```
Course-Section: HCST 100  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  926
Title        HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH          Baltimore County                                        JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  WELCH, G.                       Spring 2009                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     35
Questionnaires: 19                      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   3   8   6  3.95 1203/1576  3.95  3.90  4.30  4.11  3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   4   5   9  4.11 1076/1576  4.11  4.20  4.27  4.18  4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   9   0   1   1   3   5  4.20  879/1342  4.20  4.73  4.32  4.19  4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   3   5   3   7  3.78 1246/1520  3.78  4.43  4.25  4.09  3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   2   2   2  13  4.37  546/1465  4.37  4.21  4.12  4.02  4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0   1   5   2  11  4.21  727/1434  4.21  4.15  4.14  3.94  4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   1   3   3   3   9  3.84 1189/1547  3.84  4.28  4.19  4.10  3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   3  16  4.84  586/1574  4.84  4.86  4.64  4.59  4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0   3   4   5   1  3.31 1375/1554  3.31  3.77  4.10  4.01  3.31


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0   1   1   2   5   6  3.93 1291/1488  3.93  4.36  4.47  4.41  3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   1   1   4  10  4.44 1263/1493  4.44  4.81  4.73  4.65  4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   5   3   8  4.19 1010/1486  4.19  4.30  4.32  4.26  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   1   2   5   8  4.25  955/1489  4.25  4.37  4.32  4.22  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 3 0   1   2   2   5  4.10  653/1277  4.10  4.50  4.03  3.91  4.10


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0  0   0   1   1   5  4.57  400/1279  4.57  4.44  4.17  3.96  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0  0   0   0   2   5  4.71  458/1270  4.71  4.74  4.35  4.09  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0  0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1269  5.00  5.00  4.35  4.09  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 12   0   2   0   2   0   3  3.29  764/ 878  3.29  3.93  4.05  3.91  3.29


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  18   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 234  ****  ****  4.23  4.08  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 240  ****  ****  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0  0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 229  ****  ****  4.51  4.43  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.29  4.27  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 18   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/ 379  ****  ****  4.20  4.15  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72  4.52  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69  4.52  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 18  0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64  4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61  4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  ****  4.01  3.78  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 18   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  52  ****  ****  4.48  4.20  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  48  ****  ****  4.40  4.11  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  44  ****  ****  4.73  4.71  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   18   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.57  4.72  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 18   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 326  ****  ****  4.03  3.64  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  40  ****  ****  4.60  4.44  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  24  ****  ****  4.83  4.71  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.67  4.68  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18   0   0   0   0   1   0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.78  4.65  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18   0   0   0   1   0   0  3.00 ****/ 382  ****  ****  4.08  3.86  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   2   0.00-0.99   0   A   8   Required for Majors 12   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   0   1.00-1.99   0   B   8
 56-83   3   2.00-2.99   2   C   0   General   2   Under-grad   19   Non-major   19
 84-150   4   3.00-3.49   3   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   2   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P   0   responses to be significant
                                              I   0   Other   2
                                              ?   0

```
Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101                University of Maryland                          Page 927
Title          HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH         Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    WELCH, G.      (Instr. A)      Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   8                   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  0  1  3  3  3.88 1266/1576  3.88  3.90  4.30 4.11  3.88
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  939/1576  4.25  4.20  4.27 4.18  4.25
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1342  5.00  4.73  4.32 4.19  5.00
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  249/1520  4.75  4.43  4.25 4.09  4.75
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  5  2  4.13  778/1465  4.13  4.21  4.12 4.02  4.13
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 2 4  4.13  816/1434  4.13  4.15  4.14 3.94  4.13
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  1  2  5  4.50  527/1547  4.50  4.28  4.19 4.10  4.50
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  527/1574  4.88  4.86  4.64 4.59  4.88
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 4 1 1  3.50 1303/1554  4.00  3.77  4.10 4.01  4.00

                   Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  970/1488  4.57  4.36  4.47 4.41  4.57
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1493  5.00  4.81  4.73 4.65  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  936/1486  4.36  4.30  4.32 4.26  4.36
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  1  0  2  4  4.29  934/1489  4.43  4.37  4.32 4.22  4.43
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3 0 1 0 0 4  4.40  404/1277  4.70  4.50  4.03 3.91  4.70

                   Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  1  0  0  1  6  4.38  575/1279  4.38  4.44  4.17 3.96  4.38
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  412/1270  4.75  4.74  4.35 4.09  4.75
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 0 8  5.00    1/1269  5.00  5.00  4.35 4.09  5.00
 4. Were special techniques successful                  0   4  0  1  0  0  3  4.25  367/ 878  4.25  3.93  4.05 3.91  4.25

                   Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  ****  4.72 4.52  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.69 4.52  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  ****  4.64 4.43  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.61 4.55  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 375  ****  ****  4.01 3.78  ****
```

```
                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades      Reasons              Type              Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99   0       A   5       Required for Majors  2    Graduate     0     Major       0
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99   1       B   2
  56-83     2       2.00-2.99   0       C   0       General              0    Under-grad   8     Non-major   8
  84-150    1       3.00-3.49   2       D   0
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   3       F   0       Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                4
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101                    University of Maryland                                    Page  928
Title          HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH             Baltimore County                                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    BROWN, ERIC J.  (Instr. B)         Spring 2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    8
Questionnaires: 8                         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   0   1   3   3  3.88 1266/1576  3.88   3.90  4.30 4.11  3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   2   2   4  4.25  939/1576  4.25   4.20  4.27 4.18  4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   6   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/1342  5.00   4.73  4.32 4.19  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   0   7  4.75  249/1520  4.75   4.43  4.25 4.09  4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   5   2  4.13  778/1465  4.13   4.21  4.12 4.02  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   1   2   4  4.13  816/1434  4.13   4.15  4.14 3.94  4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   2   5  4.50  527/1547  4.50   4.28  4.19 4.10  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  527/1574  4.88   4.86  4.64 4.59  4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0  0   1   1   4  4.50  395/1554  4.00   3.77  4.10 4.01  4.00

                    Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  589/1488  4.57   4.36  4.47 4.41  4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1493  5.00   4.81  4.73 4.65  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   1   0   1   5  4.43  792/1486  4.36   4.30  4.32 4.26  4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57  614/1489  4.43   4.37  4.32 4.22  4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3  0   0   0   0   3  5.00    1/1277  4.70   4.50  4.03 3.91  4.70

                    Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   1   0   0   1   6  4.38  575/1279  4.38   4.44  4.17 3.96  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   1   0   7  4.75  412/1270  4.75   4.74  4.35 4.09  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1269  5.00   5.00  4.35 4.09  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   4   0   1   0   0   3  4.25  367/ 878  4.25   3.93  4.05 3.91  4.25

                    Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  85  ****   ****  4.72 4.52  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 7 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****   ****  4.69 4.52  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 7  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  72  ****   ****  4.64 4.43  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****   ****  4.61 4.55  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                7   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 375  ****   ****  4.01 3.78  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						