

Table of Contents

First-Year Writing Seminar (LING 1100-103), Spring 2017	2-27
Introduction to Syntax and Semantics (LING 3303), Discussion Section 201, Fall 2016	28-29
Introduction to Syntax and Semantics (LING 3303), Discussion Section 202, Fall 2016	30-31
Morphology (LING 4423), Discussion Section 201, Spring 2016	32-45
Morphology (LING 4423), Discussion Section 202, Spring 2016	46-48
First-Year Writing Seminar (LING 1100-107), Fall 2015	49-80



Cornell University

College of Arts and Sciences

John S. Knight Institute for
Writing in the Disciplines
101 McGraw Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4601
t. 607-255-2280
f. 607-255-2956
knight_institute@cornell.edu
www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute

To: Mary Moroney, Linguistics

From: David Faulkner, Director of First-Year Writing Seminars

Date: June 19, 2017

Re: Course Evaluations, Spring 2017

Enclosed are the student evaluations (written and numerical) from the course you taught in the Spring 2017 semester. We hope that the information they provide will prove useful for you.

Here is some additional information that may interest you as you examine the summaries of the bubblesheet responses:

For Spring '17 FWS, the median score for instructors (half of results above/half below) was 1.71.

Ranking (including only questions 2–33):

First quarter:	less than or equal to 1.53
Second quarter:	1.54–1.71
Third quarter:	1.72–1.89
Fourth quarter:	1.90 or greater

Further information about how to read the summary appears at the bottom of the sheet.

Thank you for your work; please let us know if we can be of help during the coming semester.

LING 1100.103

Sp17 -- First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluations

Course: 17510

Instructor:

Moroney

	Language, Thought, and Reality: Creating the Science of Language																																
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33
1	4	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	2	
2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	2	2	1	3	1	1	2	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	3
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5	4	1	1	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	4	3	2	3	4	3	5	4	3	3	5	2	2	2	3	5	4	4
6	4	2	1	1	1	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
7	1	1	2	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	2	1	2	1	1	3	4	4	2	1	2	3	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	5	4	4
9	4	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
10	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
11	5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

mean for questions 2-5:

1.18

mean for questions 6-19:

1.82

mean for questions 20-33:

1.89

overall mean for questions 2-33:

1.77

HOW TO READ THE TABLE:

Each question is listed on the top horizontal axis, starting with 1 on the left and running to question 33 on the far right.

The students are listed on the left vertical axis; their responses to each question run horizontally.

What the numbers mean: an "A" answer on the bubble sheet equals 1 on the table above; a "B" equals 2, and so on. (The evaluation questions and possible range of responses are reprinted on the back of this sheet.)

To interpret questions #2-#33, you will need to compare student opinions about what your seminar accomplished with your own goals. You will naturally have stressed some areas more than others. In some instances, a question may not be relevant to your seminar: for example, in a film course, questions about "the readings" may not apply. In general, finding a significant number of "4" and "5" responses when you scan down the column of responses for a question (question 1 aside) may be a cause for concern.

To remember: The purpose of the table is to alert you to possible strengths and weaknesses, not to measure all courses against a single inflexible standard.

We hope you will find the evaluations to be informative. Please contact David Faulkner or Paul Sawyer at the Knight Institute (101 McGraw Hall) if you would like to discuss them.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES
FWS End-of-Semester Evaluation

1) The most important reason I chose this seminar:

- 1) I liked the course description.
- 2) I thought it would be challenging.
- 3) My advisor recommended it.
- 4) It was offered at a time I had open.
- 5) I could not get into one of my top preferences.

For the following questions:

(1=An appropriate amount, 2=Too much, 3=Too little, 4=Far too much, 5=Far too little)

- 2) How much reading did you do?
- 3) How much out-of-class writing did you do? (First-Year Writing Seminar guidelines suggest a minimum of five essays and a maximum of eight.)
- 4) How much time was spent learning about writing?
- 5) How much time was devoted to learning how to revise your essays? (FWS guidelines suggest that a minimum of three essays go through a process of guided revision.)

How much do you agree with the following statements?

