```
Course-Section: HCST 100  0101          University of Maryland                          Page  923
Title      HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH        Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   TATAREWICZ, JOS              Spring 2008                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    35
Questionnaires: 14              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level Sect
              Questions                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   0   0  0  2  4  6  2  3.57 1518/1670  3.57 3.19  4.31 4.23  3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  2  4  5  2  3.54 1499/1666  3.54 3.18  4.27 4.30  3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   7  0  0  2  2  3  4.14  964/1406  4.14 3.38  4.32 4.31  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   1  0  0  6  4  2  3.67 1380/1615  3.67 3.39  4.24 4.17  3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  2  2  3  7  4.07  808/1566  4.07 3.86  4.07 4.03  4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 4 5 3  3.64 1212/1528  3.64 3.38  4.12 4.00  3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  3  5  2  3  3.21 1550/1650  3.21 3.40  4.22 4.28  3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   1  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1667  5.00 5.00  4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1 2 7 2  3.83 1191/1626  3.83 3.67  4.11 4.07  3.83


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  1  0  2  3  8  4.21 1185/1559  4.21 3.74  4.46 4.47  4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  477/1560  4.93 4.39  4.72 4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  0  9  3  4.08 1116/1549  4.08 3.53  4.31 4.32  4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  2  0  5  5  3.85 1256/1546  3.85 3.62  4.32 4.32  3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 2 1 5 4  3.92  807/1323  3.92 3.64  4.00 3.91  3.92


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 2 4 2 2  3.40 1141/1384  3.40 3.80  4.10 3.92  3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 1 0 5 2 2  3.40 1228/1378  3.40 4.02  4.29 4.09  3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 2 2 6 4.40  751/1378  4.40 4.58  4.31 4.08  4.40
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1  0  3  2  3  1  3.22  799/ 904  3.22 3.74  4.03 3.94  3.22


                                       Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     4       0.00-0.99    0       A    4       Required for Majors  4      Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0       B    4
 56-83     0       2.00-2.99    2       C    0       General              1      Under-grad  14       Non-major   14
 84-150    0       3.00-3.49    1       D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2       F    0       Electives            1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                3
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101              University of Maryland                      Page  924
Title        HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH         Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  TATAREWICZ, JOS (Instr. A)     Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      5
Questionnaires:  4               Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                              Frequencies         Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions                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   0   0   1   1   0   1   1  3.00 1620/1670  3.00  3.19  4.31  4.23  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   1   0   1   1  3.00 1603/1666  3.00  3.18  4.27  4.30  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1343/1406  3.00  3.38  4.32  4.31  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   0   1   1   1  3.25 1531/1615  3.25  3.39  4.24  4.17  3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 1144/1566  3.75  3.86  4.07  4.03  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1  0   1   1   1  3.25 1399/1528  3.25  3.38  4.12  4.00  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   1   1  3.50 1460/1650  3.50  3.40  4.22  4.28  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1667  5.00  5.00  4.67  4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0  2   0   0   2  3.50 1384/1626  3.58  3.67  4.11  4.07  3.58


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   2   0   0   2  3.50 1461/1559  3.50  3.74  4.46  4.47  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   1   0   2  3.75 1504/1560  4.13  4.39  4.72  4.68  4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   2   0   2   0  3.00 1489/1549  3.25  3.53  4.31  4.32  3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   1   0   1   1  3.00 1473/1546  3.50  3.62  4.32  4.32  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1  0   1   0   2  3.50 1040/1323  3.50  3.64  4.00  3.91  3.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  820/1384  4.00  3.80  4.10  3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  797/1378  4.33  4.02  4.29  4.09  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67  531/1378  4.67  4.58  4.31  4.08  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  461/ 904  4.00  3.74  4.03  3.94  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101           University of Maryland                            Page 925
Title      HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH         Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   BROWN, ERIC J.  (Instr. B)     Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    5
Questionnaires:  4                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                      Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                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   0   0   1   1   0   1   1  3.00 1620/1670  3.00 3.19  4.31 4.23  3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   1   0   1   1  3.00 1603/1666  3.00 3.18  4.27 4.30  3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 1343/1406  3.00 3.38  4.32 4.31  3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   1   0   1   1   1  3.25 1531/1615  3.25 3.39  4.24 4.17  3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   0   1   2  3.75 1144/1566  3.75 3.86  4.07 4.03  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1   0   1   1   1  3.25 1399/1528  3.25 3.38  4.12 4.00  3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   1   1   1  3.50 1460/1650  3.50 3.40  4.22 4.28  3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1667  5.00 5.00  4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0   1   0   1   1  3.67 1312/1626  3.58 3.67  4.11 4.07  3.58


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0   0   1   0   0   1  3.50 1461/1559  3.50 3.74  4.46 4.47  3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50 1248/1560  4.13 4.39  4.72 4.68  4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0   0   0   1   1   0  3.50 1389/1549  3.25 3.53  4.31 4.32  3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   1   0   1  4.00 1139/1546  3.50 3.62  4.32 4.32  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0   0   1   1   0  3.50 1040/1323  3.50 3.64  4.00 3.91  3.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   0   1   1   1  4.00  820/1384  4.00 3.80  4.10 3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   1   0   2  4.33  797/1378  4.33 4.02  4.29 4.09  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   0   1   2  4.67  531/1378  4.67 4.58  4.31 4.08  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   1   0   0   0   2   0  4.00  461/ 904  4.00 3.74  4.03 3.94  4.00

                               Frequency Distribution


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