

Exploration and Practice of Curriculum Evaluation Scheme for Applied Undergraduate Universities Based on OBE Concept

Shan Cheng

Guangdong University of Science & Technology, Dongguan, Guangdong, China

Abstract: The level of curriculum construction is directly related to the quality of talent cultivation in universities, and curriculum evaluation is an important way to promote curriculum construction and improve the quality of talent cultivation. In terms of course teaching, there are common problems such as insufficient teachers, unclear teaching objectives, traditional teaching methods and single assessment. In the process of designing the evaluation scheme for undergraduate courses in applied universities, the focus should be on integrating the OBE concept of "student-centered, outcome-oriented and continuous improvement" throughout the entire course evaluation process. By conducting a three-level course evaluation of "guaranteeing standard, pursuing quality and improving level", a paradigm for evaluating applied undergraduate courses is gradually established.

Keywords: OBE Concept; Applied Undergraduate Universities; Curriculum Evaluation

1. Introduction

The fundamental way to improve teaching quality is to enhance the quality of the curriculum. The core of teaching reform is curriculum reform. When teaching reform goes deep, it is curriculum reform. To meet the requirements of education and teaching reform under the new situation, strengthen the construction and sharing of high-quality courses, promote teaching mode reform, fully utilize the guiding and diagnostic functions of evaluation work, and promote curriculum construction and reform.

2. Common Problems Discovered in Course Evaluation

From the practices of curriculum evaluation conducted by Guangdong University of

Science & Technology, the common problems in the curriculum are mainly manifested in the following four aspects.

2.1 Unreasonable Structure of Course Faculty

Some courses have insufficient teachers, and some teachers' teaching abilities cannot meet the requirements of the training objectives for the teachers. The construction of the teachers in the curriculum is mainly manifested in classroom teaching as follows, some classes have too many students, the teacher's professional title is relatively low and their teaching ability is not high, teachers have insufficient research on the courses they teach and lack effective control over the classroom, the student's head up rate is low, and the classroom interaction effect is not good.

2.2 Unclear Course Teaching Objectives

Some courses have unclear teaching objectives, low compatibility between teaching content and teaching objectives, insufficient targeting of teaching design and content, and lack of prominent teaching focus. During the teaching process, some teachers are unable to use the textbooks flexibly and creatively, lacking understanding of the deep content in the textbooks, and the depth of the curriculum and academic challenges are insufficient. The teaching reference materials are relatively loose and single, lacking certain depth and reflecting academic frontiers.

2.3 Traditional Course Teaching Methods

The student-centered approach is not fully reflected in classroom teaching, and traditional teaching methods are still dominant. Modern teaching methods such as problem oriented heuristic, discussion based, case-based, and flipped classroom are rarely used, and there is insufficient cultivation of students' critical thinking and innovative thinking. Students have low classroom participation and the classroom is dull.

2.4 Single Form of Course Assessment and Evaluation

Course assessment is an important means of understanding students' learning outcomes, and ability oriented and process based evaluation are currently widely recognized concepts in course assessment. The assessment form is relatively single, the question types are relatively traditional, the evaluation of the course teaching process is not detailed and scientific enough, lacking specific and clear standards, and the homework management is also relatively loose. The differentiation of grades in daily life is not significant, and the feedback of process assessment is relatively insufficient, resulting in a low degree of achievement of course teaching objectives.

3. The Significance of Course Evaluation

Improving the curriculum evaluation system for applied undergraduate universities based on the OBE concept has practical significance for establishing and improving the internal teaching quality assurance system of applied undergraduate universities. Macroscopically, higher education courses are a curriculum system that requires essential knowledge, abilities, and qualities for talent cultivation. On a micro level, it is the fundamental unit and cell for achieving talent cultivation goals in each specific course. Curriculum is an important part of measuring the level and quality of teaching in schools, and graded curriculum evaluation is an indispensable component of improving the curriculum evaluation system of applied undergraduate universities, which is conducive to establishing and improving the internal teaching quality assurance system of applied undergraduate universities.

Establishing a dynamic monitoring and continuous improvement mechanism for applied undergraduate courses plays a leading role in the construction of applied undergraduate courses. By conducting a three-level course evaluation of "ensuring compliance with standards, pursuing quality, and improving standards" for undergraduate programs, aiming to establish a dynamic monitoring and continuous improvement mechanism for applied undergraduate courses, and promote the construction of applied

undergraduate courses.

Establishing an evaluation paradigm for applied undergraduate courses has positive reference value and promotional significance for applied universities. The universities combines reality and improves curriculum construction based on the practical results of the evaluation index system. The research results of course evaluation can be applied and transformed, reformed and implemented, and easily promoted to other similar universities.

