety of ways for me to show what I've learned in the course:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The clarity of assignment instructions:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The clarity of grading policies in this course:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The feedback provided by the instructor:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

Instructor communication:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

The support from the instructor:

- Is beneficial to my learning
- Neither adds nor detracts from my learning
- Needs improvement to help my learning

**What's been MOST helpful to your learning?**

## Attachment C

**Choose only one.**

- The way I am welcomed and included in this class
- The level of challenge in this course
- The degree to which the course includes active learning (e.g., in-class activities, hands-on activities, or field trips, etc.)
- The opportunities for student interaction in this class
- The variety of ways for me to show what I've learned in the course
- The course readings or other materials used
- The assignments or projects in this course
- The clarity of assignment instructions
- The clarity of grading policies in this course
- The feedback provided by the instructor
- Instructor communication
- The support from the instructor
- None of the elements above are helpful to my learning

What specifically about your answer to the above question helped you learn? If you chose none of the above, say more about how none of the elements are helpful to your learning.

### Attachment C

**What could MOST use some improvement to help you learn?**

**Choose only one.**

- The way I am welcomed and included in this class
- The level of challenge in this course
- The degree to which the course includes active learning (e.g., in-class activities, hands-on activities, or field trips, etc.)
- The opportunities for student interaction in this class
- The variety of ways for me to show what I've learned in the course
- The course readings or other materials used
- The assignments or projects in this course
- The clarity of assignment instructions
- The clarity of grading policies in this course
- The feedback provided by the instructor
- Instructor communication
- The support from the instructor
- None of the elements above are helpful to my learning

What specific change in the item you selected in the above question would help you learn? If you chose none of the above, say more about how none of the elements above need improvement to help you learn.

## Attachment C

### How did you support your learning?

How often did you attend class?

- 90% of the time
- 75-90% of the time
- 50-75% of the time
- 25-50% of the time
- 0-25% of the time
- This was a full online class.

Why did you attend class for the percentage of the time you chose above?

How many **hours per week** did you spend on this course (not including any face-to-face class time)?

- More than 10 hours each week
- 8-10 hours each week
- 6-8 hours each week
- 4-6 hours each week
- 2-4 hours each week
- 1-2 hours each week
- 0-1 hour each week

Approximately how many times did you interact with the instructor outside of the class (e.g., by email, office hours)?

- 1-3 times in total
- 4-6 times in total
- 7-10 times in total
- More than 10 times in total
- I did not interact with the instructor outside of the class (e.g., by email, office hours)

Is there anything you would like to say about your learning experience in this course?

## Attachment D

- 1. For the questions below, please let us know whether they are sufficiently understandable. If not, what is unclear? Any other comments/suggestions about particular questions are also welcome.**

	<u>Professor's feedback</u>	<u>Student Feedback</u>
The way I am welcomed and included in this class:		
The level of challenge in this course:		
The degree to which the course includes active learning (e.g., in-class activities, hands-on activities, field trips, etc.):		
The opportunities for student interaction in this course:		
The course readings or other materials used:		
The assignments or projects in this course:		
The variety of ways for me to show what I've learned in the course:		
The clarity of assignment instructions:		
The clarity of grading policies in this course:		
The feedback provided by the instructor:		
Instructor communication:		
The support from the instructor:		

## Attachment D

### 2. Are the answer options clear and sufficiently distinct?

	<u>Professor's Feedback</u>	<u>Student Feedback</u>
a. is beneficial to my learning		
b. neither adds nor detracts from my learning		
c. needs improvement to help my learning		

### 3. What about the length of the survey? About how long did it take students to complete?

### 4. For students: Does this survey, as a whole, capture your experience in this class? What other questions should be included?

### 5. For professors:

What do you think about the information provided through students' answers?

How could you use the results of the questionnaire to inform your pedagogy?

### 6. Any other comments or suggestions? (For example, do you or your students have any thoughts about the questions concerning the student's own participation?)

## Attachment E

### *Recommendations concerning the possible conversion of classes to online format in case of campus closure.*

Instruction Committee of the Academic Senate, BMCC.

