

Course Section: HCST 100 0101  
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH  
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1000  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1300/1669	3.89	3.89	4.23	4.02	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	5	7	3.94	1178/1666	3.94	3.94	4.19	4.11	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.00	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	958/1617	4.12	4.12	4.15	3.99	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	996/1555	3.83	3.83	4.00	3.92	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	863/1543	4.06	4.06	4.06	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	4	4	3.39	1449/1647	3.39	3.39	4.12	4.06	3.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	428/1668	4.94	4.94	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1132/1605	3.86	3.86	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	974/1514	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.89	4.89	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	6	8	4.11	1005/1503	4.11	4.11	4.24	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	1047/1506	4.06	4.06	4.26	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	8	6	4.00	587/1311	4.00	4.00	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1073/1490	3.69	3.69	4.05	3.85	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	893/1502	4.23	4.23	4.26	4.06	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	730/1489	4.46	4.46	4.29	4.07	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	908/1006	3.14	3.14	4.00	3.81	3.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	****	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	****	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: HCST 100 0101  
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH  
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS  
 Enrollment: 42  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1000  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						