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It is with great pleasure that I nominate Dr. Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. Dr. Obermark has been at UMSL for less than two years and in that short time has distinguished herself as a stellar, challenging, innovative, and inspiring instructor in composition and rhetoric while contributing significantly to museum, disability, gender and veterans studies. She has also been laying the groundwork for a national scholarly reputation and has received national recognition in the form of a 2015 travel grant from the national organization of college composition and communication scholars. Dr. Obermark’s outstanding teaching, which these nomination materials document, alone earn her candidacy for this award; but the work she does through curricular and pedagogical design, work that “fosters communication skills necessary for participation in important public discussions” eminently qualifies her to represent UMSL’s best teaching, consonant as this work is with UMSL’s mission of community service.

Dr. Obermark regularly teaches required undergraduate writing courses. As student letters and annual student evaluations indicate, she has been notably successful in turning often reluctant and fearful students into writing enthusiasts, proud of the skills they have acquired and hopeful about their success in future courses. She has shown them that writing is not an exotic, difficult art practiced by a select few, but an attainable (and necessary) skill that they can master and take with them into all areas of their studies as well as into future employment. Nor have her efforts and successes been confined to the classroom. She has continued to mentor former undergraduate students, encouraging them to prepare and submit their work for publication to journals such as Young Scholars in Writing and The Journal of Undergraduate Research at Ohio State University.

Dr. Obermark is a trained rhetorician (as well as a composition specialist) with particular interest in the connections between rhetoric and civic issues. The rhetorical emphases in her writing classes invite students to participate constructively in public discourse. Class assignments typically involve students in group discussions in which they are encouraged to express and refine their own views while listening respectfully to that of their peers. Listening, reflecting and speaking are crucial skills in the workplace, the community, and civic life. “In a world where communication skills are vital and students’ preparation for college writing is often inadequate,” writes Professor Maltby in her appraisal of Obermark’s teaching, “a highly effective teacher of writing and rhetoric is one of the
most valuable persons on campus.” “Truly high-impact teaching of writing and rhetoric is happening in Lauren Obermark’s classes.”

One of the keys to understanding Dr. Obermark’s pedagogical strength is her interest in Disability Studies and the experience she brings from having taught differently abled eighth grade students. Contributing to that pedagogy is a concept called “universal design” which she uses to construct class sessions and student assignments. Universal design is “a set of principles for curriculum development that gives all individuals equal opportunities to learn” regardless of their learning styles, cognitive processing methods, and physical limitations (National Center on Universal Design for Learning, http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl). This approach “both sparks and reinforces learning, because her students interact [in class] with every [concept,] piece of information [and task] in several of these ways: reading, questioning, thinking, explaining, discussing, writing.” Dr. Obermark regularly turns to multimedia and a range of digital options to facilitate the goals of universal design: for example, in one class, she involved students in collaborative authorship and had them use Google Docs that allowed for simultaneous composing. (Deborah Maltby’s letter in this packet lays out in detail one example of how Dr. Obermark employs universal design.) Another observer of her teaching “came away dazzled and inspired” and deeply aware of how the class structure engaged students, enabling them to “operate[e] on multiple intellectual levels at the same time . . . [and to] interact with concepts, watch themselves learn, and [to apply]” what they were learning. Obermark “employs collaborative and interactive tasks in the classroom and subtly but effectively models exactly what she teach[es].”

Dr. Obermark is a talented, skillful, compassionate instructor, who inspires students to learn—whether in her own courses or in guest appearances in those of her colleagues. After observing her teach a composition segment in his course, James Craig, Professor of Military and Veteran Studies, wrote that he was “amazed at the perceptive, appropriate, and thoughtful ideas” she succeeded in eliciting from the students. Student writing that is perceptive, appropriate, and thoughtful is more often than not the mark of an effective writing teacher, something beyond a merely “popular” one—though Dr. Obermark certainly is that. Her effectiveness, her skill and versatility in teaching techniques, as well as her dedication to every student merit the kind of special recognition identified with the Gitner Award.

I am extremely pleased to nominate Dr. Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Teaching Excellence Award. She deserves it.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Cook
Professor and Chair
March 31, 2015

To the Committee for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award:

I write in support of the nomination of Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

In the brief time she has been at UMSL, Professor Obermark has established a reputation as an exciting, challenging, and technologically innovative teacher of writing and rhetoric. Because her scholarship explores rhetoric, civic engagement, and pedagogy, there is a productive synergy between it and her teaching, and students reap the benefits. Rigorous in her expectations for students, versatile in the range of her interests, and highly effective in her instructional techniques, she has instilled new interest in UMSL’s rhetoric and writing programs.

For these reasons, I am very happy to support Professor Obermark’s candidacy for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

Sincerely,

Ronald E Yasbin
Dean and Professor of Microbiology
Teaching Philosophy

Most students do not know why they have to take writing courses at the college level. In the best case scenario, some students are excited because they have always “loved English” and assume they will be reading “great literature.” In the worst case scenario, students are offended to be in such a “basic” class, failing to see how it will be relevant to their future work inside or outside the university. Such attitudes toward writing courses prove to be a sizable obstacle. Undeniably, this initial prejudice toward classes I teach is a constant challenge. It is this very challenge, though, that has pushed me to create courses, composition and otherwise, that are explicitly meaningful for students. I make it my goal for them to leave my class understanding how language is an important part of their realities and identities, and it will continue to be even when their school days are long behind them.

To this end, I regularly teach the required Junior-Level Writing course at UMSL and design it around an approach called “writing about writing.” This is an approach heavily researched and discussed in my field (rhetoric and composition, a specialization within English Studies). At the heart of this approach is a call to make the required composition course a space to “understand and think about the role of writing in school and society” (Downs and Wardle 558). So, students will not just undertake writing as a mode of learning, they will study research about writing as the course content and confront complex questions such as: How does writing work? How do people use writing? What are problems related to writing and how can they be solved? How do identities--like race, gender, class, and disability--intersect with the ways that writing works and is distributed? In short, this course asks students not just to write (though

certainly they write a great deal!), but to engage in meta-reflection, research, and interrogation about the role of writing in their lives and in the wider world.

More specifically, students begin the course by reflecting on their own experiences with language by writing critical literacy reflections.\(^2\) They discuss meaningful moments in their own literacy development and put these moments into conversation with literacy narratives by published authors like Sherman Alexie and Barbara Mellix. From there, we read Deborah Brandt’s *Literacy in American Lives*, which serves as both a common text to discuss and a research model. Like Brandt, students interview people about their experiences using reading and writing. After spending time discussing methods to analyze their interview data, they craft literacy profiles about their interviewees, working to represent that individual’s experience and, at the same time, make a larger argument about language use. The final literacy profiles explore issues as wide ranging as homeschooling, the immigrant literacy experience, and learning disabilities.

Students from my writing courses have even continued their work on their literacy profiles after the completion of the course, submitting their essays to the peer-reviewed journal *Young Scholars in Writing*. Another student recently won the English Department’s composition award for her well-researched and developed work on race and literacy. These students now view themselves as more than just beginning writers; they realize they can participate in important scholarly and community conversations. On students’ evaluations, many of them comment that though the idea of “writing about writing” is initially off-putting or intimidating, the course makes them rethink the role that writing plays in their lives and the lives of those around them.

\(^2\) As further evidence of innovative teaching, in appendix D, I offer the prompts/requirement for all the assignments I discuss in this teaching philosophy.
It is also worth noting that I have exclusively taught English 3100 online during my time at UMSL. While this prospect frightened me at first, I have found robust ways to engage students in their writing and learning using online peer review groups, short video “mini-lectures,” multimodal presentations from the students, and close engagement and feedback with every students’ writing to provide individualized teaching and support students as they learn that writing, at the its heart, is often more about revision and re-writing. As a student from my spring 2014 online section of the course communicated via email, “I think you have a great design to your class, and I am very glad that I took Junior English with you. I am not sure if all Junior English classes are required to revolve around the idea of literacy or if that was your own creation - but you executed it well, and I really feel like I learned a lot from you” (personal email).

Though not all of my courses have focused as explicitly on the study of writing and language, they do emphasize the broader, connected idea of rhetorical education—a concept that is central to my research agenda, as well. In other words, I prepare students to participate in public discussions beyond the walls of my classroom, linking the ways they compose and communicate to civic engagement. In many of my courses, I design the assignment sequence so students move from academic writing to public composition. For instance, in English 3100, students go from writing their academic literacy profile to revising that research to share it with a public audience via a literacy “exhibit,” which they create using Prezi presentation software. Prezi allows students to pull in video footage, photographs, music, and more to explain what they have learned about writing and literacy to a broader public audience, like what they might envision at a typical museum exhibit. This assignment encourages students to rethink their academic arguments for a public audience, helping them realize that what we discuss inside the
classroom has applicability beyond its walls. A further goal was for students to develop a more complex understanding of their rhetorical situations, asking themselves why certain genres are more effective for selected audiences. Finally, students learn multimodal compositional skills that will prove useful throughout their time in college and beyond. This multimodality broadened students’ understanding of “writing” and pushed them out of their literacy comfort zones.

While writing assignments, as well as my responses to them, are at the center of any course I teach, my day-to-day pedagogy also fosters civic participation. I plan class sessions so students interact with one another and discuss their ideas, giving one another feedback and differing perspectives. Negotiating these group discussions with peers—expressing their views while also respectfully listening to the views of others—is a crucial rhetorical skill. The collaborative work that occurs in my classroom is carefully planned and explained, both verbally and in writing. In my Introduction to Disability Studies graduate seminar, for instance, I allow students to decide how they want to share their final projects with one another. Using their collaboratively formed ideas and feedback, I developed a Disability Studies Gallery Walk, facilitating a space where students could share their projects in a personal way. Rather than just lecturing the class for ten minutes, they asked one-on-one questions and even left detailed written feedback at each project they visited during the Gallery Walk.3 In my current Introduction to Rhetoric course, a course designed to learn and apply rhetorical theory to events and media surrounding Ferguson, the students themselves begin each class period by sharing what we call “artifacts” from Ferguson (articles, photos, music, poetry, etc.) and then analyzing these artifacts through the lens of scholarship we have learned throughout the semester. They ask questions, offer alternative points of view, and respectfully push one another’s thinking.

3 You can read more about this Gallery Walk in the UMSL Daily: http://blogs.umsl.edu/news/2014/12/18/gallery-walk/
illustrated by these examples, my courses cover challenging and often controversial content; disability and Ferguson are, without question, topics that are difficult to discuss. But this is precisely why we need to talk about them in higher education. Students in my course learn to listen, speak, and write in ways that are civically and community oriented--and in that process they move toward modes of participation, in the classroom and beyond, that are more ethical and equitable. In short, not only does this pedagogy challenge students, putting their learning in their hands, it also fosters communication skills that are necessary for participation in important public discussions.

My commitment to collaborative pedagogy, as well as my ability to design writing assignments that allow for student choice and engagement, help me teach in a way that respects UMSL’s richly diverse student body. I am wholly invested in an educational approach called Universal Design for Learning: I communicate information, plan assignments, and utilize classroom activities that appeal to a wide variety of learners. I also embrace flexibility and generosity in all my interactions with students. My examples from my writing classes and Disability Studies and Rhetoric seminars highlight this. I am constantly aware that there are multiple channels for learning and communicating, and embracing these various channels in my instruction makes me a better teacher for all students.
Lauren E. Obermark

484 Lucas Hall 314.516.5591
St. Louis, MO 63121 obermarkl@umsl.edu

{ Academic Appointments }

Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Missouri-St. Louis, August 2013-present

{ Education }

Ph.D, English-Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy, The Ohio State University, May 2013

Dissertation: Revising Rhetorical Education: Museums and Pedagogy
Committee: Dr. Wendy S. Hesford (chair); Dr. Brenda Brueggemann; Dr. Elizabeth Weiser

M.A., English Language and Literature, University of Missouri-Kansas City, May 2008

B.S., Secondary Education with an emphasis in English, University of Missouri-Columbia, Summa Cum Laude, May 2003

{ Research and Teaching Interests }

Contemporary Rhetorical Theory
Composition Theory and Pedagogy
Disability Studies
Public and Visual Rhetorics
Museum and Memory Studies
Rhetorical Ethics

{ Courses Taught at UMSL }

Professor for Introduction to Rhetoric (English 4160), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Spring 2015

Description: This course offers a broad understanding of rhetoric as integral to language, communication, and meaning-making. We read rhetorical theories; apply theories to various scenarios and artifacts; and become more thoughtful practitioners of rhetoric. Specifically, we use rhetorical theories and methods to better understand events, protests, and media representation surrounding Ferguson.
Professor for Introduction to Disability Studies (English 5950), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Autumn 2014

**Description:** At least a sixth of the people in the United States have some kind of disability. That fact alone suggests that disability is worth considering when we think about American culture. This course is meant to help you become more informed about disability as a matter of identity, language, writing, power, education, politics, literature, art, and more.

Professor for Teaching College Writing (English 5890), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Spring 2014, Spring 2015

**Description:** This course aims to give students a broad overview of and grounding in various theories and practices of composition studies, a robust and diverse field within English Studies that is committed to understanding *how people write* and *how writing is taught* across various spaces, with a particular emphasis on postsecondary/"college-level" writing.

Professor for Junior-Level Writing (English 3100), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Autumn 2013, Autumn 2014

**Description:** This course fulfills the University’s requirement for a junior-level course in Communicative Skills. The prime objective is to enhance analytical, communicative, persuasive, and explanatory capabilities. My specific section focuses on writing and literacy in very broad forms. Students read research on writing, explore their own reading/writing/composing experiences and practices, research the literacy experiences of others, and work to educate a public audience about important writing/literacy issues.

Co-Professor for Gender and the Military (English 2120), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Autumn 2014

**Description:** This course investigates how the military treats gender difference. We explore how military culture is defined, as well as how gender itself is a socially constructed concept. We then discuss the many complex intersections between these broad topics.

Professor for First-Year Writing (English 1100), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Autumn 2013

**Description:** This is the University’s required first-year composition course. My section of the course used a variation of the English Department Writing Program’s standard syllabus, and we focused primarily on the development of academic writing, analysis, and research skills.

**Other Teaching Experience**

Graduate Student Independent Study in Disability Studies (English 5970), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Spring 2014
Graduate Student Independent Study in Qualitative Methods in Composition Studies (English 5970), University of Missouri-St. Louis, Autumn 2013

Co-Teacher for Introduction to the Teaching of First-Year Writing (English 6781), The Ohio State University, Autumn 2012.

Graduate Teaching Associate for Introduction to Disability Studies (English 2277), The Ohio State University, Winter 2011, Spring 2011, and Summer 2011.

Graduate Teaching Associate for Second Year Writing (English 2367), The Ohio State University, Autumn 2010 and Spring 2012.

Course Themes: Places, Spaces, and Memory (AU10); Writing about Writing (SP12).

Graduate Teaching Associate for First Year Writing (English 1110), The Ohio State University, Autumn 2009-Summer 2010.

Course Themes: The World as a Text: Defining, Exploring, and Composing Rhetoric (AU 09, WI 10); Local Sites and Spaces: Exploring the Rhetoric of/in Our Community (SP 10; SU 10).

Writing Center Consultant, The Center for the Study and Teaching of Writing at Ohio State, 2009-2011.

Teaching Assistant to Professor Brenda Brueggemann for Disability Experience in the Contemporary World (English 597), The Ohio State University, Spring 2009.

Graduate Teacher for Intermediate Composition (English 225), University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007-2008.

Course Theme: Understanding and Composing Visual Rhetoric.

Graduate Teacher for Introductory Composition (English 110), University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2006-2007.

Course Theme: Language Use in Academic Contexts.

Teaching Assistant to Professor Joan Dean for American Social Film, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007-2008.


{ Professional Development }

Participant, University of Missouri Faculty Scholars Program, UM System, 2014-2015

Team Member, University of Missouri-St. Louis Service Learning Leadership Team, 2014-2015
Participant, Focus on Teaching and Technology Conference, University of Missouri-St. Louis, November 2014

Participant, iPad Teaching Circle, University of Missouri-St. Louis Center for Teaching and Learning, 2013-2014

Participant, Faculty Colloquium, University of Missouri-St. Louis Center for Teaching and Learning

Participant, New Faculty Orientation, University of Missouri-St. Louis Center for Teaching and Learning, 2013

Participant, Workshop with Professor Anis Bawarshi (English 993), “Using Genre to Facilitate Knowledge Transfer.” Ohio State University English Department, May 27, 2011.

Participant, Digital Media and Composition Institute with Dr. Cynthia Selfe and Dr. Scott DeWitt (English 993), Ohio State University English Department, June 2009.


{ Service }

Mentoring

Research and Writing Collaboration with Michael Smith, MA student at University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2013-2014.

Professional

Interviewer/Narrative Collector, The Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN), March 2014.


Camp Rhetoric Organizer and Liaison, The Ohio State University (in collaboration with Pennsylvania State University and University of Maryland), 2010-2011.

University

Invited Lecturer, “Methods in Rhetorical Studies,” Dr. Stephanie Van Stee’s Research Methods in Communication (Communication 3330) at University of Missouri-St. Louis, December 2014.
Gender Studies Film Series Leader, “Disability in Focus,” University of Missouri-St. Louis, October 2014.


Invited Panelist, “Advice for New Faculty at UMSL,” University of Missouri-St. Louis New Faculty Orientation, August 28, 2014.

Gender Studies Affiliate Faculty, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2013-2015.

Committees: Member, Writing Awards Committee, Spring 2014

Discussion Leader, First-Year Experience Buckeye Book Community, The Ohio State University, 2009 and 2010.

Volunteer Writing Tutor, Africentric Elementary, The Ohio State University’s Center for the Study and Teaching of Writing, 2008-2009.

President, University of Missouri-Kansas City English Graduate Student Association, 2007-2008.

Department

Member, Writing Certificate Committee, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2014-2015.

Member, Graduate Committee, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2014-2015.

Workshop Leader, Writing a Proposal for an Academic Conference, University of Missouri-St. Louis English Department, April 30, 2014.

Member, Graduate Committee, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2013-2015.

Member, Writing Program Committee, University of Missouri-St. Louis, 2013-2015.

Member, Corbett Lecture Selection and Organization Committee, The Ohio State University, 2010-2011.

Executive Editor, Commonplace, The Ohio State University, 2010.

Reviewer for English 110 General Education Curriculum (GEC) Assessment, The Ohio State University, 2009.
Proposal Reviewer, Expanding Literacy Studies Conference, The Ohio State University, Fall 2008.

Professional Membership

Member, Coalition of Woman Scholars in the History of Rhetoric and Composition, 2007-present.

Member, Conference on College Composition and Communication, 2006-present.

Member, National Council of Teachers of English, 2003-present.

Member, Rhetoric Society of America, 2009-present.

Member, Modern Language Association, 2006-present.

{ Forthcoming and In-Progress Peer Reviewed Scholarship }

As Editor


Articles and Book Chapters


“Moving from the ‘One and Done’ to a Culture of Collaboration: A (Re)Theorization of Professional Development for TAs.” (Lead author; with co-authors Dr. Elizabeth Brewer & Dr. Kay Halasek.) WPA: Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators. Article accepted. (Publication forthcoming, spring 2015).

“Curating Student Voices on Participation in the Writing Classroom.” Chapter in The Rhetoric of Participation: Interrogating Commonplaces in and Beyond the Classroom. Chapter accepted. (Publication forthcoming from Computers and Composition Digital Press, 2016.)

“ ‘Assurance that the world holds far more good than bad’: The Pedagogy of Memory at the Oklahoma City National Memorial Museum.” Submitted to Enculturation: a journal of rhetoric, writing, and culture, winter 2015. (Under Review.)
Book Project


{ Grants }

Faculty Research Award, $6,500, University of Missouri-St. Louis, College of Arts and Science, 2014
  
  Project: “Revising Rhetorical Education: Museums and Pedagogy”

Collaborator for Curriculum Grant (with Dr. Sally Ebest, Dr. Zoe Peterson, and Prof. Jim Craig), $6,800, University of Missouri-St. Louis, College of Arts and Science, 2014
  
  Project: Development of Gender and the Military Capstone Course

Junior Faculty Travel Grant, $1000, University of Missouri-St. Louis, Office of Research Administration, 2014

iPad Innovation Grant, $500, University of Missouri-St. Louis Information Technology Services, 2013

Collaborator for Seed Grant for GTA Program Enhancement (with Dr. Kay Halasek and Dr. Elizabeth Brewer) $10,000, The Ohio State University’s Center for Advancement of Teaching, 2012-2013.

Graduate School’s Alumni Grant for Graduate Research and Scholarship (AGGRS), $1600, The Ohio State University, 2011.

Graduate Assistance Fund Immediate Aid Grant, University of Missouri-Kansas City, $250, 2007.

{ Awards }

Disability in College Composition Travel Award, College Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), 2015.

Travel Award from the English Department to attend Camp Rhetoric, The Ohio State University, 2011.

Council of Graduate Students Ray Travel Award for Scholarship and Service, The Ohio State University, 2009.
School of Graduate Studies Superior Graduate Teaching Assistant Award, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2008.

Sosland Award for Excellence in Teaching Writing, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007.

Travel Award to attend the Conference of College Composition and Communication, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007.

\{ Fellowships \}

The Ohio State Teaching Enhancement Program Graduate Teaching Fellow, The Ohio State University’s Center for Advancement of Teaching, 2011-2012.

The Ohio State University Graduate School Fellowship, 2008.

Farnsworth Fellowship in Postcolonial Studies, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007.

\{ Presentations \}


“From the Museum to the Writing Classroom: Connecting Public and Academic Pedagogies.” Conference on College Composition and Communication Convention. Indianapolis, IN, March 2014.

“Revising Rhetorical Education: Collective Rhetoric at History Museums.” Feminism(s) and Rhetoric(s) Conference, Palo Alto, CA, September 2013.


“WPA Work as a Graduate Student.” Invited Presentation. Dr. Kay Halasek’s Graduate Composition Seminar, The Ohio State University, October 2012.

“The History and Rhetoric of Museums.” Invited Presentation. Dr. Valerie Kinloch’s Multicultural Education Class for Pre-Service Teachers, The Ohio State University, February 2012.

“What the Heck is College-Level Writing Anyway?!: Strategies To Be a Successful Writer in College and Beyond.” First-Year Success Series, The Ohio State University, October 2011.


Panel on Leading Class Discussion. Invited Presentation. First-Year Writing Program Teacher Training, The Ohio State University, August 2010.

Panel on Blogging. Invited Presentation. Digital Media and Composition Institute, The Ohio State University, June 2010.

“Out of the Academy and Into the Museum: Rethinking Spaces of Rhetorical Education.” English Graduate Organization Colloquium, The Ohio State University, May 2010.

“Representing America: The Historical Meets the Rhetorical.” Conference on College Composition and Communication, Louisville, KY, March 2010.

“Rhetorical Representations of History: The Liberty Memorial and the National World War I Museum.” Feminism(s) and Rhetoric(s) Conference, Lansing, MI, October 2009.


“‘Is it possible to teach English so that people stop killing each other?’: Developing a Pedagogy of Nonviolence through the Use of Visual Rhetoric.” English Graduate Student Association Conference, University of Missouri-Kansas City, December 2007.

“The Overlooked Rhetoric of Pauline Hopkins.” Feminism(s) and Rhetoric(s) Conference, Little Rock, AR, October 2007.

“From Theory to Practice: Engaging Multiple Literacies in the Composition Classroom.” Greater Kansas City Writing Project Workshop, University of Missouri-Kansas City, August 2007.

“Melodrama as a Rhetorical Strategy: Pauline Hopkins’ Contending Forces.” English and History Graduate Student Conference, University of Missouri-Kansas City, April 2007.

{ Administrative Experience }

Writing Program Administrator, The Ohio State University, 2012-2013.

Graduate Administrative Associate to Dr. Valerie Kinloch, Associate Professor in Literacy Studies, Winter 2012-Summer 2012.

Graduate Administrative Associate to Dr. Kay Halasek, Director of Second-Year Writing, The Ohio State University, Autumn 2011 and Winter 2012.

Graduate Administrative Associate to Dr. Brenda Brueggemann, Vice Chair of Rhetoric, Composition, and Literacy, The Ohio State University, Autumn 2011.

Writing Center Assistant Coordinator, The Ohio State University, 2010-2011.

Assistant to the Greater Kansas City Writing Project, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2008.

Assistant Director of Composition, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007-2008.

Editor, Composition E-Newsletter, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007-2008.

Assistant to Mid-American Conference for Irish Studies, University of Missouri-Kansas City, 2007.
Syllabus: English 4160, Spring 2015
Special Topics in Writing: Introduction to Rhetoric
Tuesdays and Thursdays, 11-12:15, Lucas Hall 201

Instructor:
Dr. Lauren Obermark
obermarkl@umsl.edu

Contact Information:
Email: obermarkl@umsl.edu

The best way to reach me is via email; I will typically reply within 24-48 hours.

Campus Office: 455A Lucas Hall (North Campus)

Virtual or In-Person Office Hours:

Tuesday, 12:30-1:30; Thursday, 1:30-3:30 CST; I am (enthusiastically!) available at other times, too. Contact me and make an appointment.

In Person: Stop by my office on campus to talk—making an appointment will guarantee I’m not meeting with someone else.

Virtual: Simply email me during my office hours; I will reply immediately unless I am conferencing with another student. You can also contact me in advance of office hours to schedule a virtual appointment. We can decide via email if we would like to meet by video chat, phone, IM, or simply by email.

Access, Learning Style, and Disability

I design and teach courses with access in mind. I am a practitioner of universal design for learning (UDL), which we will learn more about throughout the course. But, at its heart, UDL is about making a course work well for ALL students—that means I want to make the course as accessible and engaging as possible for a variety of learning approaches and styles. As articulated by CAST, the founders of UDL: “UDL provides a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials, and assessments that work for everyone—not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individual needs.”¹ Please let me know how I can support you to help accomplish your best learning.

Additionally, students who have a health condition or disability, which may require accommodations in order to participate effectively in this course, should contact the Disability Access Services Office. Information about your disability is confidential. Contact info for the Office:

¹ Visit the CAST website for additional information about UDL: http://www.cast.org/index.html
Course Description:

Why did you vote for that candidate? Why did your boss claim you were “laid off” rather than “fired”?
Why can’t you stop binge-watching *Scandal* when you should be studying for a test? Why do some
protests in/about Ferguson reach a wider audience than others?

The seemingly simple (but actually enormously complex) answer to these questions: “It’s all rhetoric.”
And while you may have heard that phrase used in a negative way, this course will offer you a broad
understanding of rhetoric as integral to language, communication, and meaning-making. We will read
rhetorical theories; apply theories to various scenarios and artifacts; and become more thoughtful
practitioners of rhetoric. Specifically, we will use rhetorical theories and methods to better understand
events, protests, and media representation surrounding Ferguson. One central question throughout
the semester will be “how does rhetoric help us better understand Ferguson—both the actual events,
protests, and public debates, and the representations we see in the media?”

Rhetoric and Civically Engaged Learning:

Since this is a course focused on investigating the connection of rhetoric to the public sphere and
civic engagement, an opportunity for service learning—and a way to learn and practice rhetorical
research methods—is available. The course will also feature relevant guest speakers from the
surrounding community and beyond.

Specifically, we will hear from folks who can shed light on the very real ways that rhetoric plays a role
in their experiences in Ferguson (as citizen, activists, and community leaders). I am also organizing
opportunities for us to work as a class to collect “literacy narratives” from people in/around Ferguson
so we can see how rhetoric is continually (re)theorized and utilized.

Since research methods should be part of graduate coursework, graduate students will be
required to participate in the collection of literacy narratives. For undergraduates, it is an
encouraged opportunity but not a requirement. Some of this process and learning will be built into the
class through reading and discussion (so even if you don’t collect narratives, you’ll be exposed to the
methods and objectives); otherwise, I estimate that the service-learning aspect of this course will require about ten additional hours of your time.

If you need more concrete reasons to participate, it is worth noting that the work we will do collecting Ferguson literacy narratives can be used in your final projects for the course, and it is work you can meaningfully highlight on your resume or CV.

The Objectives-As a student in “Introduction to Rhetoric” you will:

- Become familiar with the historical trajectory of rhetorical traditions.
- Consider alternative rhetorical traditions, such as African-American and feminist rhetorics, and consider how those traditions create a dialogue with and work in opposition to Westernized rhetoric.
- Interrogate rhetoric’s commitment to the development of citizenship and connection to social justice.
- Make connections between rhetoric as an ancient tradition and the ways in which we teach writing in the present day—that is, we’ll investigate rhetoric as linked to pedagogy, especially in English Studies.
- Discuss and practice methodologies used in rhetorical studies, such as rhetorical analysis, interview-based research, observational studies, and collecting and archiving texts/artifacts.
- Using some of the rhetorical theories and methods covered, we will apply rhetoric (as theory and method) to contemporary texts and situations.
  - In particular, considering our current local context, we will examine texts and discussions surrounding Ferguson (such as photographs, protest signs, editorials from local and national publications, news media coverage, etc.)
- Hone your ability to create rhetorically effective messages, whether that be for a protest movement, a website, or a resume. Learn to ask yourself: What target audiences are addressed? What messages do you wish to convey? And what strategies will you use to accomplish your rhetorical goals?
- Contribute to rhetoric as an ongoing tradition by developing your own perspective, ideas, and theory.
- Develop a critical rhetorical consciousness as a citizen, consumer, and scholar.

The Structure of the Class:

To accomplish these objectives, I have organized the course into three parts with related goals:

- **Part 1-** Defining Rhetoric, History of Rhetoric, Central Questions of Rhetoricians, and Key Rhetorical Concepts (weeks 1-3)
- **Part 2-** Challenging/Expanding THE Rhetorical Tradition: Rhetoric and Identities (weeks 4-9)
- **Part 3-** What Can Rhetoric Do?: Rhetoric and Civic Engagement (weeks 10-14)
Required texts:

- Additional readings will be available online. (Many of them!)
- *You are expected to have access to the texts—electronically or hard copy—on the days we are discussing them. Please prepare accordingly by printing readings or bringing a laptop, tablet, etc., as needed.*

Assignments and Grade Composition:

- *Detailed prompts will be distributed for each of these assignments—more info to come!*  
  - *All larger assignments will offer opportunities for revision.*

  ➢ **Weekly reading response posts via MyG (15%)**
    - At least 10 original posts and 10 comments on the posts of your classmates (four “skip weeks” built in); approximately 250-500 words/week
    - Informal writing but substantial, engaged, and provides evidence of doing the reading

  ➢ **Rhetoric Scrapbook (10%)**
    - Kept online, in hard copy, or a combination
    - Collect at least two artifacts/texts per week, especially any related to Ferguson
    - Will be collected and check periodically throughout the semester and used for in-class “show-and-tell,” as well as a place to brainstorm for the bigger “Artifact Papers”

  ➢ **Two Artifact Papers (30%)**
    - Based on Ferguson-related artifacts; two short papers (2-4 pages) with accompanying casual presentations/discussions about your discoveries
    - One paper will focus on rhetorical analysis of a found artifact; the second will ask that you create and explain an artifact of your own creation
    - Due dates are staggered—you’ll sign up

  ➢ **Recovering Rhetorics: Annotated Bibliography (20%)**
    - Research, summarize, and create an annotated bibliography of an Alternative Rhetorical Tradition
    - Partner/small group work encouraged
Final Project (25%)  
- Three options: Responding to a Rhetorical Situation OR Commenting on Ongoing Rhetorical Traditions in the Present Day OR Project of Your Own Design

- Process for all Final Projects
  - Project Proposal (week 10, April 2): 3%
  - Required Draft of Project for Lauren and for Peer Review (week 14, April 28): NA
  - Present Your Research Project to the Class (week 15, May 7): 5%
  - Final Project (finals week, May 13): 17%

- COURSE TOTAL: 100%

- I plan to document grades on MyGateway so you can keep track of how you are doing in the course.

Grading Scale: The UMSL Grading System is based on a four-point scale. The grade value for each letter grade is as follows:

- A = 4.0
- A- = 3.7
- B+= 3.3
- B = 3.0
- B- = 2.7
- C+ = 2.3
- C = 2.0
- C- = 1.7
- D+ = 1.3
- D = 1.0
- D- = 0.7
- EX = Excused
- FN = Failure/Non Participation
- DL = Delayed

Course Policies

1. Turning in Your Work On Time/No Late Work Policy

- Student work must be completed and submitted on time. All assignments—both major and minor—should be turned in by the date and time they are due according to the syllabus. No late work will be accepted.

- Draft assignments and conferences: While drafts and conferences with me do not carry a formal grade, they are required as outlined on the syllabus in the “assignments” section and discussed in class. If you miss a required draft or conference—with me or your peers—you also miss out on valuable feedback collaboration. This generally negatively affects your grade on final assignments.

- If an emergency like a severe illness or crisis within your family arises and causes issues with your ability to turn in work on time, it is your responsibility to contact Lauren as soon as possible to try and work out a plan.
2. Attendance

I want to emphasize up front that this is a class you need to attend each and every week. Though I do understand and respect that physical attendance can be difficult for folks for a variety of access reasons, so don’t hesitate to talk to me about any barriers you may experience—be it an illness, emergency, disability, learning style, etc. I know we are all just human, doing the best we can.

Generally, though, I expect you to be in class, and you can assume that class will take the whole time. Missing class will affect you performance and participation in class in a variety of ways. If you do not attend class regularly, I suspect your grade will be lower than it would otherwise.

3. Participation Expectations and Classroom Community

This is a class in which we will discuss a great deal. We will interact with each other frequently and sometimes talk about sensitive issues—including sharing our own writing. It is imperative that we handle any discussion or interaction respectfully and maturely. Overall, we will work to make class an enjoyable place to be.

Your physical presence is valued, but you also need to come to class prepared. If you are not completing the reading and writing necessary to develop your knowledge and thinking, this can also hinder your ability to participate.

4. Academic Integrity/Plagiarism

- You are responsible for being attentive to and observant of University policies about academic honesty as stated in the University’s Student Conduct Code.
- Academic dishonesty is a serious offense that may lead to probation, suspension, or dismissal from the University. One form of academic dishonesty is plagiarism – the use of an author’s ideas, statements, or approaches without crediting the source. Academic dishonesty also includes such acts as cheating by copying information from another student. Plagiarism and cheating will not be tolerated.
- Academic dishonesty must be reported to the Office of Academic Affairs for possible action. The instructor shall make an academic judgment about the student’s grade on that work and in that course. The campus process regarding academic dishonesty is described in the “Policies” section of the Academic Affairs website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/academic-dishonesty.html
- You will be expected to use proper citation of sources in your major assignments, and this will be outlined in assignment prompts. You can select the citation style you prefer
to use—MLA, APA, etc.—but your sources must be properly and consistently cited, both within the text itself and with a works cited page.

**Student Support and Services**

- **Technical Support**
  - My Gateway (Blackboard): If you have problems logging into your online course, or an issue within the course site, please contact the **Technology Support Center**:
    - Phone: (314) 516-6034
    - Email: helpdesk@umsl.edu
    - Website: http://www.umsl.edu/technology/tsc/

- **Academic Support**
  - **The Writing Center** is located at Social Science Building (SSB) 222. I will post specific information about hours for this semester on our course site.

  Appointments at the Writing Center are available for in-person or online tutorials. Visit their website to make an appointment, or call them make an appointment:
  http://www.umsl.edu/~umslenglish/Writing%20Lab/
Syllabus: English 4160, Spring 2015
Special Topics in Writing: Introduction to Rhetoric
Tuesdays and Thursdays, 11-12:15, Lucas Hall 201

Course Schedule
(subject to modification—I'll keep you updated!)

Part 1- Defining Rhetoric, History of Rhetoric, Central Questions of Rhetoricians, and Key Rhetorical Concepts (weeks 1-3)

Goals: Become familiar with the historical trajectory of the Western rhetorical tradition; establish firm understanding of common rhetorical terminology and concepts; introduction to rhetorical methods.

WEEK 1: Introductions; Defining Rhetoric; Ferguson as Extended Rhetorical Case Study; terms to know: rhetoric; rhetorical tradition; ethos, logos, and pathos

*No classes Monday, January 19; MLK Day*

* Last day any student may enroll (enter a course for credit); Last day Registrar's Office will move students automatically from the wait list to open sections: January 26*

Tuesday, January 20

Reading Due- NA

Writing Due- NA

In Class Topics- Introductions; syllabus; why are we here?; why does rhetoric matter—right NOW and right HERE? (In other words, what does rhetoric have to do with Ferguson? And why did I want to teach this class?)

Thursday, January 22

Reading Due-
- “What is Rhetoric?” episode from Mere Rhetoric podcast (MyG)
- “On Ferguson” episode from This Rhetorical Life podcast (MyG)
- Heinrichs, Ch. 1 “Open Your Eyes”; Ch. 4 “Soften Them Up”

Writing Due- NA

In Class Topics- Discuss weekly reading response posts and process—first post due next week; (mis) conceptions about rhetoric; so...what is rhetoric?
WEEK 2: Defining Rhetoric; Ferguson as Extended Rhetorical Case Study; History of Rhetoric (the Western Tradition)—Classical Rhetoric in Greece and Rome; Rhetorical Analysis as Method; terms to know: rhetorical analysis; canons of rhetoric; rhetorical education

Tuesday, January 27

Reading Due-
- Cushman, “Rhetorician as Agent of Social Change” (MyG)
- Wayne Booth, “How Many Rhetorics?” (MyG)
- Aristotle excerpt from Rhetoric (MyG)
- Plato, excerpt from Phaedrus (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Assign “Rhetoric Scrapbook”; classical rhetoric (Greeks!); Is rhetoric good or bad?

Thursday, January 29

Reading Due-
- Denman, “Rhetoric, the ‘Citizen-Orator,’ and the Revitalization of Civic Discourse in American Life” (MyG)
- Cicero excerpt (MyG)
- Quintilian excerpt (MyG)
- Heinrichs, Ch. 25, “Give a Persuasive Talk”
  - Mere Rhetoric podcast, “The Canons of Rhetoric” episode

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Introduce Ferguson Rhetoric website (collect preferred emails to access it) and Assign “Artifact Papers + Discussion Leader”; Lauren shares example artifact + discussion; classical rhetoric (Romans!); what are the “parts” of rhetoric?; what does rhetoric have to do with citizenship and civic participation?

WEEK 3: History of Rhetoric (the Western Tradition); Rhetorical Analysis as Method; terms to know: rhetorical analysis; rhetorical situation/triangle (rhetor-text-audience); composition
Tuesday, February 3

Reading Due-  
- Heinrichs Ch. 3, “Control the Argument,” Ch. 5, “Get Them to Like You,” Ch. 6, “Make Them Listen,” Ch. 9, “Control the Mood”  
- Foss, “The Nature of Rhetorical Criticism” and “Neo-Aristotelean Criticism” (MyG)  
- Bain and Hill excerpt (MyG)  
- Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (DALN) collections and materials (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Do we all have access to Ferguson Rhetoric website?; Sign up for “Artifact Discussion Leader” due dates; a bit more on classical rhetoric and the connection to rhetorical analysis as method; jump to the 19th C: rhetoric and the link to composition

Thursday, February 5

Reading Due-  
- Heinrichs Ch. 18, “Get Instant Cleverness”  
- Hesford and Brueggemann, “Introduction to Rhetorical Visions” (MyG)  
- Excerpts from “recovered” Western rhetors—Aspasia, Willard, and Douglass (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Thanks classical dudes!: Fun rhetorical strategies and tropes; but...uh...didn’t we forget some people?—“recovered” rhetors of the Western tradition; Assign “Recovering Rhetorics: Annotated Bibliography”; rhetorical situation and the role in rhetorical analysis
Part 2- Challenging/Expanding THE Rhetorical Tradition: Rhetoric and Identities (weeks 4-9)

Goals: Consider alternative rhetorical traditions, approaches, and methods, such as African-American and feminist rhetorics, and consider how those traditions create a dialogue with and work in opposition to Western rhetoric.