(1=Very strongly, 2=Strongly, 3=Somewhat, 4=A little, 5=Not at all)

In class, in conferences, or in paper comments, the teacher emphasized

- 6) choosing the words that best express ideas.
- 7) writing grammatically correct sentences.
- 8) structuring sentences carefully.
- 9) providing appropriate documentation for sources.
- 10) developing a strong argument.
- 11) writing well-focused, coherent paragraphs.
- 12) making transitions from one paragraph to the next.
- 13) focusing an essay on a significant problem, hypothesis, thesis, argument, or idea
- 14) supporting claims with pertinent, substantive evidence.
- 15) incorporating and analyzing source material and quotations.
- 16) editing essays to eliminate flaws of grammar, word choice, spelling, and format.
- 17) revising essays to enhance interest, clarity, and persuasiveness.
- 18) writing in a style appropriate for a particular purpose.
- 19) writing in a style appropriate for a particular audience.

In this seminar,

- 20) reading and writing assignments formed an understandable progression.
- 21) the level of difficulty of the readings seemed appropriate.
- 22) I learned to read with care in the discipline of the seminar.
- 23) informal/preparatory writing assignments helped me understand the readings and write an essay.
- 24) I had opportunities to confer privately with the teacher.
- 25) the teacher was well-prepared.
- 26) the teacher directed discussions well.
- 27) the teacher treated my writing with respect.
- 28) the teacher graded my papers fairly.
- 29) the teacher returned our papers within a reasonable length of time.
- 30) comments on each returned paper helped me improve the next assignment.
- 31) I felt intellectually stimulated.
- 32) I became a more confident writer.
- 33) I became a more skillful writer.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moloney

Department Linguistics Course Number 1100 103

Course Title Creating the Sci of Lang

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It was more interesting than I believed it would be. It allowed me to research what I was interested in, as long as it was related to Linguistics. I learned a lot.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes. I now feel more prepared to start a paper and just "start writing". I used to need more time to think before I write.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes. The comments focused on what she wanted us to focus on with that essay.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Good. She didn't ask us that many questions of the text in class, but we had a Reading Response due each week which let us talk about the reading.

We had several peer reviews about our writing, which I feel like that is good.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths: being able to structure an essay. I'm good with introductions and conclusions

Weaknesses: providing detail in the body of my essays.

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LING Course Number 1100 103

Course Title Creating the Sci of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Overall, it was an excellent course. I enjoyed the small in-class writing prompts and especially the textbooks that gave practical writing advice. However, I wish the class was more active and stimulating. The dynamic was rather dull, so it would have been nice for the students to use the board, engage in more active discussions, or do other related tasks.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I believe my writing has improved marginally. Instead of providing mostly advice on how to frame an argument better, I would have appreciated more solid editing (i.e. structuring of sentences, word usage).

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Written comments were helpful because they were specific and constructive.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The text discussions were on the theme of the class but did not always apply to our written assignments.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My greatest strength is my phrasing of words, while my weakness is taking too long to write.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LING Course Number 1100 - 103

Course Title Creating Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Very interesting but strongly geared towards linguistz students

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes. Simply by writing more essays with feedback.

Maybe creating arguments.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes they were specific

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Somewhat. To learn about linguistics not necessarily writing.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

S: Resuming and analyzing

W: Sophistication

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Moroney, Mary

Department Linguistic Course Number LING 1102, 103

Course Title Creating the Sci. of Lang

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This course is generally great. It introduces the linguistics to us and helps us improve the writing skills well.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, peer editing and meeting with instructor let me know which specific part of my essay need to be improved. They are very useful.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, the written comments are in detail
and help me write the next draft.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The texts are very interesting and also
inspire me to write the essay

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My strength is to have a clear logic
which the weakness is that I cannot
express my idea clearly.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Manney

Department Linguistic Course Number LMG 1100, 103

Course Title Creating the Science of language.

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I think ~~it's~~ it's good because the instructor emphasizes on how to write a ~~good~~ well-formed essay but the content of linguistic can be more interesting.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, by several peer reviews and individual meetings
Need more stress: how to find a useful sources
and form argument

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes , they guide me how to revise

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

It'd be better if we can discuss more
on our own ideas

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

writing concise and clear sentences
few weakness from argument

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mazy Moroney

Department Linguistics Course Number LNG 1100-103

Course Title Creating the Sci of Lang.

