I C E S ONLINE

Course Evaluation Results

ENG 598 - STEM Writing:Practice/Pedagogy   Spring, 2021
Section WTG, Online (John Gallagher)
F, 1pm

Evaluations were completed by **18** out of **21** students (85.7%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Medium", a course type of "Elective", and an instructor type of "Instructor".

Click a plus or minus symbol to expand or collapse an open-ended item.

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
-	-	-	-	100% (18)	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
89% (16)	6% (1)	6% (1)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
6% (1)	6% (1)	89% (16)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	67% (12)	33% (6)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	50% (9)	50% (9)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
100% (18)	-	-	-	-	-

Global Items

Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness. [Exceptionally Low ... Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
6% (1)	-	6% (1)	56% (10)	33% (6)	-	**4.11**	0.96	14	24

Rate the overall quality of this course.   [Exceptionally Low … Exceptionally High]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
6% (1)	-	11% (2)	50% (9)	33% (6)	-	**4.06**	1.00	20	21

How much have you learned in this course? [Very Little … A Great Deal]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
6% (1)	11% (2)	6% (1)	56% (10)	17% (3)	6% (1)	**3.71**	1.10	8	9

Student Government Core Items

The required texts and other materials were effectively utilized in this course. [Strongly Disagree … Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
6% (1)	6% (1)	11% (2)	33% (6)	39% (7)	6% (1)	**4.00**	1.17

The instructor was respectful of differing beliefs on race, religion, or politics. [Strongly Disagree … Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	-	11% (2)	83% (15)	6% (1)	**4.88**	0.33

Grading procedures for the course were fair. [Strongly Disagree … Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	11% (2)	11% (2)	67% (12)	11% (2)	**4.63**	0.72

The workload for the course was appropriate for the credit received. [Strongly Disagree … Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	11% (2)	33% (6)	50% (9)	6% (1)	**4.41**	0.71

The instructor was accessible to students. [Strongly Disagree … Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	6% (1)	17% (3)	72% (13)	6% (1)	**4.71**	0.59

The instructor explained material carefully. [Strongly Disagree … Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
6% (1)	-	-	28% (5)	61% (11)	6% (1)	**4.47**	1.01

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5	
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.						4.11
Rate the overall quality of this course.						4.06
How much have you learned in this course?						3.71
The required texts and other materials were effectively utilized in this course.						4.00
The instructor was respectful of differing beliefs on race, religion, or politics.						4.88
Grading procedures for the course were fair.						4.63
The workload for the course was appropriate for the credit received.						4.41
The instructor was accessible to students.						4.71
The instructor explained material carefully.						4.47

