SCF COMMITTEE MEETING
Marriott Library, Room 1705
Thursday, January 28, 2026
12:00pm to 1:00pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Pat Tripeny, Adam Halstrom, Lorelei Rutledge,
Audrey Thompson, Patricia Rohrer, Bill Hesterly, Bob Flores (visitor)
ABSENT/EXCUSED: Ann Darling, James Tabery, Matthew Brownlee, Polly
Creveling, Cindy Chen, Aubrey Keaney, Cameron Larson

MINUTES
April 29, 2015 (Move to future meeting)
November 9, 2016 (Move to future meeting)

COMMITTEE COMPOSITION AND POLICY (Joanne and Bob Flores)
General overview:
- Committee is not optimally comprised; does not report in a way to facilitate proposing changes.
- We would like to include career-line (those whose job might be on the line), and students who will attend.

Bob Flores:
- Revision will bring the committee into the Academic Senate structure which will allow it to be more directly involved in decision-making processes of the Senate.
- Revisions should focus on describing the structure of the committee and where it stands in the Senate structure (how does it report, and how often). Construct the policy to make the committee useful—think of this as a blank slate.

Historical structure:
- Involved some faculty and students, and ex-officio members (whose job is directly related to SCF); ensured representation from both Undergraduate and Graduate Council.

Immediate problem is the term (faculty for 2 years, not to be repeated).
Can we agree to a 3 year term for faculty with the possibility of repeating the term?
- There were no objections to a 3 year term for faculty.
- Discussion on the history of the two year term and the history of the committee structure.
- Whatever the term is, it should reflect pretty steep learning curve and assume that new members won't be able to contribute much early on as they learn about the committee's work.
  - Examples: The Faculty Review Standards committee is a 4 year term with 2 terms expected; most other senate committees have 3 year terms with no term limits.

We'd like a balance between career-line faculty and tenured/tenure-line faculty.
- There were no objections to including more career-line faculty.
- Half the total number of faculty should be career-line?
  - There may be difficulty in getting career-line faculty to commit to more committee-work.

The committee needs student representation.
- A problem with many Senate committees is getting student representatives who will attend and participate.

The committee needs some administrators (college and/or departments).

Should we keep the Graduate and Undergraduate representatives?
- Two options: Administrator from each council as ex-officio or appointed member, or faculty member with dual role.

Status of ex-officio members: voting or nonvoting?
- The Senate tends to discourage voting ex-officio members
- There is a difference between "ex-officio" and "appointment"
  - Ex-officio members can be nonvoting
  - Appointment members can have voting rights

The policy should be written to reflect the committee's purpose.
- What is the committee here for: Is this an advisory committee or should it be responsible for devising the instrumentation?
  - Pat raised a concern that committees may not be well-suited to "devise" an instrument, but can perform a valuable advisory and approval function.
  - The "intent" behind the current policy was to have administrators of SCF (CTLE) get data, make proposals for changes – then the committee will approve changes.
- There were no objections to revising the policy to make it clear that the role of the committee is to advise CTLE and approves changes, then submit changes to the Senate for approval.

Review: Important features of the policy.
- State the function of the committee, how it relates to CTLE, and how it relates to the Senate
- Define the membership and terms.
- Recommend diverse representation: career-line faculty, tenure-line faculty, tenured faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, academic administrator (Chair/Dean), Medical School representative.

Action Item – Joanne would like to take our revisions to the Senate Executive Committee by March.
Action Item – Adam will email draft of revisions and original policy. Set date for our next meeting as soon as possible (2 weeks).
Action Item – Pat will send some notes on wording the advisory relationship of the committee.

ARTICLE ON GENDER AND EVALUATION (Joanne)
Also see NPR Ed Article.
What are the implications?
Move discussion to a future meeting.

REPORT (Adam)
Number of survey questions compared to response rate.
Not covered.

COMMITTEE CHAIR FOR 2016-2017
Not covered.

FUTURE MEETINGS

Set next meeting for February 9th.
We will set one meeting at a time so our meeting times reflect current needs.

OTHER BUSINESS
Action Item – Pat or Adam will call the School of Medicine to get a clearer sense of which courses they evaluate with their own system.

