



Course Evaluation Results

ENGL 482 / ENGL 482 2G - Writing Technologies

Spring, 2021

Section 2U, Online (John Gallagher)

M W F, 9am

Evaluations were completed by **9** out of **10** students (90.0%).

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

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

Congratulations!

You have made it onto the List of Teachers Ranked as Excellent By Their Students!

Demographic Items

Class Status:

Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Other	Omitted
-	-	22% (2)	44% (4)	33% (3)	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
22% (2)	67% (6)	11% (1)	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
33% (3)	33% (3)	33% (3)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	56% (5)	44% (4)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	78% (7)	22% (2)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
67% (6)	33% (3)	-	-	-	-

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
-	-	-	22% (2)	78% (7)	-	4.78	0.44	68	69

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	22% (2)	78% (7)	-	4.78	0.44	68	73

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
-	-	-	22% (2)	78% (7)	-	4.78	0.44	77	75

Departmental Core Items**ENGL (Seminar)****The course objectives were: [Very Unclear ... Very Clear]**

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)	-	4.67	0.71	55

Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field? [No, Not Much ... Yes, Significantly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)	-	4.67	0.71	53

I kept up with the work in this course. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	33% (3)	67% (6)	-	4.67	0.50	74

Students engaged with one another or instructor in a constructive atmosphere. [Seldom ... Very Often]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)	-	4.67	0.71	59

Was a good balance of student participation and instructor contribution achieved? [Never ... Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)	-	4.67	0.71	68

Did the instructor encourage you to develop your ideas and approaches to problems? [Definitely No ... Definitely Yes]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	11% (1)	89% (8)	-	4.89	0.33	81

Did you improve your ability to carry out original research in this field? [No, Not Really ... Yes, Significantly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	22% (2)	67% (6)	-	4.56	0.73	82

The instructor's presentation of abstract ideas, concepts, and theories was: [Very Unclear ... Very Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	22% (2)	78% (7)	-	4.78	0.44	67

The instructor evaluated my work in a meaningful and conscientious manner. [Strongly Disagree ... Strongly Agree]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	-	89% (8)	-	4.78	0.67	60

How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course? [Never Available ... Available Regularly]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	11% (1)	11% (1)	78% (7)	-	4.67	0.71	36

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5	
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.						4.78
Rate the overall quality of this course.						4.78
How much have you learned in this course?						4.78
The course objectives were:						4.67
Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?						4.67
I kept up with the work in this course.						4.67
Students engaged with one another or instructor in a constructive atmosphere.						4.67
Was a good balance of student participation and instructor contribution achieved?						4.67
Did the instructor encourage you to develop your ideas and approaches to problems?						4.89
Did you improve your ability to carry out original research in this field?						4.56
The instructor's presentation of abstract ideas, concepts, and theories was:						4.78
The instructor evaluated my work in a meaningful and conscientious manner.						4.78
How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course?						4.67

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

ICES Open-Ended Items

What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

- He is super knowledgeable about the topics, which makes him a great resource in discussion. He picks phenomenal readings: they are consistently relevant and short enough to keep up with.
- I really enjoyed having the opportunity within the presentations to focus on activities for my peers. Sometimes, I find that presenting readings can be a bit dry, but developing matching projects foregrounded pedagogy in a way that I haven't experienced in other courses. The instructor was/is incredibly knowledgeable and, while the topic taught is rife with recursivity and remediation, he was still able to make the content digestible for undergraduates and graduates alike. It's also remarkable to think about the sheer time and space this course has accounted for, from cuneiform tablets to machine learning! So, being deliberate about "sections" of writing technologies we would be looking at from a week to week basis helped me get my bearings. That said, the instructor continued to make connections from past (and future) weeks, highlighting what were the most significant takeaways of the course.
- Professor Gallagher has exceptional strength in pushing students to go above and beyond in our analysis and application of the writing technologies that make communication possible.
- He really knew what he was talking about & shared his knowledge in an exciting way; down to earth and approachable.
- Great at making connections between topics in the syllabus week after week so material doesn't feel disjointed. Explanations about history and technical terms made understandable for students who don't have a background in computer science, machine learning, history, etc. Rightfully adjusts workload in response to how students seem to be doing, which is especially appreciated during pandemic. Fair grader who gives in-depth feedback about projects. Challenges students to think beyond their first thoughts, sometimes asking them to think of the flip side of their argument which is good for critical thinking.
- John is clearly very knowledgeable in his field (especially with regard to emerging knowledge and subfields that are growing in importance). He's also really good at building coursework so that later ideas build on those introduced earlier.
- Dr. Gallagher is good providing a classroom environment where everyone feels comfortable to share their opinions.
- He doesn't just present the class with information. (I know that a lot of professors do that.) He also goes the extra mile to make sure that we are able to understand the material. He also finds very creative ways to connect it back to the theme of writing.
- Well spoken, ideas of the course are all very inter-connected and they flow throughout the semester

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- Something students can reference to brush up on earlier things we found in the class. Every day we talk about a range of concepts, and it is hard to keep all of the theories we develop in mind for future discussions and projects. The class descriptions of everyday sort of fit this, but those are for use before class, so maybe something that reflects on where we got after the class would be useful. I suggest this because unlike other class we aren't learning super discrete or easy to conceptualize skills and knowledge.
- I think that the course was very impactful and interesting as is. I can't think of any improvements needed at this time.
- A little more transparency when it comes to what is required would be nice, although it had a nice balance.
- Vaguely remember that having students present was their first pass of including more activities into the course. I agree with past students that the more interactive activities there are, the better. Hopefully it's possible to get beyond virtual for this course, but I'd recommend saving activities you liked from students' presentations this semester as a just-in-case. For the midterm, I would've liked to have the option to gain student feedback (opt in system maybe for privacy).
- No suggestions. It was excellent.
- n/a
- Just add more group activities. But other than that, Great Job!
- N/A

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- He uses a few large grades through the semester so I only have one point to analyze this on. That grade was timely, fair, and had lots of feedback.
- Very fair. Could use a bit more specificity on what to revise for the future, but very thorough.
- The grading was fair and accurate.
- Seems to be fair, although we only had one assignment that had a grade thus far.
- Fair grading. You earn a grade based on the work you put in to the course. Never felt like there was inconsistent or unfair grading during the course. The amount of reading felt appropriate this semester, and so did the amount of projects needed, so I never felt like a grade was constantly hovering over me every week. Would recommend keeping project amount the same.
- Grading is fair and helpful. As a graduate student, I appreciate that John works with grad students to develop coursework that supports our research goals while still holding to the learning outcomes of the course at hand.
- The grading procedures are fine. He provides feedback that helps you think about ways to improve and expand on the project you're working on.
- Nothing really to comment. I think its pretty good!
- Grading is fair