4. Key Points of Course Evaluation

Student-centered, outcome-oriented, and continuous improvement are the three core concepts that run through the entire process of curriculum evaluation. Highlighting student-centered refers to emphasizing the stimulation of students' learning interest and potential, focusing on the cultivation of students' self-learning ability, analytical and problem-solving ability, as well as innovative thinking and consciousness. Highlighting learning outcomes orientation refers to the design and implementation of curriculum teaching activities being centered around students' learning outcomes. Highlighting continuous improvement refers to emphasizing teachers' self reflection and continuous improvement of the curriculum. The implementation of the "Five Degrees" in course evaluation focuses on the following aspects: first, adaptability of objectives, which examines whether the course teaching objectives and content support the achievement of professional talent training objectives and graduation requirements, whether they meet the internal requirements of the overall talent training objectives of applied universities, and whether they meet the talent needs of industry enterprises. Second, the degree of guarantee of conditions, which focuses on examining the degree of guarantee of teachers for curriculum implementation. Third, the degree of achievement of goals, which focuses on examining the degree of achievement of course teaching objectives. Four, the effectiveness of teaching operation, which focuses on the implementation of the curriculum outline and the effectiveness of course teaching operation. Five, users' satisfaction, which focuses on assessing the

satisfaction of students and industry experts with the course.

5. Course Evaluation Procedures

The school carries out a three-level course evaluation, including self-evaluation of standard courses, evaluation of high-quality courses by the school, and evaluation of high-level courses by the school. The specific procedures are as follows: the Teaching and Research Department conducts self-evaluation of the courses it is responsible for based on the Guangdong University of Science and Technology Standard Course Evaluation Index System, and the self-evaluation conclusion is reported to the colleges for confirmation. The Teaching Guidance Committee of the colleges establishes a high-quality course evaluation working group for its department. According to the Guangdong University of Science and Technology Quality Course Evaluation Index System, the courses applied for quality courses will be evaluated, and the evaluation conclusions will be reported to the school's academic affairs office for confirmation. The school's academic affairs office is responsible for establishing a high-level course evaluation working group, which will carry out high-level course evaluation work. The courses participating in the high-level course evaluation must be high-quality courses recommended by the colleges. The evaluation process consists of four stages: application, self-evaluation, expert evaluation and formation of evaluation conclusions. The evaluation conclusion will be published in school document.

6. Course Evaluation Achievements

In order to improve the quality assurance system of school teaching, enhance the level of curriculum construction and talent cultivation, Guangdong University of Science and Technology has issued the Guangdong University of Science and Technology Curriculum Evaluation Plan and the Guangdong University of Science and Technology Curriculum Evaluation Results Application and Reward Measures. Starting from 2021, four rounds of "guaranteeing standards, pursuing quality, and improving level" course evaluations have been conducted for undergraduate majors in the

whole university, with a total of 132 high-level courses, 509 high-quality courses, and 434 standard courses recognized. 22 provincial-level first-class undergraduate courses, 2 provincial-level ideological and political demonstration courses and 4 provincial-level ideological and political demonstration classes have been cultivated, 122 provincial-level and above course related projects and 58 provincial-level and above course related awards have been received. The level of course construction and the quality of course education have been steadily improved.

7. Conclusion

The school follows the OBE concept to carry out a three-level curriculum evaluation with characteristics of applied undergraduate universities, effectively promoting the process of curriculum construction. By continuously improving the curriculum evaluation system of applied undergraduate universities, a dynamic monitoring and continuous improvement mechanism for applied undergraduate university courses is constructed, problems in curriculum construction are timely discovered, summarized, and feedback are provided, course ownership is clarified, talent training plans are improved, and detailed basis is provided for formulating the school's curriculum construction plans. Continuously optimizing the evaluation process to increase the reliability and validity of the evaluation results. Establish an application and reward mechanism for course evaluation results to realize the practical value of course evaluation. Establishing an evaluation paradigm for applied undergraduate courses has positive reference value and promotional significance for applied undergraduate colleges.

References

- [1] Yang Yonghua, Xie Hongquan. Research and Practice on Curriculum Evaluation in Universities[J]. China Electric Power Education, 2014 (8): 80-81.
- [2] Feng Aiqiu, Yang Peng, Lin Lin. Reflections on the Design of Undergraduate Course Evaluation Plans for Urban and Applied Universities from the Perspective of Review and

- Evaluation[J]. Journal of Beijing Union University, 2018, 32 (03): 10-15.
- [3] Song Yue, Chen Xiangping, Hu Sheng et al. Practice and Reflection on OBE based Curriculum Evaluation[J]. Laboratory Research and Exploration, 2021, 40 (02): 215-217.