WEEK 4: Introduction to Rhetoric and Identities

* Last day to withdraw or drop a course without receiving a grade; Last day to designate a course S/U. *

Tuesday, February 10

Reading Due-
- Alcoff, “The Problem of Speaking for Others”
- Powell et. Al, “Our Story Begins Here: Constellating Cultural Rhetorics” (MyG)
- Gloria Anzaldua, excerpt from “Borderlands/La Frontera”
- Kenneth Burke excerpt(s), “Terministic Screens” and “Identification”
  - Mere Rhetoric podcast, Kenneth Burke episode

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Introduction to rhetoric and identities—connections and challenges; identification/Burke as a center to productively challenge/build upon?

Thursday, February 12

Reading Due-
- Heinrichs Ch. 20, “Make Them Identify With Your Choice” and Ch. 21, “Lead Your Tribe”
- Ratcliffe, Rhetorical Listening excerpt/article (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Continued intro to cultural rhetoric; identification and its challenges
WEEK 5: African American Rhetoric

Tuesday, February 17

Reading Due-
- Banks, pgs. 1-85 (Intro through Chapter 2)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Discuss and sign up for “Recovering Rhetorics: Annotated Bibliography” topics; Discuss Banks: African American rhetoric; the role of the digital; connection(s) to writing and pedagogy; community engagement as rhetorical commitment and method

Thursday, February 19

Reading Due-
- Banks, pgs. 86-110 (Chapter 3)
- Interview as rhetorical method materials (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Discuss Banks: left-overs from Tuesday; collective memory and storytelling in African American rhetoric; Assign Final Project!

WEEK 6: African American Rhetoric

Tuesday, February 25

Reading Due-
- Banks, pgs. 111-165 (Chapters 4 and 5)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Discuss Banks: Black Theology; African American Rhetoric 2.0
Thursday, February 27

Reading Due-
- Foss et al., “Ideological Criticism” (MyG)
- Lebduska, “Racist Visual Rhetoric and Images of Trayvon Martin” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Last words/final discussion of Banks; race (and other identities) and rhetorical analysis

WEEK 7: Feminist and Queer Perspectives

Tuesday, March 3

Reading Due-
- Ede et al., “Border Crossings: Intersections of Feminism and Rhetoric” (MyG)
- Alexander and Rhodes, “Queer Rhetoric and the Pleasures of the Archive” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- The intersections of rhetoric with feminist and queer theories

Thursday, March 5

Reading Due-
- Truth, “Ain’t I a Woman?” (MyG)
- Kohrs Campbell, “Agency: Promiscuous and Protean” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Doing feminist historiography as rhetorical method

WEEK 8: Continuing Feminist and Queer Perspectives...and Merging with Disability and Rhetoric

Tuesday, March 10
Reading Due-
- Rawson and Williams, "Transgender*: The Rhetorical Landscape of a Term" (article + website) (MyG)
- Dolmage, Disability Rhetoric excerpt (MyG)
- Brueggemann, Lend Me Your Ear excerpt (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Connections between queer perspectives and disability rhetoric; why disabling and queering rhetoric are good things

Thursday, March 12

Reading Due-
- Brueggemann, Deaf Subjects excerpt

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Approaches to disability rhetoric continued—intersections with feminist rhetorics

WEEK 9: Disability and Rhetoric

Tuesday, March 17

Reading Due-
- Cherney, “The Rhetoric of Ableism” (MyG)
- Quackenbush, “Speaking of—and as—Stigma: Performativity and Parkinson’s in the Rhetoric of Michael J. Fox” (MyG)
- Zdenek, “Which Sounds are Significant? Towards a Rhetoric of Closed Captioning” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum (ONLY POST OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WEEK!)

In Class Topics- Disability rhetoric continued—embodied, visual, textual, discriminatory?
Thursday, March 19

*In-person class cancelled because I am attending CCCC (a conference for rhetoric and writing people!); make-up class will be held online. Plan outlined below and more details to come!*

**Reading Due/ Writing Due/ In Class Topics-**
- Turn in Annotated Bibliographies by class time, 11:00 am
- Read the Annotated Bibliographies of all Classmates
- Response to Annotated Bibliographies/Reflections on Rhetoric and Identity Unit due by Sunday, 11:59 pm

**SPRING BREAK: March 23-March 27—Work on Final Projects Proposals! Read some Jenny Rice!**

**Part 3- What Can Rhetoric Do?: Rhetoric and Civic Engagement (weeks 10-14)**

**Goals:** Interrogate rhetoric’s commitment to the development of citizenship, connection to social justice, and connections to public discourse and civic engagement; make connections between rhetoric as an ancient tradition and the ways in which we use it and teach it in the present day—that is, we’ll investigate rhetoric as linked to pedagogy, especially in English Studies.

**WEEK 10: Rhetoric and/in Publics**

**Tuesday, March 31**

**Reading Due-**
- *Mere Rhetoric* podcast, “Habermas and the Public Sphere” episode
- Rice, pgs. 1-69 (Intro, Chs. 1 & 2)

**Writing Due-** Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

**In Class Topics-** Discuss Rice; conceptions of the public/public sphere
Thursday, April 2

Reading Due-
- Rice, 70-98 (Ch. 3)
- Booth, excerpt from *Rhetoric of Assent* (MyG)
- Heinrichs Ch. 11, “Gain the High Ground”

Writing Due-
- Final Project Proposal due
- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Discuss Rice, Heinrichs, and Booth; conceptions of public/public sphere (and public discourse!) continued; workshop/discuss final project proposals

WEEK 11: Rhetoric and/in Publics; the Power of Place

Tuesday, April 7

Reading Due-
- Rice, pgs. 99-128
- Hauser, *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Public and Public Spheres* excerpt

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Conceptions of the public/public sphere; place and memory

Thursday, April 9

Reading Due-
- Halloran, “Writing History on the Landscape: The Tour Road at Saratoga Battlefield as a Text” (MyG)
  - *Mere Rhetoric* podcast, “Rhetorical Landscapes” episode (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- More on rhetoric and place; Sign up for final project conferences with Lauren
WEEK 12: The Power of Place; Rhetoric and Civic Engagement

Tuesday, April 14

Reading Due-
- Heinrichs Ch. 28, “Run an Agreeable Country”
- Rice, pgs. 163-200 (Ch. 6 and Epilogue)
- Revisit Cushman, “Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Can rhetoric change the world? Or at least improve civic engagement? Do we want it to?

Thursday, April 16

Reading Due- Mountford et al., “Manifesto on Rhetorical Education” (MyG)

Writing Due- Draft of Final Project Due—for peer review (in class) and to Lauren (for conferences)

In Class Topics- Rhetorical education and civic engagement; Continue to ask: Can rhetoric change the world? Or at least improve civic engagement? Do we want it to?

WEEK 13: Rhetorical Education; Digital Future & Pedagogy

Tuesday, April 21

Reading Due-
- Revisit Denman, “Rhetoric, the ‘Citizen-Orator,’ and the Revitalization of Civic Discourse in American Life” (MyG)
- Wan, “In the Name of Citizenship: The Writing Classroom and the Promise of Citizenship” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Rhetorical education—an ancient tradition for the present day; challenging rhetoric’s civic commitment; Continue to ask: Can rhetoric change the world? Or at least improve civic engagement? Do we want it to?
Thursday, April 23

Reading Due-
- Heinrichs Ch. 24, “Use the Right Medium"
- New London Group, “A Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures” (MyG)

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Sign up for final project conferences with Lauren (drafts will be collected next class!); rhetoric in/for the 21st century and beyond—digital rhetoric, multimedia, multimodality, pedagogy

WEEK 14: Peer Review and YOU PICK! Day 😊

Tuesday, April 28

Reading Due- NA

Writing Due- Draft of final project due for peer review/conference with Lauren

In Class Topics- Peer review of drafts; start conferences with Lauren

Thursday, April 30

Reading Due- You Pick!-TBD

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum (ONLY POST OPPORTUNITY FOR THE WEEK!)

In Class Topics- You Pick!-TBD
WEEK 15: Course reflection; final project presentations

Tuesday, May 5

Reading Due- NA

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Tying it all together and course reflection—What do we take away? Where do we go from here?

Thursday, May 7

Reading Due- NA

Writing Due- Weekly post + one comment due Monday/Wednesday by 11:59 pm to MyG discussion forum

In Class Topics- Final Project Sharing/Discussion/Presentation

*********

Week 16/Finals Week: May 11-May 15 (NO CLASS FOR US!)

Writing Due- Final projects due to Lauren by Wednesday, May 13 (Submit via MyG or schedule a drop-off appointment as needed)
Instructor:
Dr. Lauren Obermark
obermarkl@umsl.edu

Contact Information:
Email: obermarkl@umsl.edu

The best way to reach me is via email; I will typically reply within 24-48 hours.

Campus Office: 455A Lucas Hall (North Campus)

Virtual or In-Person Office Hours:
Wednesday 2-4 pm; Thursday, 4:30-6:30 pm; I am available at other times, too, if you just contact me and make an appointment.

In Person: Stop by my office on campus to talk—making an appointment will guarantee I’m not meeting with someone else.

Virtual: Simply email me during my office hours; I will reply immediately unless I am conferencing with another student. You can also contact me in advance of office hours to schedule a virtual appointment. We can decide via email if we would like to meet by video chat, phone, IM, or simply by email.

Access, Learning Style, and Disability

In this class, you will quickly see that not only do we explore disability studies content, but I also plan and teach with access in mind. I am a practitioner of universal design for learning (UDL), which we will learn more about throughout the course. But, at its heart, UDL is about making a course work well for ALL students—that means I want to make the course as accessible and engaging as possible for a variety of learning approaches and styles. As articulated by CAST, the founders of UDL: “UDL provides a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials, and assessments that work for everyone—not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individual needs.”1 Please let me know how I can support you to help accomplish your best learning.

Additionally, students who have a health condition or disability, which may require accommodations in order to participate effectively in this course, should contact the Disability Access Services Office. Information about your disability is confidential. Contact info for the Office:

1 Visit the CAST website for additional information about UDL: http://www.cast.org/index.html
Course Information

Course Description:

“[The] realization that minds are best understood in terms of variety and difference rather than deviations from an imagined norm is aligned with a theoretical and activist stance called disability studies (DS). According to DS scholars and activists, disability is popularly imagined as a medical ‘problem’ that inheres in an individual, one that needs to be fixed (‘cured’) and is cause for sorrow and pity. DS countermands this popular belief by arguing that disability is a mode of human difference, one that becomes a problem only when the environment or context treats it as such.”

-Margaret Price, Mad at School: Rhetorics of Mental Disability and Academic Life (2011)

At least a sixth of the people in the United States have some kind of disability. That fact alone suggests that disability is worth considering when we think about American culture. This course is meant to help you become more informed about disability as a matter of identity, language, writing, power, education, politics, literature, art, and more.

Course Objectives:

Our broad goal is to develop an understanding of disability as a complex and crucial part of the world and of human experience. More specifically, we will work together to:

• Understand core concepts of disability studies and its emergence as a field
• Learn key definitions, categories, critiques, and controversies that comprise current research and scholarship in disability studies
• Understand and assess the value and effect of different ways of thinking about disability (which we'll refer to as “models of disability”)—social, medical, cultural, human rights—in ways that are nuanced and historically savvy
• Become versed in the specifics of disability identity, from both community and individual perspectives
• Theorize and potentially implement disability-aware educational theories and practices
• Define and challenge what access means in relation to disability
• Discuss and analyze the ways in which disability and rhetoric (textual and visual) constantly intersect and influence one another
• Apply disability studies theories to works of literature, art, and film
• Explore new frontiers for your own possible engagement in disability studies
• Practice making our own work increasingly accessible (image descriptions, captions, scripts for presentations, etc.)
Course Focus Areas:

The calendar for the course is divided into several focus areas, though you will quickly realize each overlaps and intersects. The areas are:

- Part I: The Field of Disability Studies (weeks 1-2)
- Part II: Disability and/as Identity (weeks 3-5)
- Part III: Access and Pedagogy (weeks 6-8)
- Part IV: Rhetoric and Representation Surrounding Disability (weeks 9-14)
- Part V: You Pick & You Lead! (weeks 15-16)

Required texts:

Accessing Texts: All of these texts are available as e-books, as well as in traditional print formats. *The Speed of Dark* is also available as an audio book.

*Mad at School: Rhetorics of Mental Disability and Academic Life*, by Margaret Price (ISBN: 978-0472051380)


Other readings will be available online via MyG/though links on this syllabus.

Assignments and Grade Composition:

*Detailed prompts will be distributed for each of these assignments—more info to come!*  

Assignments will include 1) weekly informal (but rigorous) discussion posts; 2) in-class show-and-tell/discussion of a disability "artifact"; 3) analysis of a literary text using the lens of disability studies; 4) an annotated bibliography project to share as part of a collective DS resource; 5) and a self-selected and designed final project.
Syllabus: English 5950, Autumn 2014

Seminar in Special Topics

The New “Normal”: Introduction to Disability Studies

Thursdays, 7-9:30, Clark 200

- Weekly Discussion Post (10 total posts; due weekly) → 20%

Objectives: Each week (due Thursday by noon so we can use them during class), there will be a discussion forum on MyGateway with a prompt that asks you to engage with the week’s reading. You must complete ten posts throughout the semester; thirteen are assigned, but you can skip three. This writing is informal, but it should be substantive, thoughtful, and reflect your engagement with the course material.

- DS “Show and Tell”: Artifact Presentations (sign up for due date in week 2; presentations take place week 4-week 14) → 10%

Objectives: Using the knowledge and insights you build in the course, you will discover and interrogate a disability studies-related “artifact” from the world around you. These brief and casual presentations will serve as a fun and thought-provoking way to start our class each week. You will also turn in a brief reflection/summary that accompanies your presentation (the accompanying reflection can be in a medium of your choice—text, audio, film, etc.).

- DS Analysis Essay on Speed of Dark OR The Elephant Man (Flexible due date depending on your book selection and schedule; assigned in week 4 and due by week 11 at the latest!) → 20%

Objectives: Applying a DS theory/theories, you will read and analyze a work of literature.

- Group/Partner/Individual: Create a Collective DS Resource- Annotated Bibliography Project (Assign in week 3; draft for peer review in week 7; final due week 9) → 20%

Objectives: In pairs/groups or individually, you will identify a DS area of interest (perhaps something we’ve already discussed, or maybe something completely new!), and you will research existing sources about this particular area. You will compose an annotated bibliography of approximately ten items—scholarly articles, fiction, films, etc.—that can be shared with the wider DS community. DS is a field that is all about sharing knowledge and resources; thus, the goals here are to 1) develop your own expertise on a particular topic and 2) share that expertise by creating a diverse collective resource that other DS scholars, teachers, and activists can discover and utilize in their own teaching, writing, research, etc. Since we’re housing our work on a website, you can use multimedia (film clips, photos, audio, etc.) to enrich your annotated bibliography.

- Final Project of Your Own Choice/Design (Assign in week 6; due week 15 or finals week) → 30%

Objectives: You will further explore an issue or topic in DS through a final project; it might build on work you’ve done in previous course assignments if you so desire. The final project can be designed in a way that is helpful to you—which is to say that you could write a formal essay, design a syllabus for a DS-informed course, make a short film, review memoirs by disabled authors, write a series of DS poems, etc. The goal here is to further your knowledge, explore a DS area of interest, and create a final project that is meaningful to you. That can look many (many!) different ways.
The Process:

a. Project Proposal (week 8): 5%

b. Required Draft of Project for Lauren and for Peer Review (week 13 and 14): NA

c. Required Conference with Lauren (weeks 8-13): NA

d. Present Your Research Project to the Class (week 15): 5%

e. Final Project (finals week): 20%

• COURSE TOTAL: 100%

• I plan to document grades on MyGateway so you can keep track of how you are doing in the course.

Grading Scale: The UMSL Grading System is based on a four-point scale. The grade value for each letter grade is as follows:

A  = 4.0  B- = 2.7  D+ = 1.3  EX = Excused
A- = 3.7  C+ = 2.3  D = 1.0  DL = Delayed
B+ = 3.3  C = 2.0  D- = 0.7  FN = Failure/Non Participation
B = 3.0  C- = 1.7  F = 0  Participation

Course Policies

1. Turning in Your Work On Time/No Late Work Policy

   o Student work must be completed and submitted on time. All assignments—both major and minor—should be turned in by the date and time they are due according to the syllabus. **No late work will be accepted.**

   o Draft assignments and conferences: While drafts and conferences with me do not carry a formal grade, they are required as outlined on the syllabus in the “assignments” section and discussed in class. If you miss a required draft or conference—with me or your peers—you also miss out on valuable feedback and collaboration. This tends to negatively affect your grade on final assignments.

   o If an emergency like a severe illness or crisis within your family arises and causes issues with your ability to turn in work on time, it is **your responsibility to contact Lauren as soon as possible to try and work out a plan.**

2. Attendance

   o Since the class will be largely driven by your interests, insights, and discussion, it would be hard to make it work without your physical presence. You need to be present so a collaborative construction of meaning can occur and, thus, to earn a good grade in the course. Since you are all graduate students, this tells me that you are committed to this
responsibility. Yet, the syllabus requires me to spell out that more than two absences (even for good reasons) will result in a one-grade penalty.

3. Participation Expectations and Classroom Community

   This is a class in which we will discuss a great deal. We will interact with each other frequently and sometimes talk about sensitive issues—including sharing our own writing. It is imperative that we handle any discussion or interaction respectfully and maturely. Overall, we will work to make class an enjoyable place to be.

4. Academic Integrity/Plagiarism

   - You are responsible for being attentive to and observant of University policies about academic honesty as stated in the University’s Student Conduct Code.
   - Academic dishonesty is a serious offense that may lead to probation, suspension, or dismissal from the University. One form of academic dishonesty is plagiarism — the use of an author’s ideas, statements, or approaches without crediting the source. Academic dishonesty also includes such acts as cheating by copying information from another student. Plagiarism and cheating will not be tolerated.
   - Academic dishonesty must be reported to the Office of Academic Affairs for possible action. The instructor shall make an academic judgment about the student’s grade on that work and in that course. The campus process regarding academic dishonesty is described in the “Policies” section of the Academic Affairs website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/academic-dishonesty.html
   - You will be expected to use proper citation of sources in your major assignments, and this will be outlined in assignment prompts. You can select the citation style you prefer to use—MLA, APA, etc.—but your sources must be properly and consistently cited, both within the text itself and with a works cited page.

Student Support and Services

• Technical Support

   - My Gateway (Blackboard): If you have problems logging into your online course, or an issue within the course site, please contact the Technology Support Center:

     ▪ Phone: (314) 516-6034
     ▪ Email: helpdesk@umsl.edu
     ▪ Website: http://www.umsl.edu/technology/tsc/
• Academic Support

  o The Writing Center is located at Social Science Building (SSB) 222. I will post specific information about hours for this semester on our course site.

  Appointments at the Writing Center are available for in-person or online tutorials. Visit their website to make an appointment, or call them make an appointment:
  http://www.umsl.edu/~umslenglish/Writing%20Lab/

Course Schedule
(subject to modification)

PART I- The Field of Disability Studies (weeks 1-2)

Week 1: August 28

* Last day any student may enroll (enter a course for credit); Last day Registrar's Office will move students automatically from the wait list to open sections: Sunday, August 31*

Reading Due-
NA

Writing Due-
NA

In Class Topics- Introduction to the course and one another—why are we here? What do we want to learn? What should you expect?; distribute and discuss the syllabus; what is/are Disability Studies/how does the field approach disability?: read Simon’s “Disability Studies: A New Normal” (from NY Times); watch Re-Framing Disability documentary (18 minutes)—discuss these materials; snack sign-up???

Week 2: September 4

* No classes on Monday, September 1; Labor Day Holiday *

Reading Due- Simi Linton, “What is Disability Studies?” (MyG); Ari Ne’eman, “Making DS Accessible” (MyG); Lennard Davis, “From The Rule of Normalcy” (DTW 206-209); “Models of Disability” (MyG; or http://www.copower.org/models-of-disability.html); Tobin Siebers, “Introduction” from Disability Theory (MyG)

Writing Due- Discussion Post due by noon on Thursday
In Class Topics- What is (and who is?) DS?; Disability and Normalcy; Models of Disability/The DS perspective; Assign “DS Show and Tell: Artifact Presentations”; Vital Signs documentary (48 minutes)

**PART II: Disability and/as Identity (weeks 3-5)**

**Week 3: September 11**

**Reading Due-** Brenda Brueggemann, “On (Almost) Passing” (MyG); Wendy Chrisman, “The Ways We Disclose: When Life-Writing Becomes Writing Your Life” (DTW, 130); Rosemarie Garland-Thomson, “The Story of My Work: How I Became Disabled” (MyG); Corbett Joan O’Toole, “Disclosing Our Relationships to Disabilities: An Invitation for DS Scholars” (MyG); start The Speed of Dark (chapters 1-7)

**Writing Due-** Discussion Post due by noon on Thursday

**In Class Topics-** Discuss Vital Signs documentary; Claiming a disabled identity; Passing and coming out; Discuss The Speed of Dark and consider the role of disabled identity; Assign “Creating a Collective DS Resource: The Annotated Bibliography Project”

**Week 4: September 18**

* Last day to drop this session without receiving a grade; Last day to place a course on Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis; Last day to change a course to Audit; Instructor & Dean's approval required-September 22. *

In-person class is cancelled because I’m attending a UM Faculty Retreat. BUT! Fear not! We can hold class via the interwebs. You will be reading, watching a film, and responding to it online. More details and instructions will be posted on MyG.

**Reading/ Watching Due-** Watch online: The Kids Are All Right documentary (30 minutes; access via MyG); Continue reading The Speed of Dark (chapters 8-14); Laura Hershey, “From Poster Child to Protestor” (MyG); Melanie Yergeau, “Defending and (Re)Defining Self Advocacy” (MyG); Garland-Thomson, “Roosevelt’s Sister: Why We Need DS in the Humanities”

**Writing Due-** Discussion Post due Thursday by noon

**Online Class Topics-** Disability community; Disability activism and advocacy; Linking disability activism and academic DS; Discuss/debate The Speed of Dark and/as activist literature; Assign “DS Analysis” essay

**Week 5: September 25**

**Reading Due-** Finish The Speed of Dark (chapters 15-Epilogue); Melanie Yergeau, “I Stim, Therefore I am” (Blog post + video; MyG); “ ‘It'll Grow Organically and Naturally’: The Reciprocal Relationships Between
Disability Studies and Student Groups on College Campuses” (MyG); Michael Berube, “From Citizenship and Disability” (DTW, 238); Deborah Little, “Identity, Efficacy, and Disability Rights Movement Recruitment” (MyG)

**Writing Due** - Discussion Post due Thursday by noon

**In Class Topics** - Disability community, advocacy, and activism continued; discuss The Speed of Dark; disability and/in literature; watch When Billy Broke His Head...and Other Tales of Wonder (57 minutes); discuss/brainstorm/consult “Creating a Collective DS Resource: The Annotated Bib Project” assignment.

**Part III: Access and Pedagogy (weeks 6-8)**

**Week 6: October 2**

**Reading Due** - John Hockenberry, “From Public Transit” (DTW, 257); Tobin Siebers, excerpt on design and access from Disability Theory (MyG); Universal Design (from NC State) and Universal Design for Learning (from CAST) resources (MyG); Jay Dolmage, “Mapping Composition: Inviting Disability in the Front Door” (DTW, 14); Brewer et al, “Multimodality on Motion: Disability and Kairotic Spaces” (MyG or http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/18.1/coverweb/ergeau-et-al/index.html)

**Writing Due** - Discussion Post due Thursday by noon

**In Class Topics** - Universal Design (as architectural movement) and Universal Design for Learning (as educational theory); accessibility (vs. accommodations); Assign “Final Project”

**Week 7: October 9**

**Reading Due** - Margaret Price’s Mad at School: Intro, Chapter 1, Chapter 2; Patricia Dunn, “From Learning Differences” (DTW, 147); David J. Connor, “The Disability Studies in Education Annual Conference: Explorations of Working Within, and Against, Special Education” (MyG)

**Writing Due** - Discussion Post due Thursday by noon; bring draft of your Annotated Bibliography Project to class

**In Class Topics** - Price on pedagogy/the possibilities of UDL; learning disabilities; special education and DS; peer review/discussion of "Annotated Bibliography Project"

*Please schedule a conference with Lauren about your final project some time between week 8 and week 13.*
**Week 8: October 16**

**Reading Due** - Margaret Price’s *Mad at School*: Chapter 3; James C. Wilson and Cynthia Lewiecki-Wilson, “Constructing a Third Space: Disability Studies, the Teaching of English, and Institutional Transformation”; Brenda Brueggemann, “An Enabling Pedagogy” (MyG); check out “Composing Access” website (MyG)

**Writing Due** - Discussion Post due Thursday by noon; Final Project Proposal due to Lauren

**In Class** - Price continued with a focus on access beyond the undergrad classroom: for teachers, as institutional policy

**Part IV: Rhetoric and Representation Surrounding Disability (weeks 9-13)**

**Week 9: October 23**


**Writing Due** - Discussion Post due Thursday by noon; “DS Annotated Bibliography” due to collective resource website

**In Class Topics** - Rhetoric(s) of Disability: verbal, textual, visual

**Week 10: October 30**

**Reading Due** - *The Elephant Man* (yes, all of it. It’s a fast read!); Clare, “Gawking, Gaping, Staring” (*DTW*, 224); Garland-Thomson, “Staring at the Other” (MyG)

**Writing Due** - Discussion Post due Thursday by noon

**In Class Topics** - Staring/The Gaze; staring back as resistance; discuss *The Elephant Man* (particularly in the context of staring and/or freak shows and/or medicalization of disability)

**Week 11: November 6**

**Reading Due** - Jay Dolmage, *Disability Rhetoric*: “Interchapter: Archive and Anatomy of Disability Myths” (31); “Interchapter: A Repertoire and Choreography of Disability Rhetorics” (135)
Writing Due- Discussion Post due Thursday by noon; Final due date for “DS Analysis Essay” (on Speed of Dark or Elephant Man)

In Class- Watch “Code of the Freaks” (work-in-progress documentary; 18 minutes); conclude discussions of The Elephant Man, including watching some film clips if they’re available; discuss Jay Dolmage’s Disability Rhetoric

Week 12: November 13

* November 17: Last day a student may drop a course. Instructor’s approval is required. A grade of EX or F will be assigned; Last day a student may withdraw from school. Instructors’ and Deans’ approvals are required. Grades of EX or F will be assigned for each course. *

Reading Due- Dolmage, Disability Rhetoric: Introduction/Prosthesis-chapter 4 (pgs. 1-192; though you can skip Interchapters because you already read them! So this is about 60 pages less than it really appears to be!)

Writing Due- Discussion Post due Thursday by noon

In Class Topics- Continue discussion of Jay Dolmage’s Disability Rhetoric

Week 13: November 20

Reading Due- Dolmage, Disability Rhetoric: Chapters 5-conclusion/Prosthesis (pgs. 149-294)

Writing Due- Discussion Post due Thursday by noon; Draft of final project (in whatever form it takes) due to Lauren

In Class Topics- Finish Jay Dolmage’s Disability Rhetoric; disability and/in film and other visual media; disability art and culture; Self-Preservation: The Art of Riva Lehrer (documentary film; 30 minutes)

November 24-November 28: Fall Break!

Part V: You Pick and You Lead! (weeks 14-15)—

Week 14: December 4

YOU PICK—What did we miss/what should we explore further?

Reading Due- TBD
Writing Due- Discussion Post due Thursday by noon; bring a draft of your final project, in whatever form it takes/wherever you’re at with it!

In Class Topics- TBD; peer review/discussion of final project

Week 15: December 11

* Last Week of Classes!*

Reading Due- NA

Writing Due- Final Projects can be turned in, or you can take a few extra days and turn them in at the start of finals week.

In Class Topics- Student presentations/discussions

Finals Week: December 15-19

No class for us! 😊

If you didn’t turn your final project in last week, I need it by Tuesday, December 16—NO EXCEPTIONS! (Submit via MyG or schedule a drop-off appointment as needed)
Instructor:
Dr. Lauren Obermark obermarkl@umsl.edu

Contact Information:
Email: obermarkl@umsl.edu

The best way to reach me is via email; I will typically reply within 24-48 hours.

Campus Office: 455A Lucas Hall (North Campus)

Virtual or In-Person Office Hours:

Tuesday, 12:30-1:30; Thursday, 1:30-3:30 CST; I am (enthusiastically!) available at other times, too. Contact me and make an appointment.

In Person: Stop by my office on campus to talk—making an appointment will guarantee I’m not meeting with someone else.

Virtual: Simply email me during my office hours; I will reply immediately unless I am conferencing with another student. You can also contact me in advance of office hours to schedule a virtual appointment. We can decide via email if we would like to meet by video chat, phone, IM, or simply by email.

Access, Learning Style, and Disability

I design and teach courses with access in mind. I am a practitioner of universal design for learning (UDL), which we will learn more about throughout the course. But, at its heart, UDL is about making a course work well for ALL students—that means I want to make the course as accessible and engaging as possible for a variety of learning approaches and styles. As articulated by CAST, the founders of UDL: “UDL provides a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials, and assessments that work for everyone— not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individual needs.”¹ Please let me know how I can support you to help accomplish your best learning.

Additionally, students who have a health condition or disability, which may require accommodations in order to participate effectively in this course, should contact the Disability Access Services Office. Information about your disability is confidential. Contact info for the Office:

¹ Visit the CAST website for additional information about UDL: http://www.cast.org/index.html
Course Information

Course Description:

- General Description from the UMSL Bulletin:

Provides the opportunity for practical application of composition theory with an emphasis on improving teaching skills. Strongly recommended for graduate teaching assistants.

- More Detailed Description, Design of the Course, and Objectives:

This course aims to give students a broad overview of and grounding in various theories and practices of composition studies, a robust and diverse field within English Studies that is committed to understanding how people write and how writing is taught across various spaces, with a particular emphasis on postsecondary/"college-level" writing.

Our ultimate goal is to think critically about writing and writing instruction and develop a sense of why teaching writing is a complicated task with high stakes for students and teachers. We will gain insight into how we might teach writing in a thoughtful and rigorous way that accounts for research on writing and writing processes.

The calendar for the course is divided into five focus areas, though you will quickly realize each overlaps and intersects, as well. The areas are:

- Part I: The Field (weeks 1-3)—Learning about the history of composition studies, its identity as discipline in English Studies, and how scholars and teachers in the field define writing.
- Part II: The Students (weeks 4-6)—We will discuss the various identities of students that make up a “typical” writing classroom and look toward practices that will best meet the needs of these students.
- Part III: The Teachers/Researchers (weeks 7-8)—While students tend to be foremost in teachers’ minds, the teachers themselves matter, too. Who makes up the field of composition studies? Who teaches writing classes? What are the concerns and needs of these teachers—especially the new and/or marginalized ones?
• **Part IV: Practices/Approaches/Pedagogies (weeks 9-12)**—We will learn about commonly utilized “best practices” as theorized and implemented by scholars and teachers in composition studies. For example: we will interrogate notions of the writing process; consider how to best respond to and grade student work; discuss the role of technology in composition; and investigate collaborative and community-based pedagogies.

• **Part V (weeks 13-15): You Pick!**—Composition studies is a large and diverse field. We’ve definitely missed some stuff and barely touched on some things you might want to dig into more deeply. So what else should we read/discuss?

- **As a student in “Teaching College Writing” you will:**
  - Articulate an understanding of important theories and pedagogies in composition studies, including material that is quite canonical in the field, as well as more diverse approaches;
  - Discuss and analyze the history of composition studies to better understand why we teach what we teach;
  - Investigate identities of writing students and teachers of writing and develop approaches to better meet the needs of both parties;
  - Understand and interact with the writing classroom as a significant site of research and scholarship;
  - Develop your own theories of writing and teaching writing;
  - Apply theories and practices to your own teaching/future teaching.

**Required texts:**

- *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*, 2nd Ed. (Tate, Taggart, Schick, and Hessler, Editors)
- *Mad at School: Rhetorics and Mental Disability and Academic Life*, by Margaret Price (ISBN: 978-0472051380)
- *First Semester: Graduate Students, Teaching Writing, and the Challenge of the Middle Ground*, by Jessica Restaino (ISBN: 978-0809330812)
- Other readings will be available online via MyG/though links on this syllabus.

**Assignments and Grade Composition:**

*Detailed prompts will be distributed for each of these assignments—more info to come!* ☝

- Theory of Writing: **(25%)**

**Objectives:** Throughout the semester you will develop a theory of writing that articulates how you define writing, how people learn writing, and what you consider effective pedagogical
practices for meeting the diverse needs of writers. Your final Theory of Writing should be based in research, theoretically sound, reflective, and practical.

a. Initial Theory of Writing (week 4): 2%
b. Revised Theory of Writing (week 9): 3%
c. Final Theory of Writing (week 15): 20%

• Weekly “Applying the Reading” Discussion Post (10 total posts): (20%)

Objectives: Each week (due Thursday by noon so we can use them during class), there will be a discussion forum on MyGateway with a prompt that asks you to engage with the week’s reading. In particular, these prompts will ask you to apply the reading to a classroom scenario, real or imagined. You must complete ten posts throughout the semester; thirteen are assigned, but you can skip three. This writing is informal, but it should be substantive and thoughtful.

• “Position Statement” on a Composition Studies Topic of Your Choice (work is ongoing; final is due week 11; Group/Individual): (15%)

Objectives: In groups or individually, you will compose a concise statement of best practices in a specific area in the teaching of writing. We will look at some examples from professional organizations, including the Conference on College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English, and the Council of Writing Program Administrators. You have the option of composing a traditional print statement or a multimedia presentation (Prezi; or an audio or video statement, for example). You will present your group’s statement to the class for discussion.

• Artifact Presentation & Leading Class Discussion, + write up of Artifact (weeks 4-14): 10%

Objectives: Using the knowledge and insights you build in the course, you will discover and interrogate a composition studies-related “artifact” from the world around you. These brief and casual presentations will serve as a fun, engaging way to start our class each week. This assignment will also give you some practice planning and facilitating a lesson of sorts.

• Final Research-Based Project on a Topic of Your Choice: (30%)

Objectives: You will further explore an issue or topic in composition studies in a research-based project; it might build on work you’ve done in previous course assignments if you so desire. The final project can be designed in a way that is helpful to you—which is to say that you could write a formal essay, design a syllabus for a new course, make a short film, plan for a larger classroom-based research project, create a series of lesson plans, write a review of scholarly books/essays—to name some options. The goal here is to further your knowledge of a specific area of composition studies, through primary and/or secondary research, and then to apply it in a way that is useful and meaningful to you.

a. Project Proposal (week 8): 5%
b. Required Draft of for Peer Review (week 13 and 14): NA

c. Required Conference with Lauren—about a draft (weeks 8-13): NA

d. Present Your Research Project to the Class (week 15): 5%

e. Final Project (finals week): 20%

• COURSE TOTAL: **100%**

• I plan to document grades on MyGateway so you can keep track of how you are doing in the course.

**Grading Scale:** The UMSL Grading System is based on a four-point scale. The grade value for each letter grade is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Policies

**Turning in Your Work On Time/No Late Work Policy**

- **Student work must be completed and submitted on time.** All assignments—both major and minor—should be turned in by the date and time they are due according to the syllabus. **No late work will be accepted.**

- **Draft assignments and conferences:** While drafts and conferences with me do not carry a formal grade, they are required as outlined on the syllabus in the “assignments” section and discussed in class. If you miss a required draft or conference—with me or your peers—you also miss out on valuable feedback collaboration. This generally negatively affects your grade on final assignments.

- **If an emergency like a severe illness or crisis within your family arises and causes issues with your ability to turn in work on time, it is your responsibility to contact Lauren as soon as possible to try and work out a plan.**

**Attendance**

I want to emphasize up front that this is a class you need to attend each and every week. Though I do understand and respect that physical attendance can be difficult for folks for a variety of access reasons, so don’t hesitate to talk to me about any barriers you may experience—be it an illness, emergency, disability, learning style, etc. I know we are all just human, doing the best we can.
Generally, though, I expect you to be in class, and you can assume that class will take the whole time. Missing class will affect you performance and participation in class in a variety of ways. If you do not attend class regularly, I suspect your grade will be lower than it would otherwise.

**Participation Expectations and Classroom Community**

This is a class in which we will discuss a great deal. We will interact with each other frequently and sometimes talk about sensitive issues—including sharing our own writing. It is imperative that we handle any discussion or interaction respectfully and maturely. Overall, we will work to make class an enjoyable place to be.

Your physical presence is valued, but you also need to come to class prepared. If you are not completing the reading and writing necessary to develop your knowledge and thinking, this can also hinder your ability to participate.

**Academic Integrity/Plagiarism**

- You are responsible for being attentive to and observant of University policies about academic honesty as stated in the University’s Student Conduct Code.
- Academic dishonesty is a serious offense that may lead to probation, suspension, or dismissal from the University. One form of academic dishonesty is plagiarism – the use of an author’s ideas, statements, or approaches without crediting the source. Academic dishonesty also includes such acts as cheating by copying information from another student. Plagiarism and cheating will not be tolerated.
- Academic dishonesty must be reported to the Office of Academic Affairs for possible action. The instructor shall make an academic judgment about the student’s grade on that work and in that course. The campus process regarding academic dishonesty is described in the “Policies” section of the Academic Affairs website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/academic-dishonesty.html
- You will be expected to use proper citation of sources in your major assignments, and this will be outlined in assignment prompts. You can select the citation style you prefer to use—MLA, APA, etc.—but your sources must be properly and consistently cited, both within the text itself and with a works cited page.
Student Support and Services

- Technical Support
  - My Gateway (Blackboard): If you have problems logging into your online course, or an issue within the course site, please contact the Technology Support Center:
    - Phone: (314) 516-6034
    - Email: helpdesk@umsl.edu
    - Website: http://www.umsl.edu/technology/tsc/

- Academic Support
  - The Writing Center is located at Social Science Building (SSB) 222. I will post specific information about hours for this semester on our course site.

