

# THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

## GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS

---

- 1. Purpose of the retention, promotion, and tenure review process.** A probationary period is normally required for all individuals appointed to regular faculty ranks prior to the granting of tenure. Annual reviews are scheduled during this probationary period to examine the academic competence of non-tenured individuals and to terminate those who do not meet the standards of the department and the university after their initial appointment. Promotion in rank and the granting of tenure are acknowledgments of excellent performance in teaching, research and creative work, professional competence and activity, and university and public service. Granting tenure implies a commitment by the university to defend faculty members' academic freedom. Likewise, faculty members who are granted tenure make an equally strong commitment to serve their students, their colleagues, their discipline and the university in a manner befitting an academic person.
- 2. Students should understand the importance of their input in the review process.** Faculty reviews for retention, promotion and tenure are important events. They involve important individual career decisions. Student advisory committee members should keep this fact in mind. Moreover, student reviews provide important and valued information for faculty committee deliberations at all levels of review. SAC members also have the responsibility to inform other students of the importance of their participation in the review process.
- 3. The review process occurs at many levels in the University, with each level having access to all information developed at lower levels.** The department review committee takes into consideration its own information but also weighs heavily information provided by the SAC. Each departmental committee makes a recommendation to the chairperson of the department, who in turn weighs all information. In departmentalized colleges, a college level committee, consisting of faculty from various departments in the college, also examines the total file, including SAC materials. This information and its recommendation are passed on to the dean of the college, who in turn makes his/her recommendation to the cognizant vice president. The cognizant vice president forwards to the University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee (UPTAC) for its recommendation the files in which there is a differing recommendation from any of the prior review levels, or when the college functions as a single academic department. UPTAC examines the file and makes a recommendation to the cognizant vice president. The UPTAC consists of one faculty member elected from each college in the University and four student members. The final decision-maker is the president of the University. There also are procedures by which a faculty member may appeal a decision and set in motion a hearing. SAC materials are read and considered over and over again in the review process and are important.
- 4. The SAC should view itself as a responsible interpreter of information concerning student opinion of an individual faculty member's teaching performance. The SAC should assess the validity and significance of the information and should present a fair and balanced synthesis of both positive and negative qualities suggested by the information.** SAC should not view itself as an advocate, but as an information-gathering and advice-giving body. A broad range of information should be sought from other students, information should be screened and weighed for its accuracy and fairness, and a SAC should make as fair and balanced a presentation as it possibly can.
- 5. The SAC should endeavor to ensure the data it works with are representative of the views of the students who have had some contact with the faculty member being reviewed.** The SAC members should attempt to obtain data from as broad based a sample as possible to ensure that individual students or a small minority do not have an overly influential role in the process. As a data-gatherer, filtering and screening group, the SAC should obtain as diverse a group of opinions as possible and describe as best it can the general thrust of those views. Extreme points of view should be carefully examined in relation to the range of opinions expressed by students, and the SAC must attempt to present as representative a view of students as possible.
- 6. The SAC should report the procedures used in obtaining data and should identify any limitations which might affect their reliability.** There are many ways for SAC to collect information about faculty - interviews, course evaluations, questionnaires, etc. University course evaluations are especially recommended as a data source. Evaluations from multiple courses should be used. To provide other recommending bodies with a clear picture about the underlying basis of SAC reports, the SAC should describe the data collection procedures used, the number and nature of student opinions that were obtained, and other features of the procedures. Where course evaluations are used, state from which courses in which semester the evaluations were reviewed. If a survey or questionnaire was used, attach a copy. The SAC should also describe any limitations or problems with the data so such matters can be considered by other review bodies.
- 7. The SAC should describe and explain the variations of opinion among members of the SAC.** In presenting their analysis and integration, SAC members should include a balanced description and an analysis of the range of opinions of SAC members. There is no reason why a SAC should seek consensus or variations in opinion. However, it is important for the SAC to reflect the range of SAC members' opinions and recommendations. An effort should be made to analyze the change in the candidate's teaching performance over the years and to note the difference in performance in undergraduate and graduate level courses. All SAC officers should sign the report.

# The University of Utah Student Advisory Committee Faculty Evaluation Report

THE FIRST STEP IN THIS EVALUATION SHOULD BE TO READ  
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE EVALUATIONS OF FACULTY MEMBERS (See Accompanying Page)

Evaluation of: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Faculty Member Present Rank

\_\_\_\_\_ Department College

Evaluation for (check applicable action):  Retention  Promotion  Tenure

Completed by (check applicable action):  Graduate SAC  Undergrad SAC  Joint Grad & Undergrad  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Recommendation (please record actual student vote in the appropriate boxes):

Retention			Promotion			Tenure		
Yes	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Abstain	Yes	No	Abstain

**PART I.** Describe the sources and methods used in gathering the data upon which this evaluation is based. Indicate the number and kinds of responses obtained from other students. (Write on separate sheet if necessary.)

**PART II.** Provide a narrative evaluation of the faculty member's teaching performance. Give particular attention to the faculty member's knowledge of the subject and effectiveness in conveying that knowledge to students. (Write on separate sheet if necessary.)

**PART III.** State the reasons for the Student Advisory Committee recommendation in this case. (Write on separate sheet if necessary.)

**Names & Signatures of the SAC Members:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

SAC Chairperson Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_