Rider University
Fall 2020 Course Evaluations

Course: TheRhetoricofScience: BHP-281-WE1

Instructor: Timothy McGee * ,Danielle Jacobs Duda

Response Rate: 11/16 (68.75 %)

1 - Is this course required for your program?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Yes	(1)	9	81.82%		
No	(2)	2	18.18%		

Response Rate
11/16 (68.75%)

2 - What grade do you expect for this course?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
A	(1)	9	81.82%		
A-	(2)	0	0.00%		
B+	(3)	2	18.18%		
B	(4)	0	0.00%		
B-	(5)	0	0.00%		
C+	(6)	0	0.00%		
C	(7)	0	0.00%		
C-	(8)	0	0.00%		
D+	(9)	0	0.00%		
D	(10)	0	0.00%		
D-	(11)	0	0.00%		
F	(12)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate
11/16 (68.75%)

3 - My own efforts in the course have resulted in greater knowledge of the subject matter.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	3	27.27%		4.18
Agree	(4)	7	63.64%		
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.18	0.60	4.00

4 - My own efforts in the course matched or exceeded the professor's expectations.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	1	9.09%		3.82
Agree	(4)	7	63.64%		
Neutral	(3)	3	27.27%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	3.82	0.60	4.00

Course:	TheRhetoricofScience: BHP-281-WE1
Instructor:	Timothy McGee * ,Danielle Jacobs Duda
Response Rate:	11/16 (68.75 %)

5 - I was well-prepared for class, having met reading and other assignment deadlines.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Always	(5)	2	18.18%		
Often	(4)	7	63.64%		4.00
Sometimes	(3)	2	18.18%		
Rarely	(2)	0	0.00%		
Never	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.00	0.63	4.00

6 - I participated in class.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Always	(5)	2	18.18%		
Often	(4)	5	45.45%		3.82
Sometimes	(3)	4	36.36%		
Rarely	(2)	0	0.00%		
Never	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	3.82	0.75	4.00

7 - My instructor explained the purpose of this course, as well as the goals of the individual lessons or units.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	36.36%		
Agree	(4)	6	54.55%		4.27
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.27	0.65	4.00

8 - My instructor set and communicated high expectations.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	2	18.18%		
Agree	(4)	8	72.73%		4.09
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		
				0 25 50 100	Question

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.09	0.54	4.00

Rider University
Fall 2020 Course Evaluations

Course: TheRhetoricofScience: BHP-281-WE1

Instructor: Timothy McGee * ,Danielle Jacobs Duda

Response Rate: 11/16 (68.75 %)

9 - Class activities and assignments were focused on achieving course objectives.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	3	27.27%		4.27
Agree	(4)	8	72.73%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.27	0.47	4.00

10 - My instructor led course sessions in an organized way.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	5	45.45%		4.36
Agree	(4)	5	45.45%		
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.36	0.67	4.00

11 - My instructor provided timely feedback on tests and other assignments.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	36.36%		4.27
Agree	(4)	6	54.55%		
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.27	0.65	4.00

12 - My instructor explained how work/performance was evaluated.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	36.36%		4.27
Agree	(4)	6	54.55%		
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.27	0.65	4.00

Course: TheRhetoricofScience: BHP-281-WE1

Instructor: Timothy McGee * ,Danielle Jacobs Duda

Response Rate: 11/16 (68.75 %)

13 - My instructor created an environment conducive to learning.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	2	18.18%		4.09
Agree	(4)	8	72.73%		
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.09	0.54	4.00

14 - My instructor demonstrated respect for the students.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	4	36.36%		4.36
Agree	(4)	7	63.64%		
Neutral	(3)	0	0.00%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.36	0.50	4.00

15 - My instructor was available for direct communication.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(5)	6	54.55%		4.45
Agree	(4)	4	36.36%		
Neutral	(3)	1	9.09%		
Disagree	(2)	0	0.00%		
Strongly Disagree	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.45	0.69	5.00

16 - This course required me to interact with my fellow students

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Always	(5)	4	36.36%		4.27
Often	(4)	6	54.55%		
Sometimes	(3)	1	9.09%		
Rarely	(2)	0	0.00%		
Never	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.27	0.65	4.00

Course: TheRhetoricofScience: BHP-281-WE1

Instructor: Timothy McGee * ,Danielle Jacobs Duda

Response Rate: 11/16 (68.75 %)

17 - This course encouraged cooperation and teamwork among students.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Always	(5)	2	18.18%		
Often	(4)	8	72.73%		4.09
Sometimes	(3)	1	9.09%		
Rarely	(2)	0	0.00%		
Never	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.09	0.54	4.00

18 - This course encouraged active or hands-on learning.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Always	(5)	2	18.18%		
Often	(4)	6	54.55%		3.82
Sometimes	(3)	2	18.18%		
Rarely	(2)	1	9.09%		
Never	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	3.82	0.87	4.00

19 - My instructor created an environment in which I was comfortable participating.

