

IA 280

F98

## FICTION WRITING WORKSHOP

Laurie Alberts

**Format:** Discussion, Workshop

**Approximate Class Size:** 15

**Surveys Returned:** 13

**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 7

**Range:** 1-12

### *Overall Satisfaction With:*

**Class:** 4

**Instructor:** 4.3

**Experience:** 4.1

### *Approximate Level of Agreement:*

**Objects clear?** 4.3

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.6

**Stimulating?** 4.0

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.0

**Instructor organized?** 4.1

**Comments helpful?** 4.3

**Instructor motivating?** 3.7

**Assignments clear?** 4.3

**Comfortable participating?** 3.6

**Course challenging?** 4.2

**Course modifiable?** 4.2

**Recommend?** 4.4

### **Assignments:**

• Two complete short stories and two rewrites, read and comment on other student's work, essay on a published short story.

### **Instructor's Teaching Style:**

• Laurie is very approachable in and out of class. She carefully reads each piece and gives strong, helpful critiques. She really wants to help her students write better fiction. She has her bias against science fiction — she hates it, but will still read and accept it.

• She tries very hard to follow the writer's train of thought and give pertinent advice — at least, with my work this has helped. Sometimes she structures the discussion a bit too authoritatively, but that's because we can't stand up for ourselves too well at 9 a.m.? Dunno.

• The teacher is very approachable. She shows a strong interest in the students and the class. She is extremely fair, almost too fair, with the student's work. She is supportive but perhaps she shouldn't be about everything.

• The instructor often does not reveal her comments until students have discussed a story. Then she'll add her personal remarks. She gently forces people to participate. She is generally easy to approach and reasonably flexible. She is also very enthusiastic about her

work. Although biased in preference of style, she is open and aware of this.

• Laurie is really approachable and helpful, but she definitely has her biases — if you write sci-fi stuff, this isn't the class for you. However, she tries to be open about other genres, and her comments are helpful. She keeps the class from making rude comments during critiques, which is good.

• Laurie is extremely personable and friendly. She is available for outside help as often as the students makes the effort and she seems to sincerely care about both the students' work and the student (in terms of respect, feelings, etc.) She gives good criticism and obviously has taken the time to think about them first.

• Laurie makes herself accessible after class if you feel the needs to talk to her. There isn't much time in class to talk to her because there is so much to do. She seems really interested in the students.

• she facilitates a discussion between students before jumping in w/ her own opinions. She is very committed to us and she is smart.

• She has her own biases but she's open, helpful, approachable, and critical without being discouraging.

• Eating popcorn.

• She's pretty focused on what she likes, understandable, but I would prefer a little more objectivity. She's intelligent, a little bit too cynical, sometimes helpful, sometimes not.

• Very nurturing... "let's be nice, guys"...very positive, like a teat. Supportive w/ constructive criticism. I wanted to spend more time talking to her, but it's my own fault. Don't know whose opinion to trust after all classes. No method, thank God, but I miss the cruel truth occasionally. The sinners should pay.

• Laurie is pretty decent. Her class is a bit formulaic, predictable, set in its ways. But she is an attractive lass. Also she often got good insights and comments. She is pretty interested in students' progress, and is a caring mother.

### **Best things about course:**

• Writing and getting feedback.

• FEEDBACK and dialogue between students. Laurel's just another writer in the crowd, to me.

• It got me to actually start writing and thinking about writing.

• The freedom of the class structure to experiment w/ your work.

• Laurie. Not too much work. The work was stuff we wanted to do anyway.

• Laurie, and her allowance of the discussion to progress and digress.

• class discussion

• getting a real chance to work on my own writing.

• Laurie

• we get to write, comments by the teacher good.

• writing my own work.

- (My stories.) No, no, let's see. The good writers made it interesting.
- when people were actually awake and into workshopping.

#### **Worst things about course:**

- 15 photocopies of both stories we wrote. Cost a lot of \$.
- Some students were a bit snobby about critique.
- Forgetting to read the stuff. Hate that.
- the students in the class.
- A workshop seems to make people forget about being polite and sensitive. It can bring out the vicious side in everyone.
- Dumb kids in class are always the worst thing.
- when only a few people speak.
- The people in the class but this has nothing to do with Laurie.
- 9:00 AM- 12.
- The choice of bad stories, and lots of them.
- reading and discussing other people's bullshit stories as if there the word of god.
- (everybody else's) no but the bad stories are painful and aren't dissed heavily enough. The questions "what's at stake in this story."

#### **How could the course be strengthened?**

- Find a room that doesn't suck the lifeblood out of art. (Gray walls.) Somehow get discourse more fired up — perhaps by beginning at 10 a.m.? Have brief discussions with Laurie out of the room so no one's afraid to look dumb or admit they haven't read it. Just banish her for 5 min. a story. Take that whole teacher/grading/evaluating element and bury it in a hole.
- Instead of doing a lottery to get into the class, I think students should submit writing samples. She can still be fair in making the class diverse.
- It's fine the way it is.
- If it wasn't a 3 hr. class.
- Maybe change the "lottery" format — this is a 200 level course, it might be better if it reflected that kind of discrimination.
- at 9:00 everyone seems to be sleepy and less willing to talk.
  - More writing in class, less discussion.
- if everyone pulled no punches and there were only ten "serious" writers in here.
- Having a screening process to keep dolts and hacks out of the class. Or serve caffeine. Lots of it. Also, make it more than once a week. Workshopping is all about talking and critiquing and feelin' good. Yeah!

#### **Additional comments:**

- HAMPSHIRE SHOULD PAY FOR THE PHOTOCOPIES!
- The reason I didn't find this class to be excellent was because of the class's make up. It has little to do with Laurie.

- drop out of college if you want to be a writer.
- Laurie's a sweetheart.
- Laurie's pretty good. Better than that bastard Michael Lesy.

**IA 274**

**F98**

**THE RUSSIAN AND CUBAN REVOLUTIONS**

**Carolee Bengelsdorf**

**Format:** Lecture, Discussion

**Approximate Class Size:** 20?

**Surveys Returned:** 18

**Preparation Time (hrs/week):** Average: 6

**Range:** 1-15

#### **Overall Satisfaction With:**

**Class:** 4

**Instructor:** 4

**Experience:** 3.6

#### **Approximate Level of Agreement:**

**Objects clear?** 3.6

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.6

**Stimulating?** 4

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 2.8

**Instructor organized?** 3

**Comments helpful?** 3.6

**Instructor motivating?** 2.9

**Assignments clear?** 3.7

**Comfortable participating?** 3.9

**Course challenging?** 3.6

**Course modifiable?** 3.5

**Recommend?** 3.9

#### **Assignments:**

- Two papers: one on Cuba, one on Russia. "Overwhelming" amount of reading. (Almost all students referred to is as such.) 10 books total.

#### **Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Carolee seems really awesome. She's funny, entertaining, and she knows tons about Cuba and Russia. But lectures were not very focused (we always got behind) and she had us continue the reading anyway. So it was always confusing, where we were supposed to be. And I think that is because of this and the big reading load — students seldom participated in class (Carolee gave opportunities) because I don't think anyone (except a few) kept up on the readings. So "discussions" were never really discussions.
- she definitely an approachable teacher and is excited and welcomes/encourages discussion in class. Her stories are entertaining and educational. But she seems rather distracted from her relationship with the students. One has the feeling she could be talking to anyone.

