Course-Section: HCST 100 0101 University of Maryland Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS

Enrollment: 35 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 923

		Frequencies				T		Carres Dans		IIMDG I arral		0			
Out on the bound	2.77	_	377		-		4	_		ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NI	R	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	2	4	6	2	3.57	1518/1670	3.57	3.19	4.31	4.23	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expecte	ed goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1499/1666	3.54	3.18	4.27	4.30	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expect	ted goals (0	7	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	964/1406	4.14	3.38	4.32	4.31	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expecte	ed goals	1	1	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	3.39	4.24	4.17	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what	you learned (0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	808/1566	4.07	3.86	4.07	4.03	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what	at you learned (0	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1212/1528	3.64	3.38	4.12	4.00	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	- (0	0	1	3	5	2	3	3.21	1550/1650	3.21	3.40	4.22	4.28	3.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	(0	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness				0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1191/1626	3.83	3.67	4.11	4.07	3.83
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepare	ared (0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	1185/1559	4.21	3.74	4.46	4.47	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the		0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	477/1560		4.39	4.72	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explain	_	1	0	0	1	0	9	3		1116/1549	4.08	3.53	4.31	4.32	4.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you	_	1	0	1	2	0	5	5		1256/1546	3.85	3.62	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your		1	1	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	807/1323		3.64	4.00	3.91	3.92
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what	vou learned	4	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1141/1384	3.40	3.80	4.10	3.92	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to	-	4	0	1	0	5	2	2		1228/1378	3.40	4.02	4.29	4.09	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and ope		4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	751/1378	4.40	4.58	4.31	4.08	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful		4	1	0	3	2	3	1	3.22	799/ 904		3.74	4.03	3.94	
1. Were special econniques successivi		1	_	O	5	2	3	_	3.22	7557 501	3.22	3.71	1.03	3.71	3.22
	Frequenc	су	Dist	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Ex	xpected Grades		Reasons					Ту	pe		Majors				

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	1						

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

University of Maryland Page 924 AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS (Instr. A) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5			
Questionnaires:	4	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

		Frequencies						Inst	tructor	Course Dept		UMBC Leve		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	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	3.19	4.31	4.23	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	3.18	4.27	4.30	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	3.38	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1531/1615	3.25	3.39	4.24	4.17	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	3.86	4.07	4.03	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1399/1528	3.25	3.38	4.12	4.00	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	3.40	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1384/1626	3.58	3.67	4.11	4.07	3.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1461/1559	3.50	3.74	4.46	4.47	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1504/1560	4.13	4.39	4.72	4.68	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1489/1549	3.25	3.53	4.31	4.32	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1473/1546	3.50	3.62	4.32	4.32	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.80	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.02	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.58	4.31	4.08	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.74	4.03	3.94	4.00
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades		Reasons							Ту	pe		Majors		
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Required for Majors 1							Graduat	 e	0	 Maior		0

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

Course-Section: HCST 100H 0101 University of Maryland Page 925
Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: BROWN, ERIC J. (Instr. B) Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

Instructor

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	5					
Ouestionnaires:	4		Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

D 0

Ρ

I

?

0

0

0

0

1

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

84-150

Grad.

	Questions						1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did y	ou gain n	ew insights,skil	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1620/1670	3.00	3.19	4.31	4.23	3.00
2. Did t	he instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1603/1666	3.00	3.18	4.27	4.30	3.00
3. Did t	he exam q	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1343/1406	3.00	3.38	4.32	4.31	3.00
4. Did o	4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1531/1615	3.25	3.39	4.24	4.17	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1144/1566	3.75	3.86	4.07	4.03	3.75
6. Did w	ritten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1399/1528	3.25	3.38	4.12	4.00	3.25
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ined	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1460/1650	3.50	3.40	4.22	4.28	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	5.00	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1312/1626	3.58	3.67	4.11	4.07	3.58
		Lecture	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1461/1559	3.50	3.74	4.46	4.47	3.50
2. Did t	he instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1248/1560	4.13	4.39	4.72	4.68	4.13
3. Was 1	ecture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1389/1549	3.25	3.53	4.31	4.32	3.25
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1139/1546	3.50	3.62	4.32	4.32	3.50
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enh	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.64	4.00	3.91	3.50
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	3.80	4.10	3.92	4.00
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.02	4.29	4.09	4.33
3. Did ti	he instru	ctor encourage i	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.58	4.31	4.08	4.67
4. Were	special to	echniques succes	ssful		1	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	3.74	4.03	3.94	4.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Rea	asons	3			Тур	e			Majors	\$
				·														
00-27 28-55	1 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 3 B 1	Required for Majors					3	1	Graduate	2	0	Majo	r	0	
28-55 56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					0	Under-gr	he:	4	Non-	major	4		
30 03	_	2.00 2.00	-	0	General						-	onacı gı		-	MOII-IIIa JOI		-	

Electives

Other

0

1