  Appointments at the Writing Center are available for in-person or online tutorials. Visit their website to make an appointment, or call them:
  http://www.umsl.edu/~umslenglish/Writing%20Lab/

Course Schedule
(subject to modification)
(GCP=Guide to Composition Pedagogies Book)

Week 1: January 22—“Introductions”

*No classes Monday, January 19; MLK Day*

* Last day any student may enroll (enter a course for credit); Last day Registrar’s Office will move students automatically from the wait list to open sections: January 26*

Reading Due-
NA

Writing Due-
NA
In Class Topics-
Introductions-- to the course and to one another; review and discuss syllabus; Write and discuss: Who are you? What brings you to this class? What do you want to learn?; watch/discuss Take 20: Teaching Writing

Week 2: January 29-“Part I: The Field”

Reading Due-

- Scan don’t have to read in detail/generally great as resource: The Bedford Bibliography for Teachers of Writing, “A Brief History of Rhetoric and Composition” (MyG or http://bedfordstmartins.com/Catalog/static/bsm/bb/history.html)
- Fleming, “Rhetoric and Argumentation” (GCP)
- Taggart et al, “What is Composition Pedagogy?: An Introduction” (GCP)
- Tremmel, “Striking a Balance, Seeking a Discipline” (MyG)
- Williams, “The Phenomenology of Error” (MyG)
- Lunsford and Lunsford, “‘Mistakes are a Fact of Life’: A National Comparative Study” (MyG)

Writing Due- Discussion Post #1 due by Thursday at noon

In Class Topics- History of rhetoric and composition studies—why do we teach what we teach?; understanding composition studies as a field—who makes up the field? What do they care about? What IS writing to this field?; disciplinary perspectives on error and grammar; Assign “Theory of Writing”; sign up for Artifact Presentation dates

Week 3: February 5, “Part I: The Field”

Reading Due-

- Connors, “From Composition-Rhetoric: Backgrounds, Theory, Pedagogy” (MyG)
- Faigley, “Competing Theories of Process: A Critique and a Proposal” (MyG)
- Villanueva, “Still Another Critique of the Comp Community” (MyG)
- “Framework for Success in Postsecondary Writing” (MyG or http://wpacouncil.org/files/framework-for-success-postsecondary-writing.pdf)
- Select three position statements/resolutions to read from the NCTE or CCCC websites: http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions; http://www.ncte.org/positions (or access via MyG)

Writing Due- Discussion Post #2 due by Thursday at noon
In Class Topics- A wee bit more on historicizing the teaching of writing; what does the field value—how do position statements reflect that/articulate that?; competing notions of what “the field” should be about; Assign “Position Statement” (group project)

Week 4: February 12, “Part II: The Students”

* Last day to withdraw or drop a course without receiving a grade; Last day to designate a course S/U. *

Reading Due-
- Micciche, “Feminist” (GCP)
- Webb-Saundershaus, “A Family Affair: Competing of Sponsors of Literacy in Academic Life” (MyG)
- Brueggemann, “An Enabling Pedagogy” (MyG)
- Dolmage, “Mapping Composition: Inviting Disability in the Front Door” (MyG)
- CCCC Disability Policy (http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/disabilitypolicy, or via MyG)

Writing Due-
- Initial “Theory of Writing” due to Lauren and for peer review
- Discussion Post #3 due by Thursday at noon

In Class Topics- Peer review of “theory of writing” drafts; identity in the writing classroom—gender (and feminism!), disability, class

Week 5: February 19, “Part II: The Students”

Reading Due-
- Royster, “When the First Voice You Hear is Not Your Own” (MyG)
- Lyons, “Rhetorical Soverignty: What Do American Indians Want From Writing?” (MyG)
- Moss, “Literacy in African-American Churches: A Conversation Between the Academy and Church Begins” (MyG)
- Matsuda and Hammill, “Second Language Writing” (GCP)
- CCCC Statement on Second-Language Writing and Writers (http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/secondlangwriting or access via MyG)

Writing Due- Discussion Post #4 due by Thursday at noon

In Class Topics- Continuing identity in the writing classroom—race, language; assign Final Project
Week 6: February 26, “Part II: The Students”

Reading Due-
  • Price, *Mad at School*, Chapters 1 and 2
  • Canagarajah, “The Place of World Englishes in Composition: Pluralization Continued” (MyG)
  • CCCC Statement on Students’ Right to Their Own Language (http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CCCC/NewSRTOL.pdf; or via MyG) (You can stop reading at the Bibliography—so about 23 pages)
  • George, “Critical” (GCP)

Writing Due-
  • Discussion Post #5 due by Thursday at noon

In Class Topics- Continuing identity in the writing classroom—what is normal? How do we meet diverse student needs?

Week 7: March 5, “Part III: The Teachers/Researchers”

Reading Due-
  • Restaino, *The First Semester*, Introduction, Chapters 1 and 2
  • Price, *Mad at School*, Chapter 3

Writing Due-
  • Discussion Post #6 due by Thursday at noon
  • Individual drafting work on “Position Statement” due to share with your group during class/conference with Lauren on statements

In Class Topics- Considering concerns and needs of teachers and scholars of writing; work with your group on “Position Statement”

Please schedule a conference with Lauren about your final project some time between week 8 and week 13—ideally to discuss your project in DRAFT form.

Week 8: March 12, “Part III: The Teachers/Researchers”

Reading Due-
  • Restaino, *The First Semester*, Chapters 3 and 4
  • Price, *Mad at School*, Chapter 6
Writing Due-
  • Proposal for Final Project—due to Lauren and for Peer Review
  • Discussion Post #7 due by Thursday at noon

In Class- Peer review of project proposals; discuss Restaino and Price and the concerns and needs
of writing teachers/scholars

Week 9: March 19, “Part IV: Approaches/Pedagogies/Practices”

Class cancelled because I am attending CCCC (a conference on writing & rhetoric stuff!); make up
class held online.

Reading Due-
  • Devitt, “Genre” (GCP)
  • Sommers, “Responding to Student Writing” (MyG)
  • White, “Responding to Student Writing” (MyG)
  • White, “Issues in Grading and Writing” (MyG)

Writing Due- Revised “Theory of Writing” due to Lauren and for Peer review (to be held via MyG); no
assigned discussion post because the entire class will be held online—more details to come.

“In Class” Topics- Collaborate online or in person on “Position Statement”; peer review of “Theory of
Writing” via MyG; online discussion/activities about genre & responding vs?? grading.

SPRING BREAK: March 23-March 27—Work on ongoing assignments as needed: “Position
Statement,” “Theory of Writing,” Final Projects.

Week 10: April 2, “Part IV: Approaches/Pedagogies/Practices”

Reading Due-
  • Anson, “Process” (GCP)
  • Berthoff, “Learning the Uses of Chaos” (MyG)
  • Sommers, “Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers” (MyG)
  • Hartwell, “Grammar, Grammars, and the Teaching of Grammar” (MyG)
**Writing Due**- Discussion Post #8 due by Thursday at noon

**In Class Topics**- Writing as a process?!; the challenge of revision; where does grammar fit in this process?; more discussion of responding and evaluating from week 9 as needed.

**Week 11: April 9, “Part IV: Approaches/Pedagogies/Practices”**

**Reading Due**-
- Kennedy and Moore-Howard, “Collaborative Writing” (GCP)
- Julier et al, “Community-Engaged” (GCP)
- Bruffee, “Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind” (MyG)
- Harris, “The Idea of Community in the Study of Writing” (MyG)
- Cushman, “Rhetorician as Agent of Social Change” (MyG)

**Writing Due**-
- “Position Statement” due to Lauren/be prepared to (casually!) discuss your statement with the class
- Discussion Post #9 due Thursday at noon

**In Class**- Share “Position Statements” with the class; Writing as a social act; the role of collaboration, community, and dialogue in the writing classroom—and beyond it

**Week 12: April 16, “Part IV: Approaches/Pedagogies/Practices”**

*Last day to drop a course or withdraw from school (F/EX grade assigned): April 20*

**Reading Due**-
- Brooke, “New Media” (GCP)
- Hewett, “Online and Hybrid” (GCP)
- Selfe, “Technology and Literacy: A Story About the Perils of Not Paying Attention” (MyG)
- George, “From Analysis to Design: Visual Communication in the Teaching of Writing” (MyG)
- CCCC Position Statement of Principles and Example Effective Practices for Online Writing Instruction (http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/owiprinciples, or via MyG) (You can scan this one—it’s pretty long and involved.)

**Writing Due**- Discussion Post #10 due Thursday at noon
In Class Topics- Finish sharing “Position Statements” with the class; the changing nature of “writing” in the 21st century

Week 13: April 23, “Part V: What Did We Miss?—You Pick!”

Reading Due-
- Price, Mad School, Chapter 4
- The rest is TBD by students
- Lauren’s “slush pile” of topics: queer identity; researched writing and plagiarism; creative writing and comp; role of lit in comp; Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines/disciplinary; writing center; First-Year Writing (as the base of comp studies and specific curricular approaches); feminism and composition studies; more on public writing/civic engagement/rhetorical education; more historical pieces/approaches

Writing Due-
- Discussion Post #11 due by Thursday at noon

In Class Topics- TBD by students

Week 14: April 30, “Part V: What Did We Miss—You Pick!”

Reading Due- TBD by students

Writing Due-
- Draft of final project due for peer review
- Discussion Post #12 due by Thursday

In Class Topics- Peer review of final project; other topics TBD by students
Week 15: May 7

*Last Week of Classes!*

Reading Due- None 😊

Writing Due-
- Final “Theory of Writing” due to Lauren
- Discussion Post #13 due by Thursday

In Class Topics- Student research presentations/discussions

*******

Finals Week: May 11-May 15

Writing Due- Final projects due to Lauren by Wednesday, May 13 (Submit via MyG or schedule a drop-off appointment as needed)
Instructor:
Dr. Lauren Obermark
obermarkl@umsl.edu

Contact Information:
Email: obermarkl@umsl.edu

The best way to reach me is via email; I will typically reply within 24-48 hours. Though this is an online course, I am NOT online 24-hours a day, and you should not expect instant or constant access to me. If you need an immediate/quicker response, you should contact me during office hours (see below) or use the “General Questions” discussion forum on MyGateway to seek a response from your peers.

Campus Office: 455A Lucas Hall (North Campus)

Virtual or In-Person Office Hours:

Wednesday 2-4 pm; Thursday, 4:30-6:30 pm; I am available at other times, too, if you just contact me and make an appointment.

In Person: Stop by my office on campus to talk—making an appointment will guarantee I’m not meeting with someone else.

Virtual: Simply email me during my office hours; I will reply immediately unless I am conferencing with another student. You can also contact me in advance of office hours to schedule a virtual appointment. We can decide via email if we would like to meet by video chat, phone, IM, or simply by email.

Access, Learning Style, and Disability

First and foremost, I plan and teach with access in mind. I am a practitioner of universal design for learning (UDL). In the simplest terms, UDL is about making a course work well for ALL students—that means I want to make the course as accessible and engaging as possible for a variety of learning approaches and styles. As articulated by CAST, the founders of UDL: “UDL provides a blueprint for creating instructional goals, methods, materials, and assessments that work for everyone—not a single, one-size-fits-all solution but rather flexible approaches that can be customized and adjusted for individual needs.” Please let me know how I can support you to help accomplish your best learning.

Additionally, students who have a health condition or disability, which may require accommodations in order to participate effectively in this course, should contact the Disability Access Services Office. Information about your disability is confidential.

---

1 Visit the CAST website for additional information about UDL: http://www.cast.org/index.html
Course Description:

• *General Description from the UMSL Bulletin:* Prerequisite: ENGL 1100 or equivalent (3-6 hours) and 56 credit hours. Focuses on writing and illiteracies in various contexts. Builds on intellectual maturity, knowledge, and abilities gained through prior university studies. Enhances analytical, communicative, persuasive, and explanatory capabilities. Includes complex readings and research. Fulfills the University’s requirement for a junior-level course in Communicative Skills. Counts toward the Certificate in Writing. May not be taken on a satisfactory/unsatisfactory basis.

• *Our Specific Section of English 3100:* Since English 3100 is a writing class, it seems appropriate that we focus on, well, writing. So, in this course, you will be writing (and reading!) about writing and literacy in very broad forms. You’ll read research on writing, explore your own reading/writing/composing experiences and practices, research the literacy experiences of others, and work to educate a public audience about important writing/literacy issues.

• *Questions that we might consider and discuss throughout the course:*
  - How do your past experiences with writing and reading shape who you are today?
  - How does literacy empower some people? And how does literacy exclude and deny power to other people?
  - How do issues of race, gender, and class intersect with learning to read and write?
  - How do abilities and disabilities affect writing and reading?
  - How is literacy shaped *throughout* life by institutions like family, school, jobs, clubs, technology, etc.?
  - What are the differences between “school” literacy and “fun” literacy?
  - How do we define “literacy”...or perhaps “literacies”? What does it mean to be “literate” in the 21st century?
  - What are the different ways that people learn to write? Are some more effective than others?
  - What do writing processes look like? How do different processes work for different people?
  - What does writing actually DO? Does it just record information? Or is it integral part of gaining knowledge?
• Assignments and Approaches to Learning: As a writing course, the major and minor work you will do is all written. You will write longer essays, as well as participate in shorter weekly discussion board activities. Each larger writing assignment will require you to go through a writing process and have drafts of your work reviewed and responded to by Lauren and/or peers. (These drafts will not be graded, but not turning them in will affect your grade on the final assignment, as detailed later in the syllabus.) You will also partake in several peer review sessions, which will require you write thoughtful letters to group members about their work. Finally, some weeks will require you to participate in short learning activities and writing workshops to help improve your general abilities and confidence in regards to writing.

Yes, indeed, it is a lot of writing. I know this can feel daunting or intimidating, but since we are writing to learn, you will see are no tests/exams—no final, no midterm, etc. 😊

Required texts:
• Readings posted to the MyGateway course site.

Time Requirements:

We will never meet in person, nor will there be specific times you need to meet online. But you will still be expected to be involved in the course—with both Lauren and your peers—throughout the semester. It will be more flexible, yes, but it will be just as demanding, if not more so, than a traditional, on campus course. You will need to self motivated, organized, and have a strong, independent work ethic.

If this course was offered on campus, you’d be in class about 2.5 hours/week, along with the travel time involved. The online version is no different in terms of expectations for your involvement. This is an active online course that requires three hours of your time each week IN ADDITION TO the time it takes you to read the required materials and watch the videos, as well as the additional work required to complete the assigned papers. That means that you need to plan to spend a minimum of six hours every week, and up to 9-10 hours a week on heavier weeks, on activities related to this course. If you do not have that amount of time to devote to this course, you should perhaps reconsider taking this course at this time. It is offered every semester, both online and in-person.

Technology Requirements:

As a student in an online course, you are expected to have access to the internet almost every day. You will, at a minimum, need to check email and MyGateway daily. If you have computing problems, it is your responsibility to address these, or come to campus to use the student computing labs. Problems with your computer or other technology issues is not an excuse for any delays in meeting expectations and deadlines for the course. So, if you have a problem, get help in solving it immediately. At a minimum, you will need the following software/hardware to participate in this course:
1. Computer with an updated operating system (e.g. Windows, Mac, Linux) and to an Internet browser (e.g. Mozilla Firefox, Internet Explorer)
2. Ability to navigate MyGateway (Blackboard Learning Management System)
3. Minimum Processor Speed of 250 mHz, 400 mHz recommended.
4. DSL Internet connection or a connection speed no less than 7 MB/s
5. Media player such as Windows Media Player to open course media. Flash player may be required by some aspects of the course and is available as a free download here: http://get.adobe.com/flashplayer/
6. Adobe Acrobat to open PDF files throughout the course – available as a free download here: http://get.adobe.com/reader/?promoid=HRZAC
7. A word processing program, like Microsoft Word or Microsoft Open Office. I will expect papers be submitted as .docx or .doc files.

Assignments and Grade Composition:

- **Literacy Artifact Presentation, Write Up, and Discussion Leader Role:** 5% (50 points)
  *Objectives:* Using the knowledge and insights you build in the course, you will discover and interrogate a literacy “artifact” from the world around you.

- **Weekly Participation in the Discussion of Peers’ Literacy Artifact Presentations:** 5% (50 points)
  *Objectives:* Engaging with presentations of your classmates and broadening your knowledge and understanding of what literacy means to others.

- **PART I Literacy Reflection/Definition Essay:** 9% (90 points)
  *Objectives:* Reflecting on your own writing and literacy experiences—good and bad—in a personal essay. Working toward a definition of/theory literacy informed by your experiences.

- **PART II Reflection/Definition Essay (Part II):** 8% (80 points)
  *Objectives:* After receiving feedback from both Lauren and peers on your original essay, you will revisit and revise this essay throughout the semester as our perceptions of writing and reading change. You will turn in your revised, final essay for another grade at the semester’s conclusion. The final essay will allow you to reflect in new ways on your own experiences, your definition(s) of literacy, and the course itself.

- **Literacy Profile:** 30% (300 points) → see breakdown of points below
  *Objectives:* Interviewing others about their literacy experiences and researching related issues to write an academic essay. A series of assignments builds toward the final product.
  - **Literacy Profile Points Breakdown:**
  - Interview Summary: 5% (50 points)
  - Annotated Bibliography: 5% (50 points)
  - Final Literacy Profile: 20% (200 points)

- **Literacy Research Exhibit:** 15% (150 points)
Objectives: Crafting an exhibit of your most important findings/discoveries from the course to be shared with your classmates at the session’s end.

• Weekly Discussion Posts and Responses: 15% (150 points)
  Objectives: Responding to readings and class discussion topics through short online posts.
  - 15 weekly discussion posts, plus two responses to peers each week; each week’s posting is worth 10 points.

• Peer Review: 13% (130 points)
  Objectives: Working with a small group of your classmates to provide one another with feedback on your work-in-progress.
  - Four peer review sessions; each one worth 32/33 points.

• COURSE TOTAL: 100% (1000 points)

• Your grades will be updated on MyGateway weekly so you can keep track of how you are doing in the course.

Grading Scale: The UMSL Grading System is based on a four-point scale. The grade value for each letter grade is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Failure/Non Participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Policies

1. Turning in Your Work On Time/No Late Work Policy

- Student work must be completed and submitted on time. All assignments—both major and minor—should be turned in by the date and time they are due according to the syllabus. **No late work will be accepted.**
- Draft assignments: Turning in your draft assignment late will mean that you cannot receive a timely or full response from me or from your peers, so turn in your drafts on time. Failure to turn in an assignment draft at all will result in the deduction of **one-third of a letter grade** on the final version of the paper (for example, B+ to B). This holds true for drafts due to Lauren and drafts due for peer review sessions.
- Final graded assignments: Late submission of a final graded assignment will result in the deduction of **one full letter grade** for each day past the due date (for example, B+ to C+).
- If an emergency like a severe illness or crisis within your family arises and causes issues with your ability to turn in work on time, it is your responsibility to contact Lauren as soon as possible to try and work out a plan.

2. Participation Expectations
This is a class in which we will discuss a great deal. We will interact with each other frequently and sometimes talk about sensitive issues—including sharing our own writing. It is imperative that we handle any discussion or interaction respectfully and maturely. Overall, we will work to make class an enjoyable place to be.

Your success in this course will heavily depend on your ability to communicate, engage and participate in all course activities. Successful completion of this course requires that a student keep up with all assignments, coursework and discussions. Timely participation in online discussions and peer review groups is a very important part of this course and participation in all major and minor class activities as assigned is not optional.

- I will not respond to each post but will be monitoring each discussion. I will respond to some posts each week, and I will also sometimes record video responses that work to synthesize discussion board participation for that week. If your posts are struggling to meet expectations, and you are consistently receiving low grades on them, you should contact Lauren so we can work to improve your participation on the discussion board.
- If you are unable to participate in the scheduled class activity, discussion, peer review session, or scheduled turn-in of an essay, you must notify the instructor within the week of that activity. An unexcused failure to engage or participate with the class will be counted as a zero; unexcused absences may result in failure. The instructor reserves the right to make judgment to accept and/or make-up assignments missed because of failed participation in the course activities.

3. Academic Integrity/Plagiarism

- You are responsible for being attentive to and observant of University policies about academic honesty as stated in the University’s Student Conduct Code.
- Academic dishonesty is a serious offense that may lead to probation, suspension, or dismissal from the University. One form of academic dishonesty is plagiarism – the use of an author’s ideas, statements, or approaches without crediting the source. Academic dishonesty also includes such acts as cheating by copying information from another student. Plagiarism and cheating will not be tolerated.
- Academic dishonesty must be reported to the Office of Academic Affairs for possible action. The instructor shall make an academic judgment about the student’s grade on that work and in that course. The campus process regarding academic dishonesty is described in the “Policies” section of the Academic Affairs website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/academic/policy/academic-dishonesty.html
- You will be expected to use proper citation of sources in your major assignments, and this will be outlined in assignment prompts. You can select the citation style you prefer to use—MLA, APA, etc.—but your sources must be properly and consistently cited, both within the text itself and with a works cited page.

4. Access, Disability and Communication

- I am committed to making this course work well for ALL students—that means I want to make the course as accessible and engaging as possible for a variety of learning approaches and styles. Please let me know how I can support you to help accomplish your best learning. Additionally, students who have a health condition or disability, which may require accommodations in order
to participate effectively in this course, should contact the Disability Access Services Office. Information about your disability is confidential.

- 144 Millennium Student Center
- Phone: (314) 516-6554
- Website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/disabled/

- If you have difficulty communicating in English with the instructor of this course, contact the Office of International Students and Scholar Services:
  - Phone: (314) 516-5229
  - Email: iss@umsl.edu
  - Website: http://www.umsl.edu/~intelstu/contact.html

**Student Support and Services**

- **Technical Support**
  - My Gateway (Blackboard): If you have problems logging into your online course, or an issue within the course site, please contact the Technology Support Center:
    - Phone: (314) 516-6034
    - Email: helpdesk@umsl.edu
    - Website: http://www.umsl.edu/technology/tsc/

- **Academic Support**
  - The Writing Center is located at Social Science Building (SSB) 222. I will post specific information about hours for this semester on our course site.

  Appointments at the Writing Center are available for in-person or online tutorials. Visit their website to make an appointment, or call them make an appointment: http://www.umsl.edu/~umslenglish/Writing%20Lab/

- **Student Services**:
  - The Center for Student Success offers assistance tailored to specific student needs.
    - 225 Millennium Student Center
    - Phone: (314) 516-5300
    - Email: css@umsl.edu
    - Website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/css/campus-resources.html
**Syllabus: English 3100, Autumn 2014**  
**Junior-Level Writing**  
“Writing About Writing”

### Course Schedule  
(subject to modification)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE NOTE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>All due dates—including drafts, responses to peers, and final assignments—are due by 11:59 pm on the date listed.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that I have tried to be CONSISTENT with days of the week assignments are due, as that often makes it easier to keep track of everything for students. Major assignments (drafts and finals) are typically due on FRIDAY; original discussion posts are due by THURSDAY and response posts are due (24 hours later) by FRIDAY. Peer review drafts are due FRIDAY, and review letters are due to group members (48 hours later) by SUNDAY. This can be a lot to keep track of—mark your calendars as necessary and be organized.*

*Artifact Presentation due dates will be staggered; you’ll each sign up for a due date during week two.*

**TSIS-They Say/I Say**  
**LIAL-Literacy in American Lives**  
**MG- MyGateway**

*For each week of the course, please see the corresponding folder on MyGateway to access materials, activities, discussion forums, etc. The folder for each week will be visible to you the Friday before that week begins.*

### Week 1: August 25-31

* Last day any student may enroll (enter a course for credit); Last day Registrar’s Office will move students automatically from the wait list to open sections: Sunday, August 31*

**Reading Due**  
*Cousre Materials:* Syllabus; “Literacy Reflection/Definition Essay” Assignment Prompt

**TSIS:** “‘I Take Your Point’: Entering Class Discussions” (141-144)

**Literacy Reflection/Definition Materials:** NPR Interactive Essay, “Language: What Lies Beneath” (MG); From the National Council of Teachers of English, “Beliefs About the Teaching of Writing” (MG); Sherman Alexie, “The Joy of Reading and Writing: Superman and Me” (MG); David Raymond, “On Being 17, Bright, and Unable to Read” (MG)

**Major Writing Assignments Due:** None

**Discussion Posts Due:** Post #1 due by Thursday, August 28; two responses to peers due by Friday, August 29

### Week 2: September 2-7

*No classes Monday, September 1; Labor Day*

---
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Reading Due-
Course Materials: “Artifact Presentation” prompt and sign up for your due date; “Artifact Presentation” example from Lauren (on MG Discussion Forum)

TSIS: “‘What’s Motivating This Writer?’: Reading for the Conversation” (145-155)

Literacy Reflection/Definition Materials: “Literacy Privilege: How I Learned to Check Mine Instead of Making Fun of People’s Grammar on the Internet” (MG); National Council of Teachers of English Policy Brief, “21st-Century Literacies” (MG); Jordan Shapiro, “Research Says Screen Time Can Be Good for Your Kids” (MG); Matt Peckham, “Wait, Fisher-Price is Selling an ‘iPad Baby’ Bouncy Seat? Come on” (MG); Brenda Brueggeman, “On (Almost) Passing” (essay and video) (MG); Barbara Mellix, “From Outside, In” (MG)

Major Writing Assignments Due- None

Discussion Posts Due- Post #2 due by Thursday, September 4; two responses to peers due by Friday, September 5

Week 3: September 8-14

Reading Due-
Course Materials: “Artifact Presentation” example from Lauren (on MG Discussion Forum)

TSIS: “Introduction: Entering the Conversation” (1-14)

Literacy Reflection/Definition Materials: David Sedaris, “Me Talk Pretty One Day” (MG); Find and watch/listen to/read TWO narratives from the Digital Archive of Literacy Narratives (MG)

Major Writing Assignments Due- Literacy Reflection/Definition Essay due to Lauren Friday, September 12 (via MG Link) (Remember: Though this is a graded essay, it is one you will continue to revisit and revise throughout the course as we learn more about literacy and language use—so, yes, you’re turning it in, but you’re by no means “done”! You’ll get feedback from me, later on more feedback from your peers, and you’ll give yourself feedback at various points in the course. This is just Part I, my friend—don’t panic.)

Discussion Posts Due- Post #3 due by Thursday, September 11; two responses to peers due by Friday, September 12

Week 4: September 15-21

*Artifact Presentations start this week and are staggered throughout the semester; remember to watch & respond!*

Reading Due-
Course Materials: “Literacy Profile” prompt

LIAL: Brandt, “Appendix: Interview Script” (208-210) and “Introduction: The Pursuit of Literacy” (1-24)

TSIS: “Ain’t So/Is Not: Academic Writing Doesn’t Always Mean Setting Aside Your Own Voice” (121-128)
Major Writing Assignments Due- None

Discussion Posts Due- Post #4 due by Thursday, September 18; two responses to peers due by Friday, September 19

Week 5: September 22-28

* Last day to drop this session without receiving a grade; Last day to place a course on Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory basis; Last day to change a course to Audit; Instructor & Dean’s approval required-September 22. *

Reading Due-
Course Materials: “Why Peer Review?” Folder (including a video from MIT “No One Writes Alone” and explanatory video from Lauren)

LIAL: Brandt, “Ch. 2-Literacy and Illiteracy in Documentary America” (47-72); “Ch. 3-Accumulating Literacy: How Four Generations of How Four Generations of One Family Learned to Write” (73-104)

Major Writing Assignments Due- None

Discussion Posts Due- Post #5 due by Thursday, September 25; two responses to peers due by Friday, September 26

Week 6: September 29-October 5

Reading Due-
Course Materials: Instructions in “Peer Review” folder to make the process go smoothly; “Dealing with Data” folder; Revisit “Literacy Definition/Reflection” materials/assignment prompt to prepare for revision of essay due in Week 8.

TSIS: “I Say” (55-92)

Major Writing Assignments Due-
- Interview Summary due to Lauren (via MG Link) and Peer Review Group (via Group Forum) by Friday, October 3
- Peer review letters due to group members by Sunday, October 5

Discussion Posts Due- Post #6 due by Thursday, October 2; two responses to peers due by Friday, October 3

Week 7: October 6-12

Reading Due-
Course Materials: “Dealing with Data” folder (Yes, again. Additional materials included. 😊 ); “Library Instruction” folder; Revisit “Literacy Definition/Reflection” materials/assignment prompt to prepare for revision of essay due in Week 8.

TSIS: “They Say” (19-42)

LIAL: Brandt, “‘The Power of It’: Sponsors of Literacy in African American Lives” (105-145)
Syllabus: English 3100, Autumn 2014  
Junior-Level Writing  
“Writing About Writing”

**Major Writing Assignments Due:** None  

**Discussion Posts Due:** Post #7 due by Thursday, October 9; two responses to peers due by Friday, October 10  

**Week 8: October 13-19**

**Reading Due:**  
Course Materials: “Meaningfully Using Secondary Sources” folder; Review “Library Instruction” Folder as needed; your own secondary sources for your project/working on your annotated bibliography!  

**Major Writing Assignments Due:**  
- Revised Literacy Reflection/Definition Essay due for Peer Review Friday, October 17 (via Group Forum)  
- Peer Review letters due by Sunday, October 19  

**Discussion Posts Due:** Post #8 due by Thursday, October 16; two responses to peers due by Friday, October 17  

**Week 9: October 20-26**

**Reading Due:**  
Course Materials: Your own secondary sources for your project/working on your annotated bibliography!  

**Major Writing Assignments Due:** Literacy Profile Annotated Bibliography Due to Lauren Friday, October 24 (via MG Link)  

**Discussion Posts Due:** Post #9 due by Thursday, October 23; two responses to peers due by Friday, October 24  

**Week 10: October 27-November 2**

**Reading Due:**  
Course Materials: “Literacy Exhibit” Prompt; “Literacy Exhibit” example Prezis  
LIAL: Brandt, “The Sacred and the Profane: Reading versus Writing in Popular Memory” (146-168)  

**Major Writing Assignments Due:** None  

**Discussion Posts Due:** Post #10 due by Thursday, October 30; two responses to peers due by Friday, October 31  

**Week 11: November 3-9**

**Reading Due:**  
Course Materials: Prezi tutorial videos (to help with “Exhibit” brainstorming!); more “Literacy Exhibit” example Prezis  

**Major Writing Assignments Due:**  
- Draft of Literacy Profile due for Peer Review on Friday, November 7 (via Group Forum)  
- Peer Review letters due by Sunday, November 9
**Syllabus: English 3100, Autumn 2014**

**Junior-Level Writing**

“Writing About Writing”

**Discussion Posts Due**- Post #11 (“Exhibit” Proposal Post!) due by Thursday, November 6; two responses to peers due by Friday, November 7

**Week 12: November 10-16**

**Reading Due**-

*LIAL*: Brandt, “The Means of Production: Literacy and Stratification at the 21st century”

**Major Writing Assignments Due**-

- Draft of Literacy Exhibit due for Peer Review on Friday, November 14 (via Group Forum)
- Peer Review letters due by Sunday, November 16

**Discussion Posts Due**- Post #12 due by Thursday, November 13; two responses to peers due by Friday, November 14

**Week 13: November 17-23**

* November 17: Last day a student may drop a course. Instructor's approval is required. A grade of EX or F will be assigned; Last day a student may withdraw from school. Instructors’ and Deans' approvals are required. Grades of EX or F will be assigned for each course. *

**Reading Due**-

*LIAL*: Brandt, “Conclusion: Literacy in American Lives,” (187-207)

**Major Writing Assignments Due**- Revised and FULL Draft of Literacy Profile due to Lauren on Friday, November 21 (via MG Link)

**Discussion Posts Due**- Post #13 due by Thursday, November 20; two responses to peers due by Friday, November 21

**November 24-30:** FALL BREAK! Work on Finalizing Your Exhibits! (And, ya know, take a break.)

**Week 14: December 1-December 7**

**Reading Due**-

*TSIS*: “Tying it All Together” (99-132)

**Major Writing Assignments Due**- Final Exhibit due to Lauren and for Classmates to “Visit” on Friday, December 5 (via MG Discussion Forum)

**Discussion Posts Due**- Post #14 (reflection on course post) due by Thursday, December 4; two responses to peers due by Friday, December 5
Week 15: December 8-14

* Last Week of Classes! *

Reading Due- None

Major Writing Assignments Due- Revised Literacy Reflection/Definition Essay due to Lauren on Friday, December 12 (via MG Link)

Discussion Posts Due- Post #15 (visiting Exhibits post) due by Thursday, December 11; no response posts this week

Finals Week: December 15-19

Major Writing Assignments Due- Final Literacy Profile due to Lauren on Tuesday, December 16 (via MG Link)
Instructor:
   Dr. Lauren Obermark
   obermarkl@umsl.edu

Teaching Assistant:
   Caiti Quatmann
   cem25c@mail.umsl.edu

Contact Information:
   Email: obermarkl@umsl.edu
   Office Phone: 314-516-5591
   Office Location: 455A Lucas Hall
   The best way to reach me is via email; I will typically reply within 24-48 hours. Or pop in during office hours!

Course Information:
   Tuesday and Thursday, 2-3:15
   206 Lucas Hall

Campus Office: 455A Lucas Hall (North Campus)

Virtual or In-Person Office Hours:

   Tuesday and Thursday, 12-1:30; I am available at other times, too, if you just contact me and make an appointment.

   In Person: Stop by my office on campus to talk—making an appointment will guarantee I’m not meeting with someone else.

   Virtual: Simply email me during my office hours; I will reply immediately unless I am conferencing with another student. You can also contact me in advance of office hours to schedule a virtual appointment. We can decide via email if we would like to meet by video chat, phone, IM, or simply by email.

Access, Learning Style, and Disability

I am committed to making this course work well for ALL students—that means I want to make the course as accessible and engaging as possible for a variety of learning approaches and styles. Please let me know how I can support you to help accomplish your best learning. Additionally, students who have a health condition or disability, which may require accommodations in order to participate effectively in this course, should contact the Disability Access Services Office. Information about your disability is confidential.

- 144 Millennium Student Center
- Phone: (314) 516-6554
- Website: http://www.umsl.edu/services/disabled/
Course Information

Course Rationale

Each of you has probably already had instruction and practice in writing before, so it’s reasonable to ask: Why am I taking another writing course? Why now? The official answer is that the university requires you to take this course to fulfill part of the general education requirements.1

But the Writing Program happens to have other answers:

1. Research about writers shows that...
   - Nobody gets better at writing without doing it. Maybe you feel you’re good enough now, but keep reading.
   - Writing about entirely new and unfamiliar subjects (like neurobiology or cultural anthropology or philosophical concepts or physics) turns proficient writers into novice ones.
   - Maturing on an intellectual level often means that you will have more complex thoughts to express. When that happens, we know that no matter how “good” a writer and thinker you are, the first, second, and third drafts you create often don’t quite say what you want them to.

2. The kind of thinking you’ll do in your college classes asks for analysis not summary, but summarizing is the most common first response students make when they write about a text. This is true for students at all levels.

3. Since the kind of thinking you’ll do in your college classes most often asks for analysis, a skill that’s emphasized little if at all in most high school writing assignments, you’ll need to learn how to do it.

4. So as your thinking gets more complex and sophisticated in college, your writing skills need to keep up and that means you need more practice, w/new and more sophisticated thinking.

5. Many of your college writing assignments will ask you to respond to written texts, texts that are usually difficult to read and understand. So as you embark on your college path, you need to work on the combined skills of reading difficult texts and writing about them, writing in ways that analyzes and takes positions on what the texts say. Summarizing them, when analysis is asked for, will earn you low grades.

6. Research shows that reading plays a big role in learning to write. Reading helps you develop familiarity with and assimilate the conventions of writing -- from lower order concerns like spelling, sentence structure and

---

1 “Students must complete a minimum of six credit hours in the Communicating Skills area including a freshman composition course (ENGL 1100, 1110 or HONORS 1200) and one other course. [To meet this goal,] students should be able to read and listen critically and to write and speak with thoughtfulness, clarity, coherence, and persuasiveness” (CBHE General Education, June 2000). http://www.umsl.edu/bulletin/undergraduate/gen_ed.html.
paragraphing through higher order concerns like essay structure. That's why reading response journals are part of the work for this class.

7. To practice the *interrelated reading, writing, and thinking skills that college demands*, this first-year college writing asks you to develop and practice strategies that you will use in other college writing and reading assignments. It asks you to

- read texts and write about them
- pull together what several class texts say about a single topic
- learn what researchers and thinkers have to say about the subject your class focuses on
- use researchers’ and thinkers’ words and thoughts in your writing.

So in this first-year writing course, you should expect to

- read and write often, usually for every class period
- write informal journals in response to everything you read
- read texts that are sometimes difficult and not what you’d choose to read if it were up to you
- work collaboratively with classmates to understand difficult texts
- write in response to your readings, sometimes in informal journal entries and sometimes in formal essays
- learn how to differentiate summary from analysis and argument
- learn how to write college-level analytic texts
- learn how to read your own draft writing and analyze its strengths and weaknesses; decide what it needs to improve and ask for help when you need it
- read and analyze your peers’ writing to hone the analytic skills you need for your own drafts and to offer suggestions for improvement to your peers
- work with others on your draft writing: peers, consultants in the Writing Center, teaching assistants in class, and your instructor
- meet in conference with your instructor
- visit the Writing Center and become acquainted with its services

**Required texts:**

- Postings to MyGateway
- Various online resources
Assignments and Grade Composition:

*Formal writing* (Drafts of formal essays are considered part of the final essay grade.)

- Essay 1—Literacy Narrative 20% (200 points)
- Essay 2—Synthesis 20% (200 points)
- Essay 3—Researched Essay & Exhibit 25% (200 points; 50 points for exhibit piece)
  - 20% for Essay; 5% for Exhibit
- Essay 4—Reflection and final portfolio 10% (100 points)

*Informal writing*

- Journals (15 total entries) 20% (200 points; each entry is worth 13/14 points)

*Participation*

- Attendance 5% (50 points; to be calculated at the end of the course)
- In-class activities (in-class writing, library, writing center, peer review, etc.)

**TOTAL: 100% (1000 points)**

- Your grades will be updated on MyGateway weekly so you can keep track of how you are doing in the course.

**Grading Scale:** The UMSL Grading System is based on a four-point scale. The grade value for each letter grade is as follows:

- A = 4.0
- A- = 3.7
- B+ = 3.3
- B = 3.0
- B- = 2.7
- C+ = 2.3
- C = 2.0
- C- = 1.7
- D+ = 1.3
- D = 1.0
- D- = 0.7
- F = 0
- EX = Excused
- DL = Delayed
- FN = Failure/Non Participation

**First-Year Writing Course Policies**

*Instructor Communication*

Sometimes I will need to make changes to the syllabus, for example, to change the order of readings, to cancel a reading, or to allow you more time for an assignment. I will announce such changes in class, on MyGateway, and/or via UMSL email. Please check your UMSL email and our course page regularly for such messages. If you do not regularly check UMSL email, then please route your UMSL email to the address you use most often. You are responsible for keeping up with such changes.

This channel of communication works both ways. I encourage you to contact me either during office hours or via email with any questions or concerns you have as class progresses. Please make use of this resource!
Absences

UMSL’s writing classes are different from lecture-based seminars where you take notes on the lecture, do the reading, and get someone else’s notes if you missed class. You can’t catch up this way in your writing class, because in it we are forming a writing community that relies heavily on collaboration with others, and most of our collaboration takes place in class. Your success in the class will grow out of that collaboration. For example, in-class discussions help you understand the difficult texts that are assigned; they give you ideas for how to shape your writing assignments; they let you hear other ideas from your peers about how to approach the work assigned. If you miss class, simply getting notes from a classmate or chatting with me about what you missed is a poor substitute for what actually happens in a lively discussion and group collaboration. In other words, much of the work you need to do in order to bring your reading and writing skills up to a college level and successfully complete this course requires you to be present in class. If you are not present, not only will you be lost, but also your classmates will miss the opportunity to hear your feedback—something crucial for their learning. Serve everyone’s best interests by coming to class.