- Carolee is very anecdotal and I found her class to be fun. After the second week she was pretty approachable, too. She welcomes opinions, but like Lynn Miller, it is hard to beat her on knowledge.
- Carolee is very approachable, frank, witty, and encouraging. Encourages class participation, but really knows the subject, has authority in it. Her style is easy to learn from, as long as you do the reading and know what she's referring to.
- I enjoy the instructor's teaching style which is to lecture and to intermix questions for the class in her lecture. She is very open to outside opinion and is sensitive to student's needs. In general I think her style is very approachable and effective.
- approachable, good to meet with, gives good feedback
- Although she has a tendency to move too slowly though some material so we're forced to skim through other material, she was a very approachable teacher, and was extremely knowledgeable about the subject matter and had a lot of cool stories to tell.
- Carolee is very casual with students — some might be intimidated by her sarcasm but she's overall approachable. She likes student participation. Very into anecdotes — may hear some several times. Good to learn from except gets off track, into details, but she's good at keeping the discussion on Russia or Cuba — squashing know-it-all-distracting-show-off-question-askers with a quick "No."
- Carolee is excited about the content but maybe too excited; she often lost focus and strayed into anecdotes, making the class confusing and unclear. We lost time talking about major chunks of history due to this tendency also.
- Carolee is somewhat distant — aloof, cold. She thinks she's too cool for us.
- Carolee is really interesting and engaging, but can ramble on for long periods of time on off topics. We often got way behind schedule.
- Carolee has superb one-on-one interaction, and has a fluid and easy style of teaching. However, she is not open to different interpretations of the material. Her interest in students is noticeable.
- Prof. Bengelsdorf [UMASS student] mostly lectures but not in any strict manner. She is willing to answer questions as she goes and takes the time to explain ideas when necessary. Carolee is able to supplement the lectures with stories and side notes that matters the material connect with reality.
- Carolee obviously is very knowledgeable about this material, but she is not very open to views contradictory to her own and this reflects in her teaching style.
- She's disorganized and although she appears to know quite a bit and care very much about the subject, it sometimes doesn't get across very well. The readings assigned often seems ridiculous.
- Carolee is incredibly knowledgeable and has inter-

esting anecdotes on both revolutions. She is amusing and I usually stayed awake and interested in the classes. I was still able to get a lot out of the classes even if I hadn't done the reading for that day. She is accessible and easy to talk to, willing to give input and a little off-the-wall.

- Carolee has a great amount of personal experience with the topics addressed in this course. Conversation was sometimes limited because she was often not speaking about the reading that had been assigned for that class period. All questions were always addressed by Carolee.

#### **Best things about course:**

- Carolee's friendly, funny little anecdotes.
- content
- Carolee is very knowledgeable about her field. You expect her to know Stalin personally.
- Carolee's teaching style — witty, informative, engaging.
- Carolee teaching style
- Carolee's interesting lecturer
- The Revolutions, Carolee
- Carolee's enthusiasm and depth of knowledge and sarcasm.
- fascinating content
- the subject material is really interesting and Carolee makes it even more so.
- the lectures
- Carolee knows about subjects personally, and can weed out most of the scholarly inconsistencies.
- Entertaining lectures. Good classroom dynamics.
- the topics are interesting
- Subject, anecdotes.
- the variety of the readings

#### **Worst things about course:**

- I honestly did not learn very much about with the Cuban or the Russian Revolutions.
- Easy to get behind, hard to feel like you accomplished much.
- Carolee can... digress. We can go whole class periods without getting to the material intended.
- She gets easily distracted (because she knows so much about the topic) so we really get behind.
- the fact that we never advance because we always get sidetracked and behind. The class seems to always end with "well, I didn't get through anything I wanted to today."
- class can get tedious.
- disorganization / getting off track. (We did Stalin—Yeltsin in one and a half days.)
- lack of clarity and cohesion.
- Carolee's attitude
- When she would diverge and not cover the lesson plan.
- The amount of reading is a little over bearing.

- too much reading. Not focused. Not enough time on Cuba.
- we are very far behind schedule.
- Not being able to do all the reading.
- lack of organization

### How could the course be strengthened?

- Either cut down on the amount of into trying to be crammed in (which I'm sure she couldn't do because she knows too much) or make the course into 2 -one on Russia, one on Cuba.
- Pay more attention to students
- more focus, more papers, less reading.
- maybe pick one revolution to study — I would have liked a more in-depth discussion of either one. It was frustrating to rush through certain sections.
- I think this course should not focus on the two revolutions because it is too much. Or rather it should focus on the 2 revolutions and not all the history leading to them and following them. It is just too much material.
- More time on Cuba. More organize Cuba section. Prioritized reading list. Less books to buy.
- keep an eye on the clock. Carolee really needs to teach in a room with a wall clock.
- more focused, less straying.
- more Marxist theory
- less and more focused readings. More focused lectures. I would have gotten a lot more out of this course if I hadn't been so lazy.
- Maybe if the course focused on only one revolution of gave brief overviews so that a comparison between the Russian and Cuban Revolutions could be better explored.
- Divide the material more evenly between Russia and Cuba. I've gained a lot of knowledgeable about the Russian Revolution but not much about the Cuba Revolution.
- better organized professor.
- Prioritize readings. Demand more writing.
- If it had been more focused, on schedule, and more writing assignments I believe this course would be strengthened.
- Carolee needs to focus the class more effectively. Her curriculum was too extensive to cover it sufficiently . She also needs to choose readings more effectively rather than dumping it on the student expecting them to weed out the most important information.

### Additional comments:

- I enjoyed this class but is someone were to question me about the actual solid events of either Revolution I wouldn't know what to say. That kinda sucks — I wanted to be able to answer that — that's why I took the class.
- I had fun, it was one of my favorite classes until December.
- Take this class, it will totally challenge you, as well

as excite you.

- I feel like this class could have been great if it was more organized and stuck to the original plan more.
- All in all a good course, but definitely what you make of it.
- fun class. Yay.
- Carolee should teach a class just about Cuba.
- Anyone looking to take this course should be fully aware that it is a history course, not a political science course.
- I was completely overwhelmed by the readings.

### IA/SS 275

### F98

### INTELLECTUALS, POLITICS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Carolee Bengelsdorf and Margaret Cerullo

**Format:** Discussion, Lecture

**Approximate Class Size:** 25

**Surveys Returned:** 16

**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 6

**Range:** 1-10

### Overall Satisfaction With:

**Class:** 4.2

**Instructors:** 4.3

**Experience:** 4.3

### Approximate Level of Agreement:

**Objects clear?** 3.5

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.6

**Stimulating?** 4.7

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 3.4

**Instructor organized?** 3.6

**Comments helpful?** 4.1

**Instructor motivating?** 3.6

**Assignments clear?** 3.2

**Comfortable participating?** 4.1

**Course challenging?** 4.7

**Course modifiable?** 2.9

**Recommend?** 4.1

### Assignments:

- 3 major papers, 6 response papers.

### Instructor's Teaching Style:

- approachability is Carolee's strong point and Margaret's weakness. The subject matter was very difficult and unclear. It needed to be explained more clearly and focused.
- Eqlbal gave the best lectures I have ever listened to. Carolee and Margaret lead discussion to were very informative and covered material well. They however

are very condescending and not responsive to where students are coming from.

- these 2 are crazy together
- mostly lecture, very entertaining – watched Carolee and Margaret engage in intellectual fencing bouts if possibly more engaging than the material. Both profs are interested in hearing what students have to say.
- Carolee is open to opinions and reactions, while Margaret tends to be opinionated and erratic.
- give key objective interpretations of the course material. Sight many references and background. Intelligible. Helpful when approached. Alternative opinion welcomes if backed up by many supporting arguments.
- both Carolee and Margaret are good at encouraging useful discussion while still addressing points they feel are important and dealing concretely with the readings. They are very informal – maybe com confusing by contradicting, talking over each other – but very fun. Eqbal was a great lecturer first have of course. Easy to talk notes from and follow.
- Benglesdorf – very encouraging wanted to give understanding and had a great deal of patience for students that were struggling. Cerullo – very to harsh in her criticism – scared many away from asking questions or seeking help. I don't see myself taking about course with Cerullo.
- Carolee is fucking crazy. She is also very cute and entertaining to watch. but honestly, she will help you when you need help but she'll be a bitch about it. Don't look to her for sympathy. Margaret is also crazy. She is also very tough and will never like anything we do. Count on her not to go easy on anyone...ever.
- I thought both the instructor were very enthusiastic about the subject, but they often got a little carried away because that. Also his professors at the same time distracted me sometimes.
- the teachers are approachable, make time and attentive – they both joke around in a way that may not always be conducive to students sharing their views. However, I don't feel threatened. They welcomes alternative views, but clearly state their own.
- both teachers enjoy conversation, sometimes insensitive. But always stimulates, funny, great environment to learn from
- Margaret and Carolee are both very approachable give a lot of constructive criticism on returned papers... both are very intense but have a good sense of humor. At times the don't seem so open to new ideas because they are both great authorities on the material. Very interesting lecture by Eqbal, Margaret and Carolee are a good team.
- the first half of the course consisted of lectures by Eqbal Ahmad, so in-class instructor time was small. But both were very, very, very, accessible, and continued to be, outside of class; always willing in fact, always excited to participate and initiate discussion about classroom material, and my own response to the mate-

rial. Both professors are energetic, and there energy is way contagious. I found the style challenging, but engaging, placing much responsibility on my own abilities as a student and “critical” one at that.

