

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 934
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5	6	12	4.21	939/1639	4.21	4.21	4.27	4.08	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	9	8	3.91	1244/1639	3.91	3.91	4.22	4.17	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1318/1397	3.33	3.33	4.28	4.18	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	2	2	3	4	8	3.74	1275/1583	3.74	3.74	4.19	4.01	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	6	11	4.14	677/1532	4.14	4.14	4.01	3.88	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	0	1	2	9	7	4.16	713/1504	4.16	4.16	4.05	3.78	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	7	3	9	3.90	1175/1612	3.90	3.90	4.16	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	3	14	3	3.90	1056/1579	3.90	3.90	4.08	3.95	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	18	4.70	561/1518	4.70	4.70	4.43	4.38	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	648/1520	4.86	4.86	4.70	4.61	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	8	12	4.30	833/1517	4.30	4.30	4.27	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	823/1550	4.35	4.35	4.22	4.17	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	4	8	9	4.09	581/1295	4.09	4.09	3.94	3.84	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	840/1398	3.94	3.94	4.07	3.85	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1141/1391	3.76	3.76	4.30	4.07	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	375/1388	4.76	4.76	4.28	4.01	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	14	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 958	****	****	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 934
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						