Any absence up to 3 is excused. Any after that is unexcused. After 3 absences, your final grade will be lowered by 1/3 of a letter grade. After 6 absences, you will fail the course. Save your excused absences for true emergencies and illness. (See emergency circumstance policy.)

Tardies

Because writing classes are so centered on community, it is very important for you to be in class on time. We need everyone present at the start of class in order to get the most out of the period, whether we’re doing in-class writing, beginning discussion, or beginning workshop. If you arrive late, you are missing the set-up of class, and it will be difficult—if not impossible—for you to catch up without disrupting your classmates’ thought processes, distracting all of us, and short-changing yourself. If you are late on a regular basis, Lauren will need to conference you, and it will affect your grade.

Classroom Community, Civility, and Participation

This is a class in which we will discuss a great deal. We will interact with each other frequently and sometimes talk about sensitive issues—including sharing our own writing. It is imperative that we handle any discussion or interaction respectfully and maturely. Overall, we will work to make class an enjoyable place to be.

• Being Present
  
  o Simply placing your body in the classroom does not mean you are present for the day. In order to be counted as present, you must:
• have all your work completed for the day— reading, writing, research, brainstorming, etc.
• have the class readings and/or writing under discussion in front of you to refer to
• participate actively, either by contributing to the discussion or listening to those contributing
• be focused on class work, not doing work for other classes, playing games, texting, checking Facebook, bidding on Ebay items, paying your gas bill, or doing other tasks unrelated to our class work. (See technology policy below).
• be awake

• If your body is in the classroom but you are failing to adhere to any of the above, I will count you absent.

• Technology in the Classroom
  o Some of the writing required of you in this course will be done in class. In these instances, you might find electronic technology a preferable medium to pen and paper. If it is appropriate to use your cell phone, laptop, iPad, or other electronic device for in-class work, I will announce that you may do so; otherwise, you should not have electronic devices out.

• Bringing Your Materials to Class
  o In the interest of making the class a bit more environmentally friendly—and allowing you all to not have to print quite as much or spend as much on books—most of our course materials are available online via MyGateway.
  o However, to make sure we can maximize in-class interaction and engagement, it is crucial that you have access to assigned reading and writing while you are IN CLASS. This means you need to print readings, journal entries, or essays due that day. Or, you can have access to these materials on a laptop, tablet, etc. In some manner, you need to be able to SEE what you read and/or wrote for that day while we are in class.
  o This goes for your textbooks, too—if we read something from one of the books, please bring it to class that day.

Turning in Assignments

With the exception of in-class writing, all assignments must be typed in order to receive credit.

In order to earn full credit on any assignment, formal or informal, your written work must be submitted by the beginning of the class period. Anything turned in after that is late and will receive 0 credit. The work must be submitted via MyGateway by the time class begins. You will turn in essays through Assignment Links on MyGateway (and only I will see them); you will turn in Journal Entries on the Discussion Board (and they will thus be open to all your classmates, too).
I will not accept assignments via email unless you have discussed an excused absence with me ahead of time and I have approved an email submission. As with all other assignments, if it is after 2:00, the assignment is late and will receive 0 credit.

*Special Exemption*

If you are struggling with a formal assignment, I may extend a deadline if and only if you contact me in advance of the deadline, explain the intellectual work you’re struggling with, and we jointly arrive at a new deadline.

**Turning in Formal Essays**

When turning in formal essays, you are required to submit all prewriting work with your final draft. This includes all drafts, copies of in-class peer review worksheets, notes from your writing center visits, brainstorming notes, etc. In short, save everything! 😊

**Late Assignments**

Student work must be completed and submitted on time. All assignments—both major and minor—should be turned in by the date and time they are due according to the syllabus. *No late work will be accepted.*

**Draft assignments:** Turning in your draft assignment late will mean that you cannot receive a timely or full response from me or from your peers, so turn in your drafts on time. Failure to turn in an assignment draft at all will result in the deduction of one-third of a letter grade on the final version of the paper (for example, B+ to B). This holds true for drafts due to Lauren and drafts due for peer review sessions.

Final graded assignments: Late submission of a final graded assignment will result in the deduction of one full letter grade for each day past the due date (for example, B+ to C+).

If an emergency like a severe illness or crisis within your family arises and causes issues with your ability to turn in work on time, it is your responsibility to contact Lauren as soon as possible to try and work out a plan.

**Emergency Circumstances**

Occasionally, a true medical or other emergency arises that may prevent you from fully participating in class. If one does, please contact me as soon as possible so that you and I may determine an appropriate course of action. Many alternatives are usually open, but they evaporate over time.
If you have already incurred more than 3 absences when a true emergency arises, your absences from the emergency will threaten your grade. So save your absences for when you truly need them.

**Campus Resources**

Because the administrators, faculty, and staff at UM-St. Louis are here to ensure your success, the campus provides a number of helpful services to all students. These include Counseling, Assessment, and Career Services, Multicultural Relations, Disability Services (where you go to document the need for learning accommodations), the Center for Student Success, and the Writing Center.

The Writing Center, which is located at 222 SSB, is an especially useful resource for guidance at any stage of the writing process. Tutors will brainstorm ideas with you, help you jumpstart your composition, and provide feedback as you finish your essays. Tutors may help you proofread your writing but will not act as editors and correct it for you. Revising and proofreading are entirely your responsibility. You will have the opportunity to learn more about this resource before the first formal essay is due.

**Academic Integrity**

Because you are UMSL students, you are expected to abide by the code of academic honesty stated in the UM-St. Louis Student Code of Conduct. This code expects that the work you turn in under your name is your own and that where you’ve borrowed from others, you’ve cited their work properly. There are many gray areas about what constitutes your “own” ideas. For example, ideas might arise in class discussion or group work that you want to write about, but you aren’t sure whether they can be “truly” yours if you didn’t express them yourself. If you have any question at all, please ask me or a writing tutor, or consult an online writing resource center (like Purdue University’s OWL: [http://owl.english.purdue.edu](http://owl.english.purdue.edu) or the University of North Carolina’s: [http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/](http://writingcenter.unc.edu/handouts/)).

There is no gray area when you turn in essays from an Internet source, a fraternity or sorority file, an athletic tutor, a roommate, or when you have someone rewrite your ideas into better form. The punishment for academic dishonesty is serious and can involve dismissal from school. **Don’t be tempted.**
Syllabus: English 1100, Autumn 2013
First-Year Composition; Section 012
“Writing About Writing”

Course Schedule
(subject to modification)

MG-MyGateway
EW-EasyWriter

Part I: The Literacy Narrative-Reflecting on, Analyzing, and Interrogating Your Own History as a Language User

WEEK 1

Tues, Aug. 20
Reading due: None
Writing due: None
In class: Introductions—to Lauren, to one another, to the course, to technology you’ll use (MG), and to the first-day writing assignment; John Duffey’s “Virtuous Arguments” in class

Thurs, Aug 22
Reading due: “How to Mark a Book” (Adler) (MG)
Writing due: First-Day Writing (prompt can be found on MG; submit BEFORE class on MG via assignment link)
In class: What makes good “writing” anyway?; critical/active reading and writing; reflect on first-day writing experience; introduce journal entries and MG discussion forum; “Writing to not Print” in class

WEEK 2

Tues, Aug. 27
Reading due: “Times, Tools, and Talismans” (Wyche) (MG); EW, “A Writer’s Choices” (12-25)
Writing due: Journal 1 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)
In class: Discuss feedback on first-day writing/how to access feedback; introduce essay 1; writing as a process

Thurs, Aug. 29
Reading due: “Superman and Me” (Alexie), “Liked for Myself” (Angelou), “Go Carolina” (Sedaris) (all on MG); EW, “Critical Thinking and Argument,” (25-35—don’t read student sample essay)
Writing due: Journal #2 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)
In class: A discussion of literacy. What is it? How has it affected you? Brainstorm ideas for essay 1, summary v. analysis

WEEK 3

Tues, Sept. 3

Reading due: “Mother Tongue” (Tan), “Leave Your Name at the Border” (Munoz) (Both on MG)
Writing due: Journal #3 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

In class: Discuss code-switching and language/literacy diversity (Tan and Munoz)

Thurs, Sept. 5

Reading due: “Shitty First Drafts” (Lamott) (MG); EW, “Integrating Sources an Avoiding Plagiarism” (197-202)
Writing due: *First Draft of Literacy Narrative due to Lauren (via MG assignment link)*

In class: Celebrate and workshop our drafts—workshop will focus on using sources

WEEK 4

Tues, Sept. 10

Reading due: Jay Hinrichs, “Thank You for Arguing” chapters (MG)
Writing due: Journal #4 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

In class: Introduction to Rhetoric; what does rhetoric/rhetorical awareness mean for your writing?

Thurs, Sept 12 –

Reading due: None
Writing due: Come to class with the latest draft of your Literacy Narrative for Writing Center Visit

In class: Writing Center Visit! 😊

WEEK 5

Tues, Sept. 17

Reading due: None
Writing due: * Latest Draft of Literacy Narrative due for Peer Review (bring a copy to class) *

In class: Peer Review Session
Thurs, Sept. 19

*Reading due:* Review section in EW that focuses on documentation style you plan to use in this course (MLA, APA, etc.); starts on pg. 206; review only the section relevant to you; also check out/review documentation resources from OWL at Purdue that are posted on MG

*Writing due:* None

*In class:* Finish peer review as needed; style and/or editing workshop; discuss documentation for Literacy Narrative (MLA/APA Format, etc.)

Part II: Synthesis—Understanding the Claims of Others and Making Your Own Claims

WEEK 6

Tues, Sept. 24

*Reading due:* “Why I Quit the Klan” (Ellis)

*Writing due:* *FINAL Literacy Narrative due to Lauren (via MG Assignment Link)*

*In class:* Celebration of Literacy Narrative turn in!; introduce essay #2; deconstruct Ellis interview and understand the claims (what IS a claim?)

Thurs, Sept. 26

*Reading due:* “Afterword” (Rose, p. 243-254), “Our Schools and Our Children” (Rose, p. 1-9)

*Research due:* Google Mike Rose. Find out a little bit about him. (Who he is, where he works, what he writes about, etc.) Bring this knowledge to our class discussion.

*Writing due:* Journal #5 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

*In class:* Dissect Rose’s claims; put your own claims in conversation with Rose’s

WEEK 7

Tues, Oct. 1

*Reading due:* “I Just Wanna Be Average” (Rose, p. 11-37); EW, “Find it, Fix it” (p. 1-10)

*Writing due:* Journal #6 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

*In class:* What are the most common errors and how will we use them?; Dissecting more claims in Rose; discuss how both Rose and Ellis use stories as evidence toward their claims
Thurs, Oct. 3

*Reading due:* “Why I Write” (Didion) (MG)

*Writing due:* Journal #7 (“Shitty First Draft” Journal!) (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

*In class:* Writing Workshop with “Shitty First Drafts”; sign up for next week’s writing conferences with Lauren/learn how to prep for a conference

WEEK 8

Tues, Oct. 8

*Reading due:* None

*Writing due:* *Latest Draft of Essay #2 due to Lauren via MG Link and bring in hard copy for Peer Review*

*In class:* Peer Review Session

Thurs, Oct. 10 – NO CLASS MEETING, INDIVIDUAL CONFERENCES

*You have signed up for a time to meet me in my office, Lucas Hall 455 A. If you miss your individual conference, it counts as one absence.*

WEEK 9

Tues, Oct. 15

*Reading due:* None

*Writing due:* Bring latest draft of Essay #2 to class

*In class:* Sentence-level revision/polishing, practice MLA with Rose and Ellis

Thurs, Oct. 17

*Reading due:* None

*Writing due:* *Final Essay #2 due to Lauren via MG Link *

*In class:* Celebrate essay #2 turn in!; introduce essay 3, check out sample “artifacts”

Part III: Entering the Academic Conversation through Research, Analysis, and Argument

WEEK 10

Tues, Oct. 22
Reading due: “Hip Hop Life” (Walker), “This Christmas, Buy a Corolla” (Jenks), “American Values and Assumptions” (Althen) (MG)

Writing due: Journal #8 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

In class: compare claims and evidence in small groups; brainstorm ideas for essay 3

Thurs, Oct. 24

Reading due: “Lies My Teacher Told Me” (Loewen); EW, “Conducting Research,” (p. 176-83)

Writing due: Journal #9 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

In Class: More on claims and evidence and how it leads to analysis; the long road to finding your argument; “Crossroads” radio lab; what does it mean to “conduct research” at the college level?

WEEK 11

Tues, Oct. 29

Reading due: “Savage Illiteracies” (Ball)

Writing due: Journal #10 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

In class: small group brainstorming on research topics

Thurs, Oct. 31

Reading due: “Legacy of a Lynching” (Worth)

Writing due: Journal #11 (prompt on MG Discussion Forum; post your journal entry there BEFORE class)

In class: Honing research topics; writing research questions; library visit prep

WEEK 12 *LIBRARY VISIT WILL HAPPEN THIS WEEK; DAY TBA*

Tues, Nov. 5—MEET AT THOMAS JEFFERSON LIBRARY

In class: listen to library research presentation; possible in-class library activity

Thurs, Nov. 7

Research due: Find 2 sources to use in your essay 3 and bring them to class!; review EW, “Integrating Sources and Avoiding Plagiarism” (197-202); read EW, “Writing a Research Project” (202-204); read EW documentation section of your choice (starts on p. 206)

Writing due: Journal #12 (Research Proposal Journal!!)

In class: Continue work with finding sources; discuss ways to meaningfully use sources; why MLA or APA format?; explain research Exhibit at end of semester and sign up for dates
WEEK 13

Tues, Nov. 12

*Research due:* Find 2 more sources to use in your essay 3 and bring them to class!

*Writing due:* Journal #14

*In class:* More on using sources; more on MLA/APA source; research help/support as needed

Thurs, Nov. 14

*Reading due:* None

*Writing due:* *Draft of Essay #3 due to Lauren via MG Link AND for Peer Review*

*In class:* Peer Review

WEEK 14

Tues, Nov. 19

*Reading due:* Reread things you’ve written this semester—in-class writing, journals, drafts, essays, etc.

*Writing due:* Journal #15 (starting your “Reflection” essay!)

*In class:* Go over portfolio and reflection essay requirements (Essay #4)

Thurs, Nov. 21

*Reading due:* None

*Writing due:* None

*In class:* In-Class Research Exhibits! 😊

WEEK 15 – NO CLASS, FALL BREAK

Part IV: Reflecting on the Course and Your Experiences/Identity as a Writer

WEEK 16

Tues, Dec. 3

*Reading due:* None

*Writing due:* None

*In class:* In-Class Research Exhibits! 😊

Thurs, Dec. 5
Reading due: None
Writing due: * Final Essay #3 due to Lauren via MG Link *
In class: Reflection Activity; Course Evaluations; say our good-byes

FINALS WEEK
Tues, Dec. 10
Final Reflection and Portfolio due to my office (Lucas 455) or via MG by 3:00 pm!
Summary of Student and Peer Letters

Peer and student letters and other comments are uniformly enthusiastic about Dr. Lauren Obermark—her “deft versatility” in the classroom, her positive impact on student achievement (evidenced in many forms), her inclusive teaching methods, her remarkable and effective means of assessing students, and her passionate dedication to all the students she teaches. All indicators show that she creates “an enthusiastic yet earnest learning environment that is truly outstanding and worthy of recognition.” As one student writes, Dr. Obermark’s “celebration of her students—the absolute faith in their abilities that she consistently, whole-heartedly displays in myriad ways—. . . makes Dr. Obermark such a remarkable educator, an invaluable asset to her department, and a treasure to this university.”

As indicated in the cover letter for these materials, Dr. Obermark designs her classes and assignments with the concept of universal design. She “plans each class period and assignment in a multimodal fashion, creating an environment in which one can participate in new ways.” In doing so, she deliberately creates multiple means of learning. As one student wrote and one colleague illustrated:

Dr. Obermark is one of the most dynamic, inspiring teachers I’ve had, and enrolling in Dr. Obermark’s class during my first semester of graduate school was a stroke of serendipity that I am extremely grateful for. Because of the nature of an Introduction to Disability Studies class, Dr. Obermark was able to be very frank and honest with us about the challenges and rewards of creating a classroom environment that is inclusive of as many people as possible. She is committed to ensuring that there are a variety of modes of teaching and learning, and because of that, I was able to see what kinds of learning worked the best for me.

In one class, students worked individually to post answers [probably via Google Docs] to guiding questions that Lauren had written on whiteboards around the room.” [In real time, students created a digitally visible dialogue, easily available to the hearing-impaired in ways that an oral discussion would not have been.] Then they began to collaborate. . . . Sitting down at small tables, the students continued to analyze the questions, quotations, and answers on the whiteboards.

Another student writes about inclusive strategies Dr. Obermark uses:

I had a bout of illness earlier this semester and was forced to miss a class, and I felt the loss of the discussion and scholarly camaraderie she creates. Luckily, because Dr. Obermark is so thoughtful in the area of disability studies, she is always thinking of ways to help those who might have issues with being present in class, so I was able to access the notes that the class had taken and see what had been discussed. Even when the classroom activity involves physically writing thoughts on the chalkboard/whiteboard, Dr. Obermark takes pictures and posts them on the class Gateway page either for those unable to attend, or simply for the students who were present to look back on, reflect, and to build upon previous concepts.
The kinds of comments students make indicate that Dr. Obermark does not aim merely for popularity among her students; she aims always much, much higher—for their learning—and she does so successfully. Her “excitement and enthusiasm for teaching and helping her students improve as writers and thinkers is infectious, and as a result, her classes are the kinds of classes you really want to attend.” In addition to her versatile teaching methods and innovative, inclusive class design, Dr. Obermark’s “mode of assessment [is] unlike most other instructors. . . . “Instead of simply penalizing for errors, she investigates why the student did not fulfill the assignment she had set, [and she] always offers guidance [to lead students toward] a more comprehensive understanding [of the task assigned.] This kind of guidance does not exist in many professors’ pedagogy yet seems so crucial to academic success.” Students indicate that when offered Dr. Obermark’s critique, they find it refreshingly valuable: It inspires them toward improvement and offers considerable guidance instead of demoralizing them.

Setting high expectations for her students’ learning, Dr. Obermark also provides “unconditional academic support” in one-on-one conferences (face-to-face and digital), in the written and oral comments she provides on their work, and in class discussions. A class discussion one of Dr. Obermark’s colleagues observed illustrates a sophisticated and complex way in which Dr. Obermark offers support for multiple points of view.

With her helpful yet unobtrusive guidance, the students were analytical and concise, yet generous and tactful when responding to the comments of their peers, particularly when disagreements arose. On these occasions, Dr. Obermark encouraged her students to push beyond polite uniformity of opinion and to search for greater insight even if it meant that differing views were not fully resolved. This, paradoxically, created a freer, more open classroom community where students could positively maintain their opinions but simultaneously were challenged to consider issues from opposing points of view. In this way, the class lived up to—or rather enacted—the goals clearly stated in the course syllabus: namely, to interrogate “public discourse and civic engagement” and to “investigate rhetoric as linked to pedagogy, especially in English Studies.

Dr. Obermark also excels in providing extra-curricular academic support. For example, she started a reading group at the end of Fall Semester 2014 when students in her class felt they wanted to continue the study the class had engaged them in. She also facilitates and encourages her students to professional academic activities. As the nomination letter for these materials indicates, she has mentored undergraduate students to publish their work. With graduate students, she offers other kinds of support:

Lauren influenced me greatly in terms of setting personal academic goals and finding work post-graduation. She encouraged me to attend the national, annual Conference on College Composition and Communication, even though I did not know anyone else attending. I am so glad she pushed me out of my comfort zone, since this was a fantastic experience for me! . . . . Thanks to Lauren’s direction, shortly after graduation I received a full-time job teaching developmental writers at Southern Illinois University-
Carbondale. Lauren is a very humble person and would insist that I achieved this on my own, but honestly if not for her guidance and her support, I don’t think I’d be where I am today, teaching full-time and working on scholarship of my own.

Another student writes:
I learned a lot [during an independent study] about qualitative research methods from the readings Dr. Obermark assigned, from the data collection process itself, and from our discussions of both. However, I think I was equally (if not more) inspired by the level of Dr. Obermark’s dedication to her role as an educator. Starting work at a new university is never easy, and her willingness to take on the extra responsibility [in her first semester at UMSL] of helping me see my project through despite the number of hurdles involved and despite already having a tremendous workload shows extraordinary commitment to the success of the department’s students. My experiences in her independent study class have inspired me both as a researcher and as a teacher, and I’m deeply grateful to her for helping me achieve my goals and for taking my work seriously.

Consistently, students echo these sentiments: She helps them achieve their goals and she takes their work seriously. She has brought new energy to the department and its students.
Summary (by the Chair) of Student Evaluations of Professor Obermark’s Courses.

Since arriving at UMSL in Fall 2013, Professor Obermark has taught first year and junior level writing composition courses as well as graduate courses on literacy and the teaching of writing. The overwhelming majority (85%) of Professor Obermark’s students “strongly agreed” that her courses challenged them intellectually, that she was an effective teacher, and that her oral and written remarks were very helpful. While not every student was equally happy with all aspects of every course (she is teaching required composition courses!) her evaluations were decidedly more positive than that of other instructors for the same courses. Many students expressed gratitude that she had made writing into an enjoyable, productive, and exciting experience. Responses were particularly impressive for her online composition courses—where student satisfaction is never easy to come by. Below are representative remarks from her students.

-- Clear, always to the point
-- A joy to work with. . . insightful, positive feedback on all my papers
-- Really helped to break down the process of writing step by step . . . Having to write papers for a college English class can be very intimidating, but this class makes it easier for everyone. . .
-- The materials that were posted online were very helpful and detailed.
-- “Extremely receptive and upbeat about everything we brought up. . .”
-- Great teaching background [for teachers] coming from Middle School. Not all college level teachers [make the effort].
-- My favorite class of my academic career, given me a renewed sense of hope in the activity of writing/teaching.
-- First course in which I was encouraged to conduct my own research in any field of composition that interested me, and the result was a wonderful learning experience
-- Teacher knows what she is doing. Extremely helpful when I went to her office . . . friendly and humble manner. I dreaded this class more than any other, but it wound up being a very good class.
-- The strengths of this course [online first year composition] were the details provided for each assignment/essay/task and the feedback required until/upon completion. Groundwork was always laid in advance, and the instructor did everything possible to permit success.
-- She is clearly meant to be a professor and teach English. Her great attitude, intentions for the class, and weekly enthusiasm made it a blast to learn and to be part of her class, which is hard to do for an online class.
-- Obermark is by far the most engaging, enthusiastic, and organized professor I have ever had at UMSL! I wish I could take every class with her.
-- Obermark cares about her students, what they learn, how they learn, and has a great passion for what she is doing. . . .

-- I can’t say enough great things about Dr. Obermark. She’s a true asset to this university, one of the best professors I’ve had. Give her tenure and a raise immediately.
1 April 2015

Dear Gitner Award Selection Committee:

It is a great pleasure to write to you regarding the distinguished teaching of Dr. Lauren Obermark. I recently observed Dr. Obermark’s Spring 2015 English 4160, Special Topics in Writing: Introduction to Rhetoric course. Deftly versatile in her pedagogic approaches, she has succeeded in creating an enthusiastic yet earnest learning environment that is truly outstanding and worthy of recognition.

Many instructors pay lip service to student-centered learning and participation; however, by approaching rhetoric not merely as an ancient tradition but as a present-day means of addressing urgent questions of citizenship and social justice, Dr. Obermark educates her students about rhetoric by empowering them to apply and to interrogate rhetorical strategies and techniques in the world around them. The robustly inquisitive conversations that result are inspiring. Though I’ve been educated and taught at a variety of public and private institutions, I’ve never witnessed anything like the energetic atmosphere in Dr. Obermark’s rhetoric course. It is less like a traditional classroom than an animated family dinner or the spirited yet scholarly debate in Plato’s *Symposium*. She demonstrates her confidence in her students by allowing them to grapple with difficult questions and concepts from their reading assignments—with the understanding that dialogue is often more important than brisk, supposedly final, “answers,” and that learning to ask better questions is sometimes the most valuable learning experience.

Her watchword is engagement. Ten of the eleven students participated in class; more important, each contributed at least one substantive observation to the discussion. In fact, most students spoke out regularly, which Dr. Obermark both expects and encourages. With her helpful yet unobtrusive guidance, the students were analytical and concise, yet generous and tactful when responding to the comments of their peers, particularly when disagreements arose. On these occasions, Dr. Obermark encouraged her students to push beyond polite uniformity of opinion and to search for greater insight even if it meant that differing views were not fully resolved. This, paradoxically, created a freer, more open classroom community where students could positively maintain their opinions but simultaneously were challenged to consider issues from opposing points of view. In this way, the class lived up to—or rather enacted—the goals clearly stated in the course syllabus: namely, to interrogate “public discourse and civic engagement” and to “investigate rhetoric as linked to pedagogy, especially in English Studies.”
The class began with an overview of the student discussion board, which distilled the important insights made there and called attention to unresolved tensions and problems. A fifteen-minute student presentation then followed, and I noted that Dr. Obermark gladly “shared the rostrum,” so to speak, by allowing the student to have the floor and speak as an authority on the material that she had researched for this presentation. Other students were clearly empowered by this pedagogical approach, for they eagerly asked questions of the presenter during the subsequent question and answer period. Dr. Obermark stepped back to allow a conversation among peers to develop but also facilitated the discussion and made her own contributions without seeming obtrusive.

I’ve never seen student break-out discussion groups work as productively and effectively as I did in Dr. Obermark’s class. The students had already posted their questions and observations on the day’s assigned texts in their online discussion boards, but now, in small groups of about three students each, they were given ten minutes to defend, emend, and synthesize their views on large sheets of paper posted around the classroom. It was a highly effective exercise to gauge as well as to facilitate student engagement with the reading material. Remarkably, no one stood idle as each group debated and discussed the important points of their reading. As each group presented their findings to the larger class, Dr. Obermark continually looked for opportunities to show how a student’s insight shed light on the complex theoretical concepts of their assigned reading and of the course. These practical, student-generated illustrations of abstract rhetorical ideas were clearly effective in the way that they reassured students who felt uncertain about the challenging, heady essays under discussion. Consequently, as they wrapped-up the class with a look ahead to their next assignment, the nods and smiles on the students’ faces reflected the eagerness and self-confidence that Dr. Obermark had imparted to them.

As personable as she is professional, as enthusiastic as she is intellectual, Dr. Lauren Obermark is setting a new standard of pedagogy for her peers at UMSL. She has my strongest possible recommendation for the Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. Thank you for the opportunity to recognize a truly outstanding teacher.

Sincerely,

Kurt A. Schreyer
Associate Chair
Department of English
Dear Committee Members:

I am writing in support of Dr. Lauren Obermark’s nomination for the Gitner Award. Having known her for two years, worked with her on committees, and team taught with her, I feel that I can speak knowledgeably about her qualifications. Indeed, Dr. Obermark meets them all.

During Fall 2013, Dr. Obermark volunteered to work with me and other Gender Studies affiliate faculty on a CAS Curriculum Development Grant to develop a new GS certificate—Gender & the Military—an innovative approach to meeting the needs of our military veterans and those who work with them. When we were awarded the grant, we met during Summer 14 to develop the eponymous core course. This course was comprised of 5 units—military culture; gender studies; LGBTQ issues; global issues; and trauma, disability, and effects on the family. Each of the committee members taught one section based on his or her strengths. Given her course work in disability studies during graduate school, Dr. Obermark took on the latter section. This was a fortuitous decision, since she had developed and was teaching Intro to Disability Studies that same semester.

While the majority of the readings for Gender & the Military were academic texts, Dr. Obermark engaged students in the process of learning during her unit by assigning Lori Amy’s memoir, The Wars We Inherit: Military Life, Gender Violence, and Memory. This reading personalized the topics. Dr. Obermark then asked the students to further engage by relating the experiences in Amy’s memoir to their own; she encouraged class discussion by de-centering the classroom, making the students the voice of authority.

During this semester, as we worked on developing the assignment for the students’ final projects, our committee drew on Dr. Obermark’s experience in teaching junior level writing and her high standards to promote our students’ academic excellence. We adapted her assignment—to use Prezi power point to develop a presentation—as guidelines for our students to present their service-learning experience. Her requirements read as follows:

- Audience members should be able to visit and “take in” your exhibit in approximately ten minutes to fifteen minutes.
- Your exhibit should be created in such a way that your peers can guide themselves through it and easily take away your main points.
- Like the best museum exhibits, your exhibit should use various forms of media. That is to say it shouldn’t just be text. Instead, engage other literacies of your audience members—use videos, audio, photos, etc. as appropriate.
- Your exhibit must, at some point, incorporate audience interaction—ask them questions, make them do something, take a survey, give a quiz—there are many options; these are just a few.
Finally, submit a one to two page “design statement” about why you designed it as you did. Explain the decisions you made in your exhibit—what you included, what kinds of media you used, how you organized it, how you engaged your audience, etc. This reflection will help me grade these presentations in a more effective and fair manner, as I’ll have a sense of your composing process.

As you can see, Obermark’s guidelines were clear and her standards high: the students had to develop digital literacy in order to fulfill the assignment. At the same time, the students knew exactly what was expected of them, for this assignment served as rubric to assess their learning. During Dr. Obermark’s unit in Gender & the Military, she also drew on a number of innovative and effective teaching strategies. She assigned students to small groups, taught them Prezi, found and screened appropriate movies and YouTube clips to keep them engaged—in addition to team-teaching. Clearly she possessed an understanding of strategies that affect student learning, assigning Service-Learning projects, encouraging digital literacy (not only through the Prezi assignment but also by relying on online discussion boards), creating multiple writing assignments (and requiring multiple drafts), and de-centering the classroom through the use of active learning and small group activities. Most importantly, she made the classes interesting and the assignments challenging, as evidenced in the following excerpt:

- Envision [your project] as an exhibit, like something you might see at a museum or an art gallery. This is your chance to be creative and think outside the academic box!
- Overall, your exhibit should clearly share the argument of your Literacy Profile and present the most interesting aspects of your research.

Dr. Obermark arrived on the UMSL campus well prepared to teach. As her CV demonstrates, she had already taught or assisted in eight different courses during her graduate work and taught eighth grade for three years (the true test of a teacher!). Nevertheless, since arriving she has demonstrated an ongoing commitment to improving teaching. She participated in the latest iteration of the New Faculty Teaching Scholars; she has become a GS affiliate faculty member; she was guest facilitator for the Gender Studies film series when it focused on disability studies; she presented at the GSC (Graduate Student Conference); she has become part of the rotation offering Teaching College Writing, the required course for new TAs; she participates in regular meetings of the writing faculty; she has volunteered her time to be a guest speaker in other’s classes; and she made the effort to master online teaching during the summer before she arrived at UMSL.

In sum, Dr. Obermark not only exhibits all the qualities expected of a Gitner winner; she actually goes way beyond those expectations. She deserves this award.

Sincerely,

Sally Barr Ebest
Professor of English,
Director of Gender Studies
Letter of Support for Lauren Obermark
The Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award
March 1, 2015

In a world where communication skills are vital and students’ preparation for college writing is often inadequate, a highly effective teacher of writing and rhetoric is one of the most valuable persons on campus. Truly high-impact teaching of writing and rhetoric is happening in Lauren Obermark’s classes.

I had heard about Lauren’s teaching of writing long before I met her. In UMKC’s English Department (where I finished my doctoral work at the time Lauren arrived there as a master’s student), she won at least two awards for outstanding teaching. Everyone I know there raved about her creative, positive, effective teaching.

So I felt as if I already knew Lauren when she came to UMSL for her interview two years ago. I was thrilled that we were able to hire her. She brings impressive research credentials and her work is already notable in the composition/rhetoric field. But one of the best things about Lauren is that she is devoted to teaching. I observed her graduate seminar in Teaching College English recently and came away dazzled and inspired.

Having taken graduate courses like this one, I knew that the course combines theory and pedagogy of writing; graduate students learn not just how to teach college writing, but why various approaches work. Class that night focused on relationships between student identity—especially gender, class, and disability—and writing. Lauren has done a great deal of work on disability studies, which informs her approach to the study of identity. Since, as she pointed out, the same pedagogies that enhance learning for disabled students make learning more effective for ALL students, it was no surprise to see those pedagogies in play in her classroom. Lauren’s approach both sparks and reinforces learning, because her students interact with every piece of information in several of these ways: reading, questioning, thinking, explaining, discussing, writing.

I watched as Lauren employed collaborative and interactive tasks, subtly but effectively modeling exactly what she was teaching. In many graduate seminars, students and instructor mostly sit around a table and discuss the readings. This class met in a learning studio; she and the students used the entire room and all its tools in several different ways. Every student in Lauren’s seminar interacted mentally and physically with the material, with each other, and with Lauren. For example, students worked individually to post answers guiding questions that Lauren had written on whiteboards around the room. Then they began to collaborate, making connections between the evening’s assigned readings and why identity matters in student writing. Sitting down at small tables, the students continued to analyze the questions, quotations, and answers on the whiteboards. To guide the discussion, Lauren posed questions, directing their attention to specific
parts of the readings, and as she proceeded, she explained her pedagogical reasons for what they were doing.

Her students enhanced the assigned material with an ‘artifact’ presentation. That evening, the student presenter, a high school English teacher, used multiple media to contextualize a number of documents related to Missouri state grammar standards. But it wasn’t just a presentation; a lively discussion ensued with relevant comments, suggestions, and concerns. During this time Lauren was seated with the students. She occasionally commented or summed up the discussion, carefully emphasizing connections with college writing and with the assigned readings for that night.

Whether they realized it or not, these students were operating on multiple intellectual levels at the same time: they were interacting with the concepts, they were watching themselves learn, and they were thinking about how that could apply to their own teaching.

In Lauren’s student-centered classroom, students took charge of their own learning, while she—almost invisibly—guided that learning the entire time. Each phase of the class smoothly connected to the next. Lauren seems very informal; there are snacks available, students call her by her first name, and she jokes and banters with them. At the same time, she’s extremely professional, maintaining focus and working in mentions of current writing studies research on the evening’s topics.

In the short time she’s been at UMSL, Lauren Obermark is already a valued colleague: active, cooperative, respected. Her area of expertise is crucial: I would argue that since we want all UMSL grads to be effective writers, there are few topics more important than learning to teach writing effectively. With Lauren on board, we are able to offer both undergraduate and graduate students stellar, effective, inspiring instruction in composition and rhetoric. I am delighted to support Dr. Lauren Obermark’s nomination for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

Sincerely,
Deborah Maltby, Associate Teaching Professor of English
University of Missouri-St. Louis
427 Lucas Hall, One University Blvd., St. Louis, MO 63121
maltbyd@umsl.edu 314.516.5579
March 18, 2015

Selection Committee
Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award
University of Missouri-St. Louis

The purpose of this letter is to highlight the outstanding and innovative teaching of Lauren Obermark and recommend that you select her as the next winner of the Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

I was first exposed to Lauren’s teaching ideas when we served together on the committee that designed the course GS 2130 “Gender in the Military” which is now the core course for a UMSL’s innovative “Gender in the Military” certificate. Lauren came to every development meeting with new and fresh ideas. She was instrumental in the development of the course module on disability studies and she thought through every lesson with an eye towards how the student experience could be improved.

I was able to see Lauren’s teaching talent when I co-taught GS2130 with her and observed her teaching prowess from the back of the classroom. Lauren’s ability to connect with our students and help them create order from and make connections to a difficult subject is a good as I have seen at UMSL. I specifically remember a week where Professor Obermark introduced a challenging new concept, the rhetoric surrounding disability. In these classes she used self-made handouts, audio-visual aids (videos), some lecture and plenty of Socratic classroom discussion to help each student make connections to the material. At the end of the lesson block, Lauren asked each student to write their thoughts and experiences to share. I was amazed at the perceptive, appropriate and thoughtful ideas that came from a 2000-level class. It was clear that Professor Obermark had connected with these students and helped them achieve the learning objectives and then some. For a dedicated teacher, there is no greater success.

Lauren is an excellent scholar and an outstanding teacher. Please consider her nomination closely – you will not be disappointed.

Sincerely,

James R. Craig
Associate Teaching Professor and Chair
Department of Military and Veterans Studies
University of Missouri-St. Louis
Appendix A: Letters of Student Support
Jami Hirsch  
Graduate Teaching Assistant  
English Department  
University of Missouri--St. Louis  
452 Lucas Hall  
jlh79c@mail.umsl.edu  

March 7, 2015  

To Whom It May Concern:

I truly cannot think of a more apt description for both Dr. Lauren Obermark herself, and her unique and vastly empowering teaching methods, than outstanding and innovative.

When I enrolled in one of Dr. Obermark’s graduate courses (“The New Normal”: Intro to Disability Studies) at the start of my second year of graduate study, I felt quite lost. I was deeply considering leaving my program, and abandoning my dreams of teaching. I am beyond grateful to be able to say that thanks to Dr. Obermark, I am still studying, am now teaching, and am more invested in my education than ever before. Simply put, Dr. Obermark saved me.

Dr. Obermark’s remarkable commitment to her students (evident, for example, in the many ways she consistently makes herself readily available to her students, or in the detailed and invaluable feedback she continually provides) is unparalleled. Her passion for teaching content she fervently believes in (content, I might add, that I never encountered before her classes, such as Introduction to Rhetoric and Disability Studies) is nothing short of remarkable. Dr. Obermark’s willingness to bend, flex and expand upon her teaching methods (whether by embracing technology in her classrooms, truly listening to and incorporating student feedback, or adjusting a lesson plan on short notice in order to better fit her students’ unique needs) is beyond exemplary. She makes her classroom an inviting place, and the learning that takes place there an accessible, achievable thing for all of her students. Her teaching methods, built around and always pushing on the boundaries of universal design and access for everyone, (concepts I had no familiarity with before her classes, but have now embraced in my own teaching) are the definitive markers of a pedagogical strategy that celebrates its students.

When a student feels so celebrated, supported and challenged by a professor like Dr. Obermark, their experience of education becomes truly life changing. Such encouragement creates an environment of striving—an environment in which a professor need not force high standards, because her students begin to set higher standards for themselves. (Papers become longer by choice, and turn into project proposals for conferences. An academic website created for class gets expanded far beyond the requirements of a prompt and continued long after finals week has ended. These are only small examples of the specific things I’ve seen happen for myself and my colleagues as a result of Dr. Obermark’s teaching.) In summation, the richly alive learning environment that Dr. Obermark carefully crafts results in a community for her students; her high standards for herself inspire the same in her students, and illustrate the pedagogical gold standard we should all strive for.
Daily now, as a graduate TA in UMSL’s English department, I endeavor to live up to the potential I know is within me; potential that was reawakened in Dr. Obermark’s class. I work to achieve the kind of professorship she models--the kind that makes learning an active, flexible, living thing. (And yet, such a short time ago, I wanted to walk away. What a difference the right teacher makes.)

