



The University of Georgia

University Council
Athens, Georgia 30602

February 5, 2010

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE – 2009-2010

Mr. David E. Shipley, Chair

Agricultural and Environmental Sciences - Dr. Timothy L. Foutz

Arts and Sciences - Dr. Roxanne Eberle (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. Sarah F. Covert

Journalism and Mass Communication - Dr. Wendy A. Macias

Law – No representative

Pharmacy - Dr. Keith N. Herist

Public and International Affairs - Dr. Jerome S. Legge

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 – Cameron Secord

Graduate Student Representative – Lauren King

Dear Colleagues:

The information concerning course evaluations that was approved by the UCC at the April 24, 2009 meeting has been included in the attached policies. Also included in the End-of-Term Course Evaluation policy is the following wording:

All students must be given the opportunity to complete an end-of-term course evaluation.

Departments, schools, colleges, and institutes have individual policies regarding course evaluation, but there is no university-wide policy that includes this statement.

Also attached is a memo from the University Curriculum Committee requesting implementation of the approved policies.

This letter and the policies will be agenda items for the February 12, 2010, Full University Curriculum Committee meeting.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "David Shipley". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style with a long, sweeping tail on the final letter.

David E. Shipley, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

cc: Professor Jere W. Morehead
Dr. Laura D. Jolly

MEMORANDUM

TO: Deans

FROM: David Shipley, Chair
University Curriculum Committee

DATE:

SUBJECT: Course Evaluations

The University Curriculum Committee approved the attached Academic Affairs Policies 4-07.16, End-of-Term Course Evaluations, and 4-07.17, Midterm Course Evaluations, at the meeting on February 10, 2010.

Academic Affairs Policy 4-07.16, End-of-Term Course Evaluations, requires that all course evaluations include four common questions. These questions will be in addition to any questions included in the course evaluation for the department, school, or college. The committee is asking schools and colleges that use an online course evaluation tool to include the four common questions in the spring 2010 course evaluations, if possible, and requiring that all schools and colleges include the four common questions in the fall 2010 course evaluations. Details are included in the attached policy.

Academic Affairs Policy 4-07-16, Midterm Course Evaluations, recommends that schools and colleges consider giving students the opportunity to complete midterm evaluations. Details are included in the attached policy.

Cc: University Curriculum Committee

4-07.16 End-of-Term Course Evaluations

All students must be given the opportunity to complete an end-of-term course evaluation.

Common Course Evaluations and Use of Common Scale

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.

Results of the End-of-Term Course Evaluations

During the one-year trial period the numerical results for the common questions in end-of-term 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.

4-07.17 Midterm Course Evaluations

Instructors are encouraged to administer midterm evaluations in their courses each semester. Questions for that evaluation might include:

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.