

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1454  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1352/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	7	3.65	1421/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	4	4	3.12	1351/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	6	3.65	1338/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1195/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	6	3.65	1129/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	837/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	2	0	0	4	1	3.29	1409/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	863/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	1060/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	779/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	5	6	3.93	1144/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	1	0	1	8	4.00	623/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1074/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	0	2	5	3.60	1192/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1157/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	682/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	69/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	71/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	43/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	42/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1454  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1455  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	2	2	2	3	8	3.76	1352/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	2	4	7	3.65	1421/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	4	4	3.12	1351/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.12	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	6	3.65	1338/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	4	3	3	3.58	1195/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	5	6	3.65	1129/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	7	4.24	837/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1318/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1069/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1033/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	973/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.26	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1385/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	529/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1074/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	3	0	0	2	5	3.60	1192/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1157/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	682/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	69/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.43	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	71/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	43/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.86	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	42/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.86	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1455  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1456  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	1	4	8	4	3.72	1378/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1193/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	8	3	4	3.44	1287/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	929/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	6	5	1	3.13	1399/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	8	6	2	3.39	1271/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	718/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1102/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	708/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	1060/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1016/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	11	2	3.71	1259/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	5	9	3	3.88	746/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	840/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	959/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	944/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	2	4	3	5	3.79	590/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.79	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	48/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.59	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	60/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	87/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.69	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	79/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.65	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	18/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0	Electives 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 6

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1457  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	977/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	926/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	954/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	455/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	942/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	478/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	694/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1155/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	286/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	405/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	832/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	586/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	494/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	854/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	112/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	57/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	79/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	56/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1457  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1458  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	977/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	926/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	954/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	455/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	942/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	478/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	694/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	494/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	854/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	112/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.36	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	57/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	79/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.64	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	56/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.54	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	



Course-Section: SCI 100 0103  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1458  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1459  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	1055/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	1003/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	7	4	3.72	1190/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	751/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	4	9	1	3.56	1206/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	5	6	3.94	896/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1044/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	766/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1022/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	807/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	1331/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	956/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	638/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	2	0	4	8	4.07	595/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	903/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1056/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	841/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	103/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	109/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.45	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	75/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0104  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1459  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1460  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	1318/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1090/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	1	6	3.67	1219/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	967/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1330/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	667/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1198/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	2	4.00	889/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	397/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1033/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	462/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	860/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	297/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1146/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	897/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	64/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	49/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	35/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0105  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1461  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	1318/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	1090/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	1	6	3.67	1219/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	967/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	1330/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	667/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	6	3.88	1198/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1109/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1223/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1215/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	505/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	965/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1146/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	897/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	64/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.81	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	49/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.81	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	35/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
-----					
			Required for Majors	12	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Non-major
			Other	4	
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1462  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	2	8	6	3.94	1206/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	840/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	722/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	8	4.22	822/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1069/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	958/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	656/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	706/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	889/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	435/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	597/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	428/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	1	13	4.28	882/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	0	1	13	4.41	337/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	0	2	10	4.20	675/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	1	11	4.40	694/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	647/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	107/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.79	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	26/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.82	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	62/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	49/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.82	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	68/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	42/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	22/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	14/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	4.80	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0201  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1462  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1463  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	4	4	5	4	3.53	1488/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	4	6	3.94	1193/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	813/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	862/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	6	2	3	3.13	1399/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	2	7	3.81	1003/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	965/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	4	9	1	3.60	1270/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	1189/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	890/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	758/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	1010/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	2	9	4.13	561/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	950/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	678/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	721/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	201/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	97/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.27	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	123/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.27	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	97/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.64	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	85/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	29/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.73	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	