• both of the professors are very good at engaging the class. I've never been bored or disinterested. Both are always available to go over papers and ideas one-on-one. They can be a little honest with their criticisms, but they genuinely care about their students. They're talented at explaining complex concepts in an accessible way.

#### **Best things about course:**

- 10 people said Eqbal (or Eqbal)
  - material,
  - knowledge of the profs.
  - thought provoking, stimulating, encouraged wide reading.
  - Carolee, Margaret The subject – what a title.
  - Bengelsdorf.
  - discussion was cool, inviting, provocative, SMART KIDS.
  - enthusiasm and personal involvement (in the subject) of the instructors.
  - the attitude within the class, the reading.
  - content, subject matter, discussions
  - Carolee and Margaret brilliant fun to watch interact
  - fanon
  - Carolee and Margaret, the readings and subsequent class discussions
  - it's super-interesting and I feel like my intellect has really been pushed beyond barriers.
- The writing is really helpful: good for developing skills. Professors really push us and have high expectations.

#### **Worst things about course:**

- after Eqbal left.
- Margaret and Carolee being condescending
- scattered
- theoretical, inaccessible reading material.
- N/A
- vague integration of Eqbal section with second half of course. Sort of a rough start in terms of understanding the purpose of the course.
- Cerullo
- annoying grafts.
- distractions caused due to debates between the instructors.
- the added lectures and speeches.
- too short
- engaging with difficult material was sometimes made more difficult by the lack of overview. But I think that is because it is the first time the course is being taught.
- the end of the semester overload of work
- hard to keep up! Sometimes the professors are too critical: everyone tries really hard, but it's challenging stuff.

### How could the course be strengthened?

- Less material and strong explanations.
- more time around a few key issues – less on a ton of different theory.
- clearer definitions of what the intention of the course is.
- more direction, slow down.
- clearer goals
- just by getting taught again – it is “structurally sound” (good syllabus) and the teachers are smart, witty and amazingly informed.

### Additional comments:

- here’s the deal with this course. It’s frustrating, difficult, vague and annoying – very Hampshire. But if you work your ass off you will learn a few things.
- may be by having a balance between lectures and discussions.
- a great course, especially for activists who want to know what they are talking about and fighting for: IT IS THE REAL DEAL for actual political analysis.
- an incredibly intense experience, extremely comprehensive, although aggravating at times, the material is worth it. Margaret and Carolee are a fun team. Eqbal rocks!
- possibly more time on the theory and then how it has manifested in the post-colonial world.
- valuable course.

**IA 131**

**F98**

**PLAYWRITING**

**Ellie Donkin**

**Format:** Workshop, Discussion

**Approximate Class Size:** 15

**Surveys Returned:** 14

**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 4

**Range:** 2-14

### Overall Satisfaction With:

**Class:** 4.7

**Instructor:** 4.9

**Experience:** 4.4

### Approximate Level of Agreement:

**Objects clear?** 4.6

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 5

**Stimulating?** 4.4

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.4

**Instructor organized?** 4.7

**Comments helpful?** 4.8

**Instructor motivating?** 4.3

**Assignments clear?** 4.4

**Comfortable participating?** 4

**Course challenging?** 4.4

**Course modifiable?** 4.6

**Recommend?** 4.7

### Assignments:

- Read 5 plays, 7 small assignments/scenes, one major work/one act play, and revision.

### Instructor’s Teaching Style:

- very energetic, very approachable, fantastic feedback and insight.
- She seems to have a good grasp of the subject and gives very useful paper comments. But she kept trying to pull a “Scooby Doo” on my Goblin!
- Elly’s style was very academic and professional but in terms of teaching a class such as playwrighting there needs to be a much more intimate setting created in order for the class to be fully involved.
- Elly is very direct and is very professional. I think that some of her style might be difficult for some people but I found it very stimulating. She is always available for conversation and discussion. Very nice. Elly rocks!!!
- In class discussions she is the most genuinely sensitive and sincere professor I’ve had. She is probably too nice for her own good, some students walk away having learned nothing. Her classes are discussion based. And she makes everyone talk. Very good. Because she wants to include everyone in the class, often there is not enough time to talk about meaningful, insightful things.
- She is very involving, interested, approachable, and dishy. She welcomes creativity.
- Elly is very passionate about her work, and yours. She will do what it takes to make your work something you can be proud of.
- Definitely approachable, good feedback, sensitive and open.
- Elly is a great teacher and easy to approach for anything. She cares about what she is doing and helping the students. She is so enthusiastic that she gets everyone else involved too.
- Very clear and is very good at summarizing theories and making statements that are universally applicable.
- Elly is wonderful.
- Elly is approachable, supportive of our ideas, and always has a good idea or two to help us write.
- She’s great, enthusiastic, free with advice.
- Elly knows what everyone has written and gives personalized comments in class in addition to cogent comments on written work which speak of long years both acting and writing.

### Best things about course:

- Energy, relaxed yet productive load.
- Getting to perform sections of the plays in class.

- 3 students said Elly
- Elly's knowledge and drive in playwrighting.
- the workshop atmosphere. The in-class writing.
- it's fun, learning atmosphere.
- working w/ Elly.
- the amount of work I produced (a lot)
- the environment create where you could put your ideas on the table and get good feedback.
- having a complete one-act written.
- the teacher
- writing
- diverse writing assignments

**Worst things about course:**

- Grounded in traditional theater.
- Trying to get tickets for Under Covers.
- The people in the class. 9:00 meeting time. Formal academic setting.
- It's only a semester long.
- There is not enough class time for the way she teaches. When she has everyone talk, there is a lot of repetition and no time for debate.
- Not enough time.
- some of the student's stupid comments.
- reading and discussing a play for an entire class.
- the fact the some students didn't always seem to take class seriously.
- I don't think there's anything wrong with it
- nothing
- having stuff read aloud. Needed, but stressful.
- people who are afraid to share work.

**How could the course be strengthened?**

- More focus/any focus on alternative narratives.
- More in-class renditions of people's work.
- — longer hours, maybe 3 hours. — reading each other's work at least once a week. — seeing more off campus plays and reading plays of different writing styles, i.e.: "For colored girls when the rainbow is enuf."
- If there was additional class time, maybe evening lab time. More time to workshop our material.
- start discussions and reviews of student one acts very early on.
- have smarter people in the class.
- more time earlier in the semester for work shopping.
- students that were more willing to participate.
- Let is run all year!
- More readings in class
- More intense cross-evaluating.

**Additional comments:**

- having cider and donuts every meeting.
- I would recommend this class to anyone interested in theater, acting or production. Viewing the world through the eyes of the playwright is an all new experience. I have not been able to view any plays or movie in a non-objective way since I began this class.

- Elly rocks my world.

**IA 123p**

**F98**

**PAGE TO STAGE**

**Elly Donkin and Wayne Kramer**

**Format:** Proseminar

**Approximate Class Size:** 27

**Surveys Returned:** 23

**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 3.5

**Range:** 1-10

**Overall Satisfaction With:**

**Class:** 3.7

**Elly Donkin:** 4.6

**Wayne Kramer:** 4.4

**Experience:** 4.2

**Approximate Level of Agreement:**

**Elly Donkin:**

**Objects clear?** 4

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.6

**Stimulating?** 4

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4

**Instructor organized?** 3.8

**Comments helpful?** 3.9

**Instructor motivating?** 3.6

**Assignments clear?** 3.6

**Recommend?** 3.9

**Wayne Kramer:**

**Objects clear?** 3.9

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.4

**Stimulating?** 4

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4

**Instructor organized?** 4

**Comments helpful?** 4

**Instructor motivating?** 3.4

**Assignments clear?** 3.6

**Recommend?** 3.9

**Both:**

**Comfortable participating?** 3.8

**Course challenging?** 3

**Course modifiable?** 3.8

**Work well together?** 4.7

**Assignments:**

- Small character sketches, drafts of monologues, one research paper, one performance, reading, one show attendance and review, one theater board attendance and review.

**Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Both of them were equally approachable and very willing to give help and feedback. Both seemed very interested in each student's learning and progress, as well as what they could contribute to class.
- If a goal for a class is to perform, the instructors should have worked more closely with the students in directing and shaping the piece. Comments on papers were not nasty enough. I don't think too many people put much effort into the course – the instructors could have enforced it.

### **Elly Donkin:**

- Elly's approachable and nice but her comments on assignments can be harsh and off-target to the student's objectives. She is very encouraging.
- Elly was very approachable in as far as help with assignments. She presented enthusiasm and optimism concerning her responses to work that lended a [??] to creating a risk-free atmosphere to what had the potential to be quite daunting.
- Elly really analyzed things. She stimulated us to criticize and rehearse our own work.
- Elly is an upbeat teacher who is excited with her work. This makes her good at encouraging the student to bring out the best in himself. Though comments on individual work is brief, she is easy to approach for help if you can both find time to meet.
- wonderful person to talk to about troubles in class, relates easy to students.
- I got a lot of feedback about my writing process and it helpful a lot I felt confidence about my work.
- Ellen is very easy going. She allows for a lot of personalization of course work due to different learning styles. She invests in each student on an individualized level. She has trouble making assignments clear.
- Elly very sweet, approachable, and gives you a great deal to positive energy. Her teaching manner is very deliberate.
- easy going and understanding, not assertive enough.
- Elly is extremely enthusiastic and understanding. You can tell she loves her students and her work.
- she's wonderful with feedback and encouragement – very open to changing our work how we see fit. I really grew from this type of learning.
- approachable for help, sensitive to your concerns. Welcomes alternative opinions. Is interested in students. Easy to learn from.
- Was very approachable and gave great feedback. Was very sensitive to different students. Welcomes alternative as well as has a great interest in students.
- Ellen is a great instructor whose office is always open for people who need help. She is very approachable and has a genuine concern for the students.
- I felt that she performed well in teaching style. She is a good teacher.
- Elly is helpful, approachable, and fun!
- Elly is very considerate almost too considerate. It's

hard to tell when she's being sincere. Her ideas are often misguided, but she's willing to revise them to meet student needs. Her comments on returned work are generally helpful.

- Elly was very approachable, funny, and sensible. Most of the time. She was sensitive to everyone's differences, welcomes opinions, was interested for the most part, but at times seemed superficial.
- very approachable. Excellent one-on-one interaction. Very helpful feedback. Seemingly very sensitive to students needs, abilities. Welcomes alternative opinions. Instructor DOES seem genuinely interested. Easy to learn from.
- Elly is a very nice lady. She'll give you enough feedback on your writing and she has plenty more to say if you as. I would have liked some feedback from her regarding the final performance. She welcomes new ideas and gives you further insight. She's very interested in the students (I felt like she was observing me for a character sketch most of the time.)
- Elly was very approachable and provided valuable feedback. Sometimes she is a bit flighty but she is also enthusiastic. She helped me edit my monologue a bit, so I'm grateful to her for that.

### **Wayne Kramer:**

- Wayne Kramer is approachable and nice, though a bit wacky. Sometimes he seems a bit confused as to what's going on, but he's enthusiastic.
- There wasn't much interaction with Wayne. For the duration of the course it seemed like Elly had charge of responding to students' assignments. Still, Wayne presented an enthusiasm for the course material that made him seem willing to help.
- Wayne provided lighthearted explanations, keeping the ball rolling in discussions. He gave individual attention when you asked him.
- Wayne seems knowledgeable about theater, and this becomes a good resource for the class progression. However, I did not spend so much time working with Wayne. Maybe this means he isn't very approachable.
- very open to suggestions, a good critic of work, good listener, participates in class.
- he didn't really react to my piece but I knew he loved it! I hope he did.
- Wayne is more interested in the class as a whole. He deals more with the group than the individual. He is better at making assignments clear. He has trouble explaining things in more than one way, and is sometimes a bit too metaphorical.
- passive and uninvolved until the end and technical aspect of the class. Often sporadic in his attitudes toward class.
- Wayne is a nice guy but I didn't get a very clear impression of him as a teacher.
- he's great for encouragement – I didn't get too much feedback from him compared to Elly ... he was won-

derful for helping me with technical aspects.

- ditto [to Elly's review]
- Was not very approachable. Did give some good feedback. Did welcome alternative as well as do a great interest in class and students.
- Wayne is helpful, approachable, hysterical. He is very knowledgeable about things theater, and has a wonderful relationship with the students.
- Wayne's enthusiasm is about everything was great. He is a good teacher.
- Wayne is good and I like hearing him talk. He has a neat accent.
- Wayne is a really funny guy with a really funny laugh. How much did I actually learn from him? Not much. But he's good at "running the show" so to speak and I guess that's what he's there for. Anyhow, I like him a lot.
- Wayne wasn't as interested in what we were doing. We actually didn't have much contact with him at all. He seemed nice enough. I never really talked to him.
- very approachable. Excellent one-on-one interaction. Feedback very helpful. Seemingly very sensitive to students needs, abilities. Opinion, alternative welcome. Genuinely interested. Easy to learn from.
- Wayne's a nice guy and he's easy to approach.
- Wayne seemed approachable, but I didn't interact with him but, so I can't really judge him.

#### **Best things about course:**

- enthusiasm of instructors and peers
- unwavering optimism from the instructors. This lent great confidence that applied to assignments.
- Elly and Wayne
- performance and preparation of a monologue.
- the monologue building techniques, the performances we watched, the assignments, Deborah Lubar.
- working with the light performance!!
- a lot of flexibility and a mother lode of information.
- Wayne's laugh. Elly using the word "shit"
- actual performance. The potential it has because it really tries to cover all of theater.
- the performance. Elly. Enthusiastic students.
- the group of students, final performance, freedom with creativity.
- I've discovered a lot.
- being able to perform.
- guest lectures, group working time.
- hands on theater work
- learning about all aspects of theater. Working on original writing.
- working with Jim Cyrus
- working with the guest artists. They're incredible.
- writing your own monologue.
- performance, tech work, writing.
- the course
- Wayne's laugh and Elly's humor. Oh yeah, and the dreamy boy with the blue eyes. For your sake I hope

he takes the class again.

- writing monologues. The final performance.

#### **Worst things about course:**

- the performance at the most inconvenient time.
- the course tried to encompass various aspects of theater but in doing so sacrificed giving each aspect the attention it deserved so some assignments seemed irrelevant.
- theater handbook reading
- Class discussion often seems superficial, and is usually pretty boring.
- not being able to direct, not being able to get feedback from classmates.
- not much specific training of in depth work.
- not enough time for every aspect of the class to be dealt with.
- lessons were short, class was unmotivating, not enough acting, to me discussing.
- reading material. Theater board. Unorganized time. Too many people.
- final paper? Class size may be a little too big.
- I've discovered a lot on my own welcomes/o inspiration from readings or discussions.
- not having enough time to do so.
- making the long trek to EDH in the morning.
- the first half of the semester goes by too slow
- how much time we had to spend on the final production.
- not enough time spent on design. Acting.
- being treated like we've never seen theater before.
- it's easy to skip because you probably won't miss anything important.
- movies, dumb theater guides
- the course being 1 semester
- there's a lot more to learn in the different aspects of theater. The class will teach you that life in the theater is hard, but honey life in the theater is a lot harder. A lot harder. [I swear, it says "honey life" what does that mean? – Ed.]
- It didn't get challenging until we began work on our monologues.

