



## Course Evaluation Results

### ENGL 481 / ENGL 481 1U - Composition Theory & Practice

Spring, 2022

Section 1G, Lecture-Discussion (John Gallagher)

M W F, 11am, 104 English Building

Evaluations were completed by **9** out of **11** students (81.8%).

For the purpose of generating percentile rankings, this course is considered to have a class size of "Small", a course type of "Required", 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
-	-	67% (6)	33% (3)	-	-	-

#### This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
-	33% (3)	67% (6)	-

#### This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
78% (7)	22% (2)	-	-

#### What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	100% (9)	-	-

#### What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	89% (8)	11% (1)	-

#### Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
78% (7)	22% (2)	-	-	-	-

### 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
-	-	-	11% (1)	89% (8)	-	<b>4.89</b>	0.33	82	81

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	11% (1)	89% (8)	-	<b>4.89</b>	0.33	85	85

**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
-	-	-	-	100% (9)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	99	99

**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% (9)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	93

**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% (9)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	93

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	44% (4)	56% (5)	-	<b>4.56</b>	0.53	67

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (9)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	72

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	33% (3)	67% (6)	-	<b>4.67</b>	0.50	55

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	11% (1)	89% (8)	-	<b>4.89</b>	0.33	79

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	-	100% (9)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	87

**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)	78% (7)	11% (1)	<b>4.88</b>	0.35	67

**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
-	-	-	-	100% (9)	-	<b>5.00</b>	0.00	86

**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)	89% (8)	-	<b>4.89</b>	0.33	74

#### Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					<b>4.89</b>
Rate the overall quality of this course.					<b>4.89</b>
How much have you learned in this course?					<b>5.00</b>
The course objectives were:					<b>5.00</b>
Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?					<b>5.00</b>
I kept up with the work in this course.					<b>4.56</b>
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					<b>5.00</b>
Was a good balance of student participation and instructor contribution achieved?					<b>4.67</b>
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					<b>4.89</b>
Writing assignments promoted greater understanding of subject matter.					<b>5.00</b>
The instructor evaluated my work in a meaningful and conscientious manner.					<b>4.88</b>
How well did the examination questions reflect the content and emphasis of the course?					<b>5.00</b>
How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course?					<b>4.89</b>

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

#### ICES Open-Ended Items

**What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?**

- Energetic, explained why we were learning something, never gave busy work, etc.
- I thought that Professor Gallagher was very good at explaining concepts and making them relevant to us.
- John was a great professor. He always came very well-prepared, and was kind, engaging, and respectful. The course was very well-executed even when external obstacles such as weather or illness came up.
- I liked that John practices what he teaches. If he teaches us a concept he will attempt to bring the practice of that concept into the class by prompting us to create a curriculum that utilizes it, as well as having us participate in activities using the concepts we learn.
- John did an excellent job explaining course material in an educational, yet very engaging way throughout the semester. John also makes it very clear to his students that he cares about them as people, and not just as students.
- This course really changed the way that I had been taught to think about writing. It made me understand that so much of writing is process and not simply an end result. I wish I would've taken it sooner.
- Not muddling the class with busy work and instead focusing on the actual course objects helped me learn a great deal more than in classes with busy work and less class discussion.
- Captures student attention well, encourages student participation, explains difficult information in an easy to understand manner
- The major strengths are that the instructor tailored classwork to fit student needs. He was very passionate about the topic and had activities which very well demonstrated objectives of lesson.

**What do you suggest to improve the course?**

- Nothing! I really enjoyed this course!
- I thought a little less time could be spent on genre theory (which has fewer practical applications, in my opinion anyway) and more time could be spent on social media and writing, which is more relevant in our day and age.
- The only thing I would potentially suggest is more hands on activities. That being said, the content does not necessarily lend itself super well to activities and I think John did the most he could even the content with small group work and freewriting prompts.
- Different modes of learning about the concepts for the course, such as videos, interactive modules, etc.
- I do not have any suggestions for improvement.
- N/A
- N/A
- n/a

**Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.**

- Grades were thoroughly explained!
- I thought the grading procedures were fair.
- The grading was fair and logical. All work had a clear purpose and grading rubric or guidelines.
- The grading was fair, the feedback was specific and communicated the same points he talked about in class
- There are few assignments in this course. Grading relies heavily on major assignments and participation. With this being said, I believe John's grading procedures to be extremely fair.
- The grading procedures are fair as well as the instructor's flexibility and comments.
- Extremely fair.
- Fair
- Great and fair. Projects are meaningful to career in the future and the course attendance is good because the class discussions are rich .