

Course-Section: HCST 100 1
 Title Human Context/Sci/Tech
 Instructor: Tatarewicz,Jose (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 864
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	4	4	7	9	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	9	3.52	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	8	3.60	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	3.77	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	3.68	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	9	3.16	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	4.92	466/1506	4.92	4.71	4.67	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	2	0	6	10	2	3.50	1241/1463	3.56	3.40	4.09	4.02	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	5	7	12	4.00	1203/1438	4.02	3.68	4.46	4.44	4.02
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	4	22	4.64	1037/1421	4.63	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	6	5	11	3.70	1222/1411	3.83	3.44	4.31	4.27	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	4	2	6	10	3.44	1282/1405	3.45	3.30	4.32	4.27	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	6	7	4	7	3.40	1031/1236	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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HCST 100 1
 Title Human Context/Sci/Tech
 Instructor: Brown, Eric J (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 865
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	4	4	4	7	9	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	9	3.52	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	8	3.60	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	3.77	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	3.68	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	9	3.16	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	4.92	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	2	3.61	1200/1463	3.56	3.40	4.09	4.02	3.56
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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: HCST 100H 2
 Title Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech
 Instructor: Brown, Eric J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 866
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
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	0	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	2.67	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	3.00	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	0	2.33	1209/1236	2.33	3.03	4.00	3.87	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 Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	0	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	0				
			? 0						

Course-Section: HCST 100H 2
 Title Hum Contxt of Sci/Tech
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 867
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

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	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 Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			