Course-Section: SCI 100 0202  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1463  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	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	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1464  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	4	2	3	5	6	3.35	1541/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	5	9	4.05	1052/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	8	3.95	1029/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	5	9	3.85	1192/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	1195/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	2	7	6	3.50	1212/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	3	3	7	3.30	1461/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	1	8	1	0	2.54	1552/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	807/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	8	9	4.39	1286/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	713/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	5	1	3	8	3.67	1274/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	4	2	9	3.94	687/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	770/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	816/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	647/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	290/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.36	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	51/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	80/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	73/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	40/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	41/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.64	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0204  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1464  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1465  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	0	2	4	5	6	3.88	1266/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1090/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	3	7	3.88	1099/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	881/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	981/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	7	5	4.00	824/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	965/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1214/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	629/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	328/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	779/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1048/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	451/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1171/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	983/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	944/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	399/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	120/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.08	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	89/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.46	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	57/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.79	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	106/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.46	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	91/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.31	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0301  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1465  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1466  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1565/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1481/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	7	3	3.44	1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	4	4	3.53	1394/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	2	0	2	2.25	1516/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	3	3	3.06	1401/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	5	5	3.63	1349/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	721/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	6	2	0	2.80	1525/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	1213/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	1136/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	1083/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1344/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	545/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	863/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	740/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	88/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	76/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.53	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	51/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	97/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SCI 100 0302  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1467  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	3	2	3	4	4	3.25	1565/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1481/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	7	3	3.44	1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	4	4	3.53	1394/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	5	3	2	0	2	2.25	1516/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	3	3	3.06	1401/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	5	5	3.63	1349/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	721/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1237/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1188/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1083/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	638/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.98	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	770/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	863/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	740/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	88/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	76/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.53	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	51/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	23/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.93	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	1	3	2	9	4.27	97/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1468  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	4	4	5	3	3.44	1520/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1281/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1261/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	5	4	0	3.08	1411/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	5	6	1	3.33	1303/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	5	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	510/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	776/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	886/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	882/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	911/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	7	1	3.70	1002/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1124/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1143/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	794/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	45/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	75/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	68/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	29/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	



Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1468  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1469  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	4	4	5	3	3.44	1520/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	5	3.88	1281/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	3	3.44	1290/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1261/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	3	5	4	0	3.08	1411/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	5	6	1	3.33	1303/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	5	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1375/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1334/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1136/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1077/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	545/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	7	1	3.70	1002/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1124/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1143/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	4	3	1	3.30	794/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.30	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	45/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.64	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	75/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	76/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	68/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	29/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0303  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1469  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1470  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	2	4	6	6	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	4	4	3.26	1550/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	2	3.00	1363/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1398/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	4	2	2	0	2.08	1520/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	8	2	2	3.06	1401/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1190/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	811/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	1	9	2	0	2.67	1541/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	1220/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	1247/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	5	6	3	3.41	1380/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	1	4	5	2	3.13	1426/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	1117/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1322/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1220/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1350/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	910/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	2.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	74/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	51/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	40/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	19/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1470  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1471  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	2	4	6	6	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.63	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	5	4	4	3.26	1550/1639	3.85	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	5	5	2	3.00	1363/1397	3.61	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	4	5	3.53	1398/1583	3.94	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	5	4	2	2	0	2.08	1520/1532	3.19	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	8	2	2	3.06	1401/1504	3.66	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	8	3	6	3.88	1190/1612	3.97	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	811/1635	4.93	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	7	0	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.52	3.55	4.08	3.95	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	529/1518	4.44	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1188/1520	4.66	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	973/1517	4.27	4.25	4.27	4.20	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	972/1550	4.03	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	943/1295	4.11	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	1322/1398	3.75	3.72	4.07	3.85	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	1220/1391	4.02	3.93	4.30	4.07	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	3	4	1	1	2.80	1350/1388	3.94	3.91	4.28	4.01	2.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	910/ 958	3.80	3.79	3.93	3.71	2.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	74/ 224	4.46	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 240	4.51	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	51/ 219	4.78	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	40/ 215	4.75	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.87	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	19/ 198	4.63	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.80	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.80	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100 0304  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1471  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100H 0101  
 Title WATER: INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1472  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	0	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1318/1639	3.81	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	633/1639	4.44	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	859/1397	4.19	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	640/1583	4.38	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	6	2	5	3.79	1012/1532	3.79	3.20	4.01	3.88	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	166/1612	4.80	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	913/1635	4.73	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1125/1579	3.82	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	745/1518	4.56	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	498/1517	4.59	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	10	4.11	1019/1550	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	428/1295	4.29	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	502/1398	4.42	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	945/1391	4.08	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	2	2	9	4.29	815/1388	4.29	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	91/ 958	4.83	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	74/ 224	4.40	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.40	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	89/ 240	4.47	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	51/ 219	4.80	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	122/ 215	4.40	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.40	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	28/ 198	4.73	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.73	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Under-grad 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Non-major 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



