



The University of Georgia

University Council
Athens, Georgia 30602

April 17, 2009

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – 2008-2009

Mr. David E. Shipley, Chair

Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Dr. Timothy L. Foutz

Arts and Sciences - Dr. Richard E. Siegesmund (Arts)

Dr. Rodney Mauricio (Sciences)

Business - Dr. James S. Linck

Ecology - Dr. James W. Porter

Education - Dr. Yvette Q. Getch

Environment and Design - Mr. Scott S. Weinberg

Family and Consumer Sciences - Dr. Jan M. Hathcote

Forestry and Natural Resources - Dr. Ronald L. Hendrick

Journalism and Mass Communication - Dr. Wendy A. Macias

Law – No representative

Pharmacy - Dr. Keith N. Herist

Public and International Affairs - Dr. Anthony M. Bertelli

Public Health – Dr. Phaedra S. Corso

Social Work - Dr. Patricia M. Reeves

Veterinary Medicine - Dr. K. Paige Carmichael

Graduate School - Dr. Malcolm R. Adams

Undergraduate Student Representative – Ms. Jamie Beggerly

Graduate Student Representative – Ms. Amrita Veliyath

Dear Colleagues:

The attached revised proposal to adopt Standard Course Evaluations will be an agenda item for the April 24, 2009, Full University Curriculum Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

David E. Shipley, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

cc: Dr. Arnett C. Mace, Jr.
Professor Jere W. Morehead

MIDTERM COURSE EVALUATIONS

Recommendation:

Instructors are encouraged to administer midterm evaluations in their courses each semester.

Questions for that evaluation might be as follows:

What's working?

What's not working?

How can we make it better?

Procedure:

The midterm course evaluation:

- Will be administered by the instructor (proctors are not necessary)
- Will be used only by the instructor to improve the course
- Will not be used to evaluate the instructor during the promotion and tenure process or annual evaluations
- Will not be kept as a record

Rationale:

The midterm evaluation can provide instructors with feedback on how to improve their courses and allow students an opportunity to provide input before the academic period is complete.

This process may have a positive effect on the end-of-term course evaluation.

COMMON COURSE EVALUATIONS AND USE OF COMMON SCALE

Recommendation:

Instructors will include the following items in their end-of-term course evaluations and use a common scale:

1. Was this course required for your degree?
(1) No, not required (2) Yes, required
2. On average, how many hours per week did you devote to this course outside of class?
(1) 0-1 hours (2) 2-3 hours (3) 4-5 hours (4) 6-7 hours (5) 8 hours or more

3. Assignments and activities were useful for helping me learn.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

4. This course challenged me to think and learn.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	2	3	4	5

Procedure:

- Instructors may include additional items designed to measure teaching effectiveness in their disciplines
- All items will use a common scale from 1 to 5, 5 being highest
- Items on the questionnaire should be positive statements

Rationale:

One of the Task Force for General Education and Student Learning recommendations (II.2.4) was to establish an online course evaluation system and a uniform set of questions for all University undergraduate courses. The Task Force expressed concern over the lack of uniformity among different departments' end-of-course evaluations and the lack of questions on academic rigor. Establishing comprehensive and uniform end-of-course evaluations, but allowing for course-specific questions, will provide an effective tool to assess undergraduate courses and the degree of academic rigor. ~~A common scale will prevent confusion for faculty undergoing the promotion and tenure process.~~

RESULTS OF THE END-OF-COURSE EVALUATIONS

Recommendation:

During the one-year trial period the numerical results for the common questions in end-of-course evaluations will not be published online. Course evaluation comments will not be published online.

Procedure:

An online process will be developed to facilitate collection of the common questions. The results will be available internally for initial assessment. Results will be available for individual courses but not for individual faculty. After results have been compiled for two semesters, the results will be available to UCC for evaluation and consideration. The UCC will determine how to proceed and whether or not to publish numerical results for the common questions.

Rationale:

The University would like a measure of rigor for all courses and to be able to compare results from the course evaluations with the NSSE results. Students want to be able to see the common course evaluation results.