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The discussions were very boring, and frankly, I only felt like coming to class formally. I thought linguistics would be fun, but I was wrong. The writing part of the course was good though and I thought the assignments were fair.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Not much. My last FWS was great, and maybe this FWS wasn't as good as I expected to be. More stress on thesis building and revision.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes. They were logical and precise.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Not at all useful.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I can't say. This FWS was only a formally I guess and I didn't learn much

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary

Department Linguistics Course Number 1lw-103

Course Title Creating the science of language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It was a good experience. I learned more about linguistics while improving my writing skills.

Readings were a little bit too much.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, I learned how to write longer essays.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, they provided suggestions for future essays.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They were adequate. I feel like we had too much readings that it was hard to discuss the material in depth.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

strengths = make arguments to support thesis
weakness = vocab.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department Linguistics Course Number 1100, 103

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I thought that the course was kind of interesting but it could have been more engaging. We didn't have much discussion and the readings were dry and scientific.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

~~I do not think~~ I think that my ability to summarize has improved from our weekly reading responses. I ~~WANTED~~ think that all of the instruction was thorough.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

They were helpful because they were detailed suggestions, not rewrites.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

We didn't discuss often, although peer edits were helpful.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My greatest strength is organization and weakness is awkward phrasing.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Many Moroney

Department Linguistics Course Number 1100, 103

Course Title _____

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The class was designed to teach introductory linguistic concepts and improve writing. Some of the in class discussions of linguistics were not very helpful for understanding linguistics as a whole. They should be more comprehensive of larger ideas and concepts.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Somewhat. Writing drafts and individual conferences were helpful.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes. the teacher's comments helped.
provided clear direction for improvement.
Peer Review is completely unhelpful. They are
usually too general and don't give enough
ideas for improvement.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Somewhat. Discussions about writing
were helpful to edit and write essays.
The linguistics discussions were
not as helpful. They provided good
background knowledge but not essay help

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I can write clearly and coherently
I still can fix transitioning and
better flow of sentences

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name ~~_____~~ Moroney, Mary

Department Ling Course Number 1100.103

Course Title Creating the Sci. of Lang

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This was a very interesting course that not only allowed me to learn to write better and ~~more~~ ^{also} organize my essay better, but also enabled me to learn various topics in linguistic that is intuitive

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

My writing skills have indeed been promoted. The teacher's evaluation and feedbacks on my draft and final version of our writing assignments were extremely useful.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, they are very insightful

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Very useful. Discussions allowed me to learn other people's
opinion

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and
weaknesses as a writer?

My greatest strength is organizing the framework of the paper
and greatest weakness is writing a clear and concise introduction

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Spring 2017

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name May Moorey

Department Linguistics Course Number 1102.103

Course Title Creativity in the Soc. of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I found a great course & learned
a lot about about linguistics but
at the same time improved my
writing.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Improved by critical analysis
in the class.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes → I know what to improve
for the next paper.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Not that we really learned much from
the time here assignments and because
discussions of writing from high
school.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

strength → critical analysis skill

weakness → longision

Cornell University

Course Evaluation Response Summary

Semester: Fall 2016 Course Owner: LING

Course: LING 3303 DIS 201 CID: 6162

Title: Intro to Syntax & Semantics

Instructor: Moroney

4 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 36.36% Response

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended.

When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

Question	Mean	StDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?	4.75	0.43	4	0	0	0	1	3
3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?	5.00	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
4. How useful were the sections?	4.75	0.43	4	0	0	0	1	3
5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?	5.00	0	4	0	0	0	0	4

Cornell University

Course Evaluation Response Summary

Semester: Fall 2016 Course Owner: LING

Course: LING 3303 DIS 201 CID: 6162

Title: Intro to Syntax & Semantics

Instructor: Moroney

4 Responses, 11 Enrolled, 36.36% Response

6. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

62480. really appreciated the section for this class with the TA, as it involved a really good amount of review from the class and practice that pushed students to apply these concepts on structures that were particularly challenging. The section slides were also really invaluable in studying for the pre-lims and just generally reviewing the concepts. I used these slides many times to better understand some of the syntactic structures and the semantic notion, because they were extremely clear and stood very well on their own as review material.