I	0	Other	3
?	0		

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1473  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	726/1639	3.85	3.67	4.27	4.08	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	382/1639	3.73	3.86	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	302/1397	3.63	3.64	4.28	4.18	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	347/1583	3.88	3.95	4.19	4.01	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	729/1532	3.09	3.20	4.01	3.88	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	824/1504	3.56	3.66	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	270/1612	3.57	3.95	4.16	4.10	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.76	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	496/1579	3.64	3.55	4.08	3.95	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	227/1518	4.18	4.41	4.43	4.38	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	328/1520	4.35	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	263/1517	3.99	4.25	4.27	4.20	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	242/1550	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.17	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	150/1295	4.02	4.10	3.94	3.84	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	494/1398	3.25	3.72	4.07	3.85	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	616/1391	3.35	3.93	4.30	4.07	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	721/1388	3.59	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	2	3	0	9	4.14	411/ 958	3.38	3.79	3.93	3.71	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	84/ 224	3.94	4.39	4.10	3.90	4.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	98/ 240	3.90	4.42	4.11	4.01	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	135/ 219	4.20	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.43	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	70/ 215	4.37	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	21/ 198	4.38	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.79	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	3.43	3.89	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	3.50	3.93	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	5.00	4.75	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0101  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: READEL, KARIN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1473  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: STAFF (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1474  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1466/1639	3.85	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	4	2	3.29	1546/1639	3.73	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1356/1397	3.63	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	1406/1583	3.88	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	1	2	2.60	1491/1532	3.09	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	3	4	3.33	1303/1504	3.56	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	1	3	3	3.00	1519/1612	3.57	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	968/1635	4.76	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1251/1579	3.64	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1213/1518	4.18	4.41	4.43	4.38	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	1363/1520	4.35	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	5	3	3.69	1283/1517	3.99	4.25	4.27	4.20	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1318/1550	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	832/1295	4.02	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1342/1398	3.25	3.72	4.07	3.85	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1363/1391	3.35	3.93	4.30	4.07	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	5	2	3	2	3.17	1292/1388	3.59	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.38	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	180/ 224	3.94	4.39	4.10	3.90	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	198/ 240	3.90	4.42	4.11	4.01	3.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	175/ 219	4.20	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	137/ 215	4.37	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	110/ 198	4.38	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	42/ 52	3.43	3.89	4.04	3.61	3.43	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	41/ 53	3.50	3.93	4.05	3.51	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	1			

Course-Section: SCI 100Y 0102  
 Title WATER; INTERDIS STUDY  
 Instructor: MERES (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1475  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	2	2	6	3	3.57	1466/1639	3.85	3.67	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	4	2	3.29	1546/1639	3.73	3.86	4.22	4.17	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	3	2	3.07	1356/1397	3.63	3.64	4.28	4.18	3.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	1406/1583	3.88	3.95	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	4	1	2	1	2	2.60	1491/1532	3.09	3.20	4.01	3.88	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	1	3	4	3.33	1303/1504	3.56	3.66	4.05	3.78	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	1	3	3	3.00	1519/1612	3.57	3.95	4.16	4.10	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	968/1635	4.76	4.90	4.65	4.56	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1516/1579	3.64	3.55	4.08	3.95	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1411/1518	4.18	4.41	4.43	4.38	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1447/1520	4.35	4.63	4.70	4.61	4.05	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	2	0	2	3	3.50	1347/1517	3.99	4.25	4.27	4.20	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	1306/1550	3.98	4.03	4.22	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	943/1295	4.02	4.10	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	1342/1398	3.25	3.72	4.07	3.85	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	2	2	1	2.78	1363/1391	3.35	3.93	4.30	4.07	2.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	5	2	3	2	3.17	1292/1388	3.59	3.91	4.28	4.01	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.38	3.79	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	180/ 224	3.94	4.39	4.10	3.90	3.73	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	198/ 240	3.90	4.42	4.11	4.01	3.64	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	175/ 219	4.20	4.70	4.44	4.44	4.09	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	137/ 215	4.37	4.68	4.35	4.43	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	110/ 198	4.38	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 78	****	****	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	42/ 52	3.43	3.89	4.04	3.61	3.43	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	41/ 53	3.50	3.93	4.05	3.51	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	1			