SCF COMMITTEE MEETING
Marriott Library, Room 1705
Wednesday, March 9, 2016
11:00am to 12:00pm

ATTENDEES: Joanne Yaffe, Pat Tripeny, Ann Darling, Adam Halstrom, James Tabery, Lorelei Rutledge, Audrey Thompson, Patricia Rohrer, Bill Hesterly, Yuji Chen, Gail Benuzillo, Mohd Iqmal Abd Halim
ABSENT/EXCUSED: (Lorelei Rutledge, absent for the vote)

POLICY CHANGES
- Question about 4 year review period:
    - Committee can suggest changes to the senate at any point, but is required to conduct a formal review every 4 years.
    - Committee Procedures Manuel should include detail about 4 year review cycle.
- "The instruments, report forms, and procedures will be continuously evaluated by the committee." – Also add to "ii. Functions."

Review of Committee Membership and Officers.
- Faculty
    - Remove "no more than three."
    - Policy 6-300 3.B states that tenure-line should have majority
        - "add, in accordance with Policy 6-300 3.B…"
    - We should have at least one faculty representative from:
        - Health Sciences
        - Academic unit administrator
        - Career-line
        - Tenure-line
- Appointed members
    - Procedures should advise appointments to be multi-year terms.
- Students
    - Annual terms of service, but may be reappointed.
- Committee Officers Appointment:
    - President appoints the committee officers… in consultation with "Director of University unit responsible…"
Functions
- This is basically a repetition of Policy 6-100.III.N.1.b

VOTE
Ann Darling moves to send policy as revised in this meeting to Senate Executive Committee. James Tabery seconds the motion.
- Unanimous affirmative vote; one abstained.

Should we meet with SoM representative to discuss their needs?
- James volunteers to do some searching in SoM.
- Look a list of SoM contacts to piece it together.

Thoughts from our student members:
- Some classes don't fit the model. The questions don't make sense for the course, and this makes them hard to answer.
- Questions aren't worded well.
- Question don't allow students to give feedback they want.
  - Questions are too restrictive.
- Students like a question about effective text book?
- Instrument as questions: Software as procedures.

Clarification of what is meant by instrument:
- Instrument as questions: Software as procedures.

What can we look at next year:
- Multiple instruments to meet diverse needs
- Re-engage ASUU on the responsibility and privilege.
- Sheer number of questions.

Other thoughts:
- Should we ask an open-ended question: What other content should be included in this course?
- Would you take another course from this instructor?

SCF COMMITTEE MINUTES
Marriott Library, Room 1705
Monday, November 9, 2015
3:30pm to 5:00pm

ATTENDEES: Not documented.

DISCUSSION
Revising Policy on Committee Structure - [Policy 6-100-III-N-1](#) (Joanne)

A revision of Policy 6-100-III is being considered.

The revision is expected to include adjustments to the committee structure to accommodate allow for broader coverage from across campus. The revision may also make the committee's charge and responsibilities clear, and may list the committee as one of the Academic Senate's standing committees.

ACTION ITEM: Joanne will pursue these changes and bring a draft to the committee next spring.

Current Issues

The committee discussed a variety of issues including response rates, the number of questions, use of SCF in RPT, and the purpose of SCF.

It was proposed and generally agreed that the committee should target its efforts on one issue, or a set of closely related issues.

Most of the questions, concerns, and issues that the committee might address will require a working definition of the purpose of student course feedback. The committee will attempt to define this purpose.

In addition to defining the purpose of SCF, the committee would like to examine the kind and number of questions being added to surveys across campus.

ACTION ITEM: Adam will prepare a report to show the kind and number of questions being used across campus. He will also develop a report to show the correlation (if there is one) between number of survey questions and response rate.

PRESENTATION
Response Rate Analysis (Adam)

The committee was presented a report that shows the average responses rate for the University beginning in 2003 when surveys were first offered online.

Fall 2007 had the highest response rate (81%); the surveys closed 21 days late.

Fall 2011 had the second highest response rate (79%); the first semester we switched to SmartEvals.

Beginning roughly in 2013 we start to see a drop in the response rates. We expect that one important variable might be the wide-spread adoption of Canvas which, if used for grading, allows students to see their grade without having to complete the survey. It has long been suspected that our high response rates have been connected with students' ability to view grades early if they complete the course survey.

DISCUSSION

Committee Objectives for 2015-2016

        The committee will attempt to define the purpose of student course feedback at the University of Utah.

        The committee will look to revise the current policy governing the committee structure and charge.

        The committee will begin to look at the kind and number of questions being employed in course surveys across campus, especially to determine whether or not those questions serve the purpose of student course feedback.

Timing and schedule for Spring Semester meetings

        The committee will try to meet once in January, February, March, and April.