For all of these reasons, and many, many more, I fervently recommend that Dr. Lauren Obermark be the recipient of the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. It is her celebration of her students—the absolute faith in their abilities that she consistently, whole-heartedly displays in myriad ways—which makes Dr. Obermark such a remarkable educator, an invaluable asset to her department, and a treasure to this university. She has more than earned the chance for her colleagues and students to celebrate her.

Sincerely,

Jami Hirsch
April 2, 2015

Senate Faculty Teaching and Service Awards Committee;

It is with sincerity and enthusiasm that I write to you in support of Dr. Lauren Obermark as you consider her for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

Last year I returned to UMSL after more than twenty years away from college. In the interim, I enjoyed a decade-long career in commercial radio and founded a successful children’s bookstore. I now work as a change management business analyst, responsible for communicating and marketing systems changes to employees within organizations. When I registered for my required junior-level writing class at UMSL, I assumed it would be ordinary -- a walk in the park considering all that I have done professionally. I had no idea that I was about to begin a journey that would change the way I define literacy, lead me to appreciate the value of collaboration, help me to discover how connected I am to where I grew up and offer me the opportunity to see my own family’s literacy experience in a different light.

Dr. Obermark was transparent about the commitment her online English 3100 class would require. In her opening posts she shared that we would work to better understand just how dynamic the concept of literacy is, how it empowers some, excludes others, and is influenced by demographics and economics. She promised that we would learn what it is like to experience an effective writing process. This class she described simply as “writing about writing” would be hard work, but it would be worth it. She was right.

Dr. Obermark used multiple strategies to engage us as students. We participated in weekly required online discussions of assigned readings. We delivered some assignments using video or voice presentations. She broke us into small peer groups where we shared our writing that was in progress and wrote letters to one another offering feedback, direction and encouragement. She offered us numerous opportunities through a variety of mediums to express our opinions and unique perspectives about literacy.

We had several major writing assignments that began early in the semester, evolving through a structured revision process until we reached a final, best version. We wrote a reflection essay about our personal experiences with literacy. We drafted the reflections and Dr. Obermark gave careful, comprehensive feedback. We revised our reflections, sharing them with our peer groups for additional feedback. We edited our reflections yet again, submitting a final version. My reflection was quite personal and I thought it was fairly powerful when I submitted the first draft, but I was genuinely enlightened by this process. By the time I finished, my final submission was much better than it had once been. Dr. Obermark stretched us as writers. She asked us to consider and reconsider our work and she asked that we collaborate to make ourselves and each other better.

The same thing happened with our research assignment. We were to interview two subjects with writing a paper about literacy in mind. I chose my stepfather as an interviewee. I knew he had attended a rural one-room school as a child and that he was poor, but I had never taken the time to learn much more. As I interviewed him, I learned things about his life I had never known. That led me to research the history and politics of rural Midwestern education. I have always held strong views on education, but this exercise resulted in significant self-discovery and subsequent recognition of the connection to my small town upbringing and concern for the rural school system. At one point, I was overwhelmed with information and struggled to find direction
while writing. Dr. Obermark helped me to strategize and better focus the writing. In the end, I was able to deliver detailed interview summaries, a valuable annotated bibliography, an interactive project companion presentation and finally, a complete research paper. I felt accomplished and learned a great deal.

As the end of the semester drew close, Dr. Obermark solicited our opinions on the class and ways to improve it. I was honest with her, telling her that it was demanding but that there was not one part of it I would give up or suggest she take away. There was too much to be learned from the experience as a whole. What I appreciated most was that she was right there with us the entire time. She was accessible, supportive and encouraging, while still expecting the best from us. Her commitment to us as students made me want to be better.

It is my hope that you will award Dr. Obermark the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. She is committed to engaging her students and she sets high academic standards while creating an environment that encourages success. I am grateful to have had her as an instructor and ensure you that she is making a difference for her students.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jane E. Shasserre
7510 Devonshire Avenue
Saint Louis, MO 63119
March 5, 2015

To whom it may concern:

My name is AJ Arena, and I am writing to recommend Dr. Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Dr. Obermark was truly one of the best instructors I had during my time at UMSL, and I believe she deserves to be honored for the exceptional care and attention she gives her students.

Lauren came to UMSL at the beginning of my final year in the Master’s program for English composition and rhetoric. I was also in my last year of a teaching assistantship, and was still learning how to juggle my own school work along with my teaching load. From her first day at UMSL, Lauren was quite apparently excited to meet all the teaching assistants, learn about our academic and personal interests, and offer guidance on our teaching and scholarship, if we wanted it. Not only was she willing to teach a section of freshmen composition herself in order to fully engage herself in UMSL’s English program, but Lauren also happily participated in our graduate assistant meetings, including grade calibration sessions and syllabus planning. Rather than acting as if these tasks were beneath her, Lauren genuinely wanted to use these sessions to form relationships with the teaching assistants and establish a rapport as a professor we could trust. It was quite common for me to stand in Lauren’s office doorway, casually chatting and asking for advice on teaching and on writing. Never once did she turn me away.

Over my last year at UMSL, Lauren influenced me greatly in terms of setting personal academic goals and finding work post-graduation. She encouraged me to attend the national, annual Conference on College Composition and Communication, even though I did not know anyone else attending. I am so glad she pushed me out of my comfort zone, since this was a fantastic experience for me! Not only did she help me find a roommate and apply for funding to attend the conference, but once we arrived she introduced me to her former colleagues at Ohio State and frequently checked in with me to make sure I was attending panels, networking, and having the best possible conference experience. Honestly, I was amazed by how attentive she was to my first-time-conference-goer needs, especially since she was networking and presenting at this conference herself. Additionally, Lauren is the reason I found full-time work after graduation. She frequently emailed me job openings I might not have found or considered for myself, and gave me feedback on my application materials. Thanks to Lauren’s direction, shortly after graduation I received a full-time job teaching developmental writers at Southern Illinois University-Carbondale. Lauren is a very humble person and would insist that I achieved this on my own, but honestly if not for her guidance and her support, I don’t think I’d be where I am today, teaching full-time and working on scholarship of my own.

Perhaps the best example of Lauren’s remarkable teaching, though, is when she agreed to conduct an independent study with me during my final semester at UMSL. During our conversations, Lauren often mentioned her scholarly interest in disability studies. I didn’t even know this field of study existed, and based on Lauren’s enthusiasm and my own personal experience with disability, I grew very interested in this area of study. Lauren readily agreed to oversee my independent study, and even insisted that we meet for lunch to discuss precisely what I wanted to learn. She listened intently as I told her about my experience growing up as a sibling of someone with disabilities, and took notes as I explained my vague idea of writing a book about my experiences. Within the week, Lauren got back to me with a full syllabus
designed with my goals in mind. She had clearly done further research on sibling experiences and had written writing prompts specifically to help me begin working on a larger project. Once we began the course, she allowed me to write untraditionally, incorporating my personal experience alongside the course material—a very unusual move for a graduate seminar. It certainly paid off for both of us, making our weekly class conversations much richer and helping me to reach higher levels of learning as I applied the course material to my own existing knowledge. Lauren pushed me out of my comfort zone in every possible way, through intense course readings, through her weekly feedback on my writing, and especially through a final project that had me submitting my work to a professional conference. Now, a year later, Lauren and I will be presenting our work from last spring at the same national conference she originally encouraged me to attend. Apart from this incredible professional development opportunity, what means even more to me as a student is that Lauren put so much time and energy into a class with just one student. In all my time at UMSL, I never saw another professor put this much effort into an independent study. By being so personally invested in my learning, she made me feel that my work was an important contribution to the discourse we were studying. I would not be where I am today as a learner, as an instructor, and as a professional if not for Lauren’s efforts last spring.

Should you have further questions about Lauren’s extraordinary teaching practices, please feel free to contact me using the information above. I do hope you will consider Dr. Lauren Obermark for this prestigious award. I am so grateful I was able to learn from her and work alongside her at UMSL, and believe her outstanding teaching efforts are truly deserving of this recognition.

Most sincerely,

AJ Arena
To Whom It May Concern:

It is my great honor to recommend Dr. Lauren Obermark for The Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. I am currently in my second course taught by Dr. Obermark, and her teaching was a large factor in choosing to take Teaching College Writing with her this semester after taking her Introduction to Disability Studies Class in the fall. Dr. Obermark is one of the most dynamic, inspiring teachers I’ve had, and enrolling in Dr. Obermark’s class during my first semester of graduate school was a stroke of serendipity that I am extremely grateful for. The other class I took that semester was a very standard read-lecture-discuss class that I found to be very discouraging, and had I not had Dr. Obermark’s class to look forward to each week, I might not have continued in my graduate studies in English.

Because of the nature of an Introduction to Disability Studies class, Dr. Obermark was able to be very frank and honest with us about the challenges and rewards of creating a classroom environment that is inclusive of as many people as possible. She is committed to ensuring that there are a variety of modes of teaching and learning, and because of that, I was able to see what kinds of learning worked the best for me. I was also encouraged to see that teaching did not having to be a static process, and that teachers can and should be continually striving to learn and grow in their instructional practices.

One of the most impressive things about Dr. Obermark’s class was that, while she allows for flexibility in expression and learning, she is still able to ensure that her students achieve an extremely high level of success, and because of her belief in the ability of her students, I was highly motivated to improve and produce my best work. All the way through the process of writing a paper or creating a project, she makes herself available for any assistance that her students in whatever way is the most useful and accessible for the student. Dr. Obermark also works to ensure that at every step of the process, her students understand what the objectives of the assignment are and the ways in which they are or are not fulfilling those objectives, and provides excellent guidance where necessary.

Dr. Obermark is constantly working to improve her own teaching in an effort to better serve her students. She experiments extensively with new methods of discussion and expression, and in some cases, has used online applications such as Google Docs to enhance the classroom experience. In one instance, we were discussing physical access and the ways it can be an impediment to disabled students, and we went around the building finding different ADA-compliant features of the building and emailed them to her in real-time in order to create a collaborative document that we were then able to discuss right then. Dr. Obermark seemingly never stops working to make her classes as rich of an educational experience as possible for her students.

As someone who aspires to teach and study composition and rhetoric further, Dr. Obermark is an inspiration. She is approachable, warm, friendly, and makes her classes inviting in a way that makes even the most timid students feel safe participating. Her excitement and enthusiasm for teaching and helping her students improve as writers and thinkers is infectious, and as a
result, her classes are the kinds of classes you really want to attend. I had a bout of illness earlier this semester and was forced to miss a class, and I felt the loss of the discussion and scholarly camaraderie she creates. Luckily, because Dr. Obermark is so thoughtful in the area of disability studies, she is always thinking of ways to help those who might have issues with being present in class, so I was able to access the notes that the class had taken and see what had been discussed. Even when the classroom activity involves physically writing thoughts on the chalkboard/whiteboard, Dr. Obermark takes pictures and posts them on the class Gateway page either for those unable to attend, or simply for the students who were present to look back on, reflect, and to build upon previous concepts.

There is no doubt in my mind that Dr. Lauren Obermark is deserving of this award. I am grateful that I happened to enroll in her class, as it has enriched my worldview and made me a more aware, compassionate person with vastly improved writing skills. I look forward to working with her in the future.

Sincerely,

Carly West
10 March 2015

Dear Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award Committee,

I have had the honor of knowing Dr. Lauren Obermark since the spring of 2014. She offered a workshop for students and faculty here at UMSL on the process of drafting and submitting a conference proposal. It was not until this time that I knew I could participate in academic conferences, introducing me to opportunities I would have otherwise not known. She has since then provided invaluable support in my development as a student and as a professional, constantly identifying the value of my work as a graduate student in the field of English.

In the course I took with Dr. Obermark, it was immediately clear that her classes offer a space for students to understand their learning style while also grasping the material. She plans each class period and assignment in a multimodal fashion, creating an environment in which one can participate in new ways. For example, a common approach to class discussion included a Google Document or Google Slides that could be added to and accessed by all students at all times during and after class. This allows students to participate in ways that break down the monotony and pressure of lecture-only or seminar-only courses. Her pedagogical approaches provide agency in students’ own learning while generating a community of learners.

Furthermore, Dr. Obermark’s mode of assessment in her classes is unlike most instructors. Instead of simply penalizing students for errors, she investigates why the student did not fulfill an assignment to the standards she had set. She always offers guidance and provides opportunities to show a more comprehensive understanding. This kind of guidance does not exist in many professors’ pedagogy, yet seems so crucial to academic success. Her active and “outside the box” evaluation ensures that students comprehend the material and develop the skills as outlined in the curriculum, but still provides a foundation for confidence in students’ ability to learn and progress in their academic achievement.

In addition to taking a course with Dr. Obermark, we have maintained academic discussions beyond the classroom and syllabus. This includes her establishing of a Disability Studies Reading Group for students interested in material that we could not further discuss and explore
in class. She sustains academic dialogues via in-person meetings and e-mail, enthusiastically sharing sources, information, and ideas. Her sincere engagement with the academic community is not only appreciated by students, but also necessary in fostering a culture of learning at UMSL.

The unconditional academic support that Dr. Obermark has provided has changed my trajectory as both a student and a professional, which is one of the many reasons why I believe she should receive The Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

Sincerely,

Lauren Terbrock
To whom this may concern:

It is my pleasure to write in support of Dr. Lauren Obermark for “The Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.” I have only had Dr. Obermark or Lauren as she prefers to be called, for one course, Teaching College Writing, but was fulfilled in what I have learned from her. Lauren possesses an amazing energy. As a Master of Fine Arts student, I took her course because I wanted to teach writing and felt the course would prepare me for life after graduate school. To my surprise, Teaching College Writing with Dr. Obermark did more than that, it motivated me to teach, while also helping me apply the skills I garnered in my graduate work to the classroom. I use most of what I have learned from taking her course with my own students.

While the reading for the course was heavy, Lauren’s approach to teaching was engaging and practical. Our opinions mattered to her, and she made certain that every voice was heard. As lovely of a person that she is, she is not someone who gives away grades; we earned our A’s in that course. Lauren held each student accountable for their work. Her instructions were always clear and her day to day lesson plans were never boring, but detailed what was read in preparation for class. A dynamic professor, Lauren was innovative in her pedagogy. I remember during one class meeting in particular, that all students responded to questions from the text on the same google doc. Imagine twelve or so students all engaged on one document, responding to questions, prompts, applying what was learned; that was life having her as a professor. I looked forward to her class and as time would tell, I was not the only one. Dr. Obermark’s approach to learning was always fresh and exciting. My nearest memory of her course is of students smiling.

With obvious mastery of the understanding of strategies that effect student learning, Lauren used multiple modes of teaching. Using technology, the text, and student experiences, Lauren appealed to our curiosities. Dr. Obermark is warm, friendly, and makes learning enjoyable. I have since recommend her specifically to colleagues and have heard only glorifying comments with regard to her teaching style, knowledge of the material, and in general of her personality.

It’s difficult to imagine that if awarded this prestigious teaching award that many more won’t follow. I recommend her without reservation. If I could be of any more service with regard to Dr. Obermark’s deserving of this award, please don’t hesitate to notify me at (314) 327 – 0799, or at vasserj@hssu.edu.

Respectfully,

Jason Nicholas Vasser, M.F.A.
Harris Stowe – State University
College of Arts and Sciences
3026 Laclede Avenue
Saint Louis, MO. 63137
To Whom it May Concern:

Hello. My name is Jennifer Frazer, a current English MA student and secondary English instructor, and I write today on the behalf of Dr. Lauren Obermark, her remarkable teaching style and contribution to the English department at UMSL.

Back in the spring of 2014, I enrolled in Teaching College Writing with this mysterious new professor not knowing what to expect. From day one, I knew that this course wasn’t going to be like the others, and I was not disappointed.

Throughout the semester, Dr. Obermark not only covered the content of the course, but did so in a manner that opened up a new dimension of learning. In both Teaching College Writing and Introduction to Disability Studies, which I took later that fall, the design and setup of her class paralleled perfectly with every concept she was teaching.

Every lesson was made relevant and applicable to learners of the twenty-first century by going above and beyond to ensure that every morsel of the course was made available online. Each and every class, all the materials discussed, resources referenced, notes taken, etc. could be found on the class website (Blackboard). Clearly labeled and organized, nothing was left off of the website and for a student on the go, such as myself, having this in place was ideal for keeping up with the course and being able to better contribute to it.

Truly dedicated to learning and furthering the field of composition, Dr. Obermark always devised new, innovative ways to present information and engage her students. Because she was never afraid to try something new and experiment with technology, Dr. Obermark fostered growth and development by also encouraging students to take control of their own learning by selecting projects and papers that catered to their own individual interests connected to the class. To this day, I am currently still applying concepts learned in Dr. Obermark’s a year ago class to my own classroom today.

On a personal level, I would just like to add that my educational experience in Dr. Obermark’s courses have not only impacted my own teaching strategies and style, but also changed my mind about composition entirely. Because of Dr. Obermark and the manner in which rhetoric and composition was presented, explored, and dissected, I decided enroll in additional courses to attain an emphasis in this area of English studies.

All in all, words truly do not give justice to the echelon of teacher Dr. Obermark is and what she has contributed so far in her short amount of time here at UMSL. Her enthusiasm for teaching and her field invoke nothing less than passion and excitement in her students. She is one of the few who makes it a priority to listen to her students and take to heart what they have to say about the course and its content and because of this and so much more, it is very clear that Dr. Obermark is more than deserving of such recognition.

Should those involved in this award committee need any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me; I am more than happy to attest to the qualifications Dr. Obermark possess for this award.

Thank you and have a wonderful day!

Sincerely,

Jennifer Frazer
March 31, 2015

To the Committee for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award:

I write in support of the nomination of Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

In the brief time she has been at UMSL, Professor Obermark has established a reputation as an exciting, challenging, and technologically innovative teacher of writing and rhetoric. Because her scholarship explores rhetoric, civic engagement, and pedagogy, there is a productive synergy between it and her teaching, and students reap the benefits. Rigorous in her expectations for students, versatile in the range of her interests, and highly effective in her instructional techniques, she has instilled new interest in UMSL’s rhetoric and writing programs.

For these reasons, I am very happy to support Professor Obermark’s candidacy for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award.

Sincerely,

Ronald E Yasbin
Dean and Professor of Microbiology
To whom it may concern:

I believe Dr. Obermark would make a very strong candidate for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. The semester that Dr. Obermark started teaching at UMSL, I was halfway through a two-year English MA program, and she agreed to take on the extra responsibility of teaching me an independent study course as part of a two-semester qualitative research project I had designed. Dr. Obermark helped me navigate the administrative process of getting an independent study approved, having that approval withdrawn and getting the course re-approved, getting IRB approval for my project, and finally collecting interview data.

I learned a lot that semester about qualitative research methods from the readings Dr. Obermark assigned, from the data collection process itself, and from our discussions of both. However, I think I was equally (if not more) inspired by the level of Dr. Obermark’s dedication to her role as an educator. Starting work at a new university is never easy, and her willingness to take on the extra responsibility of helping me see my project through despite the number of hurdles involved and despite already having a tremendous workload shows extraordinary commitment to the success of the department’s students. My experiences in her independent study class have inspired me both as a researcher and as a teacher, and I’m deeply grateful to her for helping me achieve my goals and for taking my work seriously.

I earned my MA in 2014, and I have since started teaching first year composition for UMSL. Dr. Obermark has continued to be actively engaged with both my research and my teaching. We regularly have conversations that inform both my thoughts on the project that started with her class and the teaching career I’ve recently started, which has been partially inspired by her, along with a handful of other great teachers I’ve had in my life. For these reasons, I believe Dr. Obermark should be given the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Micheal Smith
To: The Committee for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award  
From: Richard Cook, Chair, Department of English, UMSL

It is with great pleasure that I nominate Dr. Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Excellence in Teaching Award. Dr. Obermark has been at UMSL for less than two years and in that short time has distinguished herself as a stellar, challenging, innovative, and inspiring instructor in composition and rhetoric while contributing significantly to museum, disability, gender and veterans studies. She has also been laying the groundwork for a national scholarly reputation and has received national recognition in the form of a 2015 travel grant from the national organization of college composition and communication scholars. Dr. Obermark’s outstanding teaching, which these nomination materials document, alone earn her candidacy for this award; but the work she does through curricular and pedagogical design, work that “fosters communication skills necessary for participation in important public discussions” eminently qualifies her to represent UMSL’s best teaching, consonant as this work is with UMSL’s mission of community service.

Dr. Obermark regularly teaches required undergraduate writing courses. As student letters and annual student evaluations indicate, she has been notably successful in turning often reluctant and fearful students into writing enthusiasts, proud of the skills they have acquired and hopeful about their success in future courses. She has shown them that writing is not an exotic, difficult art practiced by a select few, but an attainable (and necessary) skill that they can master and take with them into all areas of their studies as well as into future employment. Nor have her efforts and successes been confined to the classroom. She has continued to mentor former undergraduate students, encouraging them to prepare and submit their work for publication to journals such as Young Scholars in Writing and The Journal of Undergraduate Research at Ohio State University.

Dr. Obermark is a trained rhetorician (as well as a composition specialist) with particular interest in the connections between rhetoric and civic issues. The rhetorical emphases in her writing classes invite students to participate constructively in public discourse. Class assignments typically involve students in group discussions in which they are encouraged to express and refine their own views while listening respectfully to that of their peers. Listening, reflecting and speaking are crucial skills in the workplace, the community, and civic life. “In a world where communication skills are vital and students’ preparation for college writing is often inadequate,” writes Professor Maltby in her appraisal of Obermark’s teaching, “a highly effective teacher of writing and rhetoric is one of the
most valuable persons on campus.” “Truly high-impact teaching of writing and rhetoric is happening in Lauren Obermark’s classes.”

One of the keys to understanding Dr. Obermark’s pedagogical strength is her interest in Disability Studies and the experience she brings from having taught differently abled eighth grade students. Contributing to that pedagogy is a concept called “universal design” which she uses to construct class sessions and student assignments. Universal design is “a set of principles for curriculum development that gives all individuals equal opportunities to learn” regardless of their learning styles, cognitive processing methods, and physical limitations (National Center on Universal Design for Learning, http://www.udlcenter.org/aboutudl). This approach “both sparks and reinforces learning, because her students interact [in class] with every [concept,] piece of information [and task] in several of these ways: reading, questioning, thinking, explaining, discussing, writing.” Dr. Obermark regularly turns to multimedia and a range of digital options to facilitate the goals of universal design: for example, in one class, she involved students in collaborative authorship and had them use Google Docs that allowed for simultaneous composing. (Deborah Maltby’s letter in this packet lays out in detail one example of how Dr. Obermark employs universal design.) Another observer of her teaching “came away dazzled and inspired” and deeply aware of how the class structure engaged students, enabling them to “operat[e] on multiple intellectual levels at the same time . . . [and to] interact with concepts, watch themselves learn, and [to] apply” what they were learning. Obermark “employs collaborative and interactive tasks in the classroom and subtly but effectively models exactly what she teach[es].”

Dr. Obermark is a talented, skillful, compassionate instructor, who inspires students to learn—whether in her own courses or in guest appearances in those of her colleagues. After observing her teach a composition segment in his course, James Craig, Professor of Military and Veteran Studies, wrote that he was “amazed at the perceptive, appropriate, and thoughtful ideas” she succeeded in eliciting from the students. Student writing that is perceptive, appropriate, and thoughtful is more often than not the mark of an effective writing teacher, something beyond a merely “popular” one—though Dr. Obermark certainly is that. Her effectiveness, her skill and versatility in teaching techniques, as well as her dedication to every student merit the kind of special recognition identified with the Gitner Award.

I am extremely pleased to nominate Dr. Lauren Obermark for the Gerald and Deanne Gitner Teaching Excellence Award. She deserves it.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Cook
Professor and Chair
To Who it May Concern,

Dr. Obermark is an extremely creative teacher who uses different kinds of teaching strategies to engage her students. After taking her Disabilities Studies course in the Fall of 2014 I was opened up to new types of learning techniques. She went out of her way to create assignments that forced her students to not only get involved academically but also with issues going on in society. Dr. Obermark assigned reading material from all over the field to give different looks into Disability Studies. She expected a lot out of every class meeting and pushed us in our class discussions. Every assignment I turned submitted came back to me with helpful in-text comments and a page or more thoughts about my work as a whole on a following page. It is extremely rare to have a professor who gives as much feedback as Dr. Obermark. She truly cares about her students and their success in her class. She pushes her students to produce their best work. She uses all kinds of different mediums for her classes, including: online posting boards, essays, videos, and research projects. Students who take her classes experience a whole new effective style of teaching.

Sincerely,

Emily Anderson
Appendix B: Course Evaluations
### Course Evaluation

**University of Missouri - St. Louis**  
**Department of English**

**Course Evaluation**

- **Course #: 5890**  
- **Semester:** Spring  
- **Instructor:** Obermark

1) **This course challenged me intellectually:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) **This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) **The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) **The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>I didn’t read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) **The instructor’s teaching was effective:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6) **This course was required:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7) **I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) **The grade I expect to receive:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9) **The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

11) Comment specifically on the following:
   
   Class activities

   Assignments

   Texts

   Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The reading load was very heavy.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
I really enjoyed all of the class discussions and the peer review groups were supportive and helpful.

Assignments
Most of the assignments helped me learn a lot, but the Theory of Writing assignment felt extraneous.

Texts
Mad at School was my favorite of the texts we used.

Materials (including online)
 Discussions were very helpful to the learning process, they often made concepts clearer than the reading did.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

She was extremely receptive and upbeat about everything we brought up in class, no matter what the subject was, and made sure we added from a wide range of scholars. She is also very respectful and aware of.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Lighten the weekly reading load to four (4) readings per week so that we can read a range of opinions but in a more manageable way.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

If she has to go out of town again, it might be good to lighten the workload that much because it is confusing to have a bunch of work due online when there is no real physical course. Otherwise, I really enjoyed this course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I didn't read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
I was challenged most to re-think how I teach writing to my struggling writers. The assigned texts and writing assignments literally forced me to confront my own practices and evaluate where I can improve and how I can better cater to all of my students needs.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
- Engaging
- Relevant to those in the teaching field

Assignments
- Practical
- Purposeful

Texts
- Awesome selection of relevant texts

Materials (including online)
- Very accessible (I've never had an instructor use Blackboard so thoroughly)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
- Obermark is so down-to-earth and approachable.
- She truly made this course accessible in every way (breaking down readings, making everything available online, etc.)
- The assignment breakdowns and side dates design prevented me from my normal procrastination

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
This course and Professor has completely changed my view of the study of English. I definitely wish I would have taken this course sooner because I'm now pursuing an emphasis in composition (due mostly to Obermark)
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course # EN 5900  Semester: Spring  Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The most challenging aspect was keeping all of the different projects straight. I sometimes felt as though I was scrambling to keep several plates spinning at once, and feared I wouldn't do as thorough a job as I should—but in the end I feel very satisfied with how the course came together.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
These were tailored to our needs and well-thought-out. We definitely needed to demonstrate our understanding.

Assignments
All assignments were extremely relevant to our interests and subject matter in the course.

Texts
I felt there was a good variety of texts, and I used each of them—no wasted money here!

Materials (including online)
Again, all relevant and clearly connected to what we studied. Excellent use of My Gateway to organize.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Lauren is very mindful of learning and how group teaching is apparent every class period. I would have liked to see more about that year writing program, but many of the issues we discussed were imperative in planning writing courses and dealing with the demands of writing classrooms.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

BEST instructor I've had in a long time!
University of Missouri - St. Louis  
Department of English  
Course Evaluation  
Course #: 5890  
Semester: Spring 14  
Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree
- [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
- [ ] Always
- [ ] Usually
- [ ] Some of the time
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
- [ ] A
- [ ] B
- [ ] C
- [ ] D
- [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The readings were challenging in a good way. Many of the concepts that we read dealt with were completely new to me. There was plenty of reading required in order to stay current. At times, it felt like too much.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
Lauren clearly takes the time to plan activities for each and every class meeting. Those activities are always meaningful, engaging, and fun.

Assignments
I really praise Lauren's attitude towards choosing assignments. There was a lot of variety. There was something for everyone. Best of all, we determined how our own final project would go.

Texts
Except for the Restivo book, the texts were good. The "Mad at School" book was especially good. I'm happy that there is a Norton for Camp Studies.

Materials (including online)
Lauren uses Blackboard very well. Also, she's a Google Docs pro!

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

- Energetic, engaging, enthusiastic attitude.
- Obvious love of the subject matter.
- Personal examples from her own experience
- Tech savvy

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

- Don't use the Restivo book
- Collaborative learning can be good, but it's a challenge with community

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I generally like the English faculty. I think that Lauren is even better than most. I truly hope that she has a long (tenured) career at UNSE so that she can continue to get students interested in the growing field of camp studies.
### University of Missouri - St. Louis
#### Department of English
#### Course Evaluation

**Course #** 4890  
**Semester:** Spring 14  
**Instructor:** Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) The Instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) The Instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) The Instructor's teaching was effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6) This course was required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) The grade I expect to receive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9) The Instructor's English pronunciation was clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
   The group project was challenging, but this was probably the fault of the group members (scheduling, organization, etc)

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   **Class activities**
   Awesome variety of class structures kept me excited for each week's

   **Assignments**
   - Unlike anything I had done before - exciting and relevant to my career

   **Texts**
   Great book, articles

   **Materials (including online)**
   My gateway page was well-organized and navigable

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

   - Great ability to turn theory into practice
   - Very helpful feedback on my writing

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

   None! Great class!

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

   This is the first course in which I have been encouraged to conduct my own research for final project in any field of comp. that interested me, and the result was a meaningful learning experience and more useful information about teaching writing than I ever could have expected.
University of Missouri - St. Louis  
Department of English  
Course Evaluation  

Course #:  
Semester: Spring  
Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>I didn't read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6) This course was required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) The grade I expect to receive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Sometimes the workload was a little heavy.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities  Excellent use of a variety of activities
                 well planned.

Assignments     Fair and a little demanding, but that’s a good thing

Texts           Interesting generally, but sometimes a little scattered

Materials (including online)

Always available and affordable.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

She’s super smart and approachable. The first time I felt
like a grad professor was interested in what students are doing
in the field. She’s an inspiration.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Allow more time for class discussions. Sometimes
we got carried away and didn’t have enough time to
finish our tasks.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Once a critique – space out large assignments.
End of semester was a little overwhelming. Maybe move
up the Theory of Writing Due date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course # 5890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester: Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor: Obermark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

   The Theory of Writing. This was an extremely difficult piece for me to write & required me to do much critical thinking, analysis, & research. Even though difficult, it was highly beneficial to my learning.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   Class activities
   Loved the artifacts
   Great use of technology

   Assignments
   Fantastic! Every assignment improved my understanding of Teaching College Writing & helped me put theory into practice.

   Texts
   Too much reading per class

   Materials (Including online)
   Fantastic! I loved all the books, articles, & teaching materials.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

   - Excitement for course
   - Wonderful feedback
   - Strong lessons
   - Strong relationships with students
   - Interesting discussions
   - Took interest in what we were learning.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

   Too much reading; there were only a handful of times I could get all the assigned reading done. I usually go to class with all the materials read.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

   Obermark was wonderful. She made the material come to life, got to know me as a student, & greatly improved my understanding of how to teach writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The coursework was challenging, but I was happy about that. I was also able to choose a challenging final project which I was grateful for.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
We did a lot of group work and discussion, which I liked because a lot of my courses have been lecture based.

Assignments
Assignments were clearly explained and let us engage with the material in a variety of ways.

Texts
I liked the texts we read, thought it covered a broad range of materials.

Materials (including online)
Easily accessible, informative and challenging intellectually to analyze.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

She knows so much and is willing to teach us. She is incredibly helpful and gives great feedback.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

This has been my favorite class of my academic career. It has given me a renewed sense of hope in the activity of writing/teaching.
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course # 5890  Semester: Spring 14  Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
   This may sound weird, but w/ our Theory of Writing assignment, I felt like we had too much time. I kind of forgot about it for a week or two.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   **Class activities**
   I liked the variety of activities - my favorite was collaborating on the google doc.

   **Assignments**
   I liked that you were flexible w/ the format of our major assignments & were sensitive to the amount of stuff we read/wrote. I really liked "Mad at School".

   **Materials (including online)**
   I have never had a class where the information on Blackboard was so organized.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
   - You were clear about your expectations.
   - The feedback on assignments was detailed & helpful.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
   Maybe an adherence to a small group w/ group projects.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
   I liked doing peer review & having multiple drafts of papers due. This helps me complete assignments in a timely fashion.
### University of Missouri - St. Louis

#### Department of English

#### Course Evaluation

**Course #**:  
**Semester**:  
**Instructor**: Lauren

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>I didn't read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6) This course was required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) The grade I expect to receive:

A | B | C | D | F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Finish all the reading, pick up classmate's ideas.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

Great.

Assignments

A lot/too much.

Texts

A lot/too much.

Materials (including online)

Great.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

She is passionate, inspiring, taking good care of students, offering insightful feedback.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Spending more time on it; finish all the reading material and apply more of them to my writing assignments.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I'd like to thank her for encouraging me, an international student here. I think I'm well-attended by her though I wish I could have done a better job. Thanks to her endless efforts for this course, I have learned quite a lot.
On questions 1-9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Balancing the reading load weird to weird with jobs and other lifestyle things

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
- Always great discussion & interactive type activities, better than just sitting through lecture

Assignments
- Theory of Writing could be more specific
- W/ possibly a list of theories that already exist so we knew for sure how to start or what we agreed/disagreed

Texts

Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course? She has great teaching

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
- More maybe about the design of First Year Camp and more discussion on how others in
  the Class would teach it. Maybe when you get to that part of the text, a good assigned
  would be for all students in the Class to bring a brief outline/syllabus of topics
  readings and major writing assignments they would expect to use in a FYCamp
  course + then copy the set of outlines for all to have back others fill in.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Great Class! Learned a lot! Must me think about what I learned + how!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn't read</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
Keeping up with the weekly writing assignments was challenging, because as a graduate assistant, my work load was pretty hefty. I still managed to get them done even if it required creative time management.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
I enjoyed the class activities. The readings were really great and the use of our classroom helped keep the attention of most of us in class.

Assignments
The assignments were nice, because they each built upon themselves. I feel as if I have a pretty good handle on teaching college writing.

Texts
I loved the Norton Anthology of Composition Studies because it was diverse in its subject matter.

Materials (including online)

Dr. Obermark did a great job with online materials. I was always in know about what was due and enjoyed the readings, videos, and announcements. They kept me organized.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
Very approachable, Dr. Obermark was energetic, very knowledgeable about the subject matter and kept my interest for the entirety of the course.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
Add resources that relate to areas of interest. For example, at the beginning of the course instructors should state their areas of research. Then they should be encouraged to use their areas while learning to teach college writing.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
Really enjoyed the experience. This was the one course I was worried about and after week 2, I was relaxed and ready to handle the course work without fear or reservations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course was required:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

11) Comment specifically on the following:
   
   Class activities

   Assignments

   Texts

   Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree [X]
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree [X]
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree [X]
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree [X]
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree [X]
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No [X]

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always [X]
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A [X]
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes [X]
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
   Keeping up with reading & challenging myself with our independent work & projects.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   Class activities: These were always engaging & thought-provoking, creating great opportunities for discussion & developing good class relationships.

   Assignments: Practical & tailored to interest within the course, challenging yet felt worthwhile.

   Texts: A mix of dense and lighter narratives—core to mix scholarly & literary.

   Materials (including online): Very organized & thorough—MUCH appreciated!

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
   She always has clear expectations & works hard to be sure everyone has access and has a voice in class.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
   None!

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
   Obermark is by far the most engaging, enthusiastic, and organized professor I've had at UMBC! I wish I could take every class with her!
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: ENG3150 Semester: Fall 2014 Instructor: D. Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
1.0) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The most challenging aspect was completing all of the assignments on time.

1.1) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
Class was always interesting and kept me engaged.

Assignments
There were a lot of assignments but they were all different which was nice.

Texts
Most of the texts were great.

Materials (Including online)
All the materials were easily accessible.

1.2) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Dr. Obermark is great at responding to student work and giving productive feedback that actually helped improve assignments.

1.3) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

I wouldn’t make any.

1.4) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I enjoyed this class and professor. Dr. Obermark obviously cares about her students and topic and it makes for an excellent course.
# Obermark Gitner Award Portfolio 158

## University of Missouri - St. Louis

**Department of English**

**Course Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>5950</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Laura Obermark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [X] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [X] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [X] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [X] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [X] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [X] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [X] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [X] No

**PLEASE TURN OVER**
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

It was a brand new area of study for me, one that I had never studied before (disability studies).

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities:
Very flexible, accessible, with good challenging variety.

Assignments:
Appropriately challenging amount of assignments we give.

Texts:
Very recent and relevant texts - addressed a wide variety of issues within disability studies.

Materials (including online):
Always posted, well organized, easy to find & manage. Very thorough online postings.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Dr. Obermark cares about her students, what they learn, how they learn, and has a great passion for what she's doing - of course, disability studies.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

WA

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I am very grateful to have had Dr. Obermark. Like I mentioned, she is very thorough & passionate, communicates everything extremely well, and she gives ample feedback on all assignments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

I had trouble with online discussions, so those were the most challenging. Also, meeting my own expectations. Dr. Obermark has a way of inspiring students to want to produce their best work.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

- Class activities
  Engaging. She also posted the work we did in class so we could access it later.

- Assignments
  There was a very reasonable number of assignments.

- Texts
  We struggled through one together, but overall, they were very good.

- Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Dr. Obermark is clearly passionate about the topic, and really encouraged us to take ownership of the class and get out of it what piqued our interest.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

N/A

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation
Course #: 5950, Semester: Fall 2014, Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
The texts were somewhat difficult at times, but that wasn't a bad thing.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
Discussions were lively and fun!

Assignments
I loved the variety and freedom we had
to put our own spin on things.

Texts

Materials (including online)
Loved the discussion board element & extra
non-required reading that were shared.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
So many things. I honestly can't say enough
good things about Dr. Obermark. She's fantastic.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
Wouldn't change anything—truthfully. Wonderful
class.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
Again, I can't say enough great things about
Dr. Obermark. She's a true asset to this
university—one of the best professors I've
had. Give her tenure & a raise immediately!

Thank you for a wonderful learning experience.
### Course Evaluation

**Course #** English 5950  
**Semester:** Fall 2014  
**Instructor:** Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The instructor’s teaching was effective:</td>
<td>Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>This course was required:</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td>Always, Usually, Some of the time, Rarely, Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>A, B, C, D, F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td>Yes, No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
    Keeping up with the weekly reading assignments

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
    sufficiently engaging

Assignments
    practical, hands-on
    applicable to my life as an educator

Texts
    relevant, thought-provoking

Materials (including online)
    easily accessible.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
    This course challenged the way in which I see the world. My eyes have been
    opened to a group of individuals who are marginalized and often discriminated
    against. Obermark's design of the class ultimately enabled me to do something
    with the information I learned (instead of merely discussing it or writing another
    essay).