More practice questions! Those were great to go over as a class and were very helpful in clearing up any doubts and perfecting the material.

62488. Sections were very helpful for the assignments. Providing even more examples, especially of trees, would be helpful.

62483. Verbal presentations of slides are sometimes awkward and trail off at the ends of phrases and sentences.

The focus on covering potentially confusing situations or potential pitfalls in the homework is very useful.

LaTeX :), but occasional slides with words too small to see without zooming and panning are hard to look at.

Cornell University

Course Evaluation Response Summary

Semester: Fall 2016 Course Owner: LING

Course: LING 3303 DIS 202 CID: 6163

Title: Intro to Syntax & Semantics

Instructor: Moroney

7 Responses, 13 Enrolled, 53.85% Response

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended.

When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

Question	Mean	StDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)	4.83	0.37	6	0	0	0	1	5
2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?	4.83	0.37	6	0	0	0	1	5
3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?	4.83	0.37	6	0	0	0	1	5
4. How useful were the sections?	4.67	0.47	6	0	0	0	2	4
5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?	4.67	0.74	6	0	0	1	0	5

6. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

62499. No changes. Mary was excellent. On point subject matter, receptive to questions. Addressed issues as they as she noticed them. Her recitation slides were great when doing hw.

62502. I found the practice problems given in recitation extremely helpful in learning the material.

62497. I liked that we did practice problems in section that modeled the upcoming homework. I think we could've started doing that earlier and could've done it more often too. The most helpful thing was when she did example problems.

62496. I really liked how we were given more examples in section, and that the solutions to those examples were posted after section. I think I would have liked to spend less time reviewing lecture material, and more time reviewing past homework and doing examples. Also at the beginning of the course it was not helpful to have the homeworks (and thus the sections) so far behind the lecture--I know this is not the fault of the TA but I would like to mention that somewhere.

62494. Going over the homeworks was good, but it might allow more time to go over the practice problems at the end if she only explained the ones we thought we got wrong.

[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> N/A
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> N/A
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> N/A
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------

4. How useful were the sections?

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> N/A
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> N/A
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

<input type="radio"/> 1	<input type="radio"/> 2	<input type="radio"/> 3	<input type="radio"/> 4	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 5	<input type="radio"/> N/A
-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

The analog exercises were interesting; might have been neff to do more with the analog

8. Additional Comments

[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. How useful were the sections?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

She was great! She was also great about letting us know when she didn't know something; a lot of TAs don't like to admit when they

8. Additional Comments

don't know answers, and it ends up generating confusion

Enjoy this cartoon Abraham Lincoln as a pelican as a token of my gratitude:



[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

4. How useful were the sections?

<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

8. Additional Comments

[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. How useful were the sections?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

The discussions could be a bit more structured, but I think that is more of a community effort. Her comments @ Review of homework were very helpful. Grading was fair.

8. Additional Comments

Only in very specific questions would material be a bit confusingly explained, but great TA overall!

[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

4. How useful were the sections?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

1 2 3 4 5 N/A

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

The TA is very good about answering individual questions

8. Additional Comments

[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

4. How useful were the sections?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

TA was helpful - sometimes explanations were a little confusing, but overall very friendly and available and helpful.

8. Additional Comments

[Skip to main content](#)[Cornell University](#)
[Search Cornell](#)

Evaluation for LING 4423 DIS 201 -- Morphology -- Moroney

INSTRUCTIONS

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended. When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material? (scale = 5 high, 1 low)

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

4. How useful were the sections?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
1	2	3	4	5	N/A

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

8. Additional Comments

Cornell University

Course Evaluation Response Summary

Semester: Spring 2016 Course Owner: LING

Course: LING 4423 DIS 202 CID: 7666

Title: Morphology

Instructor: Moroney

2 Responses, 4 Enrolled, 50% Response

The following questions refer to the TA and the section that you attended.

