

Mott Community College

2005 General Education Requirement Comment Report

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
General Education Type: CAC			
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
191	1370	4.35	Evidence of online research could be stronger.
General Education Type: MES			
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
221	1307	3	Strengths: This is an effective assignment to require students to meet the guidelines in the rubric.
221	1309	3	All aspects weren't compared.
221	1313	3	Weak response in comparison to other students.
221	1314	3	Excellent response, well written.
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
222	1226	0	Was this the correct assignment? It doesn't address the question.
222	1227	1	The assignment was based upon the comparison of structures vs. culture. This paper lacked substance on concerns of the society.
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
225	1267	1	The assignment topic is not related to the 4 outcomes listed for MES.
225	1268	1	Assignment not related to course outcomes.
225	1271	3	Strengths: Although this is the same general directions to students, this paper develops the fourth objective well.
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
228	1246	3	No instructor assignment sheet! Missing the first page of the assignment.
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
232	1287	3	Strengths: Student shared several examples of traditions, contributions and perspectives.
232	1290	3	Enjoyed the comparison - important for students.
232	1294	2	Need more about contributions.
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
234	1216	1	The assignment only partially fulfilled the outcomes for the MES rubric. Comparison, perspectives and contributions would have been beneficial to include in the assignment.
234	1219	1	Instructor's assignment elicits much about an individual, but their contributions to culture is very little.
Overall Course Comment: <input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			
<input style="width: 100%; height: 15px;" type="text"/>			

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
236	1300	0	While a worthwhile look into the deaf culture, this is not a non-western culture.
236	1304	1	Telecommuting is not a social issue, ethnic group or culture. Doesn't meet criteria.
236	1305	0	Gay and lesbians are not part of a non-western culture. Assignment must be focused enough to meet a course outcome. Doesn't meet the criteria for the MES designation.

General Education Type: SAC

Overall Course Comment:

239	1505	2.5	Random organization, incomplete sentences/ideas, and vaguely explained points.
-----	------	-----	--

Overall Course Comment:

241	1709	2.5	Spoke very fast, mumbled, and had lack of logical idea progression.
-----	------	-----	---

241	1721	2.5	Poor vocal variety, squirming, poor logical idea progression.
-----	------	-----	---

Overall Course Comment:

242	1600	2	Poor eye contact, monotone, hunching over posture. Poor idea progression, short presentation. Read directly from notes.
-----	------	---	---

Overall Course Comment:

245	1482	1	All reading from text he has never seen; no eye contact, inaccurate information.
-----	------	---	--

245	1483	2	Poor organization, superficial research.
-----	------	---	--

245	1484	2.5	Weak organization; poor visual aids.
-----	------	-----	--------------------------------------

245	1486	1.5	All mumbled reading, talked/read too fast.
-----	------	-----	--

245	1487	2	Did not demonstrate full understanding of topic.
-----	------	---	--

245	1488	1	Good speaker but misunderstood assignment completely.
-----	------	---	---

245	1489	2	Did not fully meet objectives.
-----	------	---	--------------------------------

245	1490	2	No interest in subject, does not meet objective.
-----	------	---	--

245	1491	2.5	Did not completely comprehend the assignment.
-----	------	-----	---

Overall Course Comment:

246	1567	2.5	Gum chewing was distracting. Artifact did not meet objective - it didn't address all requirements of assignment.
-----	------	-----	--

246	1569	2.5	Poor eye contact - had back to audience. Poor body language - slouchy, and voice was monotone.
-----	------	-----	--

246	1572	2.5	Monotone, decreased eye contact. Did not meet objective - poorly developed objectives. Very short presentation (not the required 4-6 minutes).
-----	------	-----	--

Overall Course Comment:

247	1524	1	Aquatic life report - not on topic.
-----	------	---	-------------------------------------

247	1525	1	Not on topic - not covering interpersonal communication.
-----	------	---	--

247	1526	1	Topic of presentation did not cover any of possible objectives in assignment.
-----	------	---	---

Overall Course Comment:

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
248	1542	2.5	Poor organization and research.
248	1546	1.5	No argument, poor organization, and lack of knowledge of topic.
248	1549	2	Distracting vocal mannerisms (uh, um). Tangled sentences - unclear ideas and poor organization.
248	1550	1.5	Argument not substantiated - many generalizations.
248	1551	2	Lots of hair - flipping and many vague generalizations.