#### **How could the course be strengthened?**

- Add more challenging assignments, more personal attention, smaller class, a performance earlier than exams week.
- and more articles on theater techniques and technical info.
- making it stretch into spring, having ensemble work.
- feedback from other students, should have a mini work shop on directing.
- I think a follow-up spring course which allowed students to specify their interests would be helpful.
- 2 semester class, automatic Div I HACU.
- smaller class and extended lessons, more acting (improvs)

- with better organization and a smaller class size.
- smaller class size, more individual scene work.
- more depth. Readings on topics covered would help.
- have less people and more time.
- the course could be strengthened by more cooperative learning.
- more acting work with more than one actor. (I.e. dialog, etc.)
- I think it's fine now
- we all don't have to act – we could have specialized in areas (design). More Jim Cyrus!
- more depth, more opportunity to EXPERIENCE theater.
- MORE action in performing writing and designing. Make us be busy.
- more tech work, more group work.
- more stage work.
- extra handouts with info about lighting. Also I would have liked a hand out that lists recommended books concerning the different facets of the theater.
- we could do with a bit less guidance at times.

**Additional comments:**

- Elly and Wayne are hilarious together.
  - Dynamic, instructors great. Wayne's laugh is hilarious.
  - Elly and Wayne are a barrel of monkeys.
  - This is a great course for a student who has never been introduced to theater. For those who have done theater but want to be introduced to Hampshire theater it is good as well. For others though, it may seem basic or trivial.
  - they worked together really well. You can really tell they've been friends for a long time, and it's great to see them play off each other like they do.
  - they are a great team.
  - GREAT CLASS!
  - They look like muppets.
  - They work well together, they are fun and enjoy their jobs. they were great together and provided a nice environment for inexperienced first years!!
  - any student interested in drama at Hampshire should take this class.
  - the instructors worked wonderfully together – they made the class educational and interesting.
  - worked well together, enthusiastic – enjoyed the course a lot.
- THIS IS AN ACTING class – if you're afraid to get up on stage, think twice before registering for this class. I would have liked to learn more about lighting, design, etc.
- Elly + Wayne are great people who balance each other nicely, but they're awfully patronizing, as if being in a proseminar makes us automatically in kindergarten. I know they're working on this class, and I think with some improvements, it could really be awesome.

- The instructors worked well together. But Wayne just didn't really work with us.
- The class was fun, which is more than I can say about my other courses.
- Elly and Wayne aren't the only instructors. There were two guest artists who directed our characters for the final performance.
- They make a good team.

**IA 132p**

**F98**

**FEMINIST FICTION**

**Lynne Hanley and Ellie Siegel**

**Format:** Discussion, Proseminar

**Approximate Class Size:** 17

**Surveys Returned:** 14

**Preparation Time (hrs/week):** Average: 4

**Range:** 1-8

***Overall Satisfaction With:***

**Class:** 4.3

**Lynne Hanley:** 4.2

**Ellie Siegel:** 4.4

**Experience:** 4.3

***Approximate Level of Agreement:***

**Lynne Hanley:**

**Objects clear?** 4.1

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.1

**Stimulating?** 3.9

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.0

**Instructor organized?** 4.3

**Comments helpful?** 4.3

**Instructor motivating?** 4

**Assignments clear?** 4.3

**Recommend?** 4.3

**Ellie Seigel:**

**Objects clear?** 4.0

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.1

**Stimulating?** 4

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.1

**Instructor organized?** 4.6

**Comments helpful?** 4.5

**Instructor motivating?** 4.3

**Assignments clear?** 4.2

**Recommend?** 4.4

**Both:**

**Comfortable participating?** 4.5

**Course challenging?** 3.4

**Course modifiable?** 3.7

**Work well together?** 4.3

**Assignments:**

- 6 novels, 1 non-fiction book, additional readings, three short creative essays, one long final.

**Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Ellie and Lynne are fantastic. They work very well together, they're organized, focused and dynamic.
- I liked them both. They're both great teachers.

**Lynne Hanley:**

- Lynne sometimes seems a little scattered, at least in one-on-one interactions. She is fairly approachable and is open to, but not always very excited about alternative opinions and was open to, but not always very helpful with my specific needs and questions. She has her own agenda and interests in the books. Think of her as a fellow reader and student, not as an "instructor" and you'll be fine! I found many of her comments in class interesting.
- Lynne seems approachable and caring, she knows a lot about the subjects, literature, feminism, but her approach seems more geared toward imparting that knowledge to us that on interpreting texts communally/getting our reactions.
- somewhat difficult to get in touch with outside of class, can focus too much on her own train of thought rather than listening to the students opinion, discussions were mediocre at times while amazing at other moments. Feedback was great.
- very open. Thought provokingly leads discussion sometimes straying to tangents but great.
- Lynne sometimes talks a little too much and that's when some people lose interest. But if you manage to pay attention the whole time her ideas are always really thought provoking.
- laid back, intellectual, questioning, approachable, sensitive.
- Very approachable, helpful, and sensitive. Also very flexible to students different ideas ...gears to exploring new ideas. Teaching style was easy to learn from.
- Lynne knows what she's talking about, but the comments she gives on papers leave me no knowing how she felt about the paper. Now every extensive. Interested in students, but discussions of books are shallow.
- I didn't find Lynne too approachable, although she was a very interesting professor and it was a good challenging experience to understand her viewpoints.
- Lynne is approachable and friendly, asks good questions to prompt discussion, which makes discussion interesting.
- Lynne's great, but they both have a tendency to get too personal. Lynne thinks I'm anorexic and has been critiquing my papers based on this instinct.

**Ellie Siegel:**

- Ellie was great – very warm and supportive. These two professors complement each other well, though they do make a quirky pair. Seems to me though I didn't test it, she'd be very welcomes towards alternative opinions or special needs or learning styles.
- Ellie is also approachable and seems very supportive of students, esp. with writing assignments. Her comments in class tend to be a little more open ended than Lynne's.
- difficult to contact outside of class, open-minded in relationship to student's comments, the discussions varied from excellent to average. Feedback was helpful.
- slightly less vocal but when she is it's amazing! Quick tidbits that shock and provoke one to think.
- Ellie always throws out really good ideas, too, but usually after she's waited for somebody else to come up with it and (I think) is disappointed when she has to say it.
- more analytical appraisal – slightly more driving (in a good way). These professor's are stars!
- Also very approachable, helpful and supportive. Very engaged in discussions and open to ideas generated in them – challenging as she made students explore their own thoughts and perspectives.
- Ellie also knows what she's talking about, but I have the same complaints.
- Ellie at first didn't seem approachable but was very workable with after I did. She said many insightful things in class and always wanted to know more about what we thought.
- Ellie is always eager to discuss papers/projects, help us find good working spaces, leads/prompts interesting class discussions. Brings food to movie showings.
- Ellie's sarcastic and funny, but too willing to put up with STUPID comments from our resident class clowns.

**Best things about course:**

- The other students. It was a cozy class. Getting to know Ellie and Lynne.
- 8 students said the books/readings
- feedback on our own writings was great
- 5 students said the discussions
- THE FINAL PAPER
- challenging papers
- Interesting ideas generated from discussions – supportive environment.
- size, people.
- movie screenings and the way we all know each other and bonded, good discussion about high school.
- the easiest class I've ever taken. Loads of easy reading and 3 papers.

**Worst things about course:**

- "Fluff" writing assignments, until final really tough one (for me anyway.) Easy to let my expectations for myself slide and do little more than the WONDER-

FUL readings.

- not enough time, sometimes felt discussions didn't extend as much as they could.
- sometimes class went off the focus in discussions
- not nearly enough time to talk in length about all the books.
- It was at a time of day (right after lunch) when I was sleepy.
- discussion were lead astray...sometimes they just died or really DUMB things would become the focus of them.
- not enough time in the day!
- sometimes the discussions get repetitive.
- having to go to the library to do research, but never including in a paper.
- teaching, class discussions, writing comments.
- nothing that horrible.
- journal entries
- the failure to be anything but general when discussing the readings.