When ranking use a scale from 1 to 5, with 5 being high and 1 being low.

Question	Mean	StDevP	Count	1	2	3	4	5
1. Was the TA knowledgeable about the material?(scale = 5 high, 1 low)	4.50	0.5	2	0	0	0	1	1
2. Overall, how would you rate the TA?	4.00	1	2	0	0	1	0	1
3. Was the TA sufficiently accessible and available to students both in and out of section?	4.50	0.5	2	0	0	0	1	1
4. How useful were the sections?	3.50	0.5	2	0	0	1	1	0
5. How well-integrated were the sections with the rest of the course?	4.00	1	2	0	0	1	0	1
6. Overall, how would you rate the sections?	4.00	1	2	0	0	1	0	1

Cornell University

Course Evaluation Response Summary

Semester: Spring 2016 Course Owner: LING

Course: LING 4423 DIS 202 CID: 7666

Title: Morphology

Instructor: Moroney

2 Responses, 4 Enrolled, 50% Response

7. Considering the teaching method of the TA, what would you continue doing, and what would you change?

49963. Mary is quite knowledgeable about linguistics, and was very willing to help out the student. However, she isn't the greatest speaker, and this sometimes made it seem as if sections were disorganized and lacked direction.

Cornell University
Course Evaluation Response Summary
Semester: Spring 2016 Course Owner: LING
Course: LING 4423 DIS 202 CID: 7666
Title: Morphology
Instructor: Moroney
2 Responses, 4 Enrolled, 50% Response

8. Additional Comments



Cornell University
College of Arts and Sciences

John S. Knight Institute for
Writing in the Disciplines
101 McGraw Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-4601
t. 607-255-2280
f. 607-255-2956
knight_institute@cornell.edu
www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute

To: Mary Moroney, Linguistics

From: David Faulkner, Director of First-Year Writing Seminars

Date: 17 December 2015

Re: Course Evaluations, Fall 2015

Enclosed are the student evaluations (written and numerical) from the course you taught in the Fall 2015 semester. We hope that the information they provide will prove useful for you.

Here is some additional information that may interest you as you examine the summaries of the bubblesheet responses:

For Fall '15 FWS, the median score for instructors (half of results above/half below) was 1.77.

Ranking (including only questions 2–33):

First quarter:	less than or equal to 1.58
Second quarter:	1.59–1.77
Third quarter:	1.78–1.95
Fourth quarter:	1.96 or greater

Further information about how to read the summary appears at the bottom of the sheet.

Thank you for your work; please let us know if we can be of help during the coming semester.

LING 1100.107

Fa15 -- First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluations

Course: 18325

Language, Thought, and Reality: Creating the Science of Language

Instructor:

Moroney

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33			
1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	3	1	2	3	2	3	2	5	3	5	2	4	4	1	1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5		
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	4	4	3	1	3	2	1	1	1	4	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	1		
3	1	3	1	1	2	4	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	5	5	3	1	4	5	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	4	3	2		
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2		
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
6	1	2	1	1	1	3	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	2	3	4	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3		
7	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	4	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3		
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
9	*	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3		
10	4	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
11	4	4	4	2	1	5	4	3	4	5	4	4	3	5	4	4	4	3	5	4	4	3	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	5	5		
12	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2		
13	4	2	1	1	1	5	3	4	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	3	3	4	4	1	1	3	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	4	2	3	4	4	4	
14	1	3	1	2	1	4	5	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	1	2	3	2	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	
	1.69	1.86	1.21	1.21	1.07	3.07	2.57	2.43	1.79	1.79	1.86	2.00	1.50	1.50	1.93	2.36	2.21	2.57	3.07	2.64	1.93	2.86	2.71	1.50	1.93	2.64	1.43	1.71	1.79	2.64	2.57	2.86	3.00			

mean for questions 2-5: **1.34**

mean for questions 6-19: **2.19**

mean for questions 20-33: **2.29**

overall mean for questions 2-33: **2.13**

HOW TO READ THE TABLE:

Each question is listed on the top horizontal axis, starting with 1 on the left and running to question 33 on the far right.

The students are listed on the left vertical axis; their responses to each question run horizontally.

