



Course Evaluation Results

ENGL 582 / CI 565 X - Topics Research & Writing

Spring, 2023

Section X, Lecture-Discussion (John Gallagher)

R, 12pm, 123 English Building

Evaluations were completed by **5** out of **5** 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% (5)	-	-

This course was:

Elective	Required, But a Choice	Specifically Required	Omitted
60% (3)	40% (2)	-	-

This course was in my:

Major	Minor	Other	Omitted
20% (1)	40% (2)	40% (2)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the instructor?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	80% (4)	20% (1)	-

What was your pre-course opinion of the course?

Negative	No Opinion	Positive	Omitted
-	60% (3)	40% (2)	-

Expected grade in the course:

A	B	C	D	F	Omitted
100% (5)	-	-	-	-	-

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
-	-	-	60% (3)	40% (2)	-	4.40	0.55	30	31

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank	Campus % Rank
-	-	-	60% (3)	40% (2)	-	4.40	0.55	36	33

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
-	-	-	60% (3)	40% (2)	-	4.40	0.55	39	28

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
-	-	-	20% (1)	80% (4)	-	4.80	0.45	78

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
-	-	-	20% (1)	80% (4)	-	4.80	0.45	73

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	40% (2)	60% (3)	-	4.60	0.55	73

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	20% (1)	80% (4)	-	4.80	0.45	45

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	20% (1)	-	40% (2)	40% (2)	-	4.00	1.22	19

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% (5)	-	5.00	0.00	82

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

1	2	3	4	5	Omitted	Mean	St. Dev	Dept. % Rank
-	-	-	20% (1)	80% (4)	-	4.80	0.45	66

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% (5)	-	5.00	0.00	84

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% (5)	-	5.00	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
-	-	-	-	100% (5)	-	5.00	0.00	84

Rating Scale Item Means

	1	2	3	4	5
Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness.					4.40
Rate the overall quality of this course.					4.40
How much have you learned in this course?					4.40
The course objectives were:					4.80
Did this course improve your understanding of concepts and principles in this field?					4.80
I kept up with the work in this course.					4.60
The instructor seemed well prepared for classes.					4.80
Was a good balance of student participation and instructor contribution achieved?					4.00
How would you characterize the instructor's ability to explain?					5.00
Writing assignments promoted greater understanding of subject matter.					4.80
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?					5.00
How accessible was the instructor for student conferences about the course?					5.00

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

ICES Open-Ended Items

What are the major strengths of the instructor/course?

- I felt like I got a really solid grounding in genre theory from the course, and I appreciated the opportunity to work on a grant that was directly relevant to me. I appreciate the enthusiasm and vulnerability you bring to the classroom. It is clear that you genuinely care about your students, and that you have a great deal of expertise.
- One of the major strengths is that you can make the assignments specific to your domain and still participate and achieve the key objectives of the course. Prof. Gallagher is always energetic and willing to engage with students and their ideas, making the class thought-provoking and exciting. Moreover, the content of the course is incredibly important in today's world. If I am lucky enough to have a career in science, I believe this will have been the single most important course I've ever taken.
- John is not only a phenomenal teacher; he is an exceptional human being. He leads classroom discussions and one-on-one meetings with empathy and respect, and he always assumes that folks are coming to him with good intentions. He is deeply knowledgeable about grant writing, literary theory, and a wide variety of related (and unrelated!) fields. I learned a great deal more than I expected.
- This is a very practical course considering helping students to write grant proposals. John always provides constructive feedback on our projects and grant writing.
- Accessible to the students and flexible on the topics of the assignments

What do you suggest to improve the course?

- More time could have been made for student contributions, and working with student work--at times your zeal for certain subjects led to longer lecture portions. Additionally, discussion was frequently mediated directly through you, rather than exchanging more freely between students. There were also some really interesting moments in the semester when we were interrogating our own writing that I would have liked to see more of. Lastly, sometimes I would get confused about assignment requirements & deadlines because we discussed changes in class, but those changes were not reflected in the CMS or written in an email.
- I've spent some time thinking about the genre theory parts of the course and how it contributes to the overall objectives of learning how to engage with the grant system. I think the genre theoretic framework equipped us with the ability to understand and adapt to the different actors in the "bureaucracy of grants" and their intentions, which you get with a deeper understanding of the theory behind why things are the way they are. I do wish that some of the connections between genre concepts and the grant writing system were made earlier in the course.
- I personally had a fantastic time. I just wish there were more folks in the class!
- Maybe allow us to work on our own project/grant proposal writing in class, and get feedback from peers.
- I think more writing time integrated into the class and more peer-feedback opportunities can be helpful.

Please comment on the grading procedures in the course.

- Your feedback is excellent. You left thoughtful, personalized comments on all submitted work. As for the grades themselves, they were appropriate and consistent with expectations for graduate coursework.
- I think the grading procedures were fair and gave a good assessment of assignment completion and quality without getting in the way of the course objectives. Because the class was so small, Prof. Gallagher was able to give thorough, thoughtful feedback. I believe this is important for a course like this, where each person produces a creative work unique to them.
- Very fair.
- Very timely and constructive to improve my thinking.

Your Open-Ended Items

How would you sequence the grant assignments differently?

- I'm a more hand-on learner; I probably would have skipped some of the "mutt genre" work, although I understand the intention behind your scaffolding. Additionally, I would probably have separated the critique of grant writing culture from the final assignment, & maybe distributed it throughout the last unit as in-class writing to provoke discussion. I was feeling a little overwhelmed with writing at the end of the semester, & the quality of my critique suffered a little.
- I think the grant assignments were sequenced well. We started from the basics of understanding the language of grants to how we can plan and put together a proposal for the grant. It is my impression that grant writing in the real world also follows a similar sequence, and it was beneficial to practice it in the classroom environment.
- I don't have a suggestion for this as I felt like all of the assignments logically led up to the final grant proposal.
- I think the current sequence looks perfect.

