Course-Section: HCST 100 0101

Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 35

Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 926 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	_	Mean	Mean	Mean
Gamana 1														
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		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		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		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		4.15	4.14	3.94	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	3	9		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		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		****	****	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	****

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101

Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH

Instructor: WELCH, G.

Enrollment: 35
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 926 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101 University of Maryland Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: WELCH, G. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnair
--

Page 927

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions				Fr	eauei	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Quescions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_		Mean	
		General															
1. Did you	ı qain ne	w insights, skills fr	om this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1266/1576	3.88	3.90	4.30	4.11	3.8
		tor make clear the e		0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.2
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions 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 oth	ner evalu	ations reflect the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.43	4.25	4.09	4.7
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.21	4.12	4.02	4.1
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.15	4.14	3.94	4.1
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.10	4.5
8. How man	ny times	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.86	4.64	4.59	4.8
9. How wou	ıld you g	rade the overall tea	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1303/1554	4.00	3.77	4.10	4.01	4.0
		Lecture															
		ctor's lectures well		1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	970/1488	4.57	4.36	4.47	4.41	4.5
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.81	4.73	4.65	5.0
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	936/1486	4.36	4.30	4.32	4.26	4.3
		s contribute to what		1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	934/1489	4.43	4.37	4.32		4.4
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enhance	your understanding	0	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	404/1277	4.70	4.50	4.03	3.91	4.7
		Discussion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contribute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	575/1279	4.38	4.44	4.17	3.96	4.3
2. Were al	ll studen	ts actively encourag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.74	4.35	4.09	4.7
		tor encourage fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269		5.00	4.35	4.09	5.0
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques successful		0	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	3.93	4.05	3.91	4.2
		Seminar															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant to th	e announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	* * *
		tor available for in		7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79		****	4.69	4.52	***
		ojects contribute to		7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	* * *
		ns contribute to wha		7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	* * *
5. Were cr	riteria f	or grading made clea	r	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	***	****	4.01	3.78	***
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 1	A 5 B 2		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	 s	2	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	1	Expected	d 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	В	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101 University of Maryland Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH Baltimore County

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

Page 928

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BROWN, ERIC J. (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

Student	('Ollrge	Evaluation	Ouestionnai	re

				Fr	Frequencies				Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera																
1 Did vo	u gain ne	Genera ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3 88	1266/1576	3.88	3.90	4.30	4.11	3.88
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.20	4.27	4.18	4.25
					0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.73	4.32	4.19	5.00
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	0	7	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.43	4.25	4.09	4.75
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	5	2	4.13	778/1465	4.13	4.21	4.12	4.02	4.13
				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
					0	0	0	0	1	2	_	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.13	4.19	4.10	4.50
	7. Was the grading system clearly explained 3. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1547	4.88	4.26	4.19	4.10	4.88
	-			abina offoatiwonoga	0 2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	395/1554		3.77	4.10	4.01	4.00
9. HOW WO	uia you g	grade the overa	II tea	ching effectiveness	۷	U	U	U	1	1	4	4.50	395/1554	4.00	3.//	4.10	4.01	4.00
		Lectur	е															
l. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						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						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						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 aud	diovisual	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	4.70	4.50	4.03	3.91	4.70
		Discus	sion															
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
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.74	4.35	4.09	4.75
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.09	5.00
		echniques succe		d open discussion	0	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	3.93	4.05		4.25
T. WELE B	peciai ce	eciniiques succe	SSIUI		U	-	U	1	U	U	J	1.23	3077 070	1.23	3.75	4.05	3.91	1.23
		Semina																
	_	-		e announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.72	4.52	****
				dividual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	****	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did res	search p	rojects contrib	ute to	what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	***
4. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute	to wha	t you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	e clea	r	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	****	4.01	3.78	****
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
														 -				
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 1	A 5 B 2		ке	quir	ea i	or Ma	ıjor	5	2	Graduat	9	0	Majo	or	0
	-		0			a		1				0	TTm d and a		0	Mari		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	•	C 0		Gei	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0								-			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	JП
				P 0									respons	es to k	e sigr	nificar	ıt	
				I 0		Ot]	her					4						