The mean for each question appears at the bottom of each column of responses for each question.
What the numbers mean: an "A" answer on the bubble sheet equals 1 on the table above; a "B" equals 2, and so on. (The evaluation questions and possible range of responses are reprinted on the back of this sheet.)

To interpret questions #2-#33, you will need to compare student opinions about what your seminar accomplished with your own goals. You will naturally have stressed some areas more than others. In some instances, a question may not be relevant to your seminar: for example, in a film course, questions about "the readings" may not apply. In general, finding a significant number of "4" and "5" responses when you scan down the column of responses for a question (question 1 aside) may be a cause for concern.

To remember: The purpose of the table is to alert you to possible strengths and weaknesses, not to measure all courses against a single inflexible standard. We hope you will find the evaluations to be informative. Please contact David Faulkner or Paul Sawyer at the Knight Institute (101 McGraw Hall) if you would like to discuss them.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES
FWS End-of-Semester Evaluation

1) The most important reason I chose this seminar:

- 1) I liked the course description.
- 2) I thought it would be challenging.
- 3) My advisor recommended it.
- 4) It was offered at a time I had open.
- 5) I could not get into one of my top preferences.

For the following questions:

(1=An appropriate amount, 2=Too much, 3=Too little, 4=Far too much, 5=Far too little)

- 2) How much reading did you do?
- 3) How much out-of-class writing did you do? (First-Year Writing Seminar guidelines suggest a minimum of six essays and a maximum of nine.)
- 4) How much time was spent learning about writing?
- 5) How much time was devoted to learning how to revise your essays? (FWS guidelines suggest that a minimum of three essays go through a process of guided revision.)

How much do you agree with the following statements?

(1=Very strongly, 2=Strongly, 3=Somewhat, 4=A little, 5=Not at all)

In class, in conferences, or in paper comments, the teacher emphasized

- 6) choosing the words that best express ideas.
- 7) writing grammatically correct sentences.
- 8) structuring sentences carefully.
- 9) providing appropriate documentation for sources.
- 10) developing a strong argument.
- 11) writing well-focused, coherent paragraphs.
- 12) making transitions from one paragraph to the next.
- 13) focusing an essay on a significant problem, hypothesis, thesis, argument, or idea
- 14) supporting claims with pertinent, substantive evidence.
- 15) incorporating and analyzing source material and quotations.
- 16) editing essays to eliminate flaws of grammar, word choice, spelling, and format.
- 17) revising essays to enhance interest, clarity, and persuasiveness.
- 18) writing in a style appropriate for a particular purpose.
- 19) writing in a style appropriate for a particular audience.

In this seminar,

- 20) reading and writing assignments formed an understandable progression.
- 21) the level of difficulty of the readings seemed appropriate.
- 22) I learned to read with care in the discipline of the seminar.
- 23) informal/preparatory writing assignments helped me understand the readings and write an essay.
- 24) I had opportunities to confer privately with the teacher.
- 25) the teacher was well-prepared.
- 26) the teacher directed discussions well.
- 27) the teacher treated my writing with respect.
- 28) the teacher graded my papers fairly.
- 29) the teacher returned our papers within a reasonable length of time.
- 30) comments on each returned paper helped me improve the next assignment.
- 31) I felt intellectually stimulated.
- 32) I became a more confident writer.
- 33) I became a more skillful writer.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department Linguistics Course Number 1100, 107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The description drastically oversold the course. I was very excited entering the semester, and the course sounded like it would be fun. However, I found myself horribly uninterested in the class discussions almost 90% of the time, largely because it seemed like we only talked about interesting/rear linguistic material for 10% of the class. The instructor was excellent, very nice and I enjoyed her very much, but the course on the whole was not writing half the time, since they did not tie up with class discussions.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

No. This course made me terribly unmotivated to write, which was an impressive feat on the part of the department considering I generally love to write. I think style - mainly the use of irony - should have been stressed more.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department Ling Course Number 100.107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I enjoyed the material taught in the course and the types of written assignments given. I felt, however, that some of the requirements and expectations of the first couple of assignments could have been made more clear. In addition, I did not feel that the "learning how to write" portion of the course was truly tied into the material learned in the course.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I believe that my writing improved mainly because I was pushed to practice writing. I already knew about most of the writing tips and suggestions, but there were a few new ones that helped. I think more emphasis on learning to write more fluidly would be better.

