

Course: ENGL42000 003 - Business Writing	Department: ENGL
	Responses / Expected: 9 / 21 (42.86%)

1a - Demographics		ENGL42000 - 003										
		Responses							Course			
		F	S	JR	SR	G	O	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev	
Q1	YOUR CLASS	0	1	3	5	0	0	9	3.6	4	.68	

Responses: [F] Fresh=1 [S] Soph=2 [JR] Jr=3 [SR] Sr=4 [G] Grad=5 [O] Other=6

1a - Demographics		ENGL42000 - 003										
		Responses							Course			
		A	B	C	D	F	P	F	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q2	EXPECTED GRADE	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	6.9	7	.42

Responses: [A] A=7 [B] B=6 [C] C=5 [D] D=4 [F] F=3 [P] Pass=2 [F] Fail=1

1a - Demographics		ENGL42000 - 003										
		Responses			Course							
		RFY	RBS	E	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev				
Q3	COURSE REQUIRED	7	2	0	9	1.1	1	.42				

Responses: [RFY] Required for your major/minor=1 [RBS] Required by school/University=2 [E] Elective=3

1a - Demographics		ENGL42000 - 003														
		Responses											Course			
		AG	ED	E	HHS	LA	M	P	SCI	T	VM	U	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q4	YOUR SCHOOL	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	1	2	0	0	9	5.9	6	1.77

Responses: [AG] AG=11 [ED] ED=10 [E] ENGR=9 [HHS] HHS=8 [LA] LA=7 [M] MGMT=6 [P] PHARM=5 [SCI] SCI=4 [T] TECH=3 [VM] VET MED=2 [U] UNDECLARED=1

2a - University questions about your course		ENGL42000 - 003										
		Responses					Course					
		E	G	F	P	VP	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev		
Q5	Overall, I would rate this course as:	1	4	4	0	0	9	3.6	3,4	.67		

Responses: [E] Excellent=5 [G] Good=4 [F] Fair=3 [P] Poor=2 [VP] Very Poor=1

2b - University questions about your instructor		Sweta Baniya										
		Responses					Individual					
		E	G	F	P	VP	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev		
Q6	Overall, I would rate this instructor as:	2	4	3	0	0	9	3.9	4	.74		

Responses: [E] Excellent=5 [G] Good=4 [F] Fair=3 [P] Poor=2 [VP] Very Poor=1

3b - PICES course based questions		ENGL42000 - 003								
		Responses					Course			
		SA	A	U	D	SD	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q7	The content of this course is consistent with the objectives of the course.	3	4	1	1	0	9	4.1	4	.94
Q8	Course requirements are clear.	2	5	0	2	0	9	4.0	4	1.03
Q9	This course provides an opportunity to learn from other students.	5	1	1	1	1	9	4.6	5	1.45
Q10	The grading system was clearly explained.	5	1	1	2	0	9	4.6	5	1.25
Q11	When I have a question or comment I know it will be respected.	5	4	0	0	0	9	4.6	5	.50
Q12	This course effectively challenges me to think.	2	4	1	1	1	9	3.9	4	1.26
Q13	I learned to use writing to analyze and address problems.	3	4	0	1	1	9	4.1	4	1.31
Q14	This course helps me understand ways audiences affect my writing.	5	2	0	1	1	9	4.6	5	1.41
Q15	I learned principles of document design.	3	5	0	1	0	9	4.2	4	.87
Q16	I learned how to manage long- and short-term writing projects.	4	3	0	2	0	9	4.3	5	1.15
Q17	I have acquired skills in working with others as member of a team.	5	2	0	2	0	9	4.6	5	1.20
Q18	I gained experience using technologies to produce documents.	4	5	0	0	0	9	4.4	4	.50

Responses: [SA] Strongly Agree=5 [A] Agree=4 [U] Undecided=3 [D] Disagree=2 [SD] Strongly Disagree=1