#### **Introduction**

The Instruction Committee has carefully considered the memo distributed by Provost Erwin Wong on April 30, 2020. This memo clarifies, among other things, the College's policy concerning **courses that are scheduled to meet in person in Fall 2020, but must be taught online** in the case of a continuing public health emergency due to COVID-19. We welcome this clarification of the College's policy. We also very much appreciate the concern expressed therein for the needs and preferences of students, and for the diverse teaching approaches of faculty. We recognize that balancing and accommodating all of these interests, especially with so much uncertainty about the fall semester, is a difficult task.

That said, we believe some clarifications and/or modifications to the current policy would ensure that faculty have the right amount of flexibility in case of a move to online teaching. We will need this flexibility in order to best serve our students (and care for ourselves), since a shift to online teaching poses practical and pedagogical challenges—as well as equity concerns—that may vary from class to class, and which may evolve after the semester is underway.

There are two core issues. The first issue concerns in-person classes that are “forced” online in case of continued campus closure. Without further clarification, the policy described in the memo implies that faculty teaching these courses must hold online classes for the full scheduled times. This may work well in many cases. But there are a number of ways in which synchronous online teaching may present difficulties which could be served by a reduction in synchronous teaching hours:

- Students may not have reliable access to computers (despite efforts to equip them with these), and to high-speed internet, or may be using mobile hotspots with limited data.
- Students and faculty may have living situations where it is difficult to schedule long periods of quiet, focused time twice a week (longer periods once a week). For example, they may be caring for children at home if schools are closed.
- Depending on course material and class format, long video sessions (in some cases upwards of two hours) may become counterproductive<sup>1</sup>
- Course materials may not lend themselves well to student engagement in a synchronous video medium.

More generally, the benefits and drawbacks of synchronous online teaching are varied and complex, and finding the right “blend” of synchronous and asynchronous teaching is a subtle art.<sup>2</sup> For these reasons, some faculty—in consultation with students—may determine that it would be best to reduce the number of synchronous teaching hours, and replace these with asynchronous activities. This should be allowed, without the need to cancel and relist the class. (See recommendation #1.) Of course, individual departments may set guidelines concerning these modifications, and faculty should never schedule new teaching times outside their scheduled hours.

---

<sup>1</sup> For some discussion see Acosta-Tello, E. (2015). Enhancing the Online Class: Effective Use of Synchronous Interactive Online Instruction. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, 17.

<sup>2</sup> For a good overview of the benefits and challenges of various online and “blended” modes of teaching, see Fadde, P. J., & Vu, P. (2014). Blended online learning: Benefits, challenges, and misconceptions. *Online learning: Common misconceptions, benefits and challenges*, 33-48.

## Attachment E

The second issue concerns faculty who want to re-list their courses as “officially” asynchronous courses, particularly when close to the beginning of the semester. Provost Wong’s memo indicates that, as the semester approaches, such a switch will be approved only with unanimous student consent. We recognize that changing the mode of teaching of a course at the “last minute” can be disadvantageous for students, and presents administrative challenges; and we agree that it should be avoided as much as possible.

However, we feel that these decisions should be left to the individual departments, which can determine criteria for when such a switch is or isn’t appropriate. Student preferences should be strongly considered, but unanimous consent may not be the right standard to use in many cases; and the practical and pedagogical concerns of faculty should matter in these decisions as well. (See recommendation #2.)

### Recommendations

In light of these concerns, **we propose the following recommendations for scheduled in-person classes in case of a move to online instruction:**

1. Professors who choose to maintain a “synchronous online” designation should be able to reduce the number of online synchronous teaching hours to a pedagogically appropriate amount. These types of decisions may be subject to departmental guidelines, but should not require review by the College, beyond the requirement that the professor be approved to teach online.
2. Professors who would like to switch to a fully asynchronous class, or to re-list their class as a hybrid class, can do so with approval of their chair. Criteria for when this is appropriate--e.g. how close to the beginning of the semester, or with how much student consent--should be determined at the department level, and the decision should not require further review by the College, beyond the requirement that the professor be approved to teach online.
3. Under no circumstance should faculty hold online teaching hours during times that fall outside their posted teaching schedules.

Respectfully submitted by the Instruction Committee of the Academic Senate, BMCC