(over)

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Written comments were mainly helpful, as they pointed out places in my paper that was either too confusing, could have been removed, too broad, etc.

c

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The discussions of assigned texts, were not very appropriate to the writing we did. This could have been improved on, perhaps by making us apply what we learn on the discussions of writing by rewriting/analyzing assigned texts.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My greatest strength is being able to organize a paper in a logical and easy to understand manner. My ^{greatest} weakness is cutting down individual sentences and making them more understandable.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Maroney

Department LING Course Number 1100.107

Course Title Creating the Science of Languages

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It is in general a good course. The materials covered is interesting and instructor presented them in an engaging way. I think one weakness is that the writing assignments do not really relate much to course materials but rather general. I personally prefer if I can write about things covered in class.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, I do, mainly in conciseness and organization.
The course regarding writing is good in my mind.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes , they inform me of what I did badly
and what ~~is~~ styles to continue .

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

The class discussion is usually not very interesting
but probably because the class - early in the morning -

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strength : Clarity and expressiveness .

Weakness : Verbosity . Sometimes lack of focus .

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LINGUISTIC Course Number LING 100-007

Course Title Creating the Sci. of Lang

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

- I enjoy taking this class. I wish I can get another interesting Fws like this for next semester.
- The materials are eye openers for people who are new to the subject.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, the goals for each assignments are stated explicitly when it is assigned.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, it allows me to see the mistakes
I made.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Although sometimes the assigned texts are
esoteric because the class discussions
really help to clarify them.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strength: finding and using sources
weaknesses: structure set up.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney
C C

Department Ling Course Number 1100.107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I really liked this course! So many people have complained about their FWS, but I don't think anyone in this one had anything but positive things to say. Mary is super understanding of the fact that everyone has many assignments for many other classes, and she does a good job of balancing teaching with reducing excessive workload.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes - this course helped me practice my writing!

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes! I was asked to improve my 2nd essay based on comments from essay 1

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They helped reinforce what we had learned from the reading by providing multiple people's understanding

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I think I am good at writing clear sentences and still need to work on writing direct & with clear purpose.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department Linguistics Course Number LNG1100.107

Course Title Creating the Sci of Lang

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It was interesting to learn about linguistics and linguistics-related topics, but sometimes it was confusing or boring. For example, we read about a certain topic, but I didn't understand it, and in class ~~she~~ she didn't really explain it either, so I'm still confused about it. However, most of the material was fun to learn about, and helpful for assignments and for knowledge.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

The course focused on making an argument and being able to support with evidence. I might have slightly improved, but I don't really see a huge difference.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Sometimes they were helpful, but a lot of the time they were a little vague and didn't help me improve the paper (suggestions). Toward the end of the semester, though, they got better and more helpful, giving tips on what to do to make my writing better.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

There were a lot of class discussions, but a lot of people either didn't know what to say or were just too shy, so sometimes the discussions seemed a little forced.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

I find that I know what I want to say, but I don't know how to say it, which are my greatest strength + weakness

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Maroney

Department LING 1100 - 607 Course Number 18325

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This course provides a good introduction to the topic of linguistics and has been useful for developing an understanding of experimental design and scientific writing.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes It has helped improve my writing through individual meetings with the instructor and through readings on grammar and style.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, because they identified weaknesses in the writing

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

They were useful, but discussions of the assigned texts about grammar and style did not occur often

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

My greatest strength is the ability to organize my writing

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LIN6 Course Number 1100,107

Course Title Creating the Art of Long

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

It was decent, not too interesting or boring.
Could be a bit boring at times.
Video audio not working was annoying.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Only slightly. I feel like I did well but
the course did not really offer that exciting
stimulation.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

yes, a lot better than online.
I had trouble viewing online
so I couldn't see all of them.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Not that useful when it
comes to essays.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths would be organization and ideas.
Weaknesses would be wordiness and
vagueness at times.