Overall Course Comment:

250	1668	2	Vague message.
250	1670	2	Vague message, no logical progression of idea. Language not always clear and appropriate. Spoke in monotone voice.
250	1675	1.25	Appeared unfamiliar with material he was reading.
250	1679	3	Appeared to be reading entire presentation.

General Education Type: *SMC*

Overall Course Comment:

253	1577	1	Scientific problem is not the "neighbor's car won't start". Problem could be stated identifying possible causes for car not starting. No hypothesis, hypothesis could be "If the spark plugs are replaced, then the car will start".
253	1577	1	No data collected - casual trial and error.
253	1578	0	No test, no results, no conclusion.
253	1579	1	This doesn't follow the scientific method. No specific hypothesis was tested. This is a trial and error procedure. However, student does demonstrate critical thinking.
253	1580	0.5	Did not use the scientific method, used the trial and error process. Several guesses are listed, none are clear and measurable. No data collected.
253	1581	0	This paper does not follow the scientific method.
253	1582	0	This does not follow the scientific method, there was no clear hypothesis tested. Used a table but didn't analyze anything.
253	1583	3	Strengths - Hypothesis is stated and tested. Conclusion relates to hypothesis.
253	1584	3	Hypothesis needs to be more firmly stated in measurable terms. Trial and error procedure was used instead of scientific method.
253	1585	2.5	Trial and error procedure. Hypothesis is too general. Data is not used to draw conclusions.
253	1586	0	This artifact does not follow the scientific method. There is not a clearly stated hypothesis.

Overall Course Comment:

256	1554	4.5	Data was displayed in a graphs, but no discussion of the data was included. Conclusion state that hypothesis was "proven wrong" should have stated that data didn't support the hypothesis.
256	1554	4.5	Strength - state how the study could be improved.
256	1555	3	The data collected does not test the hypothesis as stated. Conclusion stated that method should be changed to make the data fit the hypothesis.

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
256	1556	4	Methodology states that "scientific method" would be used. Data was displayed but not discussed and conclusion stated the hypothesis was "right".
256	1557	3	Data collected does not test the hypothesis. Data was displayed and briefly discussed, but not clearly.
256	1558	5	Methodology doesn't clearly state how hypothesis will be tested. Conclusion doesn't clearly match the hypothesis.
256	1559	4	Conclusion was stated in the results section. Hypothesis was "proven" wrong. Data needs to be converted to percentages to respond to different size of comparison groups.
256	1560	4	Problem was not stated clearly - author just gave his/her opinion.
256	1561	2	Hypothesis was not stated and no conclusion given.
256	1562	2.5	Hypothesis is very vague and methodology went beyond the scope of the hypothesis. Data analysis did not give total sample size, so no actual conclusion could be drawn.
256	1563	2.5	Listed many hypothesis and predicted specific percentages. Data analysis and conclusion do not match the hypotheses.

Overall Course Comment:

258	1472	4	Hypothesis needs to be more clearly stated, data analysis incomplete and conclusion does not discuss data.
258	1473	2	No clearly stated hypothesis, no data analysis, survey copied from another source and no clear conclusion.
258	1475	5	Very well done - well thought out, well organized, and well written.
258	1476	3.5	Hypothesis needs to be specific and measurable. Data analysis incomplete and the conclusion was not specific.
258	1477	3	Data analysis is incomplete, need to be converted to percentages.
258	1478	4	Graph did not accurately depict data.
258	1479	5	Well done!
258	1480	4	Problem is not defined.
258	1481	2.5	Survey doesn't match hypothesis and data analysis incomplete.

Overall Course Comment:

259	1531	3	Hypothesis has more than one statement.
259	1532	3	Hypothesis has multiple statements. Data is recorded but not analyzed.
259	1534	4	Hypothesis contains multiple statements. Averages were only recorded, no actual data given.
259	1535	1.5	Multiple hypotheses. Survey was not original - copied. No conclusion is given to support the hypothesis or show that it was not supported.
259	1536	2	Conclusion is incorrect based on data recorded. Two hypotheses are given that are conflicting.
259	1537	3	No hypothesis and no conclusion.
259	1539	4	The graph does not accurately reflect data and is difficult to interpret.

Overall Course Comment:

260	1452	4	This paper contained multiple hypotheses.
-----	------	---	---

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
260	1455	3	Data analysis was incomplete.
260	1456	3	Multiple hypotheses.
260	1458	4	Student used wrong graph to show their data.
260	1459	4	Data analysis could be discussed more in the paper.
260	1460	4	Hypothesis is not clearly stated.
260	1461	2.5	Data not analyzed far enough to test hypothesis.

