Course-Section: HCST 100 01 University of Maryland Title Human Context/Sci/Tech

Baltimore County Spring 2010

Page 827

JUN 28, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 36 Questionnaires: 22 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

Brown, Eric J

							Frequencies					Instructor		Course Dept		TIMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions					NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Conoro																	
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	3	4	7	Ω	2 01	1159/1447	3.91	3.91	4.31	4.18	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	1	4	2	6	9		1203/1447		3.82	4.27	4.30	3.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals					0	16	1	0	1	2	2		1096/1241		3.67	4.33	4.25	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	1	2	0	6	4	9		1107/1402		3.86	4.24	4.15	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					1	0	0	0	6	6	9	4.14	- ,		4.14	4.11	4.03	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned					1	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05			4.05	4.14	3.99	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					1	0	0	2	5	3	11	4.10	919/1427	4.10	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled					1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.90	4.90	4.69	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness					2	0	1	1	4	11	3	3.70	1125/1434	3.70	3.70	4.10	4.10	3.70	
		Lectur	e																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	3	1	6	12	4.23	1063/1387	4.23	4.23	4.46	4.46	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	264/1387	4.95	4.95	4.73	4.71	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	1	1	2	7	11	4.18	936/1386		4.18	4.32	4.32	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	971/1380	4.14	4.14	4.32	4.31	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					1	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	574/1193	4.14	4.14	4.02	3.99	4.14	
		Discus	sion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					10	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.00	4.15	3.95	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate					10	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.50	4.35	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					10	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.75	4.38	4.17	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful					10	7	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/ 800	****	****	4.06	3.95	****	
				Frequ	ıency	, Dist	rib	utio	n										
Credita E	Reasons								ጥኒን	ne			Majors	•					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades													Type 			ma joi s			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Required for Major			ajor	s	s 9 Graduat		e 0		Major		0		
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		Gamasa 1				10		1					0.0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 3		General					10		Under-grad 22		22	Non-major		22	
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0							0							1-	
Grad.	0	5.50 1.00				Electives					2			#### - Means there are not en				lu	
				P 0 I 0		0-1	Other				0		responses to be signif			ııııcar	ıcant		
				T 0		Uti	ıer					0							