I **C** **E** **S** **ONLINE**

Course Evaluation Results

ENGL 584 / CI 569 R - Topics Discourse and Writing   **Fall, 2021**
Section G, Lecture-Discussion (John Gallagher)
F, 12pm, 37 Education Building

Evaluations were completed by **3** out of **3** students (100.0%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Small", 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% (3)	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
67% (2)	33% (1)	-	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
100% (3)	-	-	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	-	100% (3)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
100% (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
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	92	99

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	90	99

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
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58	57	60

Departmental Core Items

ENGL Lecture-Discussion

The course objectives were: [Very Unclear ... Very Clear]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	94

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
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	92

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% (1)	33% (1)	33% (1)	-	**4.00**	1.00	16

The instructor seemed well prepared for classes. [No, Seldom ... Yes, Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	67

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	86

How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain? [Very Poor ... Excellent]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	85

Writing assignments promoted greater understanding of subject matter. [Almost Never ... Almost Always]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58	45

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
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00	80

How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course? [Poorly Related ... Well Related]

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58	61

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
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58	29

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
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58

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
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	-	-	100% (3)	-	**5.00**	0.00

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev
-	-	-	33% (1)	67% (2)	-	**4.67**	0.58

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5	
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.						5.00
Rate the overall quality of this course.						5.00
How much have you learned in this course?						4.67
The course objectives were:						5.00
Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?						5.00
I kept up with the work in this course.						4.00
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.						5.00
Was a good balance of student participation and instructor contribution achieved?						5.00
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?						5.00
Writing assignments promoted greater understanding of subject matter.						4.67
The instructor evaluated my work in a meaningful and conscientious manner.						5.00
How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course?						4.67
How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course?						4.67
The required texts and other materials were effectively utilized in this course.						4.67
The instructor was respectful of differing beliefs on race, religion, or politics.						4.67
Grading procedures for the course were fair.						5.00
The workload for the course was appropriate for the credit received.						4.67
The instructor was accessible to students.						5.00
The instructor explained material carefully.						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?

- John has a clear grasp on the material and explains it well. I also appreciated the feedback I received from him on my midterm and the way he ran peer review. The class as a whole was helpful but the feedback we received and the in-class explanations were huge strengths.
- I learned a lot of completely new content, new ways of delivering instruction, and new areas that I would like to focus my future instruction on based off what I found challenging in the class, which was partially due to never learning methods for reading academic articles or carrying out research. My history doing research was comprised of writing about existing research, rather than conducting any research. I liked the midterm because I was able to conduct research, which was something I had never done in this way in the past. I appreciated how the instructor made education a focus in the class and provided a final project option that was relevant to my content area.
- The major strength of John is that he sets and maintains realistic expectations. We are given plenty of time to accomplish assignments and give feedback throughout the process instead of just being assigned a major project with little to no check-in points.

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- There were some weeks when the workload felt a bit heavy. I appreciated our readings and the multiple midterm and final components allowed us to receive helpful feedback, so I wouldn't necessarily want to lose too much of that. But, there were some weeks when I really struggled to get texts read and assignments completed.
- I don't have any suggestions for improvement.
- n/a

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- Grading proceedures seemed great!
- The grading procedures were fair. Instructor provided thorough and timely feedback/grades.
- The grading procedure was based on our ability to achieve the assignment's goals and to apply feedback. The process is based on our ability to revise and apply course concepts within our writing assignments throughout the semester.