Overall Course Comment:

261	1587	3	Survey results do not "prove", but support hypothesis. Poor analysis of data, inappropriate conclusions "males more yes".
261	1587	3	Data collection method not described, how were subjects selected.
261	1588	4	The question asked three different things, but then lumped them together as one.
261	1589	3	Incorrect analysis of data. No conclusion, data analysis was written under conclusion.
261	1589	3	Hypothesis poorly written, no identification as to what type of commercials will influence subjects. Did not identify how subjects were chosen.
261	1590	3	Conclusion did not focus on one thing in the beginning of the paper. One page reads a variety of conclusions, another page gives one specific conclusion.
261	1590	3	Data analysis only done on a graph, not discussed. Procedure not described well and the conclusion is not written to address the hypothesis.
261	1592	2	Analysis of data progresses with bits of hypothesis thrown in. No clear hypothesis. Analysis not graphed or charted, only narrative; not always clear.
261	1594	4	Testing/ data collection not described.
261	1595	5	Multiple hypotheses - should only have one. Poorly written survey.
261	1596	5	Too many hypotheses. Unable to answer and test one of the hypotheses.

Overall Course Comment:

263	1464	3	Would have been a good study if sample size were appropriate.
263	1466	5	Student did a nice job on correlation.

Overall Course Comment:

264	1442	4	Sample size small and biased.
264	1443	3	No graph to report data and too small of a sample size.
264	1444	4	Survey questions are open-ended, not easily quantifiable. Survey questions do not reflect hypothesis well.
264	1446	3	Survey questions were subjective. Tried to make a correlation between 2 unrelated topics.
264	1447	5	Data analysis was performed, but student didn't understand the statistical results.
264	1448	4	Did not include any graphs or charts.
264	1449	4	Graph didn't show data analysis - only showed raw data.

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	----------------

264	1450	3	Did not perform literature review. Hypothesis did not list the problem that was identified.
-----	------	---	---

Overall Course Comment:

--

265	1507	4.5	The artifact seemed copied from the internet.
265	1508	4	Seems like it was copied from the internet.
265	1509	4	Poorly written hypothesis, unable to understand until conclusions drawn.
265	1510	4	The topic selected was very simplistic.
265	1512	4	This study is obviously taken from the internet. The table and charts were not labeled appropriately.
265	1514	4	The hypothesis was not specific.

General Education Type: WAC

Overall Course Comment:

Assignment objectives not explicit enough: How many elements to discuss? Length? Was the biographical information expected? Citation format? Inclusion of images?

267	1646	4	Entry on Works Cited page does not provide necessary information.
267	1647	2	Many run-on sentences.
267	1648	2.5	Works Cited Page. Lack of analytical detail.
267	1649	3	Works Cited page format and entries.
267	1650	2	Little development.
267	1652	2	Discusses many books - not one.
267	1653	1	Why the annotated bibliography?
267	1655	1.5	Little development and short simple sentences.
267	1656	1.5	Little development and illustration.

Overall Course Comment:

Superbly presented assignment, clear in its objectives and directions.
--

269	1621	3	Superbly presented assignment, clear in its objectives and directions.
269	1621	3	Meets objectives closely. Somewhat perfunctory in execution, but technically, pretty sound interpretation.
269	1622	1	Unfortunately, this writer has missed key points of assignment requirements, as well a clear understanding of the poem.
269	1623	2	Gets the job done, but perhaps not as sophisticated in its analysis as the objectives require.
269	1625	1	Ambiguity as a poetic device seems to lead writer in circles, unable to clearly articulate the source of ambiguity. Objectives are met, yet poorly executed.
269	1626	1	Some odd usage issues here - the poem as actor?
269	1627	1	Objectives are minimally met. Lack of concrete ideas.
269	1628	5	Well - executed! Excellent essay, superb - i.e., college level prose. Hurrah!
269	1629	5	Just a few weak spots; otherwise a fine reading experience.