3c - PICES instructor based questions		Sweta Baniya								
		Responses					Individual			
		SA	A	U	D	SD	N	Grp Med	Mode	Std Dev
Q19	My instructor attempts to relate my present learning to work in my future profession.	5	2	0	2	0	9	4.6	5	1.20
Q20	My instructor seems well-prepared for class.	6	2	1	0	0	9	4.8	5	.68
Q21	My instructor is actively helpful when students have problems.	6	2	0	1	0	9	4.8	5	.96
Q22	My instructor's responses to assignments are beneficial to me.	2	4	1	2	0	9	3.9	4	1.05
Q23	My instructor shows respect for diverse groups of people.	6	2	1	0	0	9	4.8	5	.68
Q24	My instructor addresses ethics and culture in workplace writing.	5	3	1	0	0	9	4.6	5	.68
Q25	My instructor displays enthusiasm when teaching.	5	4	0	0	0	9	4.6	5	.50

Responses: [SA] Strongly Agree=5 [A] Agree=4 [U] Undecided=3 [D] Disagree=2 [SD] Strongly Disagree=1

Q26 - We welcome your written comments below. What is something/are some things that the instructor does well, e.g., something you hope that the instructor will continue to do in the class in the future?

Faculty:	Sweta Baniya
Response Rate:	77.78% (7 of 9)
1	Very nice instructor. Allows for fixes to projects.
2	Sweta is a very nice person who legitimately wants us to learn.
3	She is very organized for class and keeps helping us with assignments.
4	Seemed to care a lot about the course.
5	I liked how she was willing to listen to student problems and needs. She is one of the few instructors on this campus that seems to understand that we have other classes. She allowed students to correct mistakes. Her care for this class is obvious, in that she loves project three.
6	Great professor, had a wonderful time in class. Always ready to help with problems I had and help me get the best experience out of the course. Seemed passionate about the subject matter and good at helping to facilitate the groupwork we did. In the future, I also suggest working on facilitating the ideas of students a little more, as sometimes it felt like the vision the professor had was the only way she wanted to do it. Overall, very helpful and readily available and made me interested in coming to class
7	- She is always caring about other's progress. - I can clearly see her passion towards to English. - Her lecture is full of content and well-prepared.

Q27 - Make a suggestion(s) for improving the course (a criticism alone is not helpful; tell your instructor how you would fix any problem).

Faculty:	Sweta Baniya
Response Rate:	66.67% (6 of 9)
1	The requirements of the projects are not always clear so having the requirements explained beforehand and deliverables laid out beforehand will be helpful.
2	The main problem is I feel she makes the course harder than it needs to be for no reason. Such as making us apply for a grant, most students didn't want to do this, and no other 420 classes do this. Other than making a lot of extra unnecessary work for us, it was also a waste of money for the school in my opinion. Most of us didn't really accomplish much and the actual charity we worked for wasn't one most of liked. It would've made more sense if we were able to choose our own community service project. This is what most other 420 classes do, just would've been nice if we followed more of the simple curriculum all the other ENGL 420 classes did. Especially as in my opinion we didn't do anything very worthwhile throughout the whole course, felt mostly like busy work.
3	The discussions over the book are a little dull and non-essential, I would like more hands on critiquing and work like the in class technology presentations, the reviewing of other resumes, or the book content on good vs bad examples
4	Make class time more enjoyable. Grading needs to be clearer
5	I think she assumes certain people will take the role of leader in groups. These people tend to share characteristics with her. Anyone who differs from how she thinks the world should be simply is not smart enough to take the lead. She should understand that just because she thinks they should lead does not mean they even want to. She should understand that not everyone needs their resume to look like an English Department resume. Different Industries require different formats and hold different objectives highly. The CCO knows what they are doing, it is their job. Also, Code for Nepal is a great organization but not the right one for this service learning course. They simply are too busy to provide materials for the project. The first 2 projects were rushed through and poorly explained. These were the ones most likely to benefit us in the future.
6	At the end of the semester, she did a feedback session. When people talked about some suggestions to improve her lecture, she behaved more like defending herself instead of listening to our feedback. I suggested that not letting everyone to read out his/her reflection for two classes because it's time consuming and not very helpful. Instead, she should just let us do a 15 minutes reflection session or read three top reflections in her opinions anonymously. In overall, she is a good lecturer.