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
    Obermark truly has a way of breaking down challenging ideas into bits that
    are totally applicable to everyday life and her teaching takes on an entirely
close because so.
### University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

**Course #:** 5950  **Semester:** Fall 14  **Instructor:** Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) **This course challenged me intellectually:**
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [x] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) **This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:**
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) **The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:**
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [x] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) **The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:**
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) **The instructor's teaching was effective:**
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) **This course was required:**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [x] No

7) **I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:**
   - [x] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) **The grade I expect to receive:**
   - [x] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) **The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [x] No

**PLEASE TURN OVER**
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The most challenging aspect of this course was the content. Disability Studies is an entirely new genre of English of which I was previously unaware. Therefore, grasping the terminology and the concepts was challenging.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
There were many activities.

Assignments
I spent a lot of time on the annotated bib, lit analysis essay, gallery presentation, and final project. I felt like one of these assignments could have possibly been cut (?) when comparing previous course expectations from other grad courses.

Texts
Relevant and well-selected.

Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Instructor strengths include creative class activities and very thorough feedback on assignments.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

I would pare down some of the assignments in order to allow more focus to be spent producing one or two quality pieces of work. I also hate blackboard! This may just be me, but I feel like it stifle classroom discussion when folks feel like they’ve already said (and shared) what they had to say online.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Overall, I believe this course has a lot of value for English Studies students. This course took a different direction from traditional English courses. I enjoyed our meetings every week!
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: 5950          Semester: Fall 2014  Instructor: Lauren Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - [ ]

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
Applying the readings in a unique way to a topic of interest, it provided an opportunity to do a lot of learning outside of class prompted by what was done in class.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
A lot of diversity and new approaches helped to look at topics from multiple perspectives and forced me out of my comfort zone.

Assignments
The freedom in assignments gave me a chance to learn in class & our, my own, and apply things in ways that have an application outside the classroom.

Materials (including online)
Always more than enough resources!

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
Knowledge of materials, willingness for freedom & diversity of assignments

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
None.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

NA
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course # ENGL 5950  Semester: Fall 2014  Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1-9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The work itself & the new theories challenged me to think in ways I hadn't before.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

Variety, engaging

Assignments

Many different ones - a benefit to learning!

Flexible

Texts

Different formats allowed me to engage the content in different ways: textbook, articles, play, novel.

Materials (including online)

Multimodal materials helped with retention.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Strong content, genuine & helpful feedback, intuitive teacher.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

N/A

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Dr. Obermark is an asset to UMSL. She greatly enhanced my graduate studies experience.
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: Eng 5750  Semester: Fall 14  Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class? Everything! But in a good way. It was challenging because it made me rethink how I view disability, and it was challenging because there was a lot of in-depth work.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   Class activities great—I enjoyed the activities that got
   us to move around the room and interact
   in ways we don’t usually in a seminar.

   Assignments
   It felt like a lot, but maybe it was how they
   were assigned. Felt like it slowed down at
   the end, which was good.

   Texts
   relevant, nothing seemed out of place

   Materials (including online)
   everything was easy to access and seemed
   purposeful.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

   Extraordinarily knowledgeable, but open to
   new/different perspectives/interpretations.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

   None that I can think of...

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
**Course Evaluation**

**University of Missouri - St. Louis**

**Department of English**

**Course #**: Eng 1100  
**Semester**: Fall 2013  
**Instructor**: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

11) Comment specifically on the following:
   - Class activities
   - Assignments
   - Texts
   - Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Missouri - St. Louis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COVER SHEET**

**Course #**  
**Semester:** FS 2013  
**Instructor:** Lauren Gitner

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) **This course challenged me intellectually:**

   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) **This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:**

   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) **The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:**

   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) **The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out**

   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn't read

5) **The instructor's teaching was effective:**

   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) **This course was required:**

   - Yes
   - No

7) **I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:**

   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) **The grade I expect to receive:**

   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) **The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:**

   - Yes
   - No
University of Missouri - St. Louis  
Department of English  
Course Evaluation  
COVER SHEET  

Course #: ENG 1100-12  
Semester: Fall 2013  
Instructor: Lauren Obermark  

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:

- Yes
- No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

- Always
- Usually
- Some of the time
- Rarely
- Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:

- A
- B
- C
- D
- F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:

- Yes
- No
University of Missouri - St. Louis

Department of English

Course Evaluation

**Course # 1180** | **Semester: 1** | **Instructor: Obermark**

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

having too awesome of a teacher

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

- Fun

Assignments

- easy but effective

Texts

- enjoyable

Materials (including online)

- good

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

- easy to talk to, fun teacher

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

- none

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: 1100  Semester:  Fall  Instructor: <NAME><br>

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The length of papers

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

Weren't always useful but usually helped

Assignments

All but essay 3 were clear and concise

3 was sort of a nightmare

Texts

Kind of strange options

Materials (including online)

I would have liked examples of full essays to give an idea of the assignment

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Strong ideas and philosophy

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Clearer instructions on essays

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Initial instructions were sometimes confusing but was always cleared up through her feedback on first drafts
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: **English 1100**  Semester: **Fall**  Instructor: **Obermark**

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Writing the essays were the most challenging part of the class.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
Class activities were a lot of fun and they required me to think differently.

Assignments
Assignments weren't always fun but required me to think differently.

Texts
The texts were informative and related to the content of the class.

Materials (including online)
Materials were always available.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

She was very outgoing and friendly.

13) What changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

I can't think of any right now.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>1100</th>
<th>Semester: Fall 2013</th>
<th>Instructor: Obermark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri - St. Louis</td>
<td>Department of English</td>
<td>Obermark Gitner Award Portfolio 188</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course #: 1100</td>
<td>Semester: 1</td>
<td>Instructor: Lauren Abermack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A   - B
   - C   - D   - F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The most challenging aspect of the class was to do discussions. It was really hard to remember this.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

were helped

Assignments

were clear to understand and easy

Texts

were really interesting

Materials (including online)

were helpful

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

My instructor always helped me and made things clear.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

I would do more work in the class instead of group discussions.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
Course Evaluation

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:

- Yes
- No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

- Always
- Usually
- Some of the time
- Rarely
- Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:

- A
- B
- C
- D
- F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:

- Yes
- No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The most challenging aspect was learning how to incorporate sources in my paper.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

They were fun and engaging. I liked interacting with my classmates to get a different perspective.

Assignments

The assignments were tedious.

Texts

The texts were very long. Some were very enjoyable.

Materials (including online)

Almost all materials were provided, even on line.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

My instructor was very calm about fun and was very confident and factual.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

The only thing I would change is the long texts we had to read.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I really liked this class and it was enjoyable writing class.
| **University of Missouri - St. Louis**  
| **Department of English**  
| **Course Evaluation**  

| Course # | eng 100-12 | Semester: Fall 2013 | Instructor: Obermark |

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | I didn't read |

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:

| Strongly agree | Agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |

6) This course was required:

| Yes | No |

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

| Always | Usually | Some of the time | Rarely | Never |

8) The grade I expect to receive:

| A | B | C | D | F |

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:

| Yes | No |

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

I believe the most challenging was learning errors in my writing.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
- discussions
- journal, essays, class readings, and class discussions

Assignments
- journals

Texts
- daily reader, E. P. Eliot

Materials (including on line)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Her great way of communicating with us, and being flexible in different teaching manners.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Nothing.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

She was a wonderful teacher, and it was definitely my favorite class.
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: 1100  Semester: Fall 13  Instructor: Lauren Obermarx

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Typing the papers.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

Discussions: fun, interesting

Assignments:

Papers, journals.

Texts

Easy reader

Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Clear, always, to the point. Made everyone get involved.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Different topics for papers. It feels like I'm in high school still.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
### Course Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>English 1100</th>
<th>Semester: Fall 2013</th>
<th>Instructor: Professor Obermark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>I didn't read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6) This course was required: **Yes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8) The grade I expect to receive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear: **Yes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Writing a claim's paper but now I know how to

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

Fun and engaging, helpful for writing and improving

Assignments

Journal posts prepared me larger writing assignments

Texts

Book was $30 and things could found online

Materials (including online)

Stories for class were interesting, handouts were helpful

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
University of Missouri - St. Louis  
Department of English  
Course Evaluation  

Course # **eng 1100-12** | Semester: **fall 2013** | Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:  
- [ ] Strongly agree  
- [ ] Agree  
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree  
- [ ] Disagree  
- [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:  
- [x] Strongly agree  
- [ ] Agree  
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree  
- [ ] Disagree  
- [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:  
- [x] Strongly agree  
- [ ] Agree  
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree  
- [ ] Disagree  
- [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:  
- [x] Strongly agree  
- [ ] Agree  
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree  
- [ ] Disagree  
- [ ] Strongly disagree  
- [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:  
- [x] Strongly agree  
- [ ] Agree  
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree  
- [ ] Disagree  
- [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:  
- [x] Yes  
- [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:  
- [x] Always  
- [ ] Usually  
- [ ] Some of the time  
- [ ] Rarely  
- [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:  
- [x] B  
- [ ] C  
- [ ] D  
- [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:  
- [x] Yes  
- [ ] No  

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

It would have to be that Prof. Obermark could teach the way she liked.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
- Fun and easy to do.

Assignments
- The right amount to do all of them.

Texts
- Some may have been omitted not needed.

Materials (including online)
- Gave many and helped a lot.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

The way she communicated and being her first year, and mine too.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

Teacher able to teach just like she wanted to.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I really enjoyed this class.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The essay #3 was the most challenging aspect of the class.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

The class activities were fun and exciting.

Assignments

The assignments were relatively easy if you listened to the professor.

Texts

The texts were easy to read and fun.

Materials (including online)

The materials were easy to get ahold of.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

The instructor emphasized with students and made the course as easy as possible for freshmen.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

None

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Laurin is the best professor I've ever had.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Evaluation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVER SHEET</strong></td>
<td>On questions 1-9, check the box that most closely represents your response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course # 110</td>
<td>Fall 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor: Obermark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) This course challenged me intellectually:

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out:

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:

- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:

- [ ] Always
- [ ] Usually
- [ ] Some of the time
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:

- [ ] A
- [ ] B
- [ ] C
- [ ] D
- [ ] F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
Okay there's no back side to this, so I'll just write!

Mrs. Obermark was a joy to work with! She was a great teacher and had very insightful and helpful feedback on all of my papers that really helped me compose later papers. If I had a chance I would have her as a teacher again!
**English Spring 2014 Survey**
SP2014

**Course:** 14104 023 - ENGL 3100 (INT)-Junior-Level Writing

**Responsible Faculty:** Lauren Obermark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB389 Educational Outcomes</th>
<th>14104 - 023</th>
<th>--- Survey Comparisons ---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The syllabus clearly expressed the goals, expectations, and the nature of the course.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course required that I come to class ready and prepared.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information was available so I could track my academic performance during the semester.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course expanded my analytical thinking, my technical skills, my creativity, my knowledge, and/or my competence.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

---

**ENGLISH - OVERALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14104 - 023</th>
<th>--- Survey Comparisons ---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course was required?</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:** [YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1

**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

---

**ENGLISH - OVERALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14104 - 023</th>
<th>--- Survey Comparisons ---</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
<td>Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course challenged me intellectually?</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning?</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://p9.courseval.net/etw/ets/et.asp
Survey Report

Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

14104 - 023 — Survey Comparisons —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH - OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A B C D F DK N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH - OVERALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A U R N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [A] Always=1 [U] Usually=2 [R] Rarely=1
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB389 - Educational Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD D N A SA N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES NO N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA AS NK DS SD N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://p9.courseval.net/etw/ets/et.asp
Survey Report

Q13 The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear?  
50% 33% 17% 0 0 6 1.67 503 1.54 70

The instructor’s oral and written responses to my work
stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and
suggested solutions?

Q14 100% 0 0 0 0 6 1.00 503 1.58 14


Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

Question: What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1 Honestly, the most challenging aspect was reading the Brandt chapters, and those weren't terribly difficult.
2 The number of similar papers we had to work on all at the same time. I don't think it would have been quite so bad if we had finished a paper before beginning the next paper or if the papers were not so similar.
3 there was just a lot of work and sometimes it was overwhelming
4 Keeping up with the class and the schedule of assignments due. Most weeks we had multiple things due, even over the weekend. So keeping everything on track was what required the most planning. I also think that the concepts we learned challenged me to think outside the box, which I actually enjoyed. It wasn't just "here's a book, write a report on it." The whole semester was centered around central theme and we could each dive into it in our our way of thinking.
5 The only challenging this about this course was trying to come up with ways to talk about literacy. every assignment was about literacy and there is really only so much that you can say about literacy.
6 The reading was the most challenging.

Question: What were the strengths of this course?
Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1 It was well organized and Lauren was always available to help. She gave constructive feedback and asked frequently for our input on how to improve the class.
2 The teacher always provided awesome feedback on our assignments, which is probably the only reason I have been able to keep up.
3 It was well organized
4 It really helped to break down the process of writing step by step and make it easier to accomplish. Having to write papers for a college english class can be very intimidating, but this class makes it easier for everyone to be successful.
5 not a whole lot
6 The discussion board element, the instructor feedback, and the peer review.

Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities
Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1 They were well organized. The due dates were clear and not too time-intensive.
2 The class activities were interesting but way too similar. I am always getting the different assignments that we are working confused because they weren't very different from each other. However I really do love the personal literacy definition paper we are doing.
everything went well

I liked the activities for the most part. The peer review was mostly helpful. Although I wish it had of been required to be submitted in some other time frame than from a friday to sunday. With family and other obligations over the weekend, I found it hard to fit it in and to complete it to the level it was asked.

class activities were dumb. we had to respond to peoples posts. and it was awful because I usually had no opinion about the topic that was being talked about.

I am not sure what this means. I enjoyed the discussion posts. I suppose that was an activity, although they were also assignments. It was interesting to feel such a sense of community in an online course.

**Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments**

**Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)**

1. We had plenty of time to work on each assignment, and the due dates were clear and easy to accomplish.

   The class activities were interesting but way too similar. I am always getting the different assignments that we are working confused because they weren't very different from each other. However I really do love the personal literacy definition paper we are doing.

2. everything went well

   The most prominent assignment was the discussion posts. I am midly in favor of these. I am the type of person who likes to get my assignments, complete them and move on. I didn't find them to be all that helpful in the context of learning the material, but they did help to see what other's were thinking.

3. assignments were all easy

4. The assignments were perfect.

**Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts**

**Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)**

1. Brandt was complicated but understandable, and I learned a lot from reading it. They say I say was easier, and proved to be a helpful guide when completing assignments.

2. The text she has us read really do work well with the assignments and have helped.

3. the books were cost effective

4. I found Brandt to be very hard to comprehend. Although the semester was centered around the book, so I can see it's place.

5. I never read any of the texts.

6. The texts were hard but appropriate for a junior level class.

**Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials**

**Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)**

1. Lauren provided numerous materials to help us with the assignments, even including some materials that we weren't required to read or watch but that would help us if we found an assignment difficult.

2. The materials needed for the class were very reasonable.

3. fine

4. I think that the materials that were posted online were very helpful and detailed.

5. materials were not really needed and a waste of time

6. I bought e-books, and they sufficed.
Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?

Response Rate: 100.00%  (6 of 6)

1 None

2 The one thing I would change is the fact that we have to work on such similar papers at the same time. I think my papers could be better if I wasn't trying to focus on multiple papers at once.

3 n/a

4 Nothing really.

5 I would change up the assignments because ever assignment was about the same topic and it became redundant.

6 I did not like making videos, but the instructor was kind in letting us choose how to post. I thought that was a great idea.

Faculty: Obermark, Lauren E

Question: What were the strengths of your instructor?

Response Rate: 100.00%  (6 of 6)

Lauren was always available to help. She checked email daily, responding quickly and making sure that all of my questions were answered. She was always aware of issues that the class seemed to be having and addressed them efficiently.

2 Amazing feedback!!!!!!

3 She was nice and well organized
   
I really like the way she approaches teaching. It takes the anxiety out of writing and makes it seem like it is easier to accomplish. I also like her feedback on papers. Very detailed and can take whatever you have and give insight into taking it further.

5 She was very nice and helpful when I did need help and she was always there to help.

6 She was a perfect instructor. She put a lot of effort towards this class. She was fair in grading. She was always timely. She was kind, and her feedback was amazing.
Obermark Gitner Award Portfolio 2013

ENGLISH - OVERALL

**Course: 13580 - 019**

*Responses: Yes=2 [N] No=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Responses / Survey Responses used for Comparisons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>111 / 221</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 0 5 0 5 0 5 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course: 13580 - 019**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Responses / Survey Responses used for Comparisons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71 / 519</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4 5 4 5 4 5 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course: 13580 - 019**

*Responses: SD Strongly agree to strongly disagree (25 responses) (5 responses)

| Overall Mean | 2.00 |
| 2.00 | YES/NO (10 responses) |
| 4.58 | SD 3.89 SD to SA (4 responses)

**Course: 13580 - 019**

*Responses: Expected: 5 / 20

Department: English

University of Missouri - St. Louis

Survey Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Individual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Overall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Mean**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: Individual**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Responses: English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This course allowed me to express myself in new ways of writing and communicating. The readings and information I received in this class I know I

and the fact that we did not just write a paper every week.
3 The course was more concerned about the content. The grammar was not the most important part which I really liked. I enjoyed the projects we did.

I

THE DISCUSSION BOARD

1 This course is very organized, and it is clear what is expected.

Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)

Question: What were the strengths of this course?

The entire class was a challenge but it was a good challenge and I really liked the class.

2 AL/ THE WRITING

I keeping up with the workload.

Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)

Question: What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pct = Percentile Rank (Higher is Better)</th>
<th>Survey Responses used for comparisons: 111 / 211</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Individuals / Survey Responses used for comparisons: 111 / 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pct = Percentile Rank (Higher is Better)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thought, problems, and suggested solutions.

The instructors' clear and written responses to my work stimulated further

The instructors' expectations for assignments were clear.

The instructors' teaching was effective.

The instructors' clear and written responses to my work stimulated further

The instructors' expectations for assignments were clear.

The instructors' teaching was effective.

The instructors' clear and written responses to my work stimulated further

The instructors' expectations for assignments were clear.

The instructors' teaching was effective.

The instructors' clear and written responses to my work stimulated further

The instructors' expectations for assignments were clear.

The instructors' teaching was effective.
They say I say broke down reading, writing, and effective communication. Brisk literacy in American lives was a challenging but awesome

1. The brisk book took a while to get into but it was very helpful at the end

2. HEAVILY INVOLVED

3. The brisk book is very interesting. It starts slow but picks up nicely.

4. **Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)**

   Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments.

   The assignments were a bit intimidating at first but they got your mind working and then became enjoyable.

   Take the literal profile and turn it into this fun interactive presentation.

   The assignments were good and they applied with what we were learning and then they formed into one another as well. There was plenty of time to complete them as well so I was never rushed to get it done.

   The assignments worked well. All three of my English classes in college was writing about writing, so the topic makes the class feel repetitive.

5. **Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)**

   Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments.

   They were very engaging.

   And learn about. We really did have class activities per say because we were online.

   The class was online so you know what was expected of you on a weekly basis. The activities were helpful and even more substance. It helped us form our ideas.

6. **Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)**

   Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities.

   The sequence, creatively is limited.

   This course challenged me to think in a creative way. A way of thinking that I haven't done in so long because in the academic setting, especially in

   didn't fall behind but stayed right on track

   The instructor was very helpful and always made herself available to meet with during or around office hours.
The assignments were fun and showed where the teachers were horrible and this was not one of them. Emphasis in a theory matter. I really enjoyed her class and part of the reason was because she was a great online instructor. I have had online classes before and not have used it in the class instead of being introduced to it so late then having to do a final big project with it and not ever have used it. I believe many students have not used this before and it would have been nice to have maybe had a mock class activity or assignment with it earlier. I introduce prezi earlier in the semester giving students more time to work with it and play with it. I know the literacy exhibit comes last that's a good move she does a great job of it!

4. none

5. none to work at least harder

4. I would change the topic of the major assignment.

3. not sure what to put here

2. A lot

1. The extra materials for the course are helpful. Prezi helps and databases.

5. Great material

4. All materials online were helpful. The links to databases and article databases helped research in this class a lot.

3. not sure what to put here

2. A lot

1. The extra materials for the course are helpful. Prezi helps and databases.

5. The books were a challenge but I was for the best because I actually read it my undergrad and it was more fulfilling afterwards because I learned and developed our literacy. The books were great assets to the class.

4. Read that looked into literacy and it impact and development on Americans. We read about Library sponsors and their influential role on how we

3. She is very active in the class and available for help.

2. She is very approachable in the class and available for help.

1. She is very approachable in the class and available for help.

Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)

Question: What were the strengths of your instructor?

Faculty: Obermark, Lauren E.

Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)

Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?

5. Great material

4. All materials online were helpful. The links to databases and article databases helped research in this class a lot.

3. not sure what to put here

2. A lot

1. The extra materials for the course are helpful. Prezi helps and databases.

5. The books were a challenge but I was for the best because I actually read it my undergrad and it was more fulfilling afterwards because I learned and developed our literacy. The books were great assets to the class.

4. Read that looked into literacy and it impact and development on Americans. We read about Library sponsors and their influential role on how we

3. She is very active in the class and available for help.

2. She is very approachable in the class and available for help.

1. She is very approachable in the class and available for help.
### University of Missouri - St. Louis
### Department of English
### Course Evaluation

#### Course #: Eng5950  Semester: Fall 2014  Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) **This course challenged me intellectually:**

   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) **This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:**

   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) **The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:**

   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) **The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:**

   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) **The instructor's teaching was effective:**

   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) **This course was required:**

   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) **I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:**

   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) **The grade I expect to receive:**

   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F
   - [ ] I don't know

9) **The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:**

   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

---

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

11) Comment specifically on the following:
   Class activities
   Assignments
   Texts
   Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
### Course Evaluation

**Course #** ENGL 5950  **Semester:** Fall 2014  **Instructor:** *Obermark*

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
- [ ] Always
- [ ] Usually
- [ ] Some of the time
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
- [ ] A
- [ ] B
- [ ] C
- [ ] D
- [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
   Keeping up with reading & challenging myself with our independent work & projects.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   Class activities
   There were always engaging & thought-provoking creating great opportunities for discussion & developing good class relationships.

   Assignments
   Practical & tailored to interest within the course challenging yet felt worthwhile.

   Texts
   A mix of dense & lighter narrative – core to mix scholarly & literary.

   Materials (including online)
   Very organized & thorough – MUCH appreciated!

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
   She always has clear expectations & works hard to be sure everyone has access and has a voice in class.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
   None!

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
   Obermark is by far the most engaging, enthusiastic, and organized professor I’ve had at UMBC!
   I wish I could take every class with her 😊
On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) This course required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
1.0) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
   The most challenging aspect was completing all of the assignments on time.

1.1) Comment specifically on the following:

   Class activities
   The class was always interesting and kept me engaged.

   Assignments
   There were a lot of assignments but they were all different which was nice.

   Texts
   Most of the texts were great.

   Materials (Including online)
   All the materials were easily accessible.

1.2) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
   Dr. Obermark is great at responding to student work and giving productive feedback that actually helped improve assignments.

1.3) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
   I wouldn't make any.

1.4) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
   I enjoyed this class and professor. Dr. Obermark obviously cares about her students and topic and it makes for a great course.
Course Evaluation

Course #: 5950
Semester: Fall 201
Instructor: Laura Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [x] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [x] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
   - [x] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

It was a brand new area of study for me, one that I had never studied before (disability studies).

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities
Very flexible, accessible, with good challenging variety.

Assignments
Appropriately challenging amount of assignments we give.

Texts
Very recent and relevant texts - addressed a wide variety of issues within disability studies.

Materials (including online)
Always posted, well organized, easy to find & manage. Very thorough online postings.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Dr. Obermark cares about her students, what they learn, how they learn, and has a great passion for what she's doing. Of course, disability studies.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

NA

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

I am very thankful to have had Dr. Obermark. Like I mentioned she is very thorough & passionate, communicates everything extremely well, and she gives ample feedback on all assignments.
### University of Missouri - St. Louis
#### Department of English
#### Course Evaluation

**Course #: 5950-02**  
**Semester: FALL 2014**  
**Instructor: Obermark**

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

3) The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

4) The instructor’s oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree
- [ ] I didn’t read

5) The instructor’s teaching was effective:
- [ ] Strongly agree
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
- [ ] Disagree
- [ ] Strongly Disagree

6) This course was required:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
- [ ] Always
- [ ] Usually
- [ ] Some of the time
- [ ] Rarely
- [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
- [ ] A
- [ ] B
- [ ] C
- [ ] D
- [ ] F

9) The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear:
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

I had troubles with online discussions, so those were the most challenging. Also, meeting my own expectations.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

- Class activities
  - Engaging.
- Assignments
  - There was a very reasonable number of assignments.
- Texts
  - We struggled through one together, but overall, they were very good.
- Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Dr. Obermark is clearly passionate about the topic, and really encouraged us to take ownership of the class and get out of it.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

n/a

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
University of Missouri - St. Louis  
Department of English  
Course Evaluation  
Course #: 5950  
Semester: Fall 2014  
Instructor: Obermark  

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree  
   - Agree  
   - Neither agree nor disagree  
   - Disagree  
   - Strongly disagree  

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree  
   - Agree  
   - Neither agree nor disagree  
   - Disagree  
   - Strongly disagree  

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree  
   - Agree  
   - Neither agree nor disagree  
   - Disagree  
   - Strongly disagree  

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree  
   - Agree  
   - Neither agree nor disagree  
   - Disagree  
   - Strongly disagree  
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree  
   - Agree  
   - Neither agree nor disagree  
   - Disagree  
   - Strongly disagree  

6) This course was required:
   - Yes  
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always  
   - Usually  
   - Some of the time  
   - Rarely  
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A  
   - C  
   - D  
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes  
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
The texts were somewhat difficult at times, but that wasn’t a bad thing.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

**Class activities**
Discussions were lively and fun!

**Assignments**
I LOVED the variety and freedom we had to put our own spin on things.

**Texts**

**Materials (including online)**
LOVED the discussion board element & extra non-required readings that were shared.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
So many things. I honestly can’t say enough good things about Dr. Obermark. She’s fantastic.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
Wouldn’t change anything—truthfully. Wonderful class.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Again, I can’t say enough great things about Dr. Obermark. She’s a true asset to this university and one of the best professors I’ve had. Give her tenure & a raise immediately!

Thank you for a wonderful learning experience
On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class? Keeping up with the weekly reading assignments.

11) Comment specifically on the following:
   - Class activities: 
     - Sincerely engaging
   - Assignments: 
     - Practical, hands-on
     - Applicable to my life as an educator
   - Texts: 
     - Relevant, thought-provoking
   - Materials (including online): 
     - Easily accessible.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course? This course challenged the way in which I see the world. My eyes have been opened to a group of individuals who are marginalized and often discriminated against. Obermark’s design of the class ultimately enabled me to do something with the information I learned (instead of merely discussing it or writing another essay).

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor. Obermark truly has a way of breaking down challenging ideas into bite-size bits that are totally applicable to everyday life and her teaching takes on an entirely deeper level because so.
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: 6950   Semester: Fall 14   Instructor: Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn't read

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree
   - I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - Strongly agree
   - Agree
   - Neither agree nor disagree
   - Disagree
   - Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - Yes
   - No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Some of the time
   - Rarely
   - Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - A
   - B
   - C
   - D
   - F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - Yes
   - No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The most challenging aspect of this course was the content. Disability Studies is an entirely new genre of English of which I was previously unaware. Therefore, grasping the terminology and the concepts was challenging.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

There were many activities.

Assignments

I spent a lot of time on the annotated bib, lit analysis essay, gallery presentation, and final project. I felt like one of these assignments could have possibly been cut (?) when comparing previous course expectations from other grad courses.

Texts

Relevant and well-selected.

Materials (including online)

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Instructor strengths include creative class activities and very thorough feedback on assignments.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

I would pare down some of the assignments in order to allow more focus to be spent producing one or two quality pieces of work. I also hate blackboards! This may just be me, but I feel like it stifle(s) classroom discussion when folks feel like they’ve already said (and shared) what they had to say online.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Overall, I believe this course has a lot of value for English Studies students. This course took a different direction from traditional English courses. I enjoyed our meetings every week!
University of Missouri - St. Louis
Department of English
Course Evaluation

Course #: 5950   Semester: Fall 2014   Instructor: Lauren Obermark

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [ ] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [ ] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
   Applying the readings in a unique way to a topic of interest.
   It provided an opportunity to do a lot of learning outside of class
   prompted by what was done in class.

11) Comment specifically on the following:
   Class activities
   A lot of diversity and new approaches helped to look at topics
   from multiple perspectives and forced me out of my comfort zone.

   Assignments
   The freedom in assignments gave me a chance to learn in
   class & outside, my own way and apply things in ways that have
   an application outside the classroom.

   Texts
   Good.

   Materials (including online)
   Always more than enough resources!

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?
   Knowledge of material; willingness for freedom & diversity
   of assignments

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?
   None.

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

NA
University of Missouri - St. Louis  
Department of English  
Course Evaluation  
Course # ENGL 5950  Semester: Fall 2014  Instructor: Gitner

On questions 1 - 9, check the box that most closely represents your response.

1) This course challenged me intellectually:
   - [ ] Strongly agree
   - [x] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree
   - [ ] I didn't read

5) The instructor's teaching was effective:
   - [x] Strongly agree
   - [ ] Agree
   - [ ] Neither agree nor disagree
   - [ ] Disagree
   - [ ] Strongly disagree

6) This course was required:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [x] No

7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:
   - [x] Always
   - [ ] Usually
   - [ ] Some of the time
   - [ ] Rarely
   - [ ] Never

8) The grade I expect to receive:
   - [ ] A
   - [ ] B
   - [ ] C
   - [ ] D
   - [x] F

9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:
   - [ ] Yes
   - [x] No

PLEASE TURN OVER
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

The work itself and new theories challenged me to think in ways I hadn't before.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

Class activities

Variety, engaging

Assignments

Many different ones - a benefit to learning!

Flexible

Texts

Different formats allowed me to engage the content in different ways:

Materials (including online)

Multimodal materials helped with retention.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

Strong content, genuine and helpful feedback, intuitive teacher.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

N/A

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.

Dr. Obermark is an asset to UMSL. She greatly enhanced my graduate studies experience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) This course challenged me intellectually:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) The instructor's oral and written response to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instructor's teaching was effective:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) This course was required:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course:</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) The instructor's English pronunciation was clear:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

   Everything! But in a good way. It was challenging
   because it made me rethink how I view disability,
   and it was challenging because there was a lot of
   in-depth work.

11) Comment specifically on the following:

   Class activities: great - I enjoyed the activities that got
   us to move around the room and interact
   in ways we don't usually in a seminar.

   Assignments:
   It felt like a lot, but maybe it was how they
   were assigned. Felt like it slowed down at the
   end, which was good.

   Texts:
   Relevant, nothing seemed out of place

   Materials (including online):
   Everything was easy to access and seemed
   purposeful.

12) What were the strengths of your instructor and this course?

   Extraordinarily knowledgeable, but open to
   new/different perspectives/interpretations.

13) What if any changes would you make in this course to improve your learning?

   None that I can think of...

14) Please use this space for any additional comments about the course or your instructor.
She was open and available, could come to her and connect her openly with any questions or concerns.

She made us feel that we could come to her and connect her openly with any questions or concerns.

She made us feel that we could come to her and connect her openly with any questions or concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>%0.00%</th>
<th>%0.00%</th>
<th>%0.00%</th>
<th>2.86%</th>
<th>2.86%</th>
<th>%2.43%</th>
<th>72.86%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>%0.00%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>76.99%</td>
<td>76.99%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%0.00%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%0.00%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>%0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This class’s averages:

- Strongly Agree: 79.3%
- Agree: 6.6%
- Neither: 6.6%
- Disagree: 1.2%
- Strongly Disagree: 0.6%

Departmental averages:

- Strongly Agree: 42.8%
- Agree: 42.8%
- Neither: 5.7%
- Disagree: 4.2%
- Strongly Disagree: 1.2%

This page contains a table with multiple-choice questions and a section titled "Obermark Gitner Award Portfolio 238." It appears to be part of a student's portfolio or assessment. The table includes responses from different groups or classes, showing percentages for strong agreement, agreement, neither, disagreement, and strong disagreement. The percentages range from 0.6% to 35.6%, with a significant number indicating strong agreement or agreement (79.3% and 6.6%, respectively). The final page seems to contain some text related to the portfolio, possibly a signature or a statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1)</th>
<th>2)</th>
<th>3)</th>
<th>4)</th>
<th>5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72.00%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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20 students
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>0.00%</th>
<th>7.50%</th>
<th>25.00%</th>
<th>67.50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>12.50%</th>
<th>25.00%</th>
<th>62.50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Lauren Obermark
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Departmental Averages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>neither</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This class's averages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Laruen Odenmark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENG 1100-012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FS13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>%</th>
<th>100.00%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**22 Students**
### English FS2014 Survey

#### Course: 13392 019 - ENGL 3100 (INT)-Junior-Level Writing

#### Responsible Faculty: Lauren Obermark

#### Department: English

#### Responses / Expected: 6 / 19

#### Overall Mean:
- 4.76 SB389 SD to SA (29 responses)
- 2.00 Yes/No (12 responses)
- 1.67 Always to Rarely (6 responses)
- 1.50 A to Don't know/unsure (6 responses)
- 1.00 Strongly Agree to Strongly disagree (30 responses)

--- Survey Comparisons ---

#### SB389 Educational Outcomes

**Q1** The syllabus clearly expressed the goals, expectations, and the nature of the course.

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2** The course required that I come to class ready and prepared.

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q3** Information was available so I could track my academic performance during the semester.

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q4** This course expanded my analytical thinking, my technical skills, my creativity, my knowledge, and/or my competence.

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--- Survey Comparisons ---

#### ENGLISH - OVERALL

**Q5** This course was required?

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:** [YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1

**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

--- Survey Comparisons ---

#### ENGLISH - OVERALL

**Q6** This course challenged me intellectually?

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q7** This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning?

**Responses (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q13 The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear?

The instructor's oral and written responses to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions?

100% 0 0 0 0 6 1.00 596 1.61 10

Q14

100% 0 0 0 0 6 1.00 596 1.56 11


Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

Question: What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1 keeping on track on the project, hard to determine which one we are working on.

2 Multi tasking with assignments

3 Waiting on students to post their work so that we could get our assignments done, since they were response posts.

4 I hate doing research papers. I hate doing a gob of work, doing what I am told to do in feedback, and then being told I have to do gobs more. This is not the teachers's fault though; it is just the way it goes in courses that require research papers-something I am not good at, partially because of lack of time, partially because I struggle with the technology, and partially because I'm not good at picking the right angle when I start. Also, no Internet at home was a worse problem than I thought.

5 I believe the submission deadlines were the most challenging part of the course. I am not use to Friday night submissions. As I had other assignments due throughout each week, I often found myself completing assignments on Friday evenings. That was definitely new to me, and hard to adjust to.

6 The most challenging aspect of this course was becoming familiar with the schedule. Many assignments, though consistent from week to week, were due on various days. Having 3 other online courses made this difficult to remember.

Question: What were the strengths of this course?

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1 learned a lot about how to create a proper paper with valid resources.

2 The content of the course, that brought more to the table than your average class did. And I did enjoy this professor. I also enjoy the concept of group peer review.

3 The professor. Always offered encouraging, helpful, intelligent insight to our work.

Teacher knows what she is doing and she picked good texts and good themes for papers. She was extremely helpful when I went to her office and she has a friendly, humble attitude. I dreaded this class more than any other but it wound up being a very good class, though I'm still struggling to fight with my final research paper to try to get through it. Lauren Obermark is the best English teacher I ever had of all I can remember having.

4 I loved having a chance for some easy extra credit.

5 Clear syllabus. Very clear syllabus!

6 The strengths of this course were the details provided for each assignment/essay/task and the feedback provided until/upon completion. Groundwork was always laid in advance, and the instructor did everything possible to permit success.

Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities

https://p9.courseval.net/etw/ets/et.asp
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Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  F  DK  N  Mean</td>
<td>A  U  R  N  Mean</td>
<td>N  Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% 50% 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q8 The grade I expect to receive: 


Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### SB389 - Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD  D  N  A  SA  N  Mean</td>
<td>SD  D  N  A  Mean</td>
<td>N  Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 33% 67% 6</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q10 The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her, via e-mail, phone, discussion board, office hours, or appointment time.


Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES  NO  N  Mean</td>
<td>YES  NO  N  Mean</td>
<td>N  Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% 0 6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 The instructor's English pronunciation was clear?

Responses: [YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1

Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses (%)</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA  AS  NK  DS  SD  N  Mean</td>
<td>SA  AS  NK  DS  Mean</td>
<td>N  Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% 0 0 0 0 6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

the weekly artifact presentations helped to create discussion throughout the class

I greatly appreciate the Prezi assignment, The professor cared enough to bring something new to the table that maybe we hadn't seen before.

Class activities, like artifact presentations and group work (mostly our peer reviews), helped me to gain a better understanding of those whom I worked with and the goals our professor had in mind.

discussion board and peer feedback good

There were a lot of activities going on throughout the week, sometimes it is hard to keep up with.

I especially enjoyed the group discussions, and peer review. Being an online course, it can be tough to find people with whom you can communicate. I also appreciated each essay being spread throughout the course of the semester- this allowed for extensive revision and writing development.

Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

the final paper was awesome because it brought together the entire semesters work.

I liked the way they were different assignments all occurring at the same time, But they all had something to do specifically with the course, they all tied in together.

The assignments each week felt excessive. With 3 responses to discussions each week, along with our own discussion posts, along with peer reviews, not to mention major assignments, it just felt like the amount of responses were just a little excessive.

I liked the interviewing. With prezi, it was hard finding folks to help me undo what the "undo" button did not undo for me. I forgot the teacher gave us a video to watch, so I don't know how much trouble I would have had otherwise if I had remembered it and watched it.

Personal literacy paper okay. I hate research papers so there is no way that I can say I liked it; I only liked the interviewing part of it. It was kind of cool to learn to do the video for the artifact.

The assignments all correlate very well, which was helpful in development throughout the semester.

The Prezi assignment was a great way to exhibit our major writing. I didn't like the weekly discussions, however. I think that some weeks, we simply just needed discussions to be open, where we could vent,

ask one another questions, or just allow our responses to be more natural. I found that with the prompts of the discussions, because the instructor made suggestions for writing topics, everyone ended up saying the same thing.

Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

the texts were helpful

One was difficult to follow, but I still learned from it. The other one 'they say I say' I enjoyed a lot

I liked the texts, Literacy in American Lives and They Say I Say were interesting and helped me gain a better insight on literacy in general.

Good texts--sometimes boring, sometimes interesting, but good. I exuberantly love that Lauren did not require us to read lust, gore or cuss words.

na

I'll be honest and say that I didn't read all of the assigned text. As I stated above, everyone said the same thing in the discussion, so often times, I would use everyone's summary to get the gist of the reading.
Having a full schedule in school and out, the time to read the text wasn't always there. The chapters I did read, however, were thought provoking and definitely help me to sustain success in this course.

**Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials**

**Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)**

1. the materials were helpful and resoureful
2. It was just the books so I guess not applicable
3. The materials, like the texts, were necessary.
4. Other reading materials were very helpful. No lust, cuss words, or gore, which is wonderful.
5. na
6. Not sure what the "materials" were for this course. As stated above, the instructor provided written and media outlines as examples for each assignment. These were helpful.

**Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?**

**Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)**

1. nope
2. I really don't have any suggestions or changes. Maybe one or two more assignments from the book 'they say I say'
3. I would reduce the weekly work load so that the student could focus more on the major assignments.
   I would tell students what I found out by chance at the library—that articles that are ordered can many times show up online and can be printed. I found this out early with another class so I knew it for her class. I had thought any interlibrary loan articles would be in books that we would not be allowed to take out of the library. Sometimes we students could not find what we looked for on the blackboard. I think it needs consolidation of some parts.
4. The submission days of the general course due dates.
5. This course and the way it was structured under this instructor was enough to improve learning.

**Faculty: Obermark, Lauren E**

**Question: What were the strengths of your instructor?**

**Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)**

1. great teacher all around very helpful!
2. It was very clear she wanted you to succeed, but still challenged you in the course. She had tools available to help you succeed and always made herself available.
   Lauren was absolutely wonderful. She is clearly meant to be an professor and teach English. Her great attitude, intentions for the class, and weekly enthusiasm made it a blast to learn and be a part of her class, which is hard to do for an online class.
   I already answered this question above. I have had a lot of teachers at UMSL. One deserved to be thrown out; I heard later she was. Some are okay, some are good. Lauren is one of the great ones. My loathing for doing research papers is not a reason to think otherwise. She is dedicated and puts gobs of time into her work.
   Lauren's feedback, and optimistic energy (even via sole online communication) was influential.
3. Her feedback is very sincere, in depth, and helpful all around.
Her feedback was amazing, her encouragement was gratifying, and her willingness to assist us with assignments and permit extra time made this course the best one I've taken on this campus...ever.
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#### English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of Courses / Survey Responses used for Comparisons:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>111 / 252</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Course:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Pct</th>
<th>Mean English</th>
<th>Mean Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SB399 - Educational Outcomes

**The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Report:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This course challenged me intellectually:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The grade I expect to receive:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Do I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Write thoughtful and analytical papers.
2. Being able to remember to do the journal entries.
3. There was not a challenging part of this class.
4. The most challenging aspect of the class was writing. I am not a good writer so hence it was really hard.
5. Writing all these essays.
6. The larger research essays that require students to use secondary sources.
7. Writing a claim's paper because I have never done one before, but I learned how to write one after taking this class.
8. Critical thinking skills and development of the thought process.

Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)

Question: What were the strengths of this course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neutral/don't know</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>[DK]</th>
<th>[N]</th>
<th>[F]</th>
<th>[AS]</th>
<th>Percent of respondents used for comparisons: 111 / 521</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)

Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments

1. I don't believe all of the assignments were completely necessary, like they were chosen by someone who would not be teaching the course. Some of them were not relevant to the text in her curriculum.
2. I enjoyed some of the assignments.
3. Fair amount of assignments and very easy to balance out with other classes that I had.
4. There was not a lot of assignments. The assignments that we did have were long and hard, but challenging.
5. This was a good paper due to the comments. The professor gives you in accordance to the paper. Essays are turned in via Microsoft Word and are very

Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)

Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities

1. Class activities were very involving and also challenging insightful. These were very many open ended discussions and a majority of the class participated, allowing classmates to be able to acknowledge other points of view.
2. Naturally, I do not like class activities but these activities were very helpful.
3. Very helpful since they were related to what was being written.
4. Class activities where good and educational, but were not always necessary to complete the assignments.
5. Group activities such as peer reviews, class discussion on topics, before class, after class, was helpful.
6. We read and wrote almost everyday in the class. If you didn't read or write in the class, you most likely had reading and writing to do for homework.
7. Always engaging and interesting. Essay problems and short essay problems and short answers always help me understand the material.
8. Class activities are fun, helps the class for essay writing.

Professor Oakmarm provided us with materials useful in helping us improve our writing such as the reverse outlining method which was helpful with organizing our essays. Another strong point was that our readings were well chosen and they helped prepare us for our written assignments and expectations.

Instructor proved better writer for their everyday lives.

The instructor was very good at making this course as easy as possible. The instructor empathized with students often and it made us feel like the student.

My personal strengths were writing the essays.
I'm not sure what kind of materials is this survey asking for, but the syllabus was great and describes the expectations of the class very well.

The materials we had to bring in class were copies of the writing of reading we had assigned to us. The instructor and the syllabus say that we were

1. I don't really understand the question. Materials required for course? They were reasonable.
2. Materials given was just right for this type of class.
3. The materials were written in the syllabus so I knew what was expected of me.
4. I received have a copy of our writing with us in class, but many times a student could have gotten away without a copy with them.
5. A lot of paper, and link, printer link.
6. The materials we had to bring in class were copies of the writing of reading we had assigned to us. The instructor and the syllabus say that we were

Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials

Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)

none

About writing formats can be found online.

was the easy writer which is required for the class. I did not like it because although it is helpful, it was 30 dollars and some of the things mentioned

1. I agreed most of the texts we read because all of them were helpful for preparing us for college level writing. The only text that I didn't necessarily like is
2. The easy writer was read online because everything in the book can be read online. The novel "uses on the boundary", that were assigned to
3. The easy writer was one that was not necessary and a book that could just not be a requirement.
4. Most of the texts were provided by pdf or word document, but the two books that we had to buy I did not use a whole lot.
5. Professor gives texts in class, and also post them on my gateway in case we lose copys.
6. I read the easy writer was provided by pdf or word document, but the two books that we had to buy I did not use a whole lot.
7. The easy writer was one that was not necessary and a book that could just not be a requirement.
8. Some of the things we read were interesting, but some seem as though the teacher was not the one who picked them, as though she was simply forced to

Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts

Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)

Assignments are not relatively difficult. It enhances the thought process very well

and receiving feedback from them.

because the topics were always ones that thinking of being able to respond to what we read. I also liked responding to my classmates' Journal entries

I enjoyed writing journal entries because I was able to provide my opinions on our readings of what about my own experiences. I also liked them

The assignments aren't very hard if the student can manage their time well. Also, additional help from the instructor can ease the writing process.

Survey Report
Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

Question: What were the strengths of your instructor?

Faculty: Obermark, Lauren E.

1. She was very conversational and very relatable. She was very easy to talk to and made the class really enjoyable with her enthusiasm and knowledge of the topics she discussed.
2. Lauren is a fantastic teacher. She is very easy to talk to and very relatable.
3. The way she was very clear with what needed to be done to receive the grade one is hoping for. Also the feedback given in class, because if I was able to get me to understand things I didn't think I'd be able to.
4. Nothing, the teacher taught the course really great. She really wants people to succeed, which was a huge help.
5. The course was fairly easy and straightforward and thanks to the instructor for teaching the course well.
6. None
7. No journal entries. However, more focused worksheets towards essay writing skills.
8. Every thing that you will expect that a professor to have.

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?

1. There is not really anything I would change per se about the course to improve learning.
2. I don’t think I could do anything.
3. Aligning the teacher to be more relatable with what she wants you to absorb for essays.
4. I do not necessarily have any changes that I would make.
5. Nothing, the teacher taught the course really great. She really wants people to succeed, which was a huge help.
6. The course was fairly easy and straightforward and thanks to the instructor for teaching the course well.
7. No journal entries. However, more focused worksheets towards essay writing skills.
8. Every thing that you will expect that a professor to have.

Each class period which told us what we will be covering in class that day. It helped us come to class prepared.
**Course:** ENGL 1100 (RSD)-First-Year Writing

**Department:** English

**Responsible Faculty:** Lauren Obermark

**Responses / Expected:** 8 / 22 (36.36%)

**Overall Mean:**
- SB389 SD to SA (8 responses): 4.50
- Yes/No (8 responses): 2.00
- Strongly Agree to Strongly disagree (24 responses): 1.17

**SB389 - Educational Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her, via e-mail, phone, discussion board, office hours, or appointment time.</td>
<td>SD D N A SA N Mean N Mean</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 7 8 4.50 520 4.37 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses Individual English</th>
<th>SD D N A SA N Mean N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 The instructor's English pronunciation was clear?</td>
<td>YES NO N Mean N Mean</td>
<td>8 0 8 2.00 521 1.99 52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Survey Comparisons**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses Individual English</th>
<th>SD D N A SA N Mean N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q3 The instructor's teaching was effective?</td>
<td>SA AS NK DS SD N Mean N Mean</td>
<td>7 1 0 0 0 8 1.13 521 1.84 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear?</td>
<td>5 3 0 0 0 8 1.38 521 1.85 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 The instructor's oral and written responses to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions?</td>
<td>8 0 0 0 0 8 1.00 521 1.78 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

**Response Rate:** 100.00% (8 of 8)

1. The most challenging aspect of the class was probably picking essay topics and writing about them that sounds very generic, but it can be rather difficult when there are not really any guidelines as to what to write about.
2. Being able to remember to do the journal entries.
3. There was not a challenging part of this class.
4. The most challenging aspect of the class was writing. I am not a good writer so hence it was really hard.
5. Writing all these essays.
6. The larger research essays that require students to use secondary sources.
7. Writing a claim's paper because I have never done one before, but I learned how to write one after taking this class.
8. Critical thinking skills and development of the thought process.

**Question:** What were the strengths of this course?

**Response Rate:** 100.00% (8 of 8)

1. It seemed to really involve my insight, and I really enjoyed that. I liked reading in between the lines of certain texts and applying my knowledge to write thoughtful and analytical papers.
2. My personal strengths were writing the essays.
3. I would have to say the strength of this class would be the small size to receive a good relationship with students and professor.
4. One strength of this course was that it taught us how to organize, write, and revise educational papers.
5. Making a student a better writer for their everyday lives.
6. The instructor was very good at making this course as easy as possible. The instructor empathized with students often, and it made us feel like the instructor cared about our success.
7. Professor Obermark provided us with materials useful in helping us improve our writing such as the “reverse outlining” method which was helpful with organizing our essays. Another strength was the readings assigned because they helped prepare us for our written assignments and expectations.
8. Critical thinking skills
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I don't believe all of the assignments were completely necessary, like they were chosen by someone who would not be teaching the course. Some of the text that we read was very basic and unnecessary as well, again, as though the teacher was simply forced to involve the text in her curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I enjoyed some of the assignments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fair amount of assignments and very easy to balance out with other classes that I had.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. There was not a lot of assignments. The assignments that we did have were long and hard, but challenging.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Journals, as long as they are done in time, you are given full points for it. Drafts weren't really a requirement but would help you get a &quot;better&quot; grade for the final paper due to the comments the Professor gives you in accordance to the paper. Essays are turned in via myGateway which is very convenient.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The assignments aren't very hard if the student can manage their time well. Also, additional help from the instructor can ease the writing process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I enjoyed writing journal entries because I was able to provide my opinions on our readings or write about my own experiences. I also liked them because the topics were always ones that thinking or being able to respond to what we read. I also liked responding to my classmate's journal entries and receiving feedback from them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Assignments are not relatively difficult. It enhances the thought process very well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Most of the texts were very interesting, but some seem as though the teacher was not the one who picked them, as though she was simply forced to involve the text in her curriculum. But, like I said, most of the texts were very good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some of the things we read were interesting but some were very boring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The easy writer was one that was not necessary and a book that could just not be a requirement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Most of the texts were provided by pdf or word document, but the two books that we had to buy I did not use a whole lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Professor gives texts in class, and also posts them on myGateway in case we lose our copy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Easy Writer book was pointless because everything in the book can be found online. The novel &quot;Lives on the Boundary&quot; that we were assigned to read seemed like a good book, but we were only assigned to read the first two chapters and the Afterword portion of the book. Most of the texts we used were given to us or we printed them out from MyGateway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I liked most of the texts we read because all of them were helpful for preparing us for college level writing. The only text that I didn't necessarily like was The Easy Writer which is required for the class. I did not like it because although it is helpful, it was 30 dollars and some of the things mentioned about writing formats can be found online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I don't really understand the question. Materials required for the course? They were reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Materials?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Material given was just right for this type of class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The materials were written in the syllabus so I knew what was expected of me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A lot of paper, and ink, printer ink.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The materials we had to bring to class were copies of the writing or reading we had assigned to us. The instructor and the syllabus say that we were required to always have a copy of our writing with us in class, but many times, a student could have gotten away without a copy with them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I'm not sure what kind of materials is this survey asking for, but the syllabus was great and described the expectations of the class very well. Examples of analyzing materials and instructions provided on myGateway/in class were great. I also liked the class agenda which was posted for each class period which told us what we will be covering in class that day, it helped us come to class prepared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (8 of 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There's not really anything I would change per se about the course to improve learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I don't think I would do anything.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Allowing the teacher to be more flexible with what she wants to assign for essays.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not necessarily have any changes that I would make.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nothing, the teacher taught the course really great that it makes me want to take it again, but the only thing that keeps me from it is the writing part.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The course was fairly easy and straightforward, and thanks to the instructor for teaching the course well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 no journal entries! However, more focused worksheets towards essay writing skills.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course:</th>
<th>13580 019 - ENGL 3100 (INT)-Junior-Level Writing</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Faculty:</td>
<td>Lauren Obermark</td>
<td>Responses / Expected:</td>
<td>5 / 20 (25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Mean:**
- SB389 SD to SA (5 responses): 4.80
- Yes/No (5 responses): 2.00
- Strongly Agree to Strongly disagree (15 responses): 1.13

**SB389 - Educational Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses Individual English Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her, via e-mail, phone, discussion board, office hours, or appointment time.</td>
<td>SD D N A SA N Mean N Mean Pct Rnk</td>
<td>0 0 1 4 5 4.80 520 4.37 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 The instructor's English pronunciation was clear?</td>
<td>YES NO N Mean</td>
<td>5 2.00 521 1.99 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 The instructor's teaching was effective?</td>
<td>SA AS NK DS SD N Mean</td>
<td>3 2 0 0 0 5 1.40 521 1.84 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 1.00 521 1.85 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 The instructor's oral and written responses to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 1.00 521 1.78 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question:** What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
**Response Rate:** 100.00% (5 of 5)
1. Keeping up with the workload."
2. ALL OF THE WRITING
3. The entire class was a challenge but it was a good challenge and I really liked the class.
4. We used a new software material called Prezi and we used this it convey ideas from a paper that we wrote and Prezi was very new to me and challenged me to tap into my creative side which I don't feel that I am very good at being creative but you had to use this software to complete your final project. Brandt's reading Literacy in American Lives was a bit challenging to read in the beginning.
5. writing

**Question:** What were the strengths of this course?
**Response Rate:** 100.00% (5 of 5)
1. This course is very organized, and it is clear what is expected."
2. THE DISCUSSION BOARD
3. The course was more concerned about the content. The grammar was not the most important part which I really liked. I enjoyed the projects we did and the fact that we did not just write a paper every week.
4. This course allowed to me express myself in new ways of writing and communication. The readings and information I received in this class I know I will take with me in my future writing. The instructor was very helpful and always made herself available to meet with during or around office hours. She showed us examples of how our writing should be before actually requiring us to do one ourselves. The class was paced at a speed that you didn't fall behind but stayed right on track
5. this course challenged me to think in a creative way. A way of thinking that I haven't done in so long because in the academic setting, especially in the sciences, creativity is limited.

**Question:** Comment specifically on the following: class activities
**Response Rate:** 100.00% (5 of 5)
1. This course has a large focus on blog posts. "It helps not having a blog post due the same week major assignments are due."
2. HEAVILY INVOLVED
3. The class activities were very helpful because they got us ready for our papers and projects. It helped us form our ideas.
4. The class was online so you knew what was expected of you on a weekly basis. The activities were helpful like artifact presentations were fun to read and learn about. We really did have class activities per say because we were online.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The assignments work well. All three of my English classes in college was writing about writing, so the topic makes the class feel repetitive.*</td>
<td>2. HEAVILY INVOLVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The assignments were good and they applied with what we were learning and then they folded into one another as well. There was plenty of time to complete them as well so I was never rushed to get it done.</td>
<td>3. The assignments were geared toward expanding our writing in new ways. The literacy profile made us dig deep into others experience with literacy and to write about it. The language memoir required us to think about and evaluate our own experiences with literacy. The literacy exhibit made us take the literacy profile and turn it into this fun interactive presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The assignments were a bit intimidating at first but they got your mind working and then became enjoyable.</td>
<td>5. The assignments were very engaging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The book by Brandt is very interesting. &quot;It starts slow but picks up nicely.&quot;</td>
<td>2. HEAVILY INVOLVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The brandt book took a while to get into but it was very helpful at the end</td>
<td>3. The Brandt Literacy in American Lives was a challenging but awesome read that looked into literacy and its impact and development on Americans. We read about literary sponsors and their influential role on how we learned and developed our literacy. The books were great assets to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The books were a challenge but it was for the best because I actually had to give it my undivided and it was more fulfilling afterwards because I knew what I had just read and I could tell you all about it and it challenge how I felt about the topics</td>
<td>5. The assignments were very engaging.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The extra materials for the course are helpful: prezi help and databases.*</td>
<td>2. A LOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. not sure what to put here</td>
<td>4. All materials online were helpful the links to tutorials and article databases helped research in this class a lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Great material</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?</th>
<th>Response Rate: 100.00% (5 of 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would change the topic of the major assignment.</td>
<td>2. YOU HAVE TO WORK REALLY HARD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. nope she does a great job!!!!!!</td>
<td>4. Introduce Prezi earlier in the semester giving students more time to work with it and play with it. I know the literacy exhibit comes last that's a good idea but many students have not used Prezi before and it would have been nice to have maybe had a mock class activity or assignment with it earlier in the class instead of being introduced to it so late then having to do a final big project with it and not ever have used it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### English Spring 2014 Survey
**SP2014**

**Course:** 14104 023 - ENGL 3100 (INT)-Junior-Level Writing  
**Department:** English  
**Responses / Expected:** 6 / 20 (30%)  

#### SB389 Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 The syllabus clearly expressed the goals, expectations, and the nature of the course.</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 The course required that I come to class ready and prepared.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Information was available so I could track my academic performance during the semester.</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 This course expanded my analytical thinking, my technical skills, my creativity, my knowledge, and/or my competence.</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

#### 14104 - 023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 This course was required?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:** [YES] Yes=2  [NO] No=1

**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

#### 14104 - 023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 This course challenged me intellectually?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

#### 14104 - 023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8 The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

#### 14104 - 023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:** [A] Always=1  [U] Usually=2  [R] Rarely=1

**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### SB389 - Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obermark, Lauren E</th>
<th>Educational Outcomes</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10 The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her, via e-mail, phone, discussion board, office hours, or appointment time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)
## Survey Comparisons

### Responses Individual English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11 The instructor's English pronunciation was clear?</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1

Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### Responses Individual English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12 The instructor's teaching was effective?</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q13 The instructor's expectations for assignments were clear?</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q14 The instructor's oral and written responses to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions?</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>NK</th>
<th>DS</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>N Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### Question: What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1. Honestly, the most challenging aspect was reading the Brandt chapters, and those weren't terribly difficult.
2. The number of similar papers we had to work on all at the same time. I don't think it would have been quite so bad if we had finished a paper before beginning the next paper or if the papers were not so similar.
3. There was just a lot of work and sometimes it was overwhelming.
4. Keeping up with the class and the schedule of assignments due. Most weeks we had multiple things due, even over the weekend. So keeping everything on track was what required the most planning. I also think that the concepts we learned challenged me to think outside the box, which I actually enjoyed. It wasn't just "here's a book, write a report on it." The whole semester was centered around central theme and we could each dive into it in our own way of thinking.
5. The only challenging this about this course was trying to come up with ways to talk about literacy. every assignment was about literacy and there is really only so much that you can say about literacy.
6. The reading was the most challenging.

### Question: What were the strengths of this course?

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1. It was well organized and Lauren was always available to help. She gave constructive feedback and asked frequently for our input on how to improve the class.
2. The teacher always provided awesome feedback on our assignments, which is probably the only reason I have been able to keep up.
3. It was well organized.
4. It really helped to break down the process of writing step by step and make it easier to accomplish. Having to write papers for a college english class can be very intimidating, but this class makes it easier for everyone to be successful.
5. Not a whole lot.
6. The discussion board element, the instructor feedback, and the peer review.

### Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities

Response Rate: 100.00% (6 of 6)

1. They were well organized. The due dates were clear and not too time-intensive.
2. The class activities were interesting but way too similar. I am always getting the different assignments that we are working confused because they weren't very different from each other. However I really do love the personal literacy definition paper we are doing.
3. Everything went well.
4. I liked the activities for the most part. The peer review was mostly helpful. Although I wish it had of been required to be submitted in some other time frame than from a friday to sunday. With family and other obligations over the weekend, I found it hard to fit it in and to complete it to the level it was asked.
5. Class activities were dumb. We had to respond to peoples posts. and it was awful because I usually had no opinion about the topic that was being talked about.
6. I am not sure what this means. I enjoyed the discussion posts. I suppose that was an activity, although they were also assignments. It was interesting to feel such a sense of community in an online course.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Comment specifically on the following: assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00% (6 of 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>We had plenty of time to work on each assignment, and the due dates were clear and easy to accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The class activities were interesting but way too similar. I am always getting the different assignments that we are working confused because they weren't very different from each other. However I really do love the personal literacy definition paper we are doing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Everything went well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The most prominent assignment was the discussion posts. I am middy in favor of these. I am the type of person who likes to get my assignments, complete them and move on. I didn't find them to be all that helpful in the context of learning the material, but they did help to see what other's were thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Assignments were all easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The assignments were perfect.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Comment specifically on the following: texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00% (6 of 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brandt was complicated but understandable, and I learned a lot from reading it. They Say I Say was easier, and proved to be a helpful guide when completing assignments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The text she has us read really do work well with the assignments and have helped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The books were cost effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I found Brandt to be very hard to comprehend. Although the semester was centered around the book, so I can see it's place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I never read any of the texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The texts were hard but appropriate for a junior level class.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>Comment specifically on the following: materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00% (6 of 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lauren provided numerous materials to help us with the assignments, even including some materials that we weren't required to read or watch but that would help us if we found an assignment difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The materials needed for the class were very reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I think that the materials that were posted online were very helpful and detailed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Materials were not really needed and a waste of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I bought e-books, and they sufficed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question:</th>
<th>What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate:</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00% (6 of 6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The one thing I would change is the fact that we have to work on such similar papers at the same time. I think my papers could be better if I wasn't trying to focus on multiple papers at once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nothing really.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would change up the assignments because every assignment was about the same topic and it became redundant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I did not like making videos, but the instructor was kind in letting us choose how to post. I thought that was a great idea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Course: ENGL 5890 (RSD)-Teaching College Writing

**Department:** English  
**Responsible Faculty:** Lauren Obermark  
**Responses / Expected:** 1 / 11 (9.09%)  
**Overall Mean:**  
- 2.00 Always to Rarely (1 response)  
- 1.80 SB389 SD to SA (5 responses)  
- 1.50 Yes/No (2 responses)  
- 1.00 A to Don’t know/unsure (1 response)  
- 1.00 Strongly Agree to Strongly disagree (5 responses)  

### SB389 Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 The syllabus clearly expressed the goals, expectations, and the nature of the course.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 The course required that I come to class ready and prepared.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Information was available so I could track my academic performance during the semester.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 This course expanded my analytical thinking, my technical skills, my creativity, my knowledge, and/or my competence.</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree = 1  
[D] Disagree = 2  
[N] Neutral = 3  
[A] Agree = 4  
[SA] Strongly Agree = 5  
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 This course was required?</td>
<td>0 1 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [YES] Yes = 2  
[NO] No = 1  
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 This course challenged me intellectually?</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning?</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [SA] Strongly agree = 1  
[AS] Agree somewhat = 2  
[NK] Neutral/don’t know = 3  
[DS] Disagree somewhat = 4  
[SD] Strongly disagree = 5  
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8 The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [A] A = 1  
[B] B = 2  
[C] C = 3  
[D] D = 4  
[F] F = 5  
[DK] Don’t know/unsure = 6  
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course?</td>
<td>0 1 1 2.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [A] Always = 1  
[U] Usually = 2  
[R] Rarely = 1  
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

### SB389 - Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10 The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her, via e-mail, phone, discussion board, office hours, or appointment time.</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 5.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree = 1  
[D] Disagree = 2  
[N] Neutral = 3  
[A] Agree = 4  
[SA] Strongly Agree = 5  
Pct Rnk: Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)
ENGLISH

Obermark, Lauren E  
--- Survey Comparisons ---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>The instructor’s English pronunciation was clear?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>[YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Rnk:</td>
<td>Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>AS</td>
<td>NK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>The instructor’s teaching was effective?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>The instructor’s expectations for assignments were clear?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>The instructor’s oral and written responses to my work stimulated further thought, pointed out problems, and suggested solutions?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Rnk:</td>
<td>Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: What was the most challenging aspect of the class?
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  finish all the reading

Question: What were the strengths of this course?
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  inspire me in many ways

Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  love all of them

Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  a lot but interesting

Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  a lot; a little bit too much

Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  great

Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?
Response Rate: 100.00% (1 of 1)
1  read more
### Course: 14994 G20 - ENGL 5970 (IND)-Independent Reading

**Department:** English

**Responsible Faculty:** Lauren Obermark

**Responses / Expected:** 1 / 1 (100%)

**Overall Mean:**
- 4.60 SB389 SD to SA (5 responses)
- 2.00 Always to Rarely (1 response)
- 1.50 Yes/No (2 responses)
- 1.00 A to Don't know/unsure (1 response)
- 1.00 Strongly Agree to Strongly disagree (5 responses)

### SB389 Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pct Rnk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 The syllabus clearly expressed the goals, expectations, and the nature of the course.</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 The course required that I come to class ready and prepared.</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3 Information was available so I could track my academic performance during the semester.</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1 4.00</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 This course expanded my analytical thinking, my technical skills, my creativity, my knowledge, and/or my competence.</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0 1 5.00</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree; [D] Disagree; [N] Neutral; [A] Agree; [SA] Strongly Agree

---

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5 This course was required?</td>
<td>0 1 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [YES] Yes; [NO] No

---

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6 This course challenged me intellectually?</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7 This class required me to be actively involved in my own learning?</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [SA] Strongly agree; [AS] Agree somewhat; [NK] Neutral/don't know; [DS] Disagree somewhat; [SD] Strongly disagree

---

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8 The grade I expect to receive:</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

### ENGLISH - OVERALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q9 I completed the required reading, writing, or study for the course?</td>
<td>0 1 0 1 2.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [A] Always; [U] Usually; [R] Rarely

---

### SB389 - Educational Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q10 The instructor of this course has given me adequate ways to contact him or her, via e-mail, phone, discussion board, office hours, or appointment time.</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 1 5.00</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses: [SD] Strongly Disagree; [D] Disagree; [N] Neutral; [A] Agree; [SA] Strongly Agree

---

### Obermark, Lauren E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Survey Comparisons

**Responses Individual English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>The instructor's English pronunciation was clear?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Rnk</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Responses:** [YES] Yes=2 [NO] No=1  
**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

---

### Survey Comparisons

**Responses English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>The instructor's teaching was effective?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pct Rnk</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pct Rnk:** Percentile Rank (100 is best, calculated vs. precise Mean)

---

### Question: What was the most challenging aspect of the class?

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. A lot of reading, but that goes without saying at the graduate level. All of it was FASCINATING (the capital letters felt necessary), and evoked deep analytical and personal reflection. It was challenging and exciting to consider my life through this new theoretical lens.

### Question: What were the strengths of this course?

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. The reading list, as I said before, was just wonderful. I felt like I was exposed to every aspect of disability studies that exists at this moment in time. Lauren was more than willing to entertain questions, even if I wanted to delve into personal experience. I was able to do so much processing of my own life while also learning and contributing to a new field of study.

### Question: Comment specifically on the following: class activities

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. I don't really think I could have done this class any other way than by one-on-one discussion. I think Lauren is perfectly capable of teaching this material to a full class of students -- just personally, the material hit too close to home for me to discuss it with a large group of people. Like I said before, Lauren was always willing to go wherever the discussion took us, and we went many interesting, deep directions!

### Question: Comment specifically on the following: assignments

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. The weekly reading and writing was extremely useful, though sometimes the reading load was heavy. I appreciated that there was a variety in the materials (e.g., films, YouTube videos, online resources, memoirs, and textbooks). I feel like I got a very well-rounded view of this topic through these course materials.

### Question: Comment specifically on the following: texts

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. Loved them. I’m amazed at how much we were able to cover this semester, and I’m definitely planning to look into other texts.

### Question: Comment specifically on the following: materials

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. Loved the variety of film, online resources, memoirs, and textbooks we examined. I can definitely see these material reaching a wide audience in future teachings of this course. Lauren will certainly be able to reach every kind of learner in some way with these diverse materials.

### Question: What if any changes would you make in this course to improve learning?

**Response Rate:** 100.00%  (1 of 1)

1. Honestly, I don't think anything needed to be done differently. Lauren tailored the class to fit my research interests, and was very easy going as far as the direction our weekly discussions went. It was a great experience.
Appendix C: Midterm Feedback
## Student feedback - Final results

Term: FS2013  
Course: First-Year Writing  
Section: 012  
Instructor: Obermark, Lauren E  
Reference: 13577  
Responses: 10

### Question | Mean
---|---
1. Clarity and organization of the course syllabus is | 4.90
2. Clarity and organization of the written communications is | 4.90
2a. Oral communication in English is | 5.00
3. Organization of course materials is | 4.80
4. Explanation of student responsibilities is | 5.00
5. Variety of examples, illustrations, and learning activities are used to enrich content | 4.70
6. Variety of resources (print materials, web sites, audio-video) are used to enrich content | 4.60
7. Openness to student views | 4.80
8. Opportunities for student interaction with peers | 5.00
9. Opportunities for student interaction with instructor | 5.00
10. Assignments support course goals and objectives | 5.00
11. Fairness of grading methods | 4.70
12. Promptness of feedback on assigned work | 4.70
13. Feedback on assignments enhanced my learning | 4.90
14. Instructor availability outside of class | 4.88
15. Overall, teaching strategies are effective | 4.70
16. Online course materials are available | 4.90
17. If applicable, online communication (discussion boards, email) is valuable to my learning | 4.60
18. Online course materials are relevant to the learning objectives of this course | 4.80
19. If applicable, professor's use of class photo rosters has enhanced my relationship with the professor | 4.83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 or 2</th>
<th>More than 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of times I have contacted my instructor outside of class</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Half</th>
<th>2 out of 3</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Since the beginning of the semester, I have attended class/lab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 21. Average hours spent on this class per week | 4.20 |
23. I come to this class/lab prepared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>90%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student’s answers for questions 24,25 and 26 are in the same row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. What is going well in this class/lab?</th>
<th>25. What needs improvement?</th>
<th>26. Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Everything! This is a great class, mostly because of the teacher! She's very relatable and is very willing to helps students when they are struggling. Her feedback on papers and essays are very useful and thoughtful and I really enjoy this class overall!</td>
<td>- Nothing :)</td>
<td>- This is a great course and wish I could have this teacher for more classes!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Professor Obermark is very nice and willing to help. She gives great feedback on our work and helps us prepare for our big writing assignments by starting us off with journal entries on the discussion board on mygateway. The lectures are engaging and the reading assigned are interesting. During class, a lot of people participate because there are a lot of interactive learning discussions. This is my favorite class so far and I'm looking forward to writing more journal entries.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The support she is willing to give to students is wonderful. She is understanding and not only gives class time but her time outside of class as well.</td>
<td>- I can honestly say this is my absolute favorite instructor and I hope to stay in touch for a very long time.</td>
<td>- Wonderful teaching mechanisms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
<td>- I believe the instruction in her class is very clear. She knows how to structure the class very well. I enjoy being in the class even though than English is not one of my favorite subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The teacher is excellent.</td>
<td>- Different topics for essay's.</td>
<td>- New topics for essay's. We have done the same essay's since sixth grade. College should be different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This class is going well with the time line in the syllabus.</td>
<td>- I cannot think of anything that needs improvement.</td>
<td>- Good job teaching this class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The essay's are turning out better than I expected.</td>
<td>- Another teacher meeting for the third essay. The meeting was very productive.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I think class is going very well. There is a very good learning</td>
<td>- I cannot think of anything improvements right now.</td>
<td>- N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you have questions, please email us at ctl@umsl.edu or contact Peggy Cohen, Director, Center for Teaching and Learning.

### Student feedback - Final results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term:</th>
<th>FS2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course:</td>
<td>Junior-Level Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor:</td>
<td>Obermark, Lauren E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference:</td>
<td>13580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses:</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarity and organization of the course syllabus is</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity and organization of the written communications is</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Oral communication in English is</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization of course materials is</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explanation of student responsibilities is</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Variety of examples, illustrations, and learning activities are used to enrich content</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Variety of resources (print materials, web sites, audio-video) are used to enrich content</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Openness to student views</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Opportunities for student interaction with peers</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Opportunities for student interaction with instructor</td>
<td>4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assignments support course goals and objectives</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fairness of grading methods</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promptness of feedback on assigned work</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Feedback on assignments enhanced my learning</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Instructor availability outside of class</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overall, teaching strategies are effective</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Online course materials are available</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If applicable, online communication (discussion boards, email) is valuable to my learning</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Online course materials are relevant to the learning objectives of this course</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If applicable, professor's use of class photo rosters has enhanced my relationship with the professor</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of times I have contacted my</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. Average hours spent on this class per week

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Half</th>
<th>2 out of 3</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Since the beginning of the semester, I have attended class/lab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-90%</th>
<th>91-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I come to this class/lab prepared

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-90%</th>
<th>91-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student’s answers for questions 24, 25 and 26 are in the same row.

### 24. What is going well in this class/lab?

- I like the video presentations, because it helps me to connect with my classmates. This is often hard to do in an online class.

- I like the general setup and that it is generally based on content.

- I actually like this class. I am learning new techniques for writing. I really don't care for writing but Lauren makes this class not to frustrating for me and I thank her for that. She is such a positive teacher.

- By this being an online class I must say that the professor is very easy to access she is quick about getting back to us if we have questions or concerns and she makes me feel comfortable about coming to her with any questions or concerns. I feel that she is here to help and her assignents are not just busy work but actually beneficial work to what we are working on in class. I have learned a lot about myself my learning abilities and writing while being in this class. And she is awesome about giving detailed helpful feedback on our assignments

- I know what is expected of me. She gives many examples. The feedback is great as well. I really

### 25. What needs improvement?

- I don't see any need for improvement.

- I think we should have more format, especially when it comes to APA and such. That is needed greatly in nursing papers.

- I don't like any for improvement.

- The teacher is very enthusiastic and never asks us to do anything she doesn't do herself. She always provides the first example, and gives copious amounts of feedback.

### 26. Other comments

- -

- -

- -

- I actually like this class. I am learning new techniques for writing. I really don't care for writing but Lauren makes this class not to frustrating for me and I thank her for that. She is such a positive teacher.

- Just like with any class we can have possible computer or technical issues but that is not in direct relation to this class neither here nor there. I am pleased with this class I just wished that our assignments would be graded a little bit earlier. I think sometimes our professor gets back logged and our assignments don't get graded as soon as we expect them to be graded. There is somewhat of a wait but when you have multiple classes this is quite understandable.

- As of right now I have no complaints. The course is great and fun.

- -
like the positive attitude she has. The class is interesting. I really like that we are graded more on the content of our writing.

- The quick turn around of peer review is difficult for those who work over the weekends, giving one more day to peer edit would be helpful.

- Since this is an online class communication can be a huge problem. I am impressed with how easy it is to communicate with other classmates and with our instructor.

- none

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale for questions 1-18: 0=No response or N/A 1=poor 2=fair 3=satisfactory 4=good 5=excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarity and organization of the course syllabus is</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity and organization of the written communications is</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Oral communication in English is</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization of course materials is</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explanation of student responsibilities is</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Variety of examples, illustrations, and learning activities are used to enrich content</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Variety of resources (print materials, web sites, audio-video) are used to enrich content</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Openness to student views</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Opportunities for student interaction with peers</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Opportunities for student interaction with instructor</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assignments support course goals and objectives</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fairness of grading methods</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promptness of feedback on assigned work</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Feedback on assignments enhanced my learning</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Instructor availability outside of class</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overall, teaching strategies are effective</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Online course materials are available</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If applicable, online communication (discussion boards, email) is valuable to my learning</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Online course materials are relevant to the learning objectives of this course
4.00
19. If applicable, professor's use of class photo rosters has enhanced my relationship with the professor
4.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>1 or 2</th>
<th>More than 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Number of times I have contacted my instructor outside of class
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Average hours spent on this class per week
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Half</th>
<th>2 out of 3</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Since the beginning of the semester, I have attended class/lab
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-90%</th>
<th>91-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. I come to this class/lab prepared
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>1-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-90%</th>
<th>91-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student's answers for questions 24,25 and 26 are in the same row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. What is going well in this class/lab?</th>
<th>25. What needs improvement?</th>
<th>26. Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- It can be difficult to find necessary information, better organization for documents would be nice. The subjects covered are not the most interesting and the class could benefit from making the subjects more interesting.</td>
<td>- Decent class, not my favorite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I am in the online class. I believe that everything is going well. The instructions are very clear and everything is given to us a week ahead so we can work ahead. I think the instructor is doing a great job and is very nice!</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Communication. Professor Obermark is very clear with everything she asks of her students (and very helpful as well). She is very helpful when I need her, too.</td>
<td>- Honestly, not a whole lot. She's a great teacher and you can just tell she loves what she does.</td>
<td>- She asks a lot of her students. I would say her workload is higher than average but none of it really seems to be busy work. The assignments, in some way, have relevance with what we are learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Term: FS2014
Course: Seminar In Special Topic
Section: G02
Instructor: Obermark, Lauren E
Reference: 14811
Responses: 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale for questions 1-18: 0=No response or N/A 1=poor 2=fair 3=satisfactory 4=good 5=excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clarity and organization of the course syllabus is</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clarity and organization of the written communications is</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Oral communication in English is</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization of course materials is</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Explanation of student responsibilities is</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Variety of examples, illustrations, and learning activities are used to enrich content</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Variety of resources (print materials, web sites, audio-video) are used to enrich content</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Openness to student views</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Opportunities for student interaction with peers</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Opportunities for student interaction with instructor</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Assignments support course goals and objectives</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Fairness of grading methods</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Promptness of feedback on assigned work</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Feedback on assignments enhanced my learning</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Instructor availability outside of class</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Overall, teaching strategies are effective</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Online course materials are available</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If applicable, online communication (discussion boards, email) is valuable to my learning</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Online course materials are relevant to the learning objectives of this course</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. If applicable, professor's use of class photo rosters has enhanced my relationship with the professor</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Number of times I have contacted my instructor outside of class</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Average hours spent on this class per week</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Since the beginning of the semester, I have attended class/lab</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I come to this class/lab prepared</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A student's answers for questions 24,25 and 26 are in the same row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. What is going well in this class/lab?</th>
<th>25. What needs improvement?</th>
<th>26. Other comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Dr. Obermark is excellent in her</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Dr. Obermark is excellent in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
field and as a professor. She can serve as a model of teaching for her colleagues, tenured and not. utilizing MyGateway to enhance the learning experience. Other professors would do well to ask her for ideas and examples of her methods. Her feedback is frequent and exceptionally helpful.