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
-------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------	----------------

269	1630	2.5	Skills of writer don't serve his ideas well enough.
-----	------	-----	---

269	1631	3	Meets objectives, somewhat awkwardly.
-----	------	---	---------------------------------------

269	1632	1	Tries hard, but fails to communicate ideas clearly.
-----	------	---	---

Overall Course Comment:

--

270	1680	2	No Works Cited page and had no clear focus - trying too much.
-----	------	---	---

270	1681	2	No Works Cited page.
-----	------	---	----------------------

270	1682	2	No Works Cited page, and too much summary.
-----	------	---	--

270	1683	1	Artifact too reliant on the source material! Most of essay is quoted.
-----	------	---	---

270	1684	2	Does not actually argue a position.
-----	------	---	-------------------------------------

270	1686	1	Unclear, incoherent sentences. This made for any expression of the ideas difficult.
-----	------	---	---

270	1687	2	Over use of quotes from sources. Claim not illustrated with analysis. Lots of big words that don't fit the context.
-----	------	---	---

270	1688	1	No Works Cited page. Does not show grasp of terms -subject and object - as the assignment requires. Overuse of quote from source.
-----	------	---	---

270	1689	2.5	Makes a claim in conclusion, but otherwise the essay describes without arguing a point.
-----	------	-----	---

270	1690	1.5	Does not take a position on the question. Does not grasp appropriate definition of "subject" for the topic.
-----	------	-----	---

Overall Course Comment:

--

271	1633	3	Good assignment with good questions and guidance for students. Serviceable.
-----	------	---	---

271	1634	4	Data used without sourcing; questionable facts. Assignment should probably explicitly remind writers to document sources correctly.
-----	------	---	---

271	1636	1	Lots of short choppy sentences. Transitions - from past to present - more organization. Punctuation missing commas. Repetitive, unsubstantial sentences - no clear idea of the real issues involved - too many clichés, no depth of thought.
-----	------	---	--

271	1636	1	Too much like a rough draft.
-----	------	---	------------------------------

271	1637	1.5	Organization starts out good, but falls apart. Grammar problems, wording awkward, wrong words, words missing. Some good specifics.
-----	------	-----	--

271	1638	3	Unsubstantiated beliefs - (about existence of quotas). Quotes are really long.
-----	------	---	--

271	1639	5	Many statements that could be substantiated with statistics. Lots of unsubstantiated opinions - clichés. Written very well. Well organized.
-----	------	---	---

271	1640	1	Unsubstantiated statements - grammar problems and no organization.
-----	------	---	--

271	1641	4.5	Wordy in places and repetitive, but written well.
-----	------	-----	---

271	1642	2.5	Lacks sources throughout for data (i.e. average tuition \$19,000). Conclusions contradicted previous ascertations. No sense conclusions were based on course information. Clichés.
-----	------	-----	--

271	1643	5	A wonderful read.
-----	------	---	-------------------

Overall Course Comment:

No assignment description provided by instructor.

272	1693	2	Small font italics too annoying.
-----	------	---	----------------------------------

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
272	1695	1.5	Annoying all caps block letters. Undigested information provided in tables - relevant information not made a part of the written description.
272	1696	1.5	Little depth or concreteness of evidence. Over reliance on attached tables and graphs.
272	1698	2	Weak development.
272	1700	4	Small type - single spaced - very difficult to read.

Overall Course Comment: No assignment provided by instructor. Objective for artifacts is unknown without assignment.

273	1722	0	If the objective is to record the listener's reaction to the piece, then this student roughly did so, finally after much wandering around.
273	1724	2	A hint of objective (implied?) comes through. Careful, thoughtful analysis.
273	1725	4	Writer seems to be able to put previous knowledge to work. A pleasure to read - make me want to listen to those pieces.
273	1726	2.5	Very repetitive; seems very comfortable with jargon, but needn't repeat the same observation for each separate part of the music.
273	1727	1	Artifact has been graded / marked up. Student hasn't learned how to use the vocabulary of music well enough to write an insightful analysis.
273	1728	1	Student does not have writing skills to convey much of anything meaningful about the music.
273	1729	3.5	Student is making a point and backing it up. Yeah!
273	1730	1	Incomplete artifact.
273	1731	1	Can a listener ever "know" the meaning of a "song"? It is irritating to see several writers refer to this piece as a "song"! Vocabulary must be distinguished and precise.
273	1732	2	What's the point of mentioning duple meter, for example, if its significance isn't explained.
273	1732	2	This is overwritten; these may be the images that come to mind for this particular listener, but as a piece of writing it should communicate more of a sense of the piece.
273	1733	0	Can't evaluate lists.