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Always	(5)	5	45.45%		
Often	(4)	3	27.27%		4.09
Sometimes	(3)	2	18.18%		
Rarely	(2)	1	9.09%		
Never	(1)	0	0.00%		

Response Rate	Mean	STD	Median
11/16 (68.75%)	4.09	1.04	4.00

20 - Additional Comments:

Response Rate	4/16 (25%)

• While online, the fun atmosphere of the class was kept alive by both professors. It was a joy to hear about how much they knew, and they both had a very large knowledge base.

• Really loved the flexibility of the class and how friendly both professors were--created a very welcoming environment.

• Everything was well with this course.

• The professors handled balancing their skill sets for the sake of our education wonderfully, and it was always interesting to hear them approach each others' subject matter from their own perspectives.

Course: TheRhetoricofScience: BHP-281-WE1

Instructor: Timothy McGee * ,Danielle Jacobs Duda

Response Rate: 11/16 (68.75 %)

---

21 - What specific advice would you have for this instructor about things he/she could do to help you learn better?
Response Rate	6/16 (37.5%)

• Canvas was a little difficult to navigate. The module section was packed full of modules, and readings were scattered throughout within the modules section. It would be easier if there was a seperate assignment tab with links to the discussions and with all the readings listed for that week.

• N/A, thoroughly enjoyed how class was conducted.

• I feel that the online format would prevent us from having as much time to review readings or powerpoints and such. Maybe putting less activities into each online class would help with going more in-depth into some of the topics or powerpoints.

• Maybe this was just me, but I feel like even though this was an honors class, the amount of work we had was intense. The bigger assignments and exams in particular were a lot, especially with the midterm and Researched Argument overlapping at one point. Maybe if things could be better paced/rearranged or the work could be cut back a bit, it might help with managing workload.

• I can not say anything that you both need to do. It was great. There isn't much to do over Zoom, besides shortening the class a bit. Although, it was not a huge problem for me. - You guys were engaging with the class. - You were both fair. - You had a goal for this course. - You had a great outline of this course.

• While I understand that this was a particularly politically charged year with two major aspects in focus, I still believe it was detrimental to the entire Rhetoric of Science in the News module that almost every article was about COVID19 and/or Donald Trump. This is not just because it drastically politically charged the classroom -- often in quite a hostile fashion -- but because the scope of application for the skills and knowledge gained in the RoS course was incredibly narrowed, where the whole apparent purpose of the "in the News" module was to broaden our awareness of how to apply what we've learned. Potential fixes for this would include a more varied collection of news subjects, and using a broader variety of news sources as well: a larger pool of opinions, writing styles, and focus points is more accurate to the environs that the RoS material would be useful in. Science is not, after all, purely about politics or disease. Additionally -- and it pains me to say this -- while Dr. McGee is an amazing professor, he has a tendency towards some dangerous classroom rhetoric: a student had presented an article in the news about how President Trump had taken all of the treatments he had publicly advocated for (see what I mean? It's all we ever talked about), suggesting that he genuinely believed in these treatments and advocated for them for a reason other than "a war on science". The professor's response was to tell her "well, he was probably faking being sick for sympathy for all we know", the kind of suggestion which would not only be considered extremely insensitive if directed at any other individual, but also actively changed the classroom dynamic to one where it was forwardly obvious that he was NOT going to entertain the idea of the president having motives rooted in something other than evil and ego. While Dr. McGee was primary offender in this fashion, Dr. Jacobs-Duda actively supported this direction of discussion as well. Please, PLEASE reconsider the degree to which political affiliations influence one's methods of teaching; it just makes students not want to participate when the discussion always wanes towards the same topic week after week.

22 - Please explain how assignments and activities supported the learning outcomes for the course.
Response Rate	5/16 (31.25%)

• the assignments helped me look deeper at the various texts we had to read. I also learned alot from various other students perspectives that I missed in the reading. The reading was dense sometimes, but having a group to work it out was helpful.

• I thought all the assignments were helpful in making me prepared for class.

• All assignments and activities were very vital to the course and helped me learn so much about different areas of science and most importantly, the various rhetoric that was used in these cases. There was a lot I was able to take away from this course.

• These assignments made me reflect on my current major. I am more interested and leaning more towards the science courses. I love learning about chemistry and the rhetoric behind it. It was super interesting to see this combination, especially when there was an assignment based on coding. It was just a great course.

• Often times, the assignments in this course involved developing a deeper understanding of scientific history and language through first-hand reading of primary or secondary sources. These tended to be accompanied by questions which -- rather than being based on a right/wrong dichotomy -- were open to discussion in the classroom and between students with the professors, helping not only with each individual's understanding of the rhetorical tools at use by the science writers, but also with their understanding of the implicit biases they themselves have as the ones reading. This format was what I believe was most productive for our learning, especially because there tended to be two, one in the early half of the class and one in the later, with which we could see the differences in our own perspectives after gaining new knowledge.