- Like everything pretty much.

| - | -
---|---|
| - The progression of topics and objectives is beneficial to my understanding of disabilities studies. Everything has a purpose, and everything is built upon what we learned the week before. | - There is a lot of work, more so than other graduate courses. It might just feel this way because we have gotten new large-ish assignments every week, but they aren't due for a number of weeks. It is feeling overwhelming at this point. |
| - Organization helps clarify the complex topics we discuss--and activities in class facilitate our discussions and demonstrate concepts. | - Nothing, really! |
| - Uncertainty about the topic isn't discouraged, and opinions are accepted as valid. The in-class discussions are always very interesting. | - I'd take every class with Obermark if I could! |
| - | - The discussion boards aren't really "discussions". |
| - | - I'm enjoying this class a lot. I hope I can take other classes with Dr. Obermark in the future. |
Appendix D: Evidence of Innovative Assignments
Overview:

In lieu of more “traditional” final presentations, we’re going to share and discuss our final projects through a Gallery Walk. The goal is to share some aspects of your final project through a stand-alone Exhibit. You will set up your Exhibit at its own station somewhere in the classroom—it can be on a laptop or it can be presented in hard copy, through poster board or a trifold (or something more creative!)—then we will wander around the room for an hour or so and visit all the Exhibits. The Gallery Walk will be followed up by casual discussion (and celebration!) of our work.

Requirements:

For the Gallery Walk, you need to prepare an Exhibit that the rest of us can guide ourselves through. Here are the basic requirements (these are what I will be looking for when I grade the Exhibits):

- Your Exhibit should communicate what you have learned/are currently learning from your work on the final project. It might not be able to communicate all aspects of the final project due to time restraints, but it should hit on some key, important, and engaging points or ideas.

- Visitors should be able to “take in” your exhibit in approximately ten minutes.

- Your exhibit should be created in such a way that visitors can guide themselves through it and easily glean your main points. (You will not be standing next to your Exhibit, so designing it as a self-guided tour is key!)

- Offer your visitors a “takeaway” from your Exhibit—some sort of handout (no more than one page—double sided is okay!) that they can take with them to remember your work. A summary of your project; a visual representation of your findings; a list of suggestions for future research; perhaps even a bibliography? Anything that you think would be useful and meaningful for your classmates. Include you name and email on this handout.

- Somewhere in your Exhibit, include questions that have been raised for you as your worked on your Final Project. These might be questions you want feedback on as you finish the project, or they might just be questions you’re opening up to the class for discussion. (To make the Gallery Walk more interactive and spur discussion afterwards, we will actually respond to these questions—and perhaps raise others, using post it notes/note cards.)

Format:

As for how you choose to craft your Exhibit, that’s up to you. Your Exhibit can be presented on a computer (using any variety of multimodal options—Powerpoint, Google Presentations, Prezi, Wordpress, etc.). Or you can present it using a poster board, trifold board, or whatever creative manner you see fit!

Generally, I don’t want these Exhibits to take up too much extra time/work for you. They can really be very simple. Just view it as another way of communicating (or thinking through) your final project.
Literacy Profile

The objectives for this assignment—meaning the criteria I will use to eventually grade your work—are in **written in bold** throughout the prompt.

************

Now that you’ve reflected on your own experiences as a language user in your memoir, it’s time to take on the role of academic literacy researcher and turn the lens on others.

For this academic essay: **(1) you will interview others about their experiences with language, (2) using library databases, research about related issues that emerge from the interviews, (3) use all of this to craft a meaningful profile about this person (or perhaps people), (4) while also making an original argument about writing/literacy.**

Your goal is to **share about individual literacy practices** so you (and your readers) develop a better sense of what literacy looks like in action and, at the same time, you will connect your interview research to larger conversations about writing occurring across various academic fields.

Of course, as is the case with most academic writing, you want to do more than summarize your interviews and what other sources say. **Your final paper should make use of the interview data and secondary sources to craft an original argument.** In short, your final essay should be thesis-driven.

The work you will be doing is very similar to Deborah Brandt’s, whose book *Literacy in American Lives* we’ll be reading and discussing as you work on your profiles, so Brandt will offer us useful methods and theory for our own work and thinking. In short, she can serve as a great example/mentor during this research and writing process.

The Literacy Profile is a fairly complex assignment. That is why we’re spending so much time working on it! (Until the end of the semester in fact!) Have no fear; you will have plenty of support and instruction from both Lauren and your peers. It might also help to see that the research and writing process can be broken down into a series of steps. In fact, these general steps are the common ones taken in most academic writing. These steps might overlap to some extent, too, and that’s completely fine. Research and writing are rarely linear; I’ve just listed these steps to try and make the process (and the expectations) clear.

************

**STEP ONE: Consider Your Interests and Collect Your Data Through Interviews**

First, you will develop an interview script and **interview TWO people.** Think carefully about who you choose as your subjects. Who do you know that might be able to share literacy experiences that interest you? What sort of people seem like they have stories that would be promising for further research and analysis? For instance, if you’re interested in historical literacy practices, it would make sense to interview a grandparent; if you want to consider how something like sports teams could influence
literacy, you need to interview someone who plays (or played) on an athletic team; if you have a desire to learn more about how literacy skills are used in certain professions, select a subject who has a job you want to know more about. (Of course, as you interview these people, you might discover entirely different things that you want to focus on, but it makes sense to select subjects who are initially interesting to you.)

You can conduct your interviews in person, on the phone, or even via email; do whatever works best for you and your interviewees. You will write up summaries of your interviews (instructions below), and you will turn these summaries in to Lauren and your peer review group so you can get some feedback on directions to take your essay.

**********

STEP TWO: Get Focused and Analyze Your Data

You will then decide if you want to continue working with one of your interviewees or both of them; in other words, you’ll decide which data to focus on. Then, you will analyze the selected interview data—we’ll talk more about what it means to analyze data, of course. You will essentially look for patterns in your interviews—what sticks out as important and worth further exploring? What parts of your interviews seem like something deserving of more research and discussion?

For example, maybe both of your interviewees discuss how they have to develop new writing skills as adults for their jobs. You might decide that this is an especially interesting part of their interviews and focus your attention there. Or, perhaps one of your interviewees discusses his struggles learning how to speak “proper” English in school. This, too, might be a promising area to focus your attention as a researcher and writer. Just follow your data and let it lead you!

At this point, you might also discover you need to ask your interview subject(s) some follow-up questions to find out more information. Follow-up interviews are encouraged!

**********

STEP THREE: Secondary Source Research (“They Say”)

After you’ve analyzed your primary data (your interviews) and gotten more focused, you will be ready to see what other researchers have said about this topic. You will use UMSL library, particularly the databases, to find scholarly/peer reviewed sources that help you better understand your interview data.

For instance, if you are focusing on how your interviewee used writing in the workplace, you might research “work and literacy,” “writing and the workplace,” or “professional communication.” If you were writing about your subject’s struggle with “proper” English, you might research “language discrimination,” “alienation and Standard English,” or “literacy struggles and school.”
In your final profile, you must make use of at least five secondary sources. At least three of them must be scholarly/peer reviewed, which generally means that you locate them using the library databases. (A Google search can find valuable sources, yes, but rarely are they scholarly ones.)

Creating an annotated bibliography (instructions below) will be the first step in helping you find and understand good scholarly/peer reviewed sources.

**********

STEP FOUR: Figure Out Your Argument (“I Say”)

You’ve collected data, focused in, analyzed the data, and done some secondary source research. At this point, it’s time to make your argument explicit. Where do you intervene in this scholarly conversation? What can your research add? What point do you want to make…and how can you use your interview data, as well as the secondary sources, to accomplish this? You might have already been thinking about your argument, but now it’s time to make it clear and direct. It should be woven throughout your profile and easy for your readers to follow.

*******

As you go through these steps of the academic research and writing process, you will be sharing drafts and sub-assignments. You will receive a great deal of feedback on all of this, so you’ll hopefully feel confident by the time you turn in your final profile.

Again, page numbers are flexible; your writing should be as long as it needs to be. Generally, I envision most “Literacy Profiles” being in the 7-11 page range.

It is expected that you will cite your sources correctly and consistently in a format of your choice (typically MLA or APA). Resources and support will be provided on this, as well.

Important Due Dates (also on your syllabus):

Friday, October 3- Interview Summaries due to Lauren and peer review group; upload on your GROUP discussion page and through an assignment LINK for Lauren. (See specific instructions below.)

Friday, October 24- Annotated Bibliography due to Lauren through assignment LINK. (See specific instructions below.)

Friday, November 7- Draft of Literacy Profile due for peer review; upload on your GROUP discussion page.

Friday, November 21- Revised and Full Draft of Literacy Profile due to Lauren through assignment LINK

Tuesday, December 16- Final, Revised Literacy Profile due to Lauren through assignment LINK
Specific Instructions for “sub-assignments” of Literacy Profile (Interview Summary and Annotated Bibliography)

Literacy Profile Interview Summary

DUE: Friday, October 3 to Lauren and Peer Review Group

This is your first chance to get feedback on your Literacy Profile. The summary step is designed to allow you to think through your interview data a bit and also to let Lauren/your peers offer you some ideas of how you might focus your essay.

Turning in these summaries is a graded part of your work on this assignment (worth 50 points). These will be graded quite easily; if you complete them and provide sufficient detail, you’ll get the full points. ☝️ But an incomplete summary, or no summary at all, will result in a 0, and that won’t be great for your grade overall.

These summaries do not have to be too long or too formal. Mainly, you just need to summarize the information that you collected in your two interviews—so you will be writing two separate summaries. (Your summaries can be in the same document, though. Just mark them as “Interview 1” and “Interview 2” or something similar.)

You don’t need to comment on this information or analyze it yet. For now, just summarize the important things you learned during your interview. To give your readers a clear picture of your interviews and not just be overly general, each summary should be at least 500 words—that’s 1,000 words total. So summarize IN DETAIL.

If you are largely following Brandt’s interview script, the headings she gives to her questions (“Early Childhood Memories,” “Reading and Writing in School,” etc.) offer you a good way to set up your summaries; you could write a brief paragraph about each topic. If you’ve come up with some of your own questions, you should organize the summaries in whatever way makes sense to you. There is no expectation that these summaries “flow”; they can feel pretty disconnected. The idea is just that you have recorded notes about your interview and that others can now help you make sense of the data you collected as you prepare to work on the actual essay.

Finally, if you already have some sense of how you want to focus your Literacy Profile, you should write a paragraph that explains your ideas. That way I can give you some directed feedback.

If you don’t have any idea where you’ll take this essay yet, have no fear! You’ll receive feedback that suggests potential directions. That’s the whole point of turning in these summaries, after all.

*******
Literacy Profile Annotated Bibliography

DUE: Friday, October 24 to Lauren

The Annotated Bibliography is designed to introduce you to a Works Cited format that you wish to use/will use in the future (usually APA or MLA style) and to give you the opportunity to read and familiarize yourself with various secondary sources before you integrate secondary research into your writing in the Literacy Profile.

Like the Summary, this is a graded part of your work on the larger Literacy Profile, worth 50 points. Again, if you meet the requirements below, it should be easy to receive a good grade on this!

In your final Literacy Profile, you need five sources, and three of them must be scholarly/peer reviewed. The scholarly sources are the ones that tend to be trickier to find and understand, so those are the ones we’ll focus on for this annotated bibliography.

First, you will use the UMSL library website to explore various scholarly sources, and you will include at least FOUR of these scholarly/peer reviewed sources in your annotated bibliography. (I will help you learn to navigate the library website/the library itself a bit better for this assignment and others!) You may or may not use all these sources in your final Literacy Profile, and you may go on to find different sources you prefer to include. But this will give you a solid start! Read these sources carefully to determine the authors’ main points and their relevance to your argument.

Second, you will create a proper citation for the article, in either APA or MLA format. (If your discipline uses a different format, just talk to Lauren about it.) There are resources for these formats on our MyGateway page to help you construct these citations properly.

Then, for each source included in the bibliography, you will write up a brief annotation. (Hence the name “annotated bibliography.”) The annotation should be a short paragraph of at least 4-5 sentences that includes the following (example below):

a. A description of the source (where it comes from, who wrote it, how a reader might determine its reliability, etc.)

b. A summary of the author’s main argument.

c. An explanation of how the source relates to your research and developing focus/argument. For instance, you might explain how this source supports, complicates, or disagrees with your research and developing claims, or you may describe which aspects of the source’s argument relate to the work you’re trying to do.

d. Example annotation for Annotated Bibliography (in MLA format):

This is an article by Deborah Brandt, who is a professor at University of Wisconsin in the English department. It comes from a journal that focuses on writing and literacy issues. Simply googling Brandt, as well as the name of the journal, indicates that this is a scholarly and reputable article, as does the technical, thoughtful academic language used in the article. Brandt's main argument is focused on the idea of "literacy sponsors," which she describes as individuals or institutions who shape the literacy development in a person's life; sponsorship can be helpful and positive, but it can also prove damaging and negative. I see Brandt's work connecting to mine because I want to use the framework of "sponsorship" to analyze the way my interviewee's mother affected his literacy learning throughout his life, as well as to consider the role the public library played in his development. So far, I only see sponsorship working in positive ways, so I might complicate Brandt's ideas that sponsorship can be damaging or negative.

**DMP Guest 6/27/13 3:35 PM**
**Comment [1]:** A. Description of source.

**DMP Guest 6/27/13 3:35 PM**
**Comment [2]:** B. Summary of main argument.

**DMP Guest 6/27/13 3:35 PM**
**Comment [3]:** C. Explanation of how source relates to my research.
Literacy Reflection/Definition Essay

**Note:** Remember, as laid out on the syllabus, though this is a graded essay, it is one you will continue to revisit and revise throughout the course as we learn more about literacy and language use—so, yes, you’re turning it in, but you’re by no means “done”! 😊 You’ll get feedback from me, later on more feedback from your peers, and you’ll give yourself feedback at various points in the course. This is just Part I, my friends.

The objectives for this assignment—meaning the criteria I will use to eventually grade your work—are in **written in bold** throughout the prompt.

**The Big Picture:**

For your first assignment, you will have **two primary goals:**

1) Share about and reflect upon specific experiences you have had in your life with literacy—good, bad, and neutral are all fair game.

2) Use these experiences, along with your own knowledge and insight you are developing from course readings thus far, to define what literacy is and what it can (and can’t!) accomplish.

In short, you want to **share some personal experiences with literacy** as you will observe authors like Sherman Alexie, David Raymond, Brenda Brueggemann, Barbara Mellix, and David Sedaris doing. But you don’t want to stop with just sharing these personal experiences—you want to **reflect on what they mean and use them to offer commentary about what literacy is to you**. Yes, this is **personal narrative of sorts**, but you should use your personal narrative to **work toward developing a theory of literacy**.

**How to Accomplish the Big Picture:**

Start by **telling a story of an experience or series of experiences** that helped shape how you feel about yourself as a speaker, writer, reader, or communicator. (Feel free to define literacy as broadly as your need to.) The experience(s) you choose may describe a moment of success or a moment of frustration or something in between; something that was very hard to learn or easy to learn; may have taken place in school or outside of school; may involve an important “teacher” (for example, parents, older siblings, friends, religious leaders, coaches, school teachers, etc.) or focus on your individual effort.

Whether you are sharing one long experience or weaving in a variety of experiences, your essay should ultimately read in a way that is **cohesive or united**. One of your jobs
as a writer is to help readers see how seemingly disconnected experiences with literacy do indeed connect and build on one another.

Based on your personal experiences with literacy, also include in this essay commentary about what these experiences mean. For instance, if your story is about a horrific instance in which your middle school teacher corrected your grammar in front of the whole class, explain how this experience made you feel and how it shaped what you understand literacy to be. In that example, maybe you now have a sense that literacy is largely about grammatical and mechanical correctness, and you feel scared every time you have to write. By offering commentary throughout your essay about what your experiences mean and how they shaped your understanding of literacy, you will be building your own theory of literacy—one we will revisit and revise throughout the course.

If it will help you develop your own ideas, please feel free to use any of the pieces we read in the class as sources in your own essay. (Though this is NOT a requirement.) This goes for the personal essays listed above, as well as the other essays/articles/blogs we read that do more work to define literacy (like the National Council of Teachers of English pieces, the “Literacy Privilege” piece, the articles about technology and literacy learning, or the interactive “Language: What Lies Beneath” essay.) If you choose to bring in an essay we’ve read in class, you need to do your best to cite it correctly within the essay itself and on a Works Cited page. You can use APA or MLA format—whatever you use in your major-specific courses works for me. We’ll discuss formatting in more detail when we move into our research-based writing.

Finally, conclude this essay with a paragraph that explains how you currently define literacy. This paragraph should clearly build upon what you have shared about your experiences and your commentary throughout the essay.

Style and Format

Stylistically, since this is largely a personal narrative essay, your voice and writing style can be more casual and conversational if you want it to be.

That said, I also expect you will work hard to make this essay as polished as possible. While I’ll be most focused on your ideas and content while grading, you want to proofread and make sure your essay is as free of grammatical and mechanical errors as possible.

As stated above, should you opt to use sources, please use MLA or APA format to cite your sources within the essay and on a Works Cited page.

Length:

I generally believe that writing should be as long as it needs to be and do not explicitly state “required” page numbers. If it helps you to have an approximation, I envision that you could meet the objectives for this assignment (as outlined in bold throughout this prompt) in 2-5 double-spaced pages using twelve point font. Please email me if you would like to discuss this further.
Some possible brainstorming questions to consider (Also refer to discussion post #1):

- Do you remember reading or writing before you started school? Perhaps with your family? With friends? What was the experience like?
- How did you feel about reading and writing once you started school?
- How did reading and writing change for you throughout your career in school?
- Did any teachers, coaches, church leaders, etc. who influenced you as a reader or writer? Can you describe that person/those people?
- Describe a moment of great pride for you that somehow involved reading or writing.
- Describe a moment of great frustration for you that somehow involved reading or writing.
- Now that you’re a college student, how do you feel about reading and writing? Have changes occurred?
- How does technology shape your literacy—now or in the past?

Due Dates (all due date are by 11:59 pm):

Part I “Literacy Reflection/Definition” Essay due to Lauren **Friday, February 7** (via MG Link)

“Revised Literacy Reflection/Definition” Essay due for Peer Review **Friday, March 14** (via Group Forum)

“Revised FINAL Literacy Reflection/Definition” Essay due to Lauren on **Friday May 9** (via MG Link)
The Exhibit: Presenting Your Literacy Profile Research to a Public Audience

The objectives for this assignment—meaning the criteria I will use to eventually grade your work—are in **written in bold** throughout the prompt.

We will conclude this semester of literacy research and “writing about writing” by sharing our research through digital exhibits. The main purpose of creating these exhibits is to share the work you have been doing on your Literacy Profile with an interested (and extended) audience—your peers and Lauren.

A related goal is that you need to re-think and revise how you are presenting your findings and argument. This exhibit should certainly not just be you reading your paper to audience members—that would be pretty boring and hard to follow. Instead, your exhibit should be engaging, clear, and suitable for a public audience. In short, don’t think of this as a typical, dull presentation. Envision it as an *exhibit*, like something you might see at a museum or an art gallery. This is your chance to be creative and think outside the academic box!

Overall, your exhibit should **clearly share the argument of your Literacy Profile and present the most interesting aspects of your research**. It doesn’t need to cover everything you’ve written about—instead pick what is most important and what would be most interesting to an audience of your peers.

To design this exhibit, **you will use Prezi** (go to prezi.com for more information and examples; I will also share resources and examples on MyGateway!). This is a website that allows you to design your own presentations; you can work on them and present them anywhere as long as there is an internet connection. This will work well for our online class so we can share links to our exhibits through the discussion board—more info to come on that. Prezi can do a lot of exciting stuff, and I’ll share resources to help you can learn how to use it. Working in Prezi will also make new demands your literacy (it can be challenging but also really fun and innovative), which seems appropriate considering what we’ve been studying throughout the course.

In an effort to make these exhibits interesting and engaging, **there are a few specific requirements**:

- Audience members should be able to visit and “take in” your exhibit in approximately **ten minutes to fifteen minutes**.
- Your exhibit should be created in such a way that **your peers can guide themselves through it** and easily take away your main points.
- Like the best museum exhibits, your exhibit should **use various forms of media**. That is to say it shouldn’t just be text. Instead, engage other literacies of your audience members—use videos, audio, photos, etc. as appropriate.
Your exhibit must, at some point, incorporate audience interaction—ask them questions, make them do something, take a survey, give a quiz—there are many options; these are just a few.

Finally, in addition to designing the exhibit, I ask that you submit a one to two page “design statement” about why you designed it as you did. Explain the decisions you made in your exhibit—what you included, what kinds of media you used, how you organized it, how you engaged your audience, etc. This reflection will help me grade these presentations in a more effective and fair manner, as I’ll have a sense of your composing process.

**Exhibit Due Dates:**

Exhibit Proposal due (as discussion post for week 11) on **Thursday, April 10** *(More info to come on what that post should look like!)*

Exhibit draft due for Peer Review **Friday, April 18**.

Exhibit Peer Review Letter due to Group Members **Sunday, April 20**.

Final Exhibit shared with Lauren and the class (through the discussion board) by **Friday, May 2**.

Discussion Post on the Exhibits of Others due **Thursday, May 8**. *(More info to come on what that post should look like!)*
Artifact Papers (+ Casual Discussion)

DUE DATE:

This assignment will be due at staggered times throughout the semester. You will sign up for TWO due dates. These presentations take place from week five through week fifteen.

On the day your papers are due, I will also ask that you get the class rolling by telling us a bit about the artifact you discovered/created.

Each paper and accompanying discussion/sharing with the class is worth 15% of your grade—so 30% of your total grade is based on these two papers.

Big Objectives:

These Artifact Papers serve as a way to:
1) Formalize and expand our discussion about the rhetoric surrounding Ferguson.
2) Practice rhetorical analysis methods and rhetorical composing skills.
3) Allow you to try on the hats of both rhetorician/analyst (paper one) and rhetor/composer (paper two).

The Basics of the Assignment:

For paper one (turned in during weeks 5-10), you will summarize and analyze an artifact connected to Ferguson. You can draw this artifact from your Rhetoric Scrapbook. When writing this paper, you are a rhetorician studying and working to understand how rhetoric operates.

For paper two (turned in during weeks 10-15), you will move from analysis to original production of rhetoric. You will compose your own rhetorical artifact that addresses what you view as an exigent rhetorical situation in/connected to Ferguson. You will turn in a design statement that explains the rhetorical strategies and/or theories that influenced your composition of the artifact. For this paper, you become the rhetor, utilizing effective rhetorical strategies to reach a specific audience.

On the days you are signed up to turn in your artifact, you will also share your work and discoveries briefly and casually with the class.

What “Counts” As an Artifact?

We have already started looking at artifacts in class and will continue to do so. For these more formal projects, I am asking that the artifacts you analyze and eventually create relate to Ferguson, since we’re continually considering Ferguson as an extended rhetorical case study this semester.
Some ideas for artifacts to analyze: clips from local news; newspaper articles from various sources; visual art; performances; speakers; flyers; community forums; photographs; protest signs or photographs of them; anything we post on the Ferguson Rhetoric website or that you’ve included in your scrapbook should be fair game! *I will also share some places where you can easily scan and locate potential artifacts.*

Some ideas for artifacts to compose: a flyer to host your own community discussion; create a public service announcement video; write a brief editorial; write a short “guide to ethical discussion practices” for your family; design a protest or a series of protest signs; take photographs; the possibilities are endless—*the key to making it effective is identifying an exigency or pressing need for this artifact and directing it toward a specific audience.* Remember that *rhetorical artifacts can span genre and media*—oral, visual, textual, or a combination of modes will likely be present in artifacts.

**Nitty Gritty Requirements:**

- **Both Papers**
  - These papers are a bit *more formal and developed* and thus should be written in a *thoughtful, academic style.*
    - Though academic style does not mean inaccessible prose; your readers for this paper will be Lauren and your classmates, so envision us as your audience when writing—we want you to make us think but that does not mean obscuring your ideas.
  - You must *cite your sources*—where you found artifact(s) and any readings you use to guide your analysis. You may use your citation style of choice, as long as it is consistent (MLA, APA, etc.)
    - This means including *in-text citations and a works cited page* for both papers.
    - I will post some citation guides and resources on MyG., and I’m always happy to consult. Citation is often a more complex process than we give it credit for, and it is good to ask questions.

- **Artifact Paper One—Analysis of a Ferguson Related Artifact**
  - Find a way to *offer readers access to the artifact* you are discussing (turn it in separately, link to it, include image, etc.)
  - Utilize *rhetorical analysis methods* that we’ve learned (read, discussed, and practiced!) in the class.
  - To frame your analysis and make it clear, you should draw on *at least one reading* we’ve done in the course to conduct the analysis.
    - In other words, you should explicitly use and explain your rhetorical lens of choice.
  - Though I am typically flexible on length—what we write is as long as needs to be—as a ballpark figure I envision these papers needing about *three to five pages* to undertake the level of analysis necessary.
Artifact Paper Two—Compose Your Own Ferguson-Related Rhetorical Artifact

- Turn in the artifact you have composed in whatever way is most convenient (email, hard copy, link to video, etc.)
- In addition to the artifact, turn in a written design statement that explains the rhetorical situation, audience, and rhetorical choices you have made.
  - In other words, you should explicitly discuss how rhetorical theories and/or strategies we’ve learned in the class influenced your work.
  - This will require drawing on at least one reading from the class.
- Again, though flexible regarding page length, I imagine that your design statement will need to be about two to four pages to sufficiently explain the complexity of your rhetorical situation and strategies.

Process and Ferguson Rhetoric Website Connection:

You will receive feedback and can revise these papers.

I will encourage (though not require) that you post the artifact papers (and the corresponding artifacts) to our Ferguson Rhetoric website (fergusonrhetoric.wordpress.com). This would create a section of the website that illustrates, in a more extended way, connections between Ferguson and rhetoric. (Though certainly you can wait to post the papers until they are revised and as “final” as you can envision them!)
Appendix E: Examples of Student Work
(Shared with Permission)
I am especially proud that some of my students’ work can be found online, where it has
developed a wider audience and expanded its reach.

Some examples:

“Annotating Disability Studies”—Access the website at: annotatingds.wordpress.com

• This is a website collaboratively authored in my Introduction to Disability Studies course
  in the fall of 2014. It shares a variety of rigorously researched and well-written annotated
  bibliographies about the field of Disability Studies:

“Universal Design” by Jen Frazer—Access the website at:
http://universaldesignforeducators.webs.com/

“The Mad Women in the Attic Project” by Theresa Nienaber—Access the website at:
https://themadwomenintheattic.wordpress.com/

“Disability and Gender Studies” by Lauren Terbrock—Access the website at:
https://disabilityandgenderstudies.wordpress.com/

“Bridging the Gaps: Education and Technology for Everyone” by Lisa Clark—Access the
website at: https://bridgingtheedgaps.wordpress.com/

“Portrait of a Modern Renaissance Man,” a Literacy Exhibit by Kris Sorsby—Access the Prezi
at: https://prezi.com/oh9d7zh0o5tq/portrait-of-a-modern-renaissance-
man/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy
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As a means of gaining a deeper understanding and appreciation for literacy learners, their sponsors, and the means by which these consumers are introduced to, process, and ultimately develop a level of appreciation for literacy practices, I developed conducted interviews with at two subjects regarding their earliest memories of literacy. I chose to interview a long-time friend who represents boldness, freedom, and a quirky self-assurance that is hard to find. He is 49 years old, African American, born and raised in St. Louis, MO, but now resides in Los Angeles, CA. He is a divorced, single father of three, a struggling yet very talented screen writer, and a server/waiter in the Hollywood Hills area. I also chose to interview another long-time friend who is 49 years old, African American, born and raised in St. Louis, MO, but now resides in Atlanta, GA. She is a divorced mother of three young-adult children and currently works as a Testing Coordinator at Georgia Perimeter College.

Through the analysis of their interview data, I discovered information and an awareness that I had not previously considered in the context of race in America. Certainly as an African American female growing up in the 70’s and 80’s I experienced difference, as well as indifference, within educational institutions, workplaces, neighborhoods, and society. However, having grown up during my formative years in communities that embraced and celebrated their multi-cultural inhabitants, I developed an assurance in the company of those who, based on the color of my skin (race), directly or indirectly challenged my position and/or integrity. What I did not develop, nor had I considered, was the ability to understand and to process the effect that these experiences had on my literacy development. It wasn’t until I began reading through both Randall and Lori’s interview data, that an underlying tone became evidently clear; as African
Americans (a.k.a people of color), racial classification can have damaging effects on literacy development in the United States.

For African Americans, race will undoubtedly intersect literacy and literacy will undoubtedly intersect race, and depending on a myriad of uncontrollable circumstances, have both positive and negative consequences relative to literacy development. Based on the construct and implications associated with one’s race, the introduction, understanding, and development of literacy runs a very different path than that of White Americans. As African American literacy learners and consumers, it is documented that biased, non-supporting, and stereotypical issues surrounding race prevail both directly and indirectly, in and outside of the classroom. The results can be seen in disproportionate numbers of illiterate African Americans and people of color, in comparison to White Americans. From Lori’s questioning of her capabilities as a fluent reader in elementary school to Randall’s need to overcompensate in a college level classroom of all-white peers, these very prevalent issues surrounding the color of one’s skin and the stereotypical associations and assumptions that surface because of it serve as “cheaters” and road blocks within learning environments across America.

What exactly is “race”? A broad question if we are only considering it in the broadest sense, however if we are considering its effects on the development of literacy, as it relates to people of color, particularly African Americans, there are more complex and wide spread ideals and opinions surrounding this sometimes illusive word. Having internet access and electronic information sources readily available, my first consideration for answering this question led me to Wikipedia, one of the largest reference websites, attracting 470 million unique visitors monthly, as of February 2012, with more than 77,000 active contributors working on more than 22,000,000 articles in 285 languages. Granted, I understand and realize this is not a
“scholarly/peer reviewed” source, however the validity of this source as a broad range sample of public opinion, for purposes of a “race” definition, are certainly worth noting. “Race is a classification system used to categorize humans into large and distinct populations or groups by anatomical, cultural, ethnic, genetic, geographical, historical, linguistic, religious, or social affiliation. First used to denote national affiliations, the term began to be used to relate to physical traits in the 17th century and promoted hierarchies favorable to differing ethnic groups. Starting from the 19th century the term was often used, in a taxonomic sense, to denote genetically differentiated human populations defined by phenotype.” Wikipedia (2013)

Given this definition and Dr. Daphne W. Ntiri’s (2009) acknowledgement that, “A good part of the recent public debate in US educational policy circles has focused on the myriad challenges we face as a nation on literacy achievement, particularly in urban communities and among African Americans,” (p. 231) we see that race has played and continues to play a significant role in this developmental process. In acknowledging this fact, it is paramount that we take an objective look at this modern day, social construct and some of the experiences of those most negatively impacted by its far reaching consequences. We can see in Randall and Lori’s reflective interviews that race is no stranger to literacy and as children of color they were direct recipients of its sometimes devastating intersection.

As young children growing up in the mid-1960s and 1970s, neither Randall nor Lori recalls there being a significant amount of print material available within their respective households. Interestingly enough, it seems that the limited material which was available did consist of the only three African American social/entertainment/news publications available during this time, Essence, Ebony, and JET magazine. Although this tid-bit of information may seem somewhat insignificant to the average, White literary consumer, it speaks volumes towards
the impact of disconnection that existed and still can exist within the classroom framework and
the households of young literary consumers. While the majority of White literary consumers are
enjoying a plethora of books, magazines, and newsprint that speaks to the very framework and
foundation of their lives, the same did not and to a large degree does not hold true for African
Americans. Attempting to provide literature at home that spoke to and supported African
American children was virtually non-existent and school libraries were no exception to this
literary absence. It was all-telling that the response concerning these three publications was the
same. As Lori put it, “Of course there was JET, Ebony, and Essence magazine. After all this was
pretty much all we [African Americans] had.”

When asked about reading materials available at school the response was also very
telling. Randall spoke about how around 5th grade he remembers being introduced to and
completely consumed by the reading of biographies about famous African Americans like Louis
Armstrong, Jackie Robinson, Ralph Bunch, and Althea Gibson. For him, this ignited an interest
and inspired something within that forever changed his desire for literary consumption as a
young African American child. For the first time, Randall had material available that spoke to
something deep within that he had not experienced before concerning his “race.” Until
transferring to a Historically Black College/University (HBCU), he would not experience this
type of literacy connection again during his educational journey.

In retrospect, Randall sees this absence as one of the major influences that impacted his
self confidence as well as his ability to use his voice to be heard. This fact is made evidently
clear by his statement, “As an African American young black boy growing up in a predominantly
white environment, it’s difficult to find yourself. I mean, sure I had black role models at home
and in my family and the [little] Essence and JET publications here and there but that wasn’t
happening so much at school. I often wonder if, you know, not having someone like a teacher, a black male teacher, is the result of me constantly trying to find my way, make a connection somewhere and with someone that was like me and just understood me. Hell, especially because I didn’t half the time understand me! I guess that is why those biographies meant so much to me when I discovered all these black people who were doing things I was totally unaware of, I mean Black men especially!”

For Lori, the awakening came in the form of difference and she too experienced something she had not experienced before, isolation, fear, separatism, and sadness. The frustration and embarrassment of not being able to complete and subsequently flat out refusing to complete an, “All About Me” assignment in 3rd grade, due to the lack of African American faces, places, foods, etc. that were available in the publications she had to choose from, will forever be remembered as a pivotal point in her literary development and her feelings about her “race.”

When asked about the effects and how the “All About Me” incident changed her, Lori’s emotional response and the scarring left by the assignment was clear. “It’s one of those things you just never forget,” she explained. I mean, it was the first time I actually realized I was Black and different and not one of the chosen ones. My parents discussed pride in heritage and being extra careful about presentation and always speaking and behaving in a ‘proper’ manner. But honestly, it wasn’t until I couldn’t find not one Black person, or anything else that related to me and my family, in all of those damn magazines and newsprints that everyone else was having a cut-fest with, that brought it all home, I think. It’s one of those kitchen table stories that’s been passed around and laughed at over the years, but honestly, I was upset. No, devastated! Bless my mama’s heart, she sat and found as many little clippings as she could and we made our own
collage at home. She kept trying to get me to take it to school but I didn’t. It was kind of strange, but looking back I think I was embarrassed. At the time, I said I didn’t want them to see my collage but honestly, that wasn’t it.”

Given these scenarios, navigating both the educational and literary arenas that are vital to standardized classroom success can often times prove to be a daunting task, at best, for African Americans. For their White classmates however, having literature, teachers, and pedagogy standards that were designed by and speak directly to their whole person is a natural occurrence, one that takes no primary or secondary thought. However, when we consider factors of availability, association, and alienation when dealing with that same literature, teachers, and pedagogy for students of color, we must ask ourselves, “What does this speak to for them”?

It is important to recognize a very poignant point raised by Michaela Colomba, in her *New England Reading Association Journal* entry titled, “Literacy for All Students: Professional Development for Cultural Continuity.” Colomba (2004) states, “Education in the United States is grounded in mainstream culture and teachers often filter curriculum through their own mainstream cultural backgrounds and teach the way they were taught (Cuban, 1995). Whereas for White middle-class children, the culture of the home and school are compatible (Ogbu, 2003; Delpit, 1995) and classroom literacy is an extension of home literacy. Students from other cultures ‘must move from one world to another; (Au, 1993 p. 9) when they go from home to school” (p. 50). What then, do these types of experiences point out about classroom dynamics that lack even the most fundamental associations for children of color?

As referenced by Catherin F. Compton-Lilly (2009), “Cultural understandings about reading and writing, the ways literacy practices connect to identity and social affiliations, and the range of literacy practices we engage with are intimately connected to race” (p. 88). In other
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words, it is evident that differentiated literacy practices and differentiated social and community experiences are significant contributing factors to literacy learners and their learning styles. We all can relate to feelings of being connected to people, places and things and how that association makes for a much more comfortable and conducive learning environment, be it educationally, socially, corporately, or otherwise. However, when that does not exist for an African American child, or any child of color, within the classroom construct, the results can and will continue to be disproportionately unequal and in favor of those non-colored literacy consumers.

In another instance, being the only person of color in his Junior level English literature class at Saint Louis University was no strange occurrence to Randall. He states, “After all, growing up in University City sort of prepared you for dealing with being the [only].” However, what it didn’t prepare him for was the injustices, frustration, and even shame that would come from being ostracized for using words, expressing thoughts, and giving culturally relevant examples that none of his White classmates or even the White professor could relate to. Hearing comments like, “Here he goes again” from classmates and, “I’m not really sure that’s relevant,” from the professor when contributing to class discussions would instantly take him back to very vivid memories of being ridiculed for improper English and grammatical errors that plagued him throughout his early school years and even now as a struggling screen writer. In Lori’s case, having had the privilege of attending predominantly White, private, catholic schools early on, she was able to develop these skills that somehow eluded Randall. Being only one of a handful of African American children in her private, catholic, 98% White school, Lori remembers, “A feeling of power I would get from being called out by the nuns as being “well spoken” and using “correct” English.” So much so, that she even became secretly arrogant about her skill level and would purposely correct other African American students who used “slang” or made
grammatical errors and would always attempt to use vocabulary that would impress and gain her accolades from her very impressed White teachers. It wasn’t until she transferred to a public, 98% African American school in the City of St. Louis and became one of only a handful of African American students who could read, speak, and write at accelerated levels that she, once again, was brought face to face with that thing called race and had to explore her own “cultural and self-imposed biases,” relative to her own race.

This shift in language from Standard English to a communication style that is shared in many African American homes and in African American communities is yet another layer in the quest for understanding, validation, and equality within classroom frameworks throughout the United States. As of 1997, and born out of a landmark resolution passed by the Los Angeles School Board, Ebonics (a.k.a. Black English Vernacular, African American English Vernacular, and Black Talk) was recognized as a valid language used amongst its school aged inhabitants, in an effort to combat the linguistic style of a large population of students who struggled with comprehension and successful communication within the classroom environment. Even though this form of orality, “Has been shown to offer a viable system of thinking and learning”, as pointed out by Dr. Nitri (2009), in White mainstream cultures and in academic institutions the argument is still raised as to whether or not this deviation from Standard English is a “contributing factor to poor performance”. This need to classify the African American language as well as the need to classify the African American identity continues to speak to the prevalence of White privilege and the dismissive attitudes towards the need for cultural awareness and support amongst African American populations in education.

Again, Compton-Lily (2009) points out the importance of race being discussed and racial differences being recognized as crucial to ones literacy development within education. She notes
the work being done by “critical race theorists” and how, “If teachers ignore the ethnic identities and cultural beliefs of students and treat all children the same, this usually means that all students are treated as if they are, or should be, both White and middle-class” (Irvine, 2003, p. svii) (p. 89). In continuing to allow this exclusionary approach to providing excellence in education to only 1/3 of our nation’s student population, we are positioning ourselves for failure.

If we, as a nation, are to continue to be considered a front-runner in technological advances, cutting edge medical research, and global business development, acknowledging, understanding and ultimately addressing the issues of imbalance relative to illiteracy in this country is paramount to our nation’s on-going development and literacy success for all.
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