Course-Section: HCST 100 1 University of Maryland Title Human Context/Sci/Tech

Tatarewicz, Jose (Instr. A)

Questions

Instructor:

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

3

Baltimore County Fall 2009

1

3

Instructor

Rank

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Page 864 MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	52				
Questionnaires:	29	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

F

Ρ

I

0

0

0

0

		2	-				_	_	_		-							
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	1	0	4	4	4	7	9	3.46	1409/1509	3.46	3.23	4.31	4.18	3.46
_	_	ctor make clear			2	0	2	3	10	3	9	3.52	1367/1509	3.52	3.26	4.26	4.25	3.52
3. Did th	ne exam qu	estions reflec	t the e	expected goals	1	20	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	668/1287	4.38	3.69	4.30	4.24	4.38
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	3	1	1	4	7	5	8	3.60	1271/1459	3.60	3.42	4.22	4.11	3.60
				what you learned	3	0	2	4	4	4	12	3.77	1038/1406	3.77	3.51	4.09	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							4	2	2	7	10	3.68	1095/1384	3.68	3.51	4.11	3.98	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							5	6	3	2	9	3.16	1388/1489	3.16	3.33	4.17	4.20	3.16
8. How ma	8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	2	23	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.71	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	6	10	2	3.50	1241/1463	3.56	3.40	4.09	4.02	3.56
		Lecture				0		_	_	_				4 00				4 00
	 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 						1	2	5	7	12		1203/1438		3.68	4.46		4.02
					Ι	0	1	0	1	4	22		1037/1421		4.75	4.73	4.66	
				explained clearly	2		3	2	6				1222/1411	3.83	3.44	4.31		3.83
		es contribute t		2	2	0	5 1	4	2				1282/1405		3.30			3.45
5. Did au	ldiovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	3	1	Τ	6	7	4	7	3.40	1031/1236	3.38	3.03	4.00	3.87	3.38
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu			what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	844/1260	3.93	3.96	4.14	3.95	3.93
				ed to participate	15	0	0	1	4	2		4.07		4.07	4.29	4.33		4.07
		_	_	nd open discussion	15	0	0	0		4		4.43		4.43	4.34	4.38	4.18	4.43
		echniques succe		ia open arroarron	15	4	2	1	3	3		3.00	,					3.00
	_	1											, , ,					
				Frequ	ıency	Dis	trib	utic	n									
G	The second of the second				ъ.		_			m				No				
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								ason	.s 			Тур	oe 			Majors 	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Re	quir	ed f	or M	lajor	s	6	Graduate	9	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	в 13	1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2					-						_		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 7		Ge	nera	1			1	.3	Under-gr	rad 2	29	Non-	-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 1														
															_			_

Electives

Other

Course-Section: HCST 100 1 University of Maryland Title Human Context/Sci/Tech

Baltimore County Brown, Eric J (Instr. B) Fall 2009

Enrollment: 52

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 29

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 865

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies					Inst	Instructor		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	1	Λ	4	4	4	7	a	3 46	1409/1509	3.46	3.23	4.31	4.18	3.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	10	3	٥		1367/1509	3.52	3.26	4.26	4.25	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	20	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	668/1287	4.38	3.69	4.30	4.24	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	4	7	5	Ω		1271/1459	3.60	3.42	4.22	4.11	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	4	4	12		1038/1406	3.77	3.51	4.09	4.02	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	2	7	10		1095/1384	3.68	3.51	4.11	3.98	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	5	6	3	2	Τ0		1388/1489	3.16	3.33	4.17	4.20	3.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	23		466/1506	4.92	4.71	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	6	9	23		1200/1463	3.56	3.40	4.09	4.02	3.56
7. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	тт	U		U	O	9		3.01	1200/1403	3.50	3.40	4.03	4.02	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1191/1438	4.02	3.68	4.46	4.44	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	1072/1421	4.63	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	1098/1411	3.83	3.44	4.31	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	2	8	6	3.45	1279/1405	3.45	3.30	4.32	4.27	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	6	5	4	6	3.36	1045/1236	3.38	3.03	4.00	3.87	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	844/1260	3.93	3.96	4.14	3.95	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	883/1255	4.07	4.29	4.33	4.15	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.34	4.38	4.18	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	15	4	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	2.63	4.03	3.89	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	·	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	13	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
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	3	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: HCST 100H 2 University of Maryland Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech Baltimore County

Title Instructor: Brown, Eric J (Instr. A) Fall 2009

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 866

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Tngt	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1473/1509	3.00	3.23	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	3.26	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	3.69	4.30	4.24	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1387/1459	3.25	3.42	4.22	4.11	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1283/1406	3.25	3.51	4.09	4.02	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.51	4.11	3.98	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	3.33	4.17	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.71	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1241/1463	3.25	3.40	4.09	4.02	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	Ο	3 00	1406/1438	3.00	3.68	4.46	4.44	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	1	0		1392/1411	2.67	3.44	4.31	4.27	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	0		1348/1405	3.00	3.30	4.32	4.27	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	0	n		1209/1236	2.33	3.03	4.00	3.87	2.33
J. Did addiovibual ecciniques ciniance your understanding	_	O	U	2	_	O	O	2.55	1200/1200	2.55	3.03	1.00	3.07	2.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.96	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.29	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	863/ 873	2.25	2.63	4.03	3.89	2.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Ω						

Course-Section: HCST 100H 2 University of Maryland Page 867 Title Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

(Instr. B)

Instructor: Enrollment:

Ouestionnaires: 4

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	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	0	2	0	3.00	1473/1509	3.00	3.23	4.31	4.18	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	3.26	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	3.69	4.30	4.24	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1387/1459	3.25	3.42	4.22	4.11	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1283/1406	3.25	3.51	4.09	4.02	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.51	4.11	3.98	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	3.33	4.17	4.20	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.71	4.67	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1392/1463	3.25	3.40	4.09	4.02	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.96	4.14	3.95	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.29	4.33	4.15	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.34	4.38	4.18	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	2.25	863/ 873	2.25	2.63	4.03	3.89	2.25

Frequency Distribution

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