### How could the course be strengthened?

- Assigned writing could have been a more continual emphasis – what a great way to compliment the readings. Journals turned in and commented on during the term, not just at end. (I pretty much wrote these off, but the could have been more useful and a dynamic part of this class, if more emphasized.
- Maybe, somehow, discussion that allowed for everyone's perspectives, some folks participates more than others.
- More male point of views. Maybe contrast the feminist fictions to (a) male author (s).
- maybe fewer course packet readings so that more time can be discussing books.
- the students could do all of the reading, because it's such a discussion course, but since it's a proseminar there are a lot of first years who haven't gotten the hang of their schedules.
- sometimes more focus to discussions
- different styles of teaching.
- Writing assignments could be made more flexible, at least for students who are not in their first semester of college.
- put more detail into discussions. Maybe choose books that are easier to analyze. Also, the final writing assignment was some thing I did in SIXTH GRADE!!
- I think Lynne could have been even more passionate and expressive. As a proseminar it was smooth and productive.
- some class requirements were not clearly suited – like journal entries.
- by paying less attention to everyone's little sob stories and being more serious about feminism as an ideology.

### Additional comments:

- they worked well. However, at times it seemed that they came unprepared to class.
- wow!
- I left this class feeling high as a kite; my mind was moving so quickly and opening up so wide I could hardly contain myself.
- Lots of times it seems they're sharing a private joke. (Lynne's constantly laughing).
- they worked well together – they weren't the same by any means but weren't antagonistic. Synergetic relationship.
- it seems that there was tension between the 2 teachers as if they competed for speaking time.
- They worked well together.
- the instructors reacted well to each other and seemed to get along/work well together.
- they will banter back and forth, which sometimes affects the students role in discussions.

**IA 240**

**F98**

**FICTION WRITING**

**Lynne Hanley**

**Format:** Workshop

**Approximate Class Size:** 15

**Surveys Returned:** 10

**Preparation Time (hrs/week):** Average: 4

**Range:** 1-10

### *Overall Satisfaction With:*

**Class:** 4

**Instructor:** 4.4

**Experience:** 4

### *Approximate Level of Agreement:*

**Objects clear?** 4.2

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.1

**Stimulating?** 3.7

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4

**Instructor organized?** 4.2

**Comments helpful?** 4.8

**Instructor motivating?** 4.1

**Assignments clear?** 4.3

**Comfortable participating?** 4

**Course challenging?** 4

**Course modifiable?** 4

**Recommend?** 4.2

### **Assignments:**

- Reading other students' work (about 4/week), writing two short stories, plus revision, optional third story.

### **Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- LYNNE IS: approachable, charming, dynamic, edu-

cated, friendly, generous, humorous, intelligent, jovial, kind, learned, meticulous, necessary, opinionated, personable, quick, reasonable, smart, teacherly, understanding, vivacious, witty, (un) xenophobic, young-at-heart, and ZANY.

• I think Lynne's teaching style is somewhat rigid. In that we stuck to the same format of responding to people's work all semester. This was a div 2 creative writing class so I understand that the expectation was that we all have material we're working on and don't need to be sent in specific directions, but I think, overall, the class discussion could have been framed in different ways. I was constantly impressed with Lynne's ability to articulate the strengths. It's hard to know exactly what we learning from this class. I think the learning style is subtle. Lynne is not an overbearing professor at all. She's very approachable and helpful with the comments she returns on the page.

• Lynne has this canty thing on the front of a tooth but it's totally endearing because when she smiles you're just like, "she's human, yeah!" and she has this mug that my father has also, that has all these bunnies in compromising positions and she drinks from it while talking about feminism or curing laughter and needless to say, it's cool.

• Lynne is always approachable and happy to offer advice. She guides discussion but doesn't monopolize them.

• Lynne is mad cool. If you 're a good writer and willing to bust your ass for it, she'll hook you up.

• Lynne gives good feedback on my work. She clearly understands my strengths/weaknesses.

• In class Lynne often seems like a physician — dissect, evaluate, and then suggest a remedy for a student's story. Her feedback is always helpful, though I'd like to see more passion. (I know it's there, so let's manifest it!) When you approach Lynne one-on-one she opens up a lot more.

• Lynne is interested in students as individuals. I don't think she is trying to make us into more versions of herself., she gives good feedback in written comments. In class she usually speaks only after most other students have.

• The teacher has good feedback, but I don't know for sure if she is honestly interested in helping us improve (instead of just interested in teaching a f. writing course. Not to say that she has to be interested in us. She is sensitive to different student's intellectual abilities. She does welcome alternative opinions. Her style is not difficult to learn from but it can be intimidating.

• Lynne is very generous with feedback, both in the class and on the manuscripts themselves. I believe she wants people to write well and tries to have conversation, rather than dominate the discussion of work. She saves her comments for the end. Overall I think Lynne is helpful in terms of finding style and structure in one's creative writing.

### **Best things about course:**

- Some occasional moments of brilliance, ("he didn't use anything dramatic like plane crashes or weddings.") "Avuncular"
- reading lots of material and learning how to articulate my thoughts better about it. — Getting to write stories leading toward my Div 3.
- Lauren's funny doodles on my papers.
- 3 students said Lynne
- Being able to write whatever kind of story I want.
- freedom to write w/o specific assignments.
- receiving feedback from dedicate readers.
- getting feedback on stories. Seeing what others are writing.
- receiving critique from other people.
- I felt Lynne Hanley and some of the class learned from one another.

### **Worst things about course:**

- **THE WRITING!** This particular crop of students seemed so uninspired. Stories about sex, drugs, and walrus slaughter do nothing to disprove myths about our generation. FEH! This may not be eloquent, but at least it's earnest. Some of the stuff we've read just doesn't make it. Also the worst: folks' attempt to cover up this phenom by hiding behind vague comments and outright lies. Writing in dialects is annoying. Outwardly abandoning grammar, spelling, and punctuation is too. Fuck.
- the sense of stagnation in this class. Lack of spoken participation from many members of the class.
- Since the writing of the course is determined by the writing of the other students, and one or two of the students are bad writers....
- the stupid kids comments on my stories.
- some kids
- stress
- people turning stories in at midnight for Tuesday class. People being absent.
- more regular, private meetings with the teacher could be scheduled.

### **How could the course be strengthened?**

- See worst column, (fix these things.) Also: inspiration would help. Attention to detail, knowing how to write properly in English according to established rules of such. [Editor would like to note that the author of these rants has decorated the rest of the LOGO with little hearts and butterflies.]
- encouraging students who are presenting their stories on a given week to frame the discussion. And/or framing the discussion and work shopping of the stories in a more flexible way. Instead of just asking for people's blanket responses, asking particular questions that the story brought up.
- let better writers in.

- early meeting time.
- spend more time discussing published work. These stories should be important models, but we neglect them in class.
- More emphasis on rewriting and a chance to discuss work more as a class.
- I felt that not everyone read the stories and participated or was engaged.

**Additional comments:**

- I understand why Lynne handed over each story to the class before she gave her response, but I think this method didn't consistently work for the members of this class.
- This course will be radically different depending on the students each time.
- I've known Lynne since my first week at Hampshire, and she impresses me more and more with every passing semester.
- people have to work to get into writing classes so they ought to value being in them more..
- I think it should be scheduled later in the day. Also, workshops should have access to the HA copier code for copies of manuscripts for class.

**IA 251  
F98  
POETRY WRITING  
Paul Jenkins**

**Format:** Discussion, Workshop  
**Approximate Class Size:** 13  
**Surveys Returned:** 11  
**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 4  
**Range:** 1-10

**Overall Satisfaction With:**

**Class:** 4.6  
**Instructor:** 4.5  
**Experience:** 4.4

**Approximate Level of Agreement:**

**Objects clear?** 4.9  
**Enthusiastic instructor?** 5  
**Stimulating?** 4.6  
**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.4  
**Instructor organized?** 4.4  
**Comments helpful?** 4.3  
**Instructor motivating?** 4.2  
**Assignments clear?** 4.5  
**Comfortable participating?** 4.2  
**Course challenging?** 4.6  
**Course modifiable?** 4.6  
**Recommend?** 4.7

**Assignments:**

- Wrote and submitted poetry, reading and commenting on other's work.

**Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Paul has a focus on the literal tangible and physical in poetry which is extremely helpful in establishing a foundation but becomes almost dogmatic and limiting in the end. However, as a professor he is extremely pleasant to be around, to look at, and to receive feedback from. He always takes a back seat in discussions. He is genuinely interested in our work and growth.
- Mr. Jenkins has charisma, expertise in the subject matter, and a keen sensitivity to students' needs.
- Paul is very easygoing and is always open to students. He makes even the suckiest poem have some redeeming value.
- I think Paul's ability to respond well to work is directly related to whether or not her personally likes a student's poetry. As someone who has taken many workshop classes identical to this one, I thought that this class was one of the least helpful for making my writing better.
- Paul is cool — he definitely cares for the students and I value his comments.
- The instructor is very laid back, but makes very deft comments which are welcomed. Paul has a knack for expressing comments gently and is open to the fact that he might be wrong.
- very approachable, workshop style, very clear and helpful
- he is very laid back. On the other hand, he has one style and doesn't seem to like poems of other people when they aren't in that style.
- Paul's great, but allows students critiques of work to border on rudeness at times.

**Best things about course:**

- receiving feedback on my work, giving feedback to others.
- the poems
- motivation to do your best work
- the work load was the least of any class I've taken.
- reading other people's poetry and sharing — I felt like a BOND was formed in the class which I will miss greatly. When everyone loves of your poems.
- Easy, comfortable setting...chance to develop writing skills.
- feedback from class, reading other's work.
- the poetry
- Paul Jenkins.

**Worst things about course:**

- the TA
- the meeting time
- 9 a.m. Some insensitive comments from classmates now and then.

- did not live up to my expectations. As a Div II poetry student, I will not take Paul's class again.
- 9AM to 12 PM EVERY FRIDAY. When everyone hates one of your poems.
- the other students aren't necessarily (cough cough) poet kings.
- 9 am Friday.
- talking.
- The girl who said everything was a cliché

**How could the course be strengthened?**

- A good TA. The class is only as good as the students in it...
- it could happen in early afternoon.
- if people were more committed to coming to class maybe there wouldn't be such animosity.
- The school would be strengthened if there was not only one poetry professor.
- Make people actually show up — it sucked when people only showed up when they were presenting their poetry.
- coffee
- it could meet more than once a week.

**Additional comments:**

- Paul is good. I always looked forward to this class!
- I am very satisfied with this satisfactory class!
- I loved this class! Yea! It made me happy and tickled my tummy.
- coffee

**IA 293**  
**F98**  
**DESIGN RESPONSE**  
**Wayne Kramer**

**Format:** Lab, Discussion  
**Approximate Class Size:** 3  
**Surveys Returned:** 3  
**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 6  
**Range:** 2-15. (2, 3, 4-15)

*Overall Satisfaction With:*

**Class:** 5  
**Instructor:** 4.6  
**Experience:** 4.6

*Approximate Level of Agreement:*

**Objects clear?** 4.6  
**Enthusiastic instructor?** 5  
**Stimulating?** 5  
**Lect./Disc. focused?** 3.3  
**Instructor organized?** 3  
**Comments helpful?** 5  
**Instructor motivating?** 4.6

**Assignments clear?** 4.6  
**Comfortable participating?** 5  
**Course challenging?** 4.6  
**Course modifiable?** 4.6  
**Recommend?** 4.6

**Assignments:**

- 2 major design projects, 2 minor image gathering projects.

**Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Interactive, discussion based work about work done in/during class.
- Constructed class by Wayne. Open to class for discussion. Meat of class come up with by students as well as Wayne.
- very laid back but still very productive. He's real fun ... but still gets shit done.

**Best things about course:**

- Super interactive, very constructive evaluation of work.
- the intimacy and closeness of classmates in thought and development.
- the working relationship and feedback necessary fore the [?] of design.

**Worst things about course:**

- It could use 2 more students in it.

**How could the course be strengthened?**

- don't know.
- no way
- something in the way of [? Dude! Get better hand-writing! -Ed.] strengthening.

**Additional comments:**

- I [heart] Becca Steiner, my hunny bun bucket.

**IA 140**  
**F98**  
**READING/WRITING AUTOBIOGRAPHY**  
**Michael Lesy**

**Format:** workshop, discussion  
**Approximate Class Size:** 14  
**Surveys Returned:** 14  
**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 7  
**Range:** 3-15

*Overall Satisfaction With:*

**Class:** 4.5  
**Instructor:** 4.7  
**Experience:** 4.6

### **Approximate Level of Agreement:**

**Objects clear?** 4.5

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 4.8

**Stimulating?** 4.7

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.6

**Instructor organized?** 4.6

**Comments helpful?** 4

**Instructor motivating?** 4.5

**Assignments clear?** 4.5

**Comfortable participating?** 4.1

**Course challenging?** 4.6

**Course modifiable?** 3.5

**Recommend?** 4.7

### **Assignments:**

- Read 5 autobiographies, 5 short and two long narratives.

### **Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Michael Lesy does not care who you are on a personal level, but he treats you with utmost respect and critical honesty on the professional. He is open to discussion during office hours, but discourages talk or critiques of work-in-progress, citing a need for outside readers. The trade-off in class is that Lesy will hear anything you or the class has to say, but it must be of quality, and presented with confidence, which he tests. Overall demeanor is candid. He's gentle after you get used to him.

- Lesy's brilliant but he is also sort of an asshole. He isn't very sensitive to people's feelings. He expects a lot and there is a certain harshness to him. I have really enjoyed this class. I can imagine someone who is less secure about their writing abilities getting their feelings hurt by Lesy's written comments on their papers. He is fine with people disagreeing with him, especially during our workshops.

- Lesy is extremely honest. No bullshit. He's incredibly on the ball and in my opinion a really wonderful thinker. He takes his time when addressing individuals' work. Although he is sometimes hard to approach and/or have a dialog with, he also seems to have read the clear idea of where to go with particular issues and topics. This clear path can sometimes overtake the originality of thought.

- M.L. is brilliant and passionate, both about writing and teaching. His style is direct and intense. Sometimes his passion, his opinions take over the class discussion and other voices are lost. M.L. is genuinely interested in students' growth not as artists, merely, but as human beings.

- feedback is generally encouraging — but not always specific enough. When you read to the class, the instructor gives better feedback and you have more opportunity to ask questions. I didn't always feel comfortable or welcome to question the criticism of praise for the pieces he commented on in writing. Lesy openly

welcomes students' opinions — alternative opinions encouraged. He is easy to learn from because he is bold, knowledgeable and secure enough that you can disagree with him openly — there is no ass kissing of Lesy — it isn't that type of environment.

- Mr. Lesy is an abrupt man who sometimes seems more concerned with showcasing his diverse knowledge of random subjects (such as the Talmud) than saying things that are actually relevant. He definitely likes the sounds of his own voice. He seems to be constantly busy and I found him hard to approach. His comments on individual's writing was helpful and relevant though. He is not a bad teacher, (I would even say a good teacher) but he is a little abrasive.

- Michael comes off as abrasive and arrogant in the beginning. He is honest, straightforward, and loud, so he can be intimidating. He is definitely approachable and gives excellent feedback, but in order to use and accept his critiques I had to come to an understanding of him — stand my own ground, respect his "way". He is a good teacher — genuinely interested in what he does.

- I could see him being intimidating. But since he liked my work, I liked him. He will occasionally break out into quite memorable lessons about evoking the essence of writing.

- Lesy seems scary, but he's not. Whenever I saw him outside of class he was friendly, approachable, and encouraging. He tends to make it seem like his opinions are infallible, but in a way I like his confidence and mastery over his subject. He always finds something good to say about somebody's piece before he criticizes it. Lesy makes students want to do their personal best.

- Lesy is a literary monster. He eats up everything; text, writing, students, LIFE. He's a jerk-off, but in a good way. He calls you on your shit, and you come out of the class and better writer and person because of it.

- Lesy is enthusiastic about writing, when he talks about it he inspires me. He is also very intimidating, I don't feel like I can say whatever I want. I also feel like I can't write whatever I want. But over all he is a passionate teacher and writer.

