

Course-Section: HCST 100 0101  
 Title HUMAN CONTEXT/SCI/TECH  
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 956  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	0	6	1	6	10	8	3.42	1521/1649	3.42	3.42	4.28	4.11	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	3	5	11	7	3.47	1499/1648	3.47	3.47	4.23	4.16	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1034/1375	3.91	3.91	4.27	4.10	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	3	1	5	8	10	3.78	1275/1595	3.78	3.78	4.20	4.03	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	6	8	11	3.73	1084/1533	3.73	3.73	4.04	3.87	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	0	5	9	11	3.79	1095/1512	3.79	3.79	4.10	3.86	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	4	5	7	10	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	3.50	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1646	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	5	11	5	3.83	1132/1621	3.83	3.83	4.06	3.96	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	3	9	16	4.34	1041/1568	4.34	4.34	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	858/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	5	11	12	4.14	1055/1564	4.14	4.14	4.28	4.20	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	8	14	4.07	1093/1559	4.07	4.07	4.29	4.20	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	1	3	12	9	3.72	935/1352	3.72	3.72	3.98	3.86	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	0	4	8	3	3.44	1105/1384	3.44	3.44	4.08	3.86	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	7	7	4	3.68	1137/1382	3.68	3.68	4.29	4.03	3.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	3	2	4	9	3.89	1035/1368	3.89	3.89	4.30	4.01	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	3	0	2	1	1	2.57	****/ 948	****	****	3.95	3.75	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	****	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 18	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 12					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General 8	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 5				
				? 0					