Midcourse Review
Jay Todd's English 1020
Conducted 2/13/17
by Jeremy Tuman

## Summary:

The students are satisfied with the class overall. The appreciate the instructor and noted many strengths. The complaints and suggestions detailed below were of a narrow, procedural nature, which suggests overall satisfaction.

## What's Working

-High level of student engagement.
-Instructor easy to talk to.
-Assignment preparation.
-In-class activities.
-Video quizzes.
-Videos.
-Reading quizzes (good level of detail).
-Paper games (I couldn't quite understand what these are, but they like them).
-Before-class prompts.
-Story selections (some disagreement here).

## What's Not Working

-Multiple peers reviews that produce contradictory suggestions.
-"Reading guide" questions are repetitive (I think the idea here was that the same questions are asked of each selection, not that one individual set of questions was repetitive.).
-They Say, I Say is redundant.
-The peer review after the final draft, presumably toward a portfolio version. Here they seemed to want this earlier, which somewhat contradicts the complaint of multiple peer reviews.
-The online peer-review (perhaps a one-time thing?) was unanimously disliked.
-Minimum word count on peer review responses (perhaps only online?) also disliked.
-One student disliked reading aloud together in class. Others voiced mild agreement.

## Suggestions

-Conduct peer review before final draft is due.
-Make peer reviews anonymous.
-Less in-class writing, or more time to complete in-class writing.
-More time to complete assignments in general.
-Regarding the "grace period," some felt this should be established or automatic, and not be based on a personal request.
-More extra credit (Lol, every time, but really only 1-2 students)
-Regarding your videos, at times your voice cuts in and out, which several found problematic.
-More learning games.
-Regarding reading selections, some like them, some wanted different selections.