= below 3.0   /   = 3.0 - 4.0   /   = above 4.0

ICES Open-Ended Items

What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

- -John is a really great professor. He makes everything clear to understand, gives thorough feedback, his lectures are relevant to us as students, he uses good rhetorical techniques in his lectures!
- Very interactive Class assignments and group activities kept the class engaging
- The varied topics provide a comprehensive look at how to understand engineering writing and teach it more effectively. The instructor does a great job of presenting the topics in a way accessible to engineering students without dumbing down the content or being afraid of using appropriate nomenclature. The pacing of lectures was great, with a good amount of interaction between the instructor and students. Student questions were always answered well, and were not "copy-paste" answers but always directed back to the full group to illustrate how the topic of discussion was related.
- Well organized, extremely helpful and patient
- -- Pedagogy -- Very accessible -- Prepares the plan for the next week's lecture in advance and lets the students be mentally prepared for it -- Not so rigid deadlines. -- SPRING BREAK!!!!!!
- The instructor's kindness facilitates students to ask questions.
- No strengths, all weaknesses. He should not teach this course.
- The interest showed in submitted assignments. Also the conversational tone of the lecture to encourage discussions.
- 1. The instructor is very nice and easy-going, who tries his best to have more students engage in the class. 2. His course is very interesting and useful for my future career. 3. The instructor prepares for class carefully and give us many useful materials
- The instructor has a good preparation for course materials. The assignment deadline is flexible. I like the interacting section where students do freewriting on a google doc and discuss with the instructor.
- He reached out to students and motivated us to learn. There are clear active learning strategies in his teaching.
- Prof. Gallagher is gentle, flexible, and is an expert in the field. He did a great job of including active learning even in the online class. Initiating this course was definitely a good idea.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- -Not be in a pandemic :(
- A little more emphasis on writing styles and formats for scientific writing would be great
- Although answering student questions was great, there was a propensity for this to stray a bit too far off topic to be useful to the entire class. Perhaps suggesting the student come back with that question during office hours would have been more effective for keeping course on time.
- -- A few more writing assignments. I really enjoyed the second assignment and was hoping more assignments of this kind. -- I understand the limitations of not being able to organize an actual poster session, but the eposter assignment on zoom somehow felt more about delivery and presentation than "writing". I enjoyed the assignment though. -- Optional assignments: some students took this course for research writing and others teaching writing. I think each assignment could have two optional choices for each genre for the students to choose from.
- The course is good but some of the students may have expected something different. For me, I expected more writing tasks.
- This course combined students from a huge variety of disciplines in which the writing techniques does not match. The instructor had no idea how things go on in my field. Being a writing course, I expected some minimal writing exercises and get that evaluated. There were a few writing tasks of which all except one were kind of redundant for me. I so not see such exercise will help me anywhere in the future given the way my discipline runs. It was more of a workshop rather than a course. It was like having discussion with a senior grad student on the verge of graduation. I sincerely did not expect this course to stoop to such low levels of my expectations. When I take a course, I expect to learn something from the instructor, which I can say, I have not learnt a single thing from him. I would rather discuss what I discussed in this course with my colleagues in my department and lab, I will not take a course for that. Coming to the instructor, he does not know how to teach. Given my experience, I have seen a fair number of instructors in my home country and across two very reputed universities in USA, he was definitely the worst I had. His slides were extremely poor. Some undergrads in my department can make better slides. the instructor was very inconfident in what he was saying. his feedbacks were very vague. The attitude was more of getting the "job done" rather than doing a part of the on "well". I feel more research and streamlining of the disciplines with similar writing requirements is required to group students. Offering this course again will be a waste of money in this format. And, definitely change the instructor. Someone who has closely monitored the writing of a discipline or has a little more expertise in wriitng is required to teach this course. I feel the instructor was simply not qualified enough. Some of the 4th 5th year PhD students were more qualified in my areas than he was. I did not drop the course, expecting it to get better, but it was equally bad throughout. I can understand this was the first time, but there were too many mistakes and many could have been avoided. Absolutely no thought was given to designing the course or the assignments. The informations thrown at the students are very much aligned with one doing research on writing. However, nothing was taught and or exercised to teach how to apply the good things or avoid the mistakes. Being in engineering, I keep the applications in very high regard. I hope this helps. No hard feelings for anyone. But innovative thought process.
- Hmm I dont know. But I wanted to learn more about academic writing so that I could get better. There was only one assignment which looked into writing.
- Nothing to suggest
- The course seemed overly loaded, probably it was conducted for the first time. I thought some assignments (and related lectures) were too introductory for some graduate students while the others were too advance for the remaining students. Maybe split the course into two semesters, and focus on new/early students in one semester and on matured once in the second. Some of the content could be more efficiently conducted, e.g. presentation and corresponding peer review feedback. I wanted to pay full attention to the interesting presentation from my classmates, however, giving feedback seemed distracting and I ended up not learning from these presentation lectures.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- extremely fair and conducive to learning as we are given a chance to incorporate instructor feedback and improve our grade.
- The grading procedure seems to be fair.
- Grading was clear, guidelines were always presented and unambiguous. Grading felt fair overall and feedback was useful to understand what could be done in the future to improve our performance.
- -- Very fair, transparent and relaxed. Took away a lot of pressure in Covid times.
- It was acceptable.
- I really do not want to comment anything here. Previous comments should be convincing of my opinion here.
- I think grading was fair.
- It is fair and good
- no comment
- Fair
- I think the grading was fair. Some of the assignments need to be reorganized, for e.g. Prof gave feedback on audience analysis but there was no follow-up. So, I am not sure if the changes I made were addressing his comments or not.