

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 953
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	0	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1353/1674	3.85	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	8	8	4.05	1111/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1029/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	6	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	934/1651	4.20	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	12	3	3.95	1056/1656	3.37	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	5	8	7	4.10	1250/1586	4.15	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	917/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	819/1582	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	867/1575	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	379/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1068/1520	3.71	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	1	12	4.29	865/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	525/1511	4.65	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	773/ 994	3.43	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 953
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 954
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	0	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1353/1674	3.85	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	8	8	4.05	1111/1674	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	15	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1423	****	4.36	4.27	4.16	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	6	8	4.11	1029/1609	4.11	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	6	7	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	6	7	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	934/1651	4.20	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	706/1673	4.90	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1592/1656	3.37	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1191/1586	4.15	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1309/1585	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1582	4.37	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1138/1575	4.18	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	540/1380	4.30	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1068/1520	3.71	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	1	12	4.29	865/1515	4.29	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	525/1511	4.65	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	1	2	7	2	3.43	773/ 994	3.43	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.33	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.33	4.48	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	3.99	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.10	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	3.69	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.32	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	3.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.19	4.45	4.34	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	3.86	4.12	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	3.87	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	3.91	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.39	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.22	4.36	3.92	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.25	4.34	3.88	****	

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 954
 JAN 21, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 955
 JAN 21, 2006
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1377/1656	3.88	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	858/1586	4.58	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	313/1582	4.71	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	692/1575	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	666/1380	3.83	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: BROWN, ERIC J. (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 956
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1674	4.50	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	931/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	490/1609	4.50	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	224/1585	4.67	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	330/1651	4.67	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	719/1656	3.88	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	663/1586	4.58	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.71	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	886/1575	4.42	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	962/1380	3.83	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	205/ 994	4.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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