Overall Course Comment:

278	1734	4	Opening sentences in general are weak - whole first paragraph is.
278	1734	4	Doesn't focus on specific skills acquired or explain about her quotations - just details facts of her experience.
278	1734	4	Doesn't explain how she gained respect for all members of a nursing team or why that is significant to her qualifications. Middle paragraph has no underlying organizing principle.
278	1735	3	A list of experiences, not a cover letter. First paragraph could contain more specific language - what "type" of patients? Add to the skills required by employer.
278	1736	3	Mentions areas where she excels but doesn't provide any support. Wording tone is inappropriate in places. Needs to be more concise and to the point, needs more substance.
278	1737	4	Writer should provide more specific support/examples of qualities. Needs more variety in sentence length and structure.
278	1738	2.5	Merely lists skills - doesn't explain or talk about them. Lists a lot of qualities but doesn't indicate how they were developed, or whom they've been recognized by.
278	1738	2.5	Repeats information found in the resume.
278	1739	4	Grammar / mechanics problems, along with word choice.

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
278	1740	4	Opening sentence weak.
278	1741	2.5	A list of facts, rather than a presentation of "selling points" and personal qualities. Some information irrelevant and wording unclear.
278	1742	3	Lists work experience rather than discusses what he/she has gained from them. Inappropriate tone in places. Assignment could allow for 3-5 paragraphs, instead of just 3.
278	1743	4.5	Wording/diction, wordiness, overly stuffy, formal language that comes across as awkward.
278	1744	2.5	Lists work experience rather than discuss what she gained from them. Needs more personal information that can't be construed from a resume.

Overall Course Comment:

--

280	1701	2.5	Did not follow assignment to critique what conclusion the group came to.
280	1702	1	Sentence fragments, sentences too long, just an article summary, no reference to group, doesn't follow assignment.
280	1703	2	Basically just reporting what group said.
280	1705	1.5	Fragments - not organized.
280	1706	1	Punctuation missing, no organization, doesn't follow assignment.
280	1707	1	Many problems with wording, grammar and sentences. Unable to communicate ideas.
280	1708	1	Inappropriate diction.

Overall Course Comment:

In general, the assignment doesn't call for any thinking or processing of the information reported. Overall critique of this assignment - when opinions are clearly prejudices as in these papers - what follow-up deals with evaluating these opinions.
--

281	1609	2	Use knowledge to comment on why activities may or may not be age appropriate - define CDA? Seems to be just answering questions that reader would be unaware of.
281	1609	2	In general, the assignment doesn't call for any thinking or processing of the information reported.
281	1609	2	Facts have been given but student has done no comparison of the two as assigned. There was nothing in-depth about the activities.
281	1610	2.5	Explain why some of the children seemed "good" and other not so "good". Where do these judgments come from. Perhaps leave out the one about the abuse because all the facts were not presented.
281	1610	2.5	Doesn't address question of what could have been done to avoid these people in court.
281	1610	2.5	Use of abbreviations not defined. Problems with subject/verb agreement/tense. Most sentences OK - a few run ins. Problems with conclusions.
281	1611	1	Sentences confusing, numerous grammatical errors, does not fulfill requirements of assignment. Quoting unclear.
281	1611	1	Assignment should include suggested issues or questions to discuss.
281	1612	3	Organized in the beginning but when student gets to her experience it starts to ramble. She addresses the working issue but not the "global society" issue.
281	1612	3	More explanation of what is meant by "global society". Paper doesn't discuss possible solutions.
281	1613	2	Student needs to proof read the paper. More information about activities and compare/contrast as assignment states.
281	1614	2	Make clear why student is attending this hearing - to record impressions and to think about, etc. Generally about the assignment, how does this relate to classwork?

<i>Course ID#</i>	<i>Artifact Control#</i>	<i>Artifact Score</i>	<i>Comment</i>
281	1615	2	Lots of problems with grammar, spelling and CDA? Just a bundle of facts with no apparent meaning.
281	1616	2	Main point - removal of child - isn't mentioned until second paragraph. Grammar problems inappropriate words. Last paragraph - what kind of programs? Who are these "Americans"!
281	1617	2.5	Student not using critical thinking skills here. This paper makes or implies a racist stereotype that low-income minority parents do not value education.
281	1617	2.5	Overall critique of this assignment - when opinions are clearly prejudices as in this paper - what follow-up deals with evaluating these opinions.
281	1618	3	Too many short sentences. What is "tummy time"? This student at least seems engaged with the assignment and went beyond just asking questions and listing answers. But still there is no clear focus.
281	1620	3.5	Too many short sentences and punctuation.