

# JUSTIN W. KEENA

## EVIDENCE OF TEACHING ABILITY

The following two tables are a quantitative summary of student evaluations from all the sections of English 101: Logic and Rhetoric that I have taught at the Catholic University of America.

The tables demonstrate that I have succeeded, both as an instructor and in the course itself, in consistently creating an engaging, organized, and effective learning environment for developing skills in academic writing. Each semester I take student and peer feedback into account and revamp or improve the course accordingly. This is especially evident in the positive change in ratings from 2016 to 2017, when I overhauled much of the course to make it more focused on argumentative prose, more systematic in presentation, and more infused with a variety of examples outside literature.

English 101, as a required course, is primarily attended by students who would not otherwise choose to study writing. Their evaluations of my course, as the numbers show, are emphatically and consistently positive despite that initial negative bias.

Table 1: Rating of Instructor  
(on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree)

<b>The instructor...</b>	<b>Fall 2016</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2017</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Fall 2017</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>	<b>Spring 2018</b>
Had a thorough understanding of the course content.	6.18	6.88	6.31	6.59	6.61	6.71	6.59
Was well prepared for each class.	5.88	6.81	6.44	6.71	6.72	6.86	6.59
Presented material in a clear and systematic manner.	4.88	6.44	5.88	6.53	6.28	6.57	6.41
Communicated a sense of enthusiasm about the course material.	5.94	6.81	6.44	6.53	6.72	6.79	6.53
Was responsive to the diverse learning needs and styles of the students.	4.59	6.38	5.88	6.00	6.39	6.29	6.35
Provided timely and detailed feedback on tests, reports, and other assignments.	6.41	6.69	6.38	6.65	6.50	6.36	6.53
Had a clear and realistic definition of good performance.	5.75	6.63	5.88	6.00	6.56	6.50	5.94
Was available outside of class to provide assistance.	6.29	6.63	6.31	6.35	6.50	6.71	6.35
Treated students with respect.	6.41	6.75	6.5	6.59	6.78	6.50	6.47
I would recommend this instructor to a fellow student.	5.06	6.69	6.00	6.29	6.78	6.07	5.82
<b>Average</b>	5.74	6.67	6.20	6.42	6.58	6.54	6.36
<b>Amount of surveys/ Total enrollment</b>	17/18	16/17	16/18	17/17	18/19	14/20	17/18

Table 2: Rating of Course  
(on a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree)

Prompt	Fall 2016	Spring 2017	Spring 2017	Fall 2017	Fall 2017	Spring 2018	Spring 2018
Aims objectives were clearly articulated at the start of the course.	5.35	6.44	6.13	6.24	6.56	6.64	6.18
Aims and objectives were achieved by the end of the course.	5.18	6.31	6.19	6.41	6.11	6.64	6.00
The text and/or required readings were appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.	5.41	6.47	6.06	6.12	6.00	6.50	6.00
Assignments were appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.	5.53	6.38	5.88	6.31	6.61	6.43	6.00
Discussions and lectures were appropriate to the aims and objectives of the course.	5.50	6.63	6.20	6.38	6.72	6.43	6.29
This course challenged me intellectually.	5.71	5.88	5.69	6.53	6.50	5.64	5.76
I looked forward to attending this course.	4.29	5.56	4.94	5.29	4.94	5.36	4.53
This course was well organized.	4.65	6.19	5.81	6.65	6.17	6.64	6.29
This course met my expectations.	4.88	5.88	5.63	5.82	5.89	6.21	5.65
I would recommend this course to a fellow student.	4.82	5.95	5.40	6.06	6.28	5.29	5.12
<b>Average</b>	5.13	6.17	5.79	6.18	6.18	6.18	5.78
<b>Amount of surveys/ Total enrollment</b>	17/18	16/17	16/18	17/17	18/19	14/20	17/18