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LING 1100-107 Course Number 18325

Course Title Creating the Sci of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

This course was pretty interesting.

The TA provided many intellectually stimulating articles and topics to discuss.

TA just needs to be more comfortable leading discussions.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, I believe I am better able to incorporate material from sources and remain more focused in my writing.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, comments were concise and to the point.

More comments on papers would have been appreciated.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Class discussions helped me understand the texts + writings better, but would have been more helpful if the TA took more lead and guided the discussions more often.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Strengths: - explaining ideas/concepts fluently
- grammatical accuracy

Weaknesses: - thesis writing
- conciseness

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LINA 1100 Course Number 107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Strengths

- Good teacher - willing to help, made discussions clear.
- Interesting Topic
- Weaknesses
- Didn't engage whole class frequently.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes. Profs. meetings + personal comments on essays helped me.

The books assigned, I think, did not relate to the topic addressed in the course.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Useful.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

- Style
 - Ability to write & edit
 - Weak
 - Weak grammar
-

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LING Course Number 1100,107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language.

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

FWSs in general are annoying requirements, a waste of time and effort.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

No . We should get rid of FWS

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Maybe

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Little.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

Greatest strength: don't spend a lot of time on FWS.

Greatest weaknesses: being forced to take FWS

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LING Course Number LING 1100 - 107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

The course was good, though I would prefer to have
less style readings + more linguistic
readings.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

Yes, because my writing is now more clear and coherent
due to the type of essays assigned. A clear thesis,
unified topics in each paragraph, and supporting
evidence were stressed heavily.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes, because the comments pointed out flaws in my writing and suggested ways to fix the flaws without being too formulaic or telling me exactly what to do so I didn't have to think about it myself

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Quite useful.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

strength: my writing is very focused,
with a clear topic & support for topic
weakness: my writing is ~~also~~ not particularly
interesting (word choice + sentence
structure)

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department LING Course Number 1100-107

Course Title Creating the Science of Language

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

Very interesting topic with a nice progression of essays
(start easy, get harder/more involved) that help develop
skills useful to other college writing. Readings were
not too boring and reasonably easy to comprehend.
Instructor was very sweet and very helpful.

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

- Not really. I feel like I still write at the same level and my style has not changed.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

Yes. Written comments, especially from the instructor, helped me gain insight on how to ~~proceed~~ proceed with my writing, ~~as well~~ what other information I could include, and how to improve.

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

Provided more insight I guess, but they weren't that useful overall. Discussing writing often helped me look at my writing from a different perspective, ~~but~~ and reading other people's writing helped me get a better idea of what I could/should be doing.

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?

~~weakness:~~ I tend to not explain myself very well sometimes; what is clear to me often does not translate into my writing. I also have a very narrow vocabulary.

strength: I am usually pretty concise?)

JOHN S. KNIGHT INSTITUTE FOR WRITING IN THE DISCIPLINES

First-Year Writing Seminar Evaluation

Fall 2015

Part I: Written responses

Instructor's Name Mary Moroney

Department Linguistics Course Number LING 1100.107

Course Title Creating the Sci of Lang

What are your overall impressions of the course? Please be as specific as possible in analysis of strengths and/or suggestions for improvement.

I felt like

This course had more writing and less linguistics than I expected and wanted. I realize that this is an FWS, but the main reason I signed up for this particular FWS was because of the blurb that promised linguistics. I appreciated the ~~text~~ readings on linguistics — yes — but those readings were the main way that we learned about linguistics. Much of class time was spent on writing prompts or spent (in my opinion, somewhat redundantly) on discussions where almost every student had to ~~speak~~ speak exactly once. Which could be good or bad. Thanks for the food!

Do you believe your writing has improved? If so, how did the course promote this improvement? Are there aspects of writing we should have stressed more heavily?

I don't think my writing has improved significantly.

Were written comments on papers helpful? If so, why? If not, why not?

✓ (es. Sometimes, they pointed out errors or unclear language; sometimes, they helped me figure out how to organize my essay better.)

How useful were class discussions of the assigned texts? of writing?

:/

After taking this course, what do you consider to be your greatest strengths and weaknesses as a writer?