- The instructor welcomes all opinions and listens to them all entirely and provides feedback. He sees to it that everyone participates in the discussions which I think is good. He is very genuine and enthusiastic about the class.

- The feedback from the classroom discussions was almost always helpful. Lesy's comments, however, were not so much. I don't feel like he gave me enough of an idea of what I need to do to work with each piece.

- incredibly interested in students success. Teaches resilience.

### **Best things about course:**

- the students are truly and rigorously challenged to do quality work and to scrutinize their motives for writ-

ing.

- we read and wrote a lot which was awesome. My reading and writing has improved.
- Lesy. His ensemble criticism. The books. The writing.
- M.L.'s lectures. Other students' writing. Multiple revelations about myself.
- Lesy's knowledge, experience and alternative views about writing. Inspiration from other classmates in the workshop and from published work.
- class discussions
- learning to listen, what is good in writing, what is not, learning to be honest.
- When he gave good responses to written work.
- Lesy's nuggets of wisdom.
- Lesy pissing kids off to get them to learn something about their passion.
- the workshops
- the writing workshops, where students give students feedback on their written work.
- classroom comments. Lesy's high standards and expectation. Some of the books we read.
- Lesy.

#### **Worst things about course:**

- It takes courage to assert oneself, or write in a style not reflected in the text. I often got a false impression that I was expected to mirror the tones of works we read.
- sometimes with all the negative criticism on my papers it's hard to tell if it is good under all the problems. Also sometimes it was hard to read a novel in two weeks.
- the ages we write about (it gets old). His railroading of idea/optimism.
- M.L.'s strong opinions, when you disagree and haven't thought of a particularly snappy way to express yourself.
- you need to take initiative to work on pieces on your own — there are no second drafts.
- Lesy's tangents
- getting snubbed during writing workshops. Trying to lay low in class when I didn't read the book.
- 9 a.m., being in the spotlight at the head of the table having your work critiqued. Especially if it's your least favorite piece and you have to read it anyway.
- Lesy on a bad day. First year pretentious, fresh-outta-the-gate writers who think they have nothing left to learn because they already know everything.
- not enough workshops
- a couple of the texts, but that was not too bad either.
- not enough feedback
- class times short

#### **How could the course be strengthened?**

- Perhaps a more diverse sampling of writing styles might be explored. Lesy's technique is to choose notable, unique best-sellers and ask "why is this art?" and "why was it successful critically/on the market?"

- The formal was we presented text when we had "text responsibility" (Citing page numbers and having a real argument) for a book was a little intimidating. I would have liked to have said more at these times.
- More class/workshop time. More awareness of movement with regard to student.
- more workshop.
- more emphasis on out-of-class workshops. Have class outside when the wind is a holy warmth.
- I think to achieve equal discussion time for each students there needs to be more class time, like one discussion class and 2 workshop classes. Also maybe more comments on narratives.
- It's not possible — already incredible.
- clear assignments, more writing, editing, more teacher comments.
- additional class time.

#### **Additional comments:**

- I wasted a lot of time trying to prove to Lesy that I was smart, instead of paying attention to my own voice in the narratives. He doesn't care that you made straight A's in high school or did well in writing classes: he assumes that you are talented and would prefer that you disagreed with him.
- Good Hampshire professor. And enthusiast. He's a recourse and gift for our writing community as well as the over-all community.
- I recommend this class to everyone, with my highest praise. It will make you strong and beautiful.
- I wish I was outside today. I have been watching Judge Judy lately and am starting to like it.
- don't take this class if you are weak. You'll get eaten alive by Lesy, and run home crying. You need some serious balls to take this course. If you can't tell Lesy to fuck off, don't apply.
- I enjoyed this course and recommend it for fucked up writers and serious poets.
- my writing style has definitely improved with this class.
- I really enjoyed the process of writing for this class. Lesy makes you take yourself and your writing very seriously and that attitude helps you to squeeze everything you have from each attempted piece.

**IA 235**

**F98**

**LITERARY NONFICTION**

**Michael Lesy**

**Format:** Discussion, Workshop

**Approximate Class Size:** 10

**Surveys Returned:** 9

**Preparation Time (hrs/week): Average:** 10

**Range:** 5-15

**Overall Satisfaction With:**

**Class:** 4.5

**Instructor:** 4.6

**Experience:** 4.9

**Approximate Level of Agreement:**

**Objects clear?** 4.7

**Enthusiastic instructor?** 5

**Stimulating?** 4.9

**Lect./Disc. focused?** 4.8

**Instructor organized?** 4.9

**Comments helpful?** 4.1

**Instructor motivating?** 4.5

**Assignments clear?** 4.5

**Comfortable participating?** 3.8

**Course challenging?** 4.9

**Course modifiable?** 4.7

**Recommend?** 4.7

**Assignments:**

- Four books, three long narratives, two shorter ones. Fieldwork.

**Instructor's Teaching Style:**

- Lesy is great in a workshop format. He is not very approachable and open to one-on-one interaction. He is domineering, but challenges people to voice their own opinions. He expects us all to be responsible for our own learning — and to have our shit together. Good challenge.
- Lesy knows his shit.
- Intimidating, overbearing, enthusiastic, genuinely interested.
- Lesy is completely manipulative of class discussions and intimidates everyone. He's also totally responsive to everyone's work and really challenges us to go further with our projects/writing.
- He's tough but a real softy on the inside. He scared the hell out of me the first day, but you really get to love him by the end.
- Lesy is super juiced about this subject and it spills out all over the place. He is stern but flexible, colorful but coherent. It is necessary to be very devoted to the class and the work involved.
- Michael Lesy, from all that I've heard and expected, must've mellowed out over the years. Yes. He is as eccentric and full of almost mystical and conflicting (albeit inspiring) words of wisdom from his own knowledge of the genre and experience with it. What I found was a man who was devoted to students, in this instructor.
- Although Lesy is unpredictable, not always the best one-on-one depending on the day, his brilliance makes up for it. I doubted him at first. He definitely has bad days and good ones, but he is there with you always, even if it is only sitting on the sidelines and watching. He is also extremely good at listening once you get to

know him.

• This is the real thing. Authenticity is the only option. Lesy expects nothing less that your entire soul and flesh, all or it. He does not believe in literary journalism for the sake of literary journalism. He does not believe in masturbation of literary journalism. He wants what is primal, basic. He wants song lines. He wants you to stand in a field and shit and tell him how it tastes and what it smells like and the texture of it on your feet. He'll ask you how you wound up there and how you plan to get yourself out. But you know what? HE GETS IT.

**Best things about course:**

- workshops where whole group responded to my work
- opportunity to do field work.
- invigorating, challenging, Lesy's specificity.
- Lesy's imitations of people.
- Extensively helped by writing and reading skills.
- Lesy relaxed, fluid, group atmosphere of writes who can learn from each other. He changed the structure of the class to focus on student's field work.
- the heavy, non-stop work.

**Worst things about course:**

- readings and forced discussions of text where each person must go to the front of the class
- reminded me of high school.
- writing is painful.
- sometimes I really wish Lesy would shut up.
- deadlines
- was an extremely draining class, as it was very challenging.
- Lesy's unyielding demands for ultimate perfection or your immortal writer self.
- the heavy, non-stop work.

**How could the course be strengthened?**

- include readings by a diverse group of authors from different intellectual and ethnic perspectives — doing away with the stiff, formal format of reading discussions.
- more time in workshop and more feedback on papers.
- To be more friendly to those who slack. (Just kidding.)
- Less time analyzing books or at least better use of time dedicated to it. Most importantly more written comments on writing. There needs to be more comments made on the initial drafts by the instructor.

**Additional comments:**

- Overall, good course. Challenged me to think for myself. Most of the readings were disappointing and did not move me. (Except for SACKS.)
- If you are a writer, you should take the class.
- Not recommended if you are not confident and/or

willing to risk some price at Lesy's teasing.

- Lesy is brilliant. The two classes I took here with him were the best out of any I have taken in the past four years.

- Papa Lesy :). Seriously? My life at